

FEBRUARY, 1967



POLITICAL
AFFAIRS

Henry Winston
NEGRO-LABOR
UNITY

Herbert Aptheker
SLAVERY AND
THE NEGRO

MONOPOLY CAPITAL:
THE BARAN-SWEEZY MODEL

Hyman Lumer

George Shaw Wheeler

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party, U. S. A.

VOL. XLVI, No. 2

FEBRUARY, 1967

Betty Gannett, Editor Hyman Lumer, Associate Editor

CONTENTS

<i>Henry Winston</i> Forge Negro-Labor Unity	1
<i>Hyman Lumer</i> Monopoly Capital: The Baran-Sweezy Model	11
<i>George Shaw Wheeler</i> A Book of Questionable Scientific Merit	26
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i> Slavery, the Negro and Militancy	36
ON THE JEWISH QUESTION	
<i>Jack Kling</i> Further Probing Needed	44
<i>D. N.</i> The Jewish Community is a Reality	47
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>William Weinstone</i> An Evaluation of Gompers	52
<i>Joe Higgins</i> Labor Faces New Problems	55
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>Joan Bellamy</i> A Valuable Study of Neo-Colonialism	58

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 799 Broadway, Room 618, New York, N. Y. 10003, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; for foreign and Canada: \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

Forge Negro-Labor Unity*

“White backlash” is one of the key weapons in the hands of the ultra-Right in its drive against democracy in this country, which begins with the drive against the Negro people. “White backlash” is a concept which *conceals* the role of the monopolists as well as the role of the ultra-Right. It is a concept intended to be a dagger in the heart of the democratic struggle. It is a weapon against the trade union movement in this country. It must be rejected and exposed for what it is—*a weapon of reaction and fascism in this country.*

No greater mistake could be made than to try to equate the concept of “white backlash” with that of “black power.” The first comes from the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, most war-minded elements of finance capital; the other emerges from an oppressed people fighting for democracy and liberation from capitalist bondage.

Labor—Key Link

The need for correct strategic and tactical leadership is of great concern and is being widely discussed on all levels of leadership within the Negro people’s movement. The theory which guides our Party—Marxism-Leninism—enables us to make a distinct contribution to this discussion. This is an urgent requirement of the moment. Why? Because of the danger on the one hand that the new and positive developments in the labor movement can be dissipated by a reactionary offensive aimed at splitting Negro and white workers, and by the growth on the other hand of nationalist separatist tendencies within the Negro people’s movement which carry with them the concept of “no confidence” in the labor movement. The victory of either of these tendencies would be disastrous both for labor and the Negro people.

It would also be fatal to conclude that new and militant developments in the struggle for Negro rights are possible only outside the labor movement. This line of thinking can likewise be harmful to a successful struggle for full equality. The problem of leadership is to find the road in militant struggle to unite these mass currents and deliver powerful blows for economic, political and social equality.

The key link in the chain leading to accomplishment of such an

*This is a section of the report made to a meeting of the National Committee CPUSA, on December 6, 1966.

objective is the labor movement. In relation to the struggle of the Negro people for economic, political and social equality, the Communist Party must formulate a line of policy which will help to strengthen their connections with the organized millions in this country. For only the organized millions will determine the fate of democracy and peace in our nation. Any other course would be acceptance of a strategy which would separate us from the masses precisely at that moment when the possibilities for making great social advances are greater than ever before. That is why the new developments must be seen in their totality—new developments in *all* democratic movements and first of all in the ranks of organized labor.

It would be wrong in my opinion to view the New Left solely as emerging from the middle-class and student forces in this country. The New Left is growing also within the labor movement, and such a development is of decisive importance. For social forces are emerging whose daily struggle against monopoly exploitation gives special meaning to the present struggle. However, there are varying degrees of consciousness. Comrade Gus Hall in his report laid stress on three levels of movements now taking place: movements for Negro-white unity within the labor movement and other mass organizations; independent movements which may develop outside of the established organizations but which create ties with them based on minimum programs; and advanced movements for unity which are based on programs with higher demands, and which must, of course, also seek to maintain the greatest possible contact with the mass organizations and movements. The qualitative improvements in the work of our Party in support of these developments and in helping to guide them can help to galvanize the millions at the grass roots.

What are we saying here? It is that democracy for all is possible only if it exists for the Negro. The reverse is also true. Democracy for the Negro is possible only if it exists for all. *A mandatory precondition for success in the struggle against reaction is unity of Negro and white.*

Unity at the Point of Production

What then is the starting point for tackling this basic problem of unity which is at the heart of the struggle for democracy in this country? It is the point of production. Why the point of production? It is here that monopoly practices its divisive policies. It is here that monopoly's discriminatory practices against Negroes force them into unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. It is here that monopoly pays Negroes annually billions less than it pays to white workers for corresponding

work. This represents a major source of superprofits derived from the Negro people as a whole.

The wage differential is used by monopoly as a form of bribery of the white workers. The creation of lily-white and ghetto communities is monopoly's attempt to maintain and widen the divisions which begin at the point of production and is designed to maintain the dominance of monopoly over both Negro and white.

The primary issue that is posed is to wipe out discrimination on the job and thus to win for the Negro workers the billions of dollars of which they are now being robbed. With this, the purchasing power of the whole Negro community would be greatly increased.

The relationship of such a struggle to the fight against the ghetto is immediately apparent. But what is also clear is that the struggle to achieve such an objective would not only eliminate this differential between Negro and white but in addition would guarantee that the wage standards for both Negro and white could be raised to new and higher levels. What is evident is that the fight to put an end to the special exploitation of the Negro worker represents the interests of the working class as a whole. Labor must place high on its agenda the ending of inequality in the shops as well as in the community.

Meany's Line

In this connection, let me draw attention to the following important developments:

The importance of the Meany-Randolph confrontation in 1959 was not fully appreciated. Yet this was a development which reflected growing moods of militancy within the ranks of organized labor, moods which affected Negro workers in the first place but large numbers of white workers as well. Randolph's challenge to Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, was supported not only by Negro workers but also by a united Negro people. This unity was in turn supported by progressive white trade unionists, and was a dramatic and high point of the new developments which are growing in the labor movement. Unfortunately, important demonstrative actions such as marches, sit-ins and the like tend more often than not to shove to the background events which flow from such confrontations as the above. Yet it must be said that it is precisely the latter developments that constitute an indispensable rallying point which when joined with the other movements can assure victory for full equality.

The November 1966 issue of the *American Federationist* is devoted exclusively to the problems of the Negro worker. This is the first time in history that this labor journal has been devoted entirely to this

subject. Read it and you will find many inadequacies. Read it and you will find many wrong views. But read it and you will also find views which, if acted upon by progressive forces within the unions, can advance the struggle for equality to a new and higher level.

George Meany is to the right of Johnson on the war in Vietnam. He is notorious for his anti-Communism. Nonetheless Mr. Meany finds it necessary to speak up against discrimination. Obviously the struggle against inequality is in contradiction to a policy which supports a criminal and unjust war against the Vietnamese people and a policy based on anti-Communism. The fact that Mr. Meany raises this question at all is due to new developments among Negro and white workers to advance the struggle for equality on the job. It follows that advanced forces within the ranks of labor desiring to advance the struggle for equality can utilize such expressions to arouse the organized millions. An effective struggle in this sphere must in turn merge with and strengthen the struggles for a rejection of anti-Communism and an end to the war in Vietnam.

Here is an editorial by George Meany which appeared in the same issue of the *American Federationist*. He says among other things:

There is in America today a so-called white backlash. It is deplorable. It was born out of the ability of demagogues to capitalize upon rioting. It stems from unreasoning fear stimulated by the reckless cries of "black power."

In this statement Mr. Meany whitewashes the monopolists. He whitewashes the ultra-Right and places the responsibility for what he terms the "so-called white backlash" upon the struggle of the oppressed Negro people.

Clearly one must reject such a statement. But then there is a second one. He dedicates the AFL-CIO to building a decent America and he continues: "It is poverty and ignorance and despair that are the real root causes of all America's domestic problems."

Two things have to be said here. First, Mr. Meany points up the fact that the AFL-CIO—labor—cannot turn its back upon the struggle for democracy. Neither can it turn its back upon poverty, ignorance and despair. I think that irrespective of how one interprets this observation, it is clear that the Left and advanced progressive forces within the trade unions must give proper consideration to this statement if they wish to give effective aid to the fight for equality in the shops.

At the same time, Mr. Meany argues that the root cause of all of America's domestic ills is poverty, ignorance and despair. Is this correct? Of course not. *The cause of all our domestic ills, the cause of all*

our international problems is monopoly capitalism in this country. Mr. Meany's statement conceals the brutal hand of monopoly, the force responsible for the inequality between Negro and white.

The forces responsible for the criminal war against the people of Vietnam are likewise those of monopoly. The forces that will eventually lay U.S. monopoly capitalism low are the organized millions, Negro and white, who are to be found in the plants of Ford and General Motors, in the steel mills of Gary and Pittsburgh, in the General Electric plants, and in basic industry generally.

It is not possible, however, to develop a consistent struggle for democracy and for socialism unless one becomes concerned with the *immediate* problems of the working class—wages, hours, inequality, speedup, problems flowing from automation, unemployment, Section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act, and so on. It is therefore incumbent upon the New Left which is emerging outside of the labor movement and which regards the labor movement as part of "the establishment" to understand the indispensability of the struggle for immediate demands if they wish to achieve socialism. Socialism is possible of achievement only to the degree that the working class first of all is convinced of its need. That class has to be won at the point of production.

Failure to see this can only mean that the source of the special exploitation of the Negro worker at the point of production, from which the monopolists extract extra surplus value, remains unchallenged. If this is not seen, then all talk about Negro equality is merely phrasemongering.

This problem must be tackled by the labor movement, Negro and white. This is basic to strengthening Negro-white solidarity. It is basic to maintaining, defending and extending the trade union movement in this country. It is basic to the whole question of alliance between labor and the Negro people. It is basic to realizing the objectives of struggle for peace, democracy and equality in this country.

Two Basic Concepts

In this connection, two requirements are posed at one and the same time. First: the indispensability, as a precondition for the strengthening of labor solidarity, of conducting a struggle on the job against monopoly policies which consciously uphold the ideology and practice of white supremacy. Second: the solution of the problem of strengthening the alliance between the labor movement and the Negro people in which success depends upon how the fight for economic equality of the Negro worker is tackled on the job.

The two concepts—labor solidarity and the alliance of labor and the

Negro people—constitute the cornerstone of the struggle for democracy in the USA. The accomplishment of a qualitative improvement in the development of mass struggle against the Administration's war policies in Vietnam and against the ultra-Right is largely dependent upon an understanding of the primacy of this point. This is how our Party places the question. It is this approach which gives substance to the struggle for the solution of the special problems of the Negro people.

Two errors are made on this important question. One is the notion in the labor movement that the problems of Negroes can be solved only when there is full employment for all. This kind of thinking overlooks the central fact that the widespread unemployment aggravated by automation and cybernation hits first and hardest at the Negro worker. An effective struggle for full employment has meaning only if there is a day-to-day fight against discrimination today.

Second is the thinking among nationalist groupings in the Negro community which poses as primary the idea of self-sufficiency of the Negro community. Such a position overlooks the fact that the main mass of the Negro people work for a living in the industries and services outside of the ghetto. While correctly fighting to bring about basic changes within the ghetto, this outlook fails to take into account the fact that the ghetto cannot economically fully absorb this mass of people, that is, give them employment. Moreover, the proponents of this view do not even place for action the need of a resolute struggle among Negro and white workers for a change in the economic status of the Negro workers in *all* areas of the economy. But it is crystal-clear that to give meaning to the fight for economic change in the ghetto, this struggle must be linked to the general fight for changing the economic status of the Negro people in the country as a whole.

The "Freedom Budget" and the Fight for Peace

In this connection, I should like to call attention to A "*Freedom Budget*" for All Americans—the result of the work of a conference organized by Bayard Rustin, director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute. This "*Freedom Budget*" proposes an expenditure by the Federal government of \$185 billion over the next 10 years to achieve "freedom from want." It is supported by a veritable Who's Who in the labor and Negro people's movements. It concerns itself with such problems as abolition of poverty, guaranteed full employment, full production and high economic growth, adequate minimum wages, farm income parity, guaranteed incomes for all unable to work, a decent home for every American family, modern health services for all, full educational opportunity for all, updated social security and

welfare programs, and equitable tax and monetary policies.

This is indeed an ambitious undertaking. Certainly the authors of this program can be under no illusion that such a great task can be achieved solely on the basis of an expenditure of \$185 billion in a period of 10 years. Nor should there be any illusion that even this sum will be granted out of the "benevolence" of the powers-that-be. Yet these authors have performed a real service in proving that federal expenditures on a meaningful level are both necessary and possible. We hasten to state, however, that wresting this sum from the federal government can have real meaning only if the tens of millions at the grass roots make such an objective their very own, so that it becomes a weapon of struggle against the war in Vietnam—against monopoly.

Should we give support to this "*Freedom Budget*"? I say without hesitation, yes. I say this despite the fact that I differ with many of the economic and political considerations advanced in its support.

There are those that say it is possible to achieve such an objective even though there is war in Vietnam, that ways can be found to get the money without reducing the huge sums now spent for war. What can we say about this? This line of thinking fails to project a struggle against the criminal war of aggression by U.S. imperialism in Vietnam and could lead many to believe that a certain accommodation can be made with that war. It gives rise to the dangerous illusion that it is possible to have both guns and butter.

There are others who say that one does not have to concern oneself with separate appropriations for the war and for the economic and social needs of the people. They argue that there can be one appropriation from which money is taken both for the war and for the social needs of the people. This is only a variation of the same idea.

It must be said that with such an approach the "*Freedom Budget*" is not presented as an imperative need which, if placed correctly, can be developed and fought for as a part of the struggle to put an end to the war in Vietnam.

Then there are those who say that you can't do anything anyhow until the war is over. Here, too, no line of struggle against the war is projected. Rather it is a wait-and-see policy, a policy which says that the struggle to meet the economic needs of the people can wait until the war is ended.

Need one argue against this fallacious concept? What must be seen is what was mentioned earlier—the necessity of anchoring the struggle in the grass roots. What is obvious is that support of the "*Freedom Budget*" and the fight for its realization necessarily mean a struggle against all false and misleading ideas on the one hand, and a struggle

for clarity on the other. For unless this is done, the result will be confusion among the masses and the blunting of their vigilance and militancy in struggle.

These wrong views, unless rejected, can become a major deterrent to the development of the labor movement. And if spontaneous movements develop, such wrong views can derail them. If they are not fully clear, there is also the danger that the masses in their eagerness to secure much-needed economic reforms may be misled into supporting the most brutal and unjust war now being waged by U.S. imperialism against the people of Vietnam.

The Negro American Labor Council

I think that the creation of the Negro American Labor Council was a major stroke on the part of labor. This important organization can become a most powerful medium for waging the ideological struggle to show that the interests of the white workers and the strengthening of class solidarity demand a new and quickened consciousness of the need to put an end to the economic inequality forced on the Negro workers by monopoly. The Negro American Labor Council at the same time can play a most important role in the involvement of Negro workers in the leadership of the Negro people's movement. Acting thus, the Negro American Labor Council can help to develop a fighting alliance between labor and the Negro people in a common program which unites Negro and white workers against the common enemy in every field of endeavor. This formation represents something new. Developments are now taking place which open up new possibilities for its growth. That is why leaders of the NALC are now calling for the building of NALC committees in all unions.

The problem of automation must become one of increasing concern to the NALC. For it aggravates the problem of abolishing the inequality in skills. Many and others say that this cannot be remedied until everybody in the United States has a job. Thus they put forth a perspective of continued inequality until the problem for all is solved. On the contrary, the problem of achieving equality for all can be solved only to the extent that solidarity is achieved on the job, a solidarity which recognizes the special needs of the Negro worker and establishes unity with him in struggle to meet these needs.

The NALC can help to develop further in the unions a campaign of enlightenment against racist ideas and practices. This is imperative for the maintenance of the trade union movement and the unfolding of a drive to organize the unorganized in the North and especially in the South. The effort by the steelworkers' union at its recent conven-

tion and the steps being taken by many other unions to reestablish fair employment practices committees in the locals is a most welcome sign. The NALC in addition can play a most important part in promoting the fight to integrate Negroes into policy-making bodies on all levels of leadership in the trade union movement.

Properly understood, the NALC must be regarded as one of the main forces for building unity within the labor movement and developing the alliance of labor and the Negro people in the fight for full equality.

Approach to White Workers

The fight for equality must begin now. It must be raised to a higher level and become a part of the everyday consciousness of the trade union movement. Let me give an instructive experience.

Important headway has been made in bringing the menace of racism to a larger mass of the rank and file. But one thing is still lacking. The arguments presented to the white workers smack too much of liberal white moralistic preachments and are not placed in sharp enough class and trade union self-interest terms. That is, the workers are not told bluntly enough that unless freedom for the Negro people is practical everywhere—in the community as well as in the shop—a sharp and dangerous collision may arise between the labor movement and the Negro people and be reflected in a cleavage in the ranks of labor itself. No union in mass industry today can exist without the support of the Negro people, both inside and outside the shops. Yet unity in the shop cannot last if disunity in the neighborhood is countenanced.

A refreshing example of how this matter was placed squarely and correctly to workers who were prejudiced, and with excellent results, is to be found in this incident taken from a recent news report:

When segments of United Federation of Teachers in Staten Island threatened to resign from the union due to their disagreement with the union's support of the Review Board, Albert Shanker, President of the UFT, was able to convince them that the union's position was right. Staten Island teachers are the most conservative in the union. Shanker could not convince them fully of the merits of the Board. He could only dispel some of their illusions of how it functioned. He won them over by pointing out that the UFT was going into contract negotiations and they had in the past gotten the support of Negroes and Puerto Ricans. The UFT, he continued, again needed the support of these minority groups and if teachers did not support them on issues they felt were important, then teachers could expect nothing in return. With this coalition argument he convinced most of the teachers and none resigned.

Is this not an example which should be emulated and become the basis of daily operation in every union throughout the country?

For a Negro-Labor Electoral Alliance

Last November's elections also contain many rich experiences relating to the struggle for Negro rights. I listened to the election returns as they were coming in and heard the Democrat Mahoney who was running for governor in Maryland make a premature victory statement, before all the returns were in. The main plank in Mahoney's program was racist. He made his appeal to the most backward sentiments of the white voters with the slogan, "Your home is your castle."

To counter this the United Steelworkers conducted a massive campaign. The union issued brochures and leaflets, held meetings and made radio appearances, and it is to its everlasting credit that it played an independent role, broke relations with the Democratic machine, supported the Republican candidate Agnew and helped to defeat Mahoney. At the same time the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and other organizations of the Negro people carried on a campaign against Mahoney. The result was that only one out of every 37 Negroes voted for Mahoney. Here we have a practical illustration of a developing alliance between labor and the Negro people.

The trade union movement is concerned first of all with economic problems affecting Negro and white workers. It is also concerned with political and social issues, as the Maryland example indicates. It fights for labor legislation which defends the vital interests of labor and the people and seeks the election of pro-labor and pro-democratic candidates. It cannot be said, however, that the labor movement fully understands and appreciates as yet the necessity of supporting the election of Negro candidates to city, state and federal offices. This deplorable situation is to be explained on the one hand by the white supremacist policies of the ruling circles but also, on the other hand, by the failure of labor actively to combat this form of racism and to take measures to change this situation. Labor's understanding of the kind of fight-back needed in the struggle against the unholy alliance of the ultra-Right, the reactionary Republicans and the Dixiecrats will be measured by its actions on this question.

Monopoly Capital: The Baran-Sweezy Model

A neglected aspect of Marxist economic theory has been the elaboration of a systematic political economy of the monopoly stage of capitalism. Baran and Sweezy, in their book *Monopoly Capital*,* undertake this task. As a major effort to develop an economic model of monopoly capital, which has already aroused widespread discussion and debate, the book demands serious and thorough examination. It is not within the scope of a single article to consider fully all of its many facets; here we shall deal only with certain basic Marxist economic concepts and categories as they are treated in it.

The New Model

The authors are at pains to make clear that their effort is only a beginning. "The purpose of this book," they write, "is to begin the process of systematically analyzing monopoly capitalist society. . . . a beginning can be of two kinds: a sketch of the overall conception to be elaborated and filled in later, or the actual commencement of the final work. Our effort is in the nature of a sketch. . . ." (P. 7.)

What, then, is the character of this initial sketch and what is its validity as a basis for systematic analysis?

The stagnation in Marxist thought in this sphere, the authors assert, has one important cause the fact that "the Marxian analysis of capitalism still rests in the final analysis on the assumption of a competitive economy." Although Lenin defined imperialism as the monopoly stage of capitalism, "yet . . . neither Lenin nor any of his followers attempted to explore the consequences of the predominance of monopoly for the working principles and 'laws of motion' of the underlying capitalist monopoly. There Marx's *Capital* continued to reign supreme." (P. 4.)

In short, they argue, in economic analysis monopoly has been treated only as a modification of competitive capitalism and not as a qualitatively new stage. And this, they insist, cannot be remedied by patching up Marx's model but only by constructing a new model based on monopoly, not competition, as the predominant feature of

* Paul A. Baran and Paul M. Sweezy, *Monopoly Capital*, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1966, ix + 402 pp., \$8.75.

modern capitalism. They proceed to the construction of such a model, whose framework is "the generation and absorption of the economic surplus under conditions of monopoly capitalism." (P. 8.) The economic surplus is defined as "the difference between what a society produces and the costs of producing it." (P. 9.)

In this connection, they find that the central feature of the U.S. economy has been the tendency of the surplus to rise in relation to the gross national product: from 46.9 per cent of the GNP in 1919, it had grown to 56.1 per cent by 1963. This is established in an elaborate series of tables compiled by Joseph D. Phillips and presented as an appendix to the book. The tendency of the surplus to rise is attributed to the operations of giant monopolistic corporations which fix prices at what the market will bear. Increasing productivity, therefore, leads to rising profits and rising profit margins. The authors conclude: "If we provisionally equate aggregate profits with society's economic surplus, we can formulate as a law of monopoly capitalism that the surplus tends to rise both absolutely and relatively as the system develops." (P. 72.) And this stands in sharp contrast to the classical Marxian law of the falling tendency of the rate of profit, founded on the assumption of competitive capitalism.

Subsequent chapters deal with various forms of absorption of the surplus: capitalists' consumption and investment, the sales effort (advertising, etc.), expenditures of civilian government, military spending. In these the thesis is developed that the growing surplus cannot be absorbed without increasing resort to wasteful forms of expenditure such as advertising and especially military expenditures. Indeed, without the latter the economy would be plunged into crisis.

"Economic Surplus" and "Surplus Value"

Such is the new economic model which Baran and Sweezy offer as a beginning of systematic analysis of monopoly capitalism. What are its merits? In my opinion, this is the wrong beginning.

At the heart of the error lies the abandonment of the concept of surplus value and the substitution of a vaguely defined concept of economic surplus.* For this the authors offer the following explana-

*One of the most disturbing features of the book is the authors' failure to give a clear, precise definition of this term, which is central to their analysis. Two different definitions are already indicated in the quotations given above. Still other definitions appear later, such as "the difference between the total social output and the socially necessary costs of producing it" (p. 112) and "the difference between the aggregate net output and the aggregate real wages of productive workers" (p. 125). Such ambiguity exists also with regard to other basic terms.

tion. The economic surplus, they say, appears "in many forms and disguises," and they add:

It is for this reason that we prefer the concept "surplus" to the traditional Marxian "surplus value," since the latter is probably identified in the minds of most people familiar with Marxian economic theory as equal to the sum of profits + interest + rent. (P. 10n.)

Today, they point out, such forms as revenues, costs of realization and wages of unproductive workers are far more prominent than in Marx's day. Hence, presumably, the term "surplus value" conveys too restricted a meaning, and it is hoped that "a change in terminology will help to effect the needed shift in theoretical position."

Much more is involved, however, than a mere change in terminology. Neither the term nor the concept "surplus value" appears anywhere in the remainder of the book. And more, with reference to the United States, neither the term nor the concept "exploitation" is to be found in it, with one exception: the Negro people. Directly related to this is an omission which the authors themselves explicitly recognize. "And we are particularly conscious," they state, "of the fact that this approach, as we have used it, has resulted in almost total neglect of a subject which occupies a central place in Marx's study of capitalism: the labor process." (P. 8.)

The authors justify their omission of these basic concepts from their model on the grounds that monopoly is a qualitatively new stage of capitalism which requires a new approach. And to be sure, it is a qualitatively distinct stage of capitalism. But it is still *capitalism* and it exhibits the essential features of capitalism as such no less than does the premonopoly stage.

It is true that Marx based his analysis on the assumption of competition, not monopoly, as the central feature of the capitalist economy. But it does not follow at all that his basic concepts and categories are any less valid for monopoly capital.

The essence of capitalism is the exploitation of wage labor, the extraction of surplus value from the unpaid labor of productive workers. "Means of production," writes John Eaton in his elementary text *Political Economy*, "do not become capital until they are owned by a small group in society and used to extract surplus value. . . ." (International Publishers, New York, 1966, pp. 80-81. Emphasis in original.) And if surplus value is secured by competitive capitalists who must give an equivalent for the prices they receive, is this not

all the more true of monopoly capitalists who are not compelled to give an equivalent?

The fact is that in a capitalist economy the economic surplus takes the form of surplus value, that all its components are components of surplus value, the sums squandered on advertising and war no less than rent or interest.* The starting point of any economic model of monopoly capitalism, therefore, must be the derivation, distribution and absorption of surplus value under monopoly conditions. This means that the model must embrace the nature and degree of exploitation and the character of the class struggle, not as incidental features or addenda but as part of its central structure.

What we are presented with here is a model which skirts these essential features and avoids the essential questions which must be posed. Such a model cannot, in my opinion, properly be called "Marxian." This is not to say that there is no merit whatever in the concept of economic surplus, properly defined, or to deny the validity of many of the points made concerning it. Certainly the tables compiled by Phillips must be considered a valuable contribution. But this concept cannot by itself serve as the basis of any systematic Marxist analysis of capitalist economy.

Monopoly and Competition

In their emphasis on what is qualitatively new in monopoly capital, Baran and Sweezy lose sight of its continuity with the past, of its derivation from competitive capital by way of the concentration and centralization of production and capital, which Marx saw as the heart of the historical tendency of capitalist accumulation. True, Marx never envisioned the culmination of this process in a monopoly *stage* of capitalism; this was left to Lenin. But he did see that it tended toward monopoly, a fact which Lenin took pains to point out in the opening chapter of *Imperialism*. He wrote:

Fifty years ago, when Marx was writing *Capital*, free competition appeared to most economists to be a "natural law." Official science tried, by a conspiracy of silence, to kill the works of Marx, which by a theoretical and historical analysis of capitalism showed that free competition gives rise to concentration of production,

* It has been pointed out that monopoly profits may go *beyond* surplus value, that is, that they may include sums obtained by methods akin to primitive accumulation, stemming from the expropriation of small producers ruined by the monopolies or through outright theft or plunder of the resources of other countries. (See, for example, Andre Barjonet, "On the Law of Maximum Profits," *Political Affairs*, September 1960.) But this does not invalidate the point made here.

which, in turn, at a certain stage of development leads to monopoly. Today monopoly has become a fact. The economists are writing mountains of books in which they describe the diverse manifestations of monopoly, and continue to declare in chorus that "Marxism is refuted." (*Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, International Publishers, New York, 1939, p. 20.)

Because it has thus evolved out of competition, monopoly exists not in unalloyed form but in a context of competition, which remains a significant factor even today (in agriculture, in non-monopolized sections of industry and commerce, in inter-industry and international competition, etc.), interwoven with and conditioning monopoly price-setting. In the light of this, an economic model needs to take the interaction and conflict between monopoly and competition into account at the outset and cannot, in my opinion, be constructed *solely* on the basis of giant monopolies even as a first approximation.

Nor can the economic laws established by Marx be dismissed as laws *confined* to competitive capitalism. This includes the law of the declining tendency of the rate of profit, whose starting point is the rising organic composition of capital. The question which needs to be examined is how this rise affects the rate of profit under monopoly conditions. But this the book does not do. The absolute and relative rise of the economic surplus which Phillips' tables show does not necessarily contradict the idea of a falling tendency in the rate of profit. The latter is defined as the ratio of surplus value to total capital invested, while Baran and Sweezy speak of the ratio of the economic surplus to the gross national product. The two are by no means identical.

The Nature of the Class Struggle Today

The authors deny that their analysis neglects the class struggle. But their very denial contains an affirmation. They state:

Our neglect of the labor process does not . . . mean that this book is not concerned with the class struggle. For a number of reasons, some of which are analyzed in Chapter 7, the class struggle in our time has been thoroughly internationalized. The revolutionary initiative against capitalism, which in Marx's day belonged to the proletariat in the advanced countries, has passed into the hands of the impoverished masses in the underdeveloped countries who are struggling to free themselves from imperialist domination and exploitation. It is the exigencies of this international class struggle which, as we attempt to show, play an increasingly decisive part in determining the utilization of the surplus, and therewith the

whole character of the society, in the leading imperialist power. We also deal in Chapter 9 with the racial problem in the United States, which is one of the critical links between the international class struggle and the internal balance of social forces within the United States. (P. 9.)

Accordingly, they proceed to ignore the class struggle within the United States and to omit the American working class as a factor in their analysis. For their extreme emphasis on the "international class struggle" the reasons given in Chapter 7 are chiefly the tremendous rise in foreign investments since World War II and in the share of corporate profits obtained from abroad. Thus, it is argued, the center of gravity of U.S. capitalist exploitation is increasingly shifting from American workers to the peoples of other countries, notably those of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

As an illustration of the predominant weight of profits from foreign operations, the case of Standard Oil of New Jersey is cited. As of the end of 1958, "while two thirds of Jersey's investments were located in North America, only one third of its profits came from that region. . . . The indicated profit rate abroad is thus four times the domestic rate." (P. 194.) But the oil industry is not typical. It is the largest single area of foreign investment, accounting for nearly one third of the total; moreover, oil companies have the highest proportion of foreign investments to total investments, and in the biggest corporations the proportion is highest of all. (For Standard Oil of New Jersey, more recent published figures, according to the Labor Research Association's *Economic Notes*, December 1966, show 52 per cent of fixed assets outside of the U.S. and 60 per cent of profits originating abroad.) For industry as a whole, although there has been a considerable rise in the share of profits from abroad in recent years, the bulk of the profit is still obtained in this country, from the exploitation of domestic wage labor.*

In the final chapter, Baran and Sweezy complete their writing off of the industrial working class as a revolutionary force in these words:

The answer of traditional Marxian orthodoxy—that the industrial proletariat must eventually rise in revolution against its capitalist oppressors—no longer carries conviction. Industrial workers are a

*Accurate estimates of foreign profits are difficult to arrive at. Harry Magdoff ("Aspects of U.S. Imperialism," *Monthly Review*, November 1966) estimates that earnings on foreign investments rose from 20.5 per cent of net profits of domestic nonfinancial corporations in 1960 to 36.1 per cent in 1965. But even these figures, which are higher than other estimates, do not invalidate the point made here.

diminishing minority of the American working class, and their organized cores in the basic industries have to a large extent been integrated into the system as consumers and ideologically conditioned members of the society. They are not, as the industrial workers were in Marx's day, the system's special victims, though they suffer from its elementality and irrationality along with all other classes and strata—more than some, less than others. (P. 363.)

In other words, the industrial workers, in their diminishing numbers, have become part of "the establishment," and if they suffer from the evils of capitalism they do so along with all other classes, including, apparently, the capitalist class.

For their lack of conviction the authors offer no direct evidence other than, presumably, the two points mentioned in the paragraph itself. It dovetails, however, with their initial premise: the abandonment of the concept of surplus value.

But if the essence of capitalism is the extraction of surplus value, if the main base of its extraction remains the United States itself, and if the maximization of profit and accumulation of capital remain the basic motivation of monopoly (as the authors agree they do), it follows that the industrial workers (and with them other sections of the working class) *are* the special victims of the system, today as in Marx's day, whatever the changes in the composition of the working class (and these require far more examination than the few words devoted to them in the book). Hence they continue to be its antagonists, in the sense that their basic interests can be served ultimately not by advancing within it but only by its abolition.

If the workers in basic industry have succeeded, through their organization combined with a favorable combination of circumstances, in achieving a substantial improvement in their economic status, this improvement has been won and maintained only through ceaseless struggle. And today it is being increasingly undermined by the encroachments of automation which threaten the security of even the most affluent of industrial workers. Indeed, if there is any country in which the "paradox of plenty" sharply poses the necessity of socialism, it is the United States.

In eliminating the working class as the revolutionary force in American society, Baran and Sweezy eliminate what Marx and Engels considered the motive force of social change in a class society—the internal class struggle engendered by its exploitative character. In the last two chapters they paint a devastating picture of the corruption, decadence, emptiness and banality of life in our monopoly capitalist society, even venturing an excursion into Freudian analysis

of the psychic disorders which they see as the well-nigh universal consequence of the underlying social malaise. But the picture (which is essentially a picture of middle-class American life) becomes entirely too devastating. Having dismissed the working class they end up with a society devoid of any effective internal force for basic social change. "If we confine attention to the inner dynamics of advanced monopoly capitalism," they assert, "it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the prospect of effective revolutionary action to overthrow the system is slim." (P. 367.) Internally, therefore, the only outlook appears to be one of continued decay leading to eventual breakdown of the functioning of the system.

But there is hope—from abroad. It lies, they contend, in the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who have been conducting—in a number of cases successfully—the highest form of resistance, namely, "revolutionary war aimed at withdrawal from the world capitalist system and the initiation of social and economic reconstruction on a socialist basis." (P. 365.) And as this world revolutionary movement spreads, it may eventually have an internal impact in this country. In a word, the salvation of our society lies not primarily within itself but elsewhere.

There is, to be sure, an international class struggle. It is the struggle, dating from 1917, between world socialism and world capitalism—between that part of the world in which the working class has been victorious, has won state power and has taken the socialist path, and that part in which the capitalist class retains state power and capitalism still reigns. This is the central conflict of the present historical period, the period of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale. To it is linked the class struggle—the struggle whose ultimate goal is socialism—within each of the capitalist countries. And to it are linked the national liberation struggles of the oppressed countries. It is in the amalgamation of these struggles into a common revolutionary front that the path to the worldwide triumph of socialism lies.

Baran and Sweezy, however, identify the international class struggle with the national liberation movement, which they evidently view as today constituting virtually the totality of the forces of socialist revolution. In doing so they negate the actual class struggle on a world scale as they do that within the United States. Consequently they isolate the national liberation struggle from the class struggle, and in this country they see the Negro freedom struggle as linked not to the class struggle and the fight for Negro-white unity, but only to the anti-imperialist struggles of the oppressed peoples in

other parts of the world, and conducted in the face of an American working class supposedly corrupted and bought off by U.S. imperialism. Much more could be said on these questions, but space does not permit their elaboration here.*

The "Irrational System"

Baran and Sweezy do not characterize monopoly as an exploitative system, rather, in the final chapter of the book, they describe it as an "irrational" one. In capitalism as a system of commodity production and exchange, they state, "relations among individuals are dominated by the principle of the exchange of equivalents, of *quid pro quo*, not only in economic matters but in all other aspects of life as well." They add, however, that "the rationality of *quid pro quo* is specifically capitalist rationality which at a certain stage of development becomes incompatible with the underlying forces and relations of production." (Pp. 336-337.)

But in the case of monopoly capitalism, "with commodities being priced not according to their costs of production but to yield the maximum possible profit, the principle of *quid pro quo* turns into the opposite of a promoter of rational economic organization and instead becomes a formula for maintaining scarcity in the midst of potential plenty." (P. 337.) Out of this, they assert, grows the bankruptcy of bourgeois ideology, which manifests itself mainly "in the stubborn upholding of old fetishes and half-truths which now turn into blatant lies." Among these are the old shibboleths of "free enterprise" and "democracy."

They sum up: "The contradiction between the increasing rationality of society's methods of production and the organizations which embody them on the one hand and the undiminished elementality and irrationality in the functioning and perception of the whole creates that ideological wasteland which is the hallmark of monopoly capitalism." (P. 341.)

Here again, in their zeal for singling out what is qualitatively distinct about monopoly capitalism, the authors disregard what it has in common with the premonopoly stage—what is basic to capitalism as such. And in the name of updating Marx they substitute the kind of discourse about "irrationality" indicated above for the

* They are at the heart of the ideological controversy between the present leaders of the Chinese Communist Party and the rest of the world Communist movement, a controversy in which the authors, in the pages of *Monthly Review* and elsewhere, have consistently supported the Chinese position. The points at issue have been dealt with in a number of editorials and articles in *Political Affairs* during the past few years.

dialectical method—the cornerstone of Marxist analysis—which seeks to comprehend the nature of capitalist development by investigating the internal contradictions inherent in capitalism.

The basic contradiction in all human society, Marxism holds, is that between the forces of production and the social relations of production. It is this contradiction which is the motive force of all social development. In capitalist society it takes the form of “the incompatibility of socialized production with capitalistic appropriation,” which “contains the germ of the whole of the social antagonisms of today.” (Frederick Engels, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, International Publishers, New York, 1935, p. 58.) The history of capitalism is one of the progressive intensification of this incompatibility as production becomes more and more socialized. And the evolution of this contradiction runs like a red thread throughout Marx’s entire economic analysis.

In *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, Engels points out that

... these productive forces themselves, with increasing energy, press forward to the removal of the existing contradiction, to the *practical recognition of their character as social productive forces.*

This rebellion of the productive forces, as they grow more and more powerful, against their quality, as capital, this stronger and stronger command that their social character shall be recognized, forces the capitalist class itself to treat them more and more as social productive forces, so far as this is possible under capitalist conditions. (P. 65. Emphasis in original.)

This command, Engels notes, finds expression first through the combining of individual capitals in joint stock companies, and at a later stage in the formation of trusts, in which “freedom of competition changes into its very opposite—into monopoly.” (P. 66.) And ultimately the state itself is compelled to enter the picture.

But all this leaves capitalist productive relations intact, and therefore does not halt the continued deepening of the contradiction; in fact, it only contributes to it. Its resolution can come about only through true socialization of ownership, “by society taking possession of the productive forces which have outgrown all control except that of society as a whole.” (P. 68.) And the achievement of this is the function of the working class, for which socialization of ownership is the only way of ending its exploitation.

Here, in the progressive deepening of this central contradiction of capitalism (and with it of all the other internal contradictions) lies the root of the mounting corruption, immorality and destructiveness of present-day capitalist society and the all-pervading symptoms

of crisis which it exhibits. Here, too, lies the elucidation of both the necessity of socialism as the next stage of society and of the forces within capitalist society which must bring it into existence.

But Baran and Sweezy, having rejected the working class as the agency of basic social change, abandon also the dialectical method of Marxism, which sees the source of change in the internal contradictions in phenomena, and which sees in the qualitatively new of the present not only its distinctness but also its continuity with the past and its genesis through the accumulation of the quantitative changes of the past. Instead, they seek to build a wall between monopoly and premonopoly capitalism and to see the latter as governed by an entirely new set of laws.

Hence it is that they find in monopoly capitalism only a special irrationality, absent in competitive capitalism. And hence it is that they visualize the task before us only in terms of the need to overthrow this irrational society and to replace it with a more rational one. This way of placing the question is reminiscent of the eighteenth-century French materialist philosophers who rejected feudalism as an irrational system and hailed the emergent bourgeois society as a rational one, as ushering in the “Age of Reason.” It is reminiscent, too, of the utopian socialists who advocate socialism as a moral and rational system of human relationships which reasonable people should prefer to the immorality and irrationality of capitalism.

It is not, however, the approach of scientific socialism. And it leads not to developing and organizing the forces of socialism in our country but into a blind alley.

Monopoly and the State

There is one point to which the authors’ emphasis on the new does not extend, namely, the relations of monopoly capital and the state. They reject out of hand the concept of merger of monopoly and the state designated by Marxists as state monopoly capitalism and regarded as having become the dominant feature of monopoly capitalism today. They write:

We have chosen not to follow this precedent but rather to use the terms “monopoly capital” and “monopoly capitalism” without qualification for two reasons. In the first place, the state has always played a crucial role in the development of capitalism, and while this role has certainly increased quantitatively we find the evidence of a qualitative change in recent decades unconvincing. Under the circumstances, to lay special emphasis on the role of the state in the present stage of monopoly capitalism may only mislead people

into assuming that it was of negligible importance in the earlier history of capitalism. Even more important is the fact that terms like "state capitalism" and "state monopoly capitalism" almost inevitably carry the connotation that the state is somehow an *independent* social force, coordinate with private business, and that the functioning of the system is determined not only by the cooperation of these two forces but also by their antagonisms and conflicts. This seems to us a seriously misleading view—in reality, what appear to be conflicts between business and government are reflections of conflict within the ruling class—and we think it desirable to avoid terminology which tends to give it currency. (Pp. 66-67.)

Here again a question of substance is presented as a question of terminology. But it is clear that what the authors reject is not merely the term "state monopoly capital" but the concept itself. In particular, they reject the idea that there has been any qualitative change in the role of the state.*

But such a view overlooks the fact that state economic intervention today takes place in a quite different historical context than in the past. First, the great quantitative increase in state economic activity since Lenin's day has taken place during the period of the general crisis of capitalism, ushered in by World War I and the October Revolution. This, the period of the actual transition from capitalism to socialism, is marked by the progressive *contraction* of the sphere of operation of world capitalism and represents a qualitatively new stage of development, in which monopoly capital is increasingly driven to chronic reliance on the economic resources of the state.

Second, the growth of state intervention has taken place, especially in the years since World War II, in the period of the burgeoning new technological and scientific revolution, which is producing a tremendous new upsurge in the socialization of production. It has brought our society to the very threshold of "productive forces which have outgrown all control except that of society as a whole," and has led

* There is a very extensive body of theoretical work on state monopoly capital. Innumerable articles and books have been written. International conferences have been held on the subject, with the participation of Marxist economists of considerable standing. To dismiss all of this without citing any of it, with the mere comment that "we find the evidence . . . unconvincing," is to say the least a cavalier approach to an important body of thought. This type of expression occurs at several points in the book. What is most remarkable is the fact that the book, which is presented as a Marxist work, contains not one reference to any Marxist writer, with the exception of Marx and Lenin. In a scholarly Marxist work, this is a curious void indeed.

to the growing role of the state in one sphere of production after another.

I submit that there *is* something new about the state-monopoly "partnerships" which have developed, for example, in the space and atomic energy industries, and about the concept of the state as the "regulator" of the economy and the appearance of the Keynesian theoretical rationale for such a role. There *is* something new about the tremendous proliferation of government economic functions and agencies, about the wholesale invasion of the executive branch of government by direct spokesmen for the monopolies, and about the far-reaching changes taking place in the structure of the state apparatus. And not least, there *is* something new about the establishment of a permanent war economy with the accompanying emergence of an industrial-military complex and of an "invisible government" dedicated to promoting the economic and political interests of U.S. monopoly capital throughout the world. All this, and much more that could be cited, adds up to the evolution of a state-monopoly complex of truly awesome proportions.

The authors portray monopoly capital as having an atomized structure, as consisting of a mass of autonomous big corporations. They consider finance capital as rapidly diminishing in importance, and outside control of these corporations as no longer having sufficient significance to merit inclusion in their model. But this is contrary to reality. Not only do finance capital and the inclusion of the bulk of the big corporations within a handful of financial empires remain central features of monopoly capitalism,* but a further degree of integration has developed through the merger of monopoly with the state apparatus. It is this integrated whole, this complex which employs the financial and economic resources of the state more and more as an instrument for extracting increased monopoly profits from all other sections of the population, that is fundamental to any valid economic model of monopoly capitalism.

Baran and Sweezy also object to the term "state monopoly capitalism" on the grounds that it creates illusions that the state is an independent force rather than the instrument of monopoly capital and hence subordinate to it. But their own concept of the state is, I believe, a one-sided and mechanical one.

True, Marxism views the state as the political instrument of the ruling class, serving to maintain and perpetuate its system of exploitation. But this is only one side of the picture. If one stops with

* On this, see Victor Perlo, "Sweezy on Finance Capital," *Political Affairs*, December 1966.

this, one is led to a negation of the role of democratic struggles and to the conclusion that little of real value can be won by anything short of the overthrow of the capitalist state—of socialist revolution. And such a negation runs throughout the book. All important decisions, its authors state, are made by the ruling oligarchy, and although it prefers democratic forms of rule, under conditions in which popular democratic struggles threaten to win real victories it simply “abandons the democratic forms and resorts to some form of authoritarian rule.” (P. 156.) As for reforms, they reach the conclusion that

. . . No outraged protests, no reforms within the monopoly capitalist framework can arrest the decay of the whole. . . . We have reached a point where the only true rationality lies in action to overthrow what has become a hopelessly irrational system. (P. 363.)

Such views overlook the other side of the picture, however. For the working class the state is not only the political instrument of its exploiters but also a vital arena of struggle. The fight for the preservation and extension of democratic rights—the right to vote, the right to organize, freedom of expression and assembly, etc.—has always been a central part of the class struggle. These rights are essential to workers not only in their immediate struggles but also as the basis of the fight for working-class political power, for socialism. Indeed, where fascism wipes them out, the fight must first be waged for their restoration as a prerequisite to the establishment of socialism. But what are the struggles for these rights if not struggles to compel the state in some measure to serve the interests of the working people and to provide the conditions necessary for their organized action?

Today, with the exploitation by monopoly capital of all other sections of the American people, and with the development of state monopoly capital which shifts the center of struggle increasingly into the political arena, democratic movements and struggles have acquired a new significance. They take on the character of struggles to limit the powers of monopoly, to establish democratic controls over it, and they lead in the direction of the emergence of an anti-monopoly political party which can seriously contend for political power. They are the basis of the struggle for socialism and in their course the conscious forces of socialism multiply and mature.

Undoubtedly one of the most striking features of the American scene today is the great upsurge of these movements and struggles—for civil rights, for peace, and in growing measure for economic demands. These are tending to merge into a common front of demo-

cratic struggle against the monopolies, and in the course of all this we witness a new growth of the Left. It is *in the advances of this movement and in its growing political strength* that the foundations of the struggle for a socialist America are being laid.

In the eyes of Baran and Sweezy, however, these struggles have no such significance. Indeed, they apparently have little merit other than to teach their participants their futility and the need of launching the socialist revolution. And since there is no large body of people currently demanding the overthrow of capitalism, they conclude that nothing of any real consequence is taking place but must await the successes of the revolutionary movements in other parts of the world.

This is truly an ironic commentary on the whole of their analysis. In his often-quoted thesis on Feuerbach, Marx said: “Philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point however is to *change* it.” This has been a guiding principle for Marxists, to whom theory has meaning only as a guide to action. Despite their seemingly radical stance in their insistence on the socialist revolution, their book is a guide to inaction, to a counsel of wait and prepare for the day something happens elsewhere to change things here.

A systematic economic analysis of monopoly capitalism is much needed. But despite the fact that the book presents some ideas which have merit, I do not believe that the basis of such an analysis is contained in it.

Our approach to the problem of state monopoly capitalism is a Leninist one. We see in it not a primitive scheme in which everything is reduced to the point that individual monopolies dictate their will to the state, but above all to the qualitatively new force which has arisen—the combined might of the bourgeois state and monopoly capital.

A. Arzumanyan, *The Marxist Quarterly*
(Canada), Summer 1965, p. 26.

A Book Of Questionable Scientific Merit

In the years since *Monopoly Capital*, by Baran and Sweezy, was first announced I have anticipated it with high hopes. Perhaps I expected too much, but I must report that I was sorely disappointed. The essay does have some real insights, and the appendix of calculation of the volume of the surplus by Joseph D. Phillips is worth the price of the book. But, on balance, the book may add more to confusion than to an understanding of monopoly capitalism.

This is a serious charge and we must document it in detail before most of our readers will be willing to accept it. The style of writing is unpretentious. This has the great merit of making the arguments understandable, but at the same time it exposes the inconsistencies and incorrect formulations. Some of these are minor, some are serious, and in total they detract much from the worth of the book.

Perhaps we should just be amused at "The United States was expansionist and empire-minded long before it achieved independence and nationhood . . ." (p. 181). But this reflects careless thinking, not a scientific analysis of the complex class forces of the then emerging capitalism. At times this carelessness extends to the more serious problem of misrepresentation of fact. As one example, let us turn to page 145 where we find: "Since the focus of our attention is the economy of the United States, and since American fiscal history has not been characterized by persistent and steadily mounting deficits, we can concentrate on changes in the level of government spending." Actually, since 1946 state and local governments as a whole have *not* once balanced their budgets, and their net debt has risen from \$16.3 billion in 1946 to \$92.8 billion in 1965. In the same period the federal government has had deficits in all but four of 19 years and its debt has risen from \$229.7 billion to \$270 billion. (*Economic Report of the President*, 1966, p. 272.) These are not petty errors, but a test of the scientific quality of the entire study. Our main test of the book will be whether it is in fact a scientific "systematic analysis" of monopoly capitalism.

Growth of Employee Income: A Serious Omission

Baran and Sweezy write: "Our essay sketch makes no pretense to comprehensiveness. It is organized around and attains its essential unity from one central theme: the generation and absorption of the surplus under conditions of monopoly capitalism." (P. 8.) Here we return again to Phillips' tables in which that surplus is estimated. These are a model of scientific work. He defines his terms, gives his methods and states his sources precisely so that other economists can check on and continue his work.

Baran and Sweezy first define the economic surplus as "the difference between what a society produces and the costs of producing it." (P. 9.) This does not tell us how "what society produces" is measured, but since the surplus is most often compared with the gross national product that is probably what is meant. On page 125 we find that "the surplus is the difference between the aggregate net output and the aggregate real wages of productive workers." The main elements of the economic surplus as shown in Phillips' tables are property income (profits, interest, and rent), wastes in distribution and advertising, surplus compensation of employees and all government expenditures. Of these elements the expenditures of government are by far the largest, amounting to \$168 billion in 1963, with property incomes of \$105 billion in that year. Total economic surplus had risen from \$48.9 billion in the boom year of 1929 (46.9 per cent of the GNP) to \$328 billion in 1963 (56.1 per cent of the GNP). (Appendix, p. 389.)

The difference between the economic surplus and the GNP, that is, "costs of production" or "real wages of production workers," in the same period rose from \$54.2 billion to \$347.9 billion. It is curious that Baran and Sweezy do not calculate or use these last figures since they are obviously of great and direct significance in determining the disposition of the total product, the opportunities for growth of the economy and for profitable investment.

Is it because the increase in wages reflects the class bargaining power of the labor unions, one of the decisive elements in the distribution of social incomes which Baran and Sweezy neglect almost completely? This neglect of the growth and influence of nearly half of the gross national product is probably the main defect in the authors' model of the monopoly economy, a departure from reality so important that it leads them far astray in regard to such matters as the tendency toward stagnation. The growth of service facilities, such as those serving recreation, could not be understood unless this growth of employee incomes is put into the model.

The Role of Interest Groups

The model of monopoly capitalism which Baran and Sweezy construct starts with the giant corporation, the chief characteristics of which are:

- 1) Control rests in the hands of management.
- 2) Management is a self-perpetuating group.
- 3) Each corporation aims at and normally achieves financial independence. (Pp. 15-16.)

From this the authors conclude that: "What needs to be emphasized is that the location of power inside rather than outside the typical giant corporation renders obsolete the conception of the 'interest group' as a fundamental unit in the structure of society." (P. 17.) They continue: "A whole series of developments have loosened or broken the ties that formerly bound the great interest groups [such as Morgan or Rockefeller] together. . . . We are not of course maintaining that interest groups have disappeared or are no longer of any importance in the United States economy. We do hold that . . . an appropriate model of the economy no longer needs to take account of them." (Pp. 17-18.)

We are not sure what this means. It is true that most of the giant corporations have outgrown direct control by individuals or even families. The dispersion of corporate stocks permits the management, in normal situations, to operate with a great deal of independence. In fact this development of stock ownership, even though that ownership is concentrated in a very small fraction of the population, is a partial form of socialization and another adaptation by which capitalism at the same time extends its life and renders itself as a system more obsolete.

The authors are correct when they state that the influence of the large owners is now customarily exerted from *inside* the management group (p. 17). Further, "The fact is that the managerial stratum is the most active and influential part of the propertied class. . . . But there is no justification for concluding from this that managements in general are divorced from ownership in general. Quite the contrary, managers are among the biggest owners; and because of the strategic positions they occupy, they function as the protectors and spokesmen for all large-scale property. Far from being a separate class, they constitute in reality the leading echelon of the property-owning class." (Pp. 34-35.)

This kind of analysis of class structure is returned to again only in the chapter dealing with race relations and again in reference to

imperialism. Otherwise their "model" has large gaps in regard to class struggle and social structure and such problems as the changing composition of the labor force and its effects upon the labor unions, the growth of total employment and demand and the influence of such factors as the social character of new technology upon the economic and political stability of monopoly capitalism. The authors may protest, as they do at the beginning of the book, that they do not pretend that the essay is complete, and it is obvious that no book could be. But the model still must be judged by how much it explains the working of the system, not by how well it fits a particular theory.

Innovation and Investment

This is directly related to the central theme of the book, the generation and absorption of the economic surplus, yet it is precisely here that the book has some of its main shortcomings. In Table 1, page 103, the authors compare the rapid increase in expenditures for research and development with the rise in expenditures of non-financial corporations for plant and equipment and allowances for depreciation. The table shows that in one decade (1953-62) R&D expenditures rose from \$3.5 billion to \$12 billion while investment in new plant and equipment plus depreciation rose from \$35.7 billion to \$58.2 billion. The conclusion of Baran and Sweezy from this is amazing: "Without claiming that these data constitute proof, we nevertheless do believe that they provide strong support for the view that there is little if any correlation between innovation and investment outlets, and that monopoly capital is increasingly able to take care of its investment needs from depreciation allowances." (Pp. 103-4.)

The investment opportunities are no less because the tax structure makes it more profitable to make those investments from exaggerated transfers to the depreciation account. The effect on the surplus is the same. Just as important, these plant and equipment expenditures are only a part of the investments made. In 1962 gross private domestic investment had risen to \$79 billion (not the \$32 billion for plant and equipment that Baran and Sweezy focus on) and by 1965 they were \$96 billion. (*Economic Report of the President*, 1966, p. 210.) All of this was very closely related to new technology and to the productivity and incomes that the new technology made possible. To dismiss this as showing "little if any correlation" is simply to fly in the face of facts.

The men who would know best whether there is an actual correlation between innovation and investment opportunities presumably would be the managers and investment bankers. Would not a rigor-

ous testing of the model require some mention of their conclusions on the subject? All of the trade publications emphasize the great importance of new products, new materials, new technology to their operations, to their markets and opportunities for profit. Corporate advertisements boast that half or more of their sales are of products that were not even known 20 years ago. Let us quote from one typical statement, that of William Butler of the Chase Manhattan Bank: "When dramatic innovations of technology promising substantial cost reductions are available, competitive pressure may force management to invest in plant and equipment incorporating the new technology, thereby extending capacity regardless of whether the additional capacity is immediately required for the satisfaction of current demands." (*American Economic Review*, May 1958, p. 256.)

It seems to us inconsistent that Baran and Sweezy recognize the great impact of historic developments of technology, the steam engine, the railroad, the automobile, upon investment opportunities, yet can not see the same process working on a much wider scale in contemporary society. They say: "All in all, it would seem that even such a major technological break-through as electricity must have had relatively minor effects on the surplus absorption process. . . . (Pp. 222.) This is a subjective judgment so divorced from reality that it is hard to believe that the same authors had advised us as recently as page 123 to defer to the opinions of "businessmen and business analysts dealing with the realities of the American economy."

Their own failure to follow this advice is emphasized by the character of the sources they cite. Only rarely (Phillips aside) do they cite original sources. Instead, the analysis relies mainly upon the debate with or approval of the comments of other professors. If an analysis is to explain and add to the knowledge of monopoly capitalism today it must do better than this. It must put into the model the latest available primary information. Instead, the table on government spending by type of purchase (p. 152) breaks off in 1957 on the ground that Professor Bator's estimates ended then! Similarly, such easily available data as the share of corporate profits in national income ends with 1957 (p. 148), and the table on number of gainful workers in agriculture (p. 255), brings us up to 1930! Yet, repeatedly the authors seem to think that they are dealing with the most recent period in which dramatic changes have occurred.

As an example we find on pages 162-163: "With this backgrounds it is hardly surprising that there has been little change in the relative importance of state and local outlays during the *last three decades* when the role of government spending as a whole has undergone such a

radical transformation. State and local expenditures constituted 7.4 per cent of GNP in 1929 and 8.7 per cent in 1957." (My emphasis—G.W.) By 1964 state and local expenditures had risen to \$69 billion or 11 per cent of the GNP. (*Economic Report of the President*, 1966, p. 283.) In one decade, 1955 to 1964, full-time employment of state and local governments had risen from 4,487,000 to 6,586,000—one of the largest increases in the entire economy. (*Statistical Abstract*, 1965, p. 422.)

The Forces of Economic Expansion

This consistent belittling of the role of innovation and of the growth of useful services leads the authors straight into their major political and economic error: to their belief that spending on armaments is the main expansive force of monopoly capitalism. Let us start with their conclusion: "If military spending were reduced once again to pre-Second World War proportions, the nation's economy would return to a state of profound depression, characterized by unemployment rates of 15 per cent and up, such as prevailed during the 1930's." (P. 153.) This is an unqualified, profoundly discouraging conclusion for all but the war-contractors and the Pentagon. Note that it is *not* qualified by any such phrase as "unless offset by other measures such as tax cuts." How did the authors arrive at it?

First, as we have said, they underestimate other forces of expansion. This is particularly true with reference to the role of the credit system. The credit system gets scant attention—about a paragraph on pages 244-245 where mention is made of the "second great wave of automobilization fueled by a tremendous growth of mortgage and consumer debt." But the authors do not think the subject important enough to give any data. In fact, consumer debt is only a part of the total. Consumer debt did increase from \$5.7 billion in 1945 to \$86.1 billion in 1965. But in the same period total public and private debt jumped from \$190 billion to the incredible total of \$1,260 billion. Certainly this is an element in the "disposition of the surplus" which must be carefully considered if the postwar development of the economy is to be understood.

In relation to the volume of investment the Chase Manhattan Bank commented: "To take part in postwar economic growth, business has invested almost \$800 billion in plant and equipment and has increased inventories more than \$70 billion. To finance this spending business has dipped into many sources of funds, including bank loans. From the end of 1945 to 1965 commercial and industrial loans at the

nation's commercial banks have multiplied nearly six times." (*Business in Brief*, June 1966.)

Such a volume of investment would seem to indicate that normally there must be strong forces even under monopoly capitalism impelling it to grow. This is far from the concept of the authors: "Left to itself—that is to say, in the absence of counteracting forces which are no part of what may be called the 'elementary logic' of the system—monopoly capitalism would sink deeper and deeper into a bog of chronic depression." (P. 108.) "The question is how to stimulate demand." (P. 111.)

The first means is "the sales effort"—advertising which "has a central function." (P. 123.) To prove this the authors quote a number of self-serving arguments, mainly by those who are in some way dependent upon advertising. Certainly advertising uses up billions of funds, but it is not so clear that it actually helps move more units from the market. Those billions spent on advertising are added to the costs of the products and so certainly reduce the volume of units consumers can buy. Much of the advertising bill in the United States is spent on such items as cigarettes. But do people smoke more or less because of it? In Czechoslovakia where there is no cigarette advertising, consumption is unfortunately among the highest per capita in the world.

Somehow the authors concluded that advertising is a self-supporting operation: "The direct impact of the sales effort on income and output structure of the economy is therefore similar to that of government spending financed by tax revenue. This impact, measured by what has come to be called in economic literature the 'balanced budget multiplier,' is to expand aggregate income and output by an amount as large as the original revenue (and outlay)." (P. 126.)

Let us turn to pages 143-145 where they explain how this magic works. After explaining that Keynesians hold that if there are idle resources the government can expand output by creating more effective demand, the authors make the following contention: "For some time it was widely believed, however, even among economists, that the government could create additional demand only if it spent more than it took in and made up the difference by such forms of 'deficit financing' as printing more money or borrowing from banks. The theory held that the total increment in demand (government plus private) would be some multiple of the government deficit." (P. 143.) "This view is now generally recognized to be wrong." (P. 144.)

Let us examine the logic and arithmetic of the case:

Where there is unemployed labor and unutilized plant, govern-

ment can create additional demand even with a balanced budget. A simple numerical example will illustrate the point, without omitting any of the essential factors. Suppose that total demand (= Gross National Product, GNP) is represented by the figure 100. Suppose that the government share of this is 10, which is exactly matched by taxation of 10. Government now decides to increase its purchases of goods and services—say, for a larger army and more munitions—by another 10 and to collect additional taxes of the same amount. The increased spending will add 10 to the total demand and (since there is idle labor and plant available) to total output as well. The other side of the coin is an increase in income by 10, the equivalent of which can be drained into the public treasury through taxation without affecting the level of private spending. The net result is an expansion of GNP by 10, the exact amount of the increase in the government's balanced budget. In this case the "multiplier" is equal to 1: the increased taxation cuts off any secondary expansion of private demand. (P. 144.)

How can an increase in taxes for any purpose be so painless and not "affect the level of private spending"? The error here is that the "other side of the coin" is not an increase in demand—they have already counted that once—but a decrease in demand (perhaps by 10, perhaps more, perhaps less depending on many factors) as the result of the increase in taxation by 10 in order to keep the budget in balance. No lag in taxing or temporary deficit is allowed by their assumption of a balanced budget. For this purpose the presence of idle labor and capacity is irrelevant since there is no increase in output unless there is an increase in demand. The key question is whether demand is increased. Let us examine the arithmetic again. We start with the situation in which the following is given:

Private spending 90 plus government spending 10 = 100 GNP.
Then 10 is added to government spending and 10 taken in taxes. The result can only be private spending of 80, government spending of 20 and, again, GNP of 100.

Where does any "net increase in demand" come from? One can not assume that money taken in taxes circulates any faster and creates any more demand than that left with workers or other consumers or investors. Experience with the tax cut of 1964 (*rates* only—the total increased!) indicated clearly, in the opinion of Wall Street analysts, that the additional funds left with the consumers and investors had a decided "multiplier effect." For some reason Baran and Sweezy postulate the "multiplier effect" only for federal government spending, but when a worker gets his pay check and it is gone before the end of the week no multiplier effect is assumed. If workers are hit with a

100 per cent increase in taxes (10 before, 10 added) no one is going to persuade them that there is a *net gain* of 10 because not they but the government spends it. It is a transfer, and whether it is socially good or bad must be judged by the purpose for which the taxes are used.

Alternatives to Military Spending

As for the volume of employment created by the alternative forms of spending, even Baran and Sweezy do not contend that a dollar spent on arms creates more work than one spent on food or clothes. In fact they argue: "Here at last [in the H-bomb] monopoly capitalism had seemingly found the answer to the 'on what' question: On what could the government spend enough to keep the system from sinking into the mire of stagnation? On arms, more arms, and ever more arms. Yet it somehow has not worked out quite this way. . . ." (P. 213.)

One reason that it has not, they state, is the shift in military spending from mass-produced military hardware to research and development, engineering, etc. They continue. "This change in the composition of military demand means that a given amount of military spending employs far fewer persons today than it used to. In these circumstances, even very large increases in military spending, while enormously profitable to the big corporations, may have relatively little effect on investment and employment." (P. 214.)

Despite this, and because they revert to the false arithmetic of the multiplier, Baran and Sweezy continually stress the positive role of arms expenditure: "Hence we must incorporate wars into our explanatory schema, and this we propose to do by including them, along with epoch-making innovations, as major external stimuli." (P. 223.)

Baran and Sweezy emphasize their scorn for those who argue that even monopoly capitalists might be forced to accept alternatives to the profits which some of them make on military spending: "One group of liberals, having apparently forgotten all about Keynes and never having understood the relation of monopoly to the functioning of the economy, asserts that if there were less military spending there would be more private investment and consumption." (Footnote, pp. 176-177.) Could it just be possible that Baran and Sweezy never understood Keynes and have forgotten all about the actual functioning of the economy? They continue their argument: "They [the liberals] do not explain why it failed to work out that way in the 30's, when there was in fact less military spending, nor do they explain why un-

employment has crept up during the 50's and 60's, when military spending as a proportion of GNP has remained generally stable. Until they can offer a rational explanation of these phenomena . . . their pronouncements on the probable effects of military cutbacks are not entitled to be taken seriously."

This, I submit, is not scientific argument, because just such explanations have been made and they do fit the case far more closely than this biased analysis for which Baran and Sweezy try to invoke the authority of Marx! (P. 177.) The fact is, of course, that during the New Deal period government interventions were timid—Roosevelt only reluctantly permitted a slight use of government credit. Then, during the war, government use of credit was lavish, and the private sector of the economy knew that for the time being there would be no reversal of the inflationary policy. Of course, the Pentagon and a small group of contractors benefit most from military expenditures—but that does not mean that society does. In fact they are the *worst* form of waste, reducing national security as well as setting up deep contradictions in the economy (military expenditures abroad against gold losses, for example) and within the capitalist class. To argue that monopoly capitalism cannot be forced to expand expenditures for non-military purposes is to ignore both the history of the last three decades and also the possibility of mobilizing class interests of the workers and intra-class conflicts of interest among the capitalists. As a first step in that direction I suggest that we get the arithmetic of the "balanced budget multiplier" straight. Ten minus ten is still zero, no matter how many times we turn the coin over.

It is a temptation to continue to point out other inconsistencies of logic and theory of which there are a regrettably large number. Instead we will point to a final bit of philosophy which we think reveals a fundamental misunderstanding of world forces. On page 216 we find: "The real battlefields between capitalism and socialism have for years now been in Asia, Africa and Latin America. . . ." According to this, Stalingrad and Berlin must be in Africa. It is a comfortable view for intellectuals in the United States to take. Nothing can be done now at home, the battle is abroad and for others. Again the conclusion is demobilizing. Would it not be more scientific, more realistic, more useful both for other, non-Marxist, economists and for the public generally to have a more balanced study of monopoly capitalism, showing its sources of growth and at the same time the manifold and often acute contradictions that are developing even within the capitalist class?

HERBERT APTHEKER

Slavery, The Negro and Militancy

Ultra-Leftism is a kind of defeatism; exaggeration of the prowess of those who rule, and despair—if not contempt—for those ruled characterize it and determine both its tactics and strategy.

In history-writing in the United States one of the reflections of ultra-Leftism has been a denial of the militancy of the working class and therefore a sharp assault upon the work of Philip S. Foner in particular; a denial of the militancy of the Negro people and therefore a sharp assault upon the work of the present writer; and an insistence upon the “alien” character of socialism and so attacks upon all Marxian writers of the past.*

Thus, now in the name of the “Left” one has an Editor of *Studies on the Left*, Mr. Ronald Aronson, urging in that journal (Sept.-Oct. 1966, p. 60), that those on the Left “admit we are at zero . . . realize our political irrelevance,” and arguing “for Marxism’s irrelevance and . . . we have no objective political basis for a commitment to socialism.”

* * *

Illustrating these remarks has been the recent work of Professor Eugene D. Genovese in areas of slavery, Negro life and the civil rights movement. His remarks on the latter were offered in a very long paper delivered at the Second Socialist Scholars Conference, held in New York City, September 11, 1966; the present writer was afforded twenty minutes in which to reply and comment and the text of the remarks he then offered are published in the pages that follow.

It should be added that at the final session of the most recent Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, held in New York City on December 30, 1966, Professor Genovese presented a paper evaluating the work of the late Ulrich Bonnell Phillips—author of *American Negro Slavery* (1918) and *Life and Labor in the Old South* (1939). This Professor Phillips was the incarnation of racism; some

*I do not mean that such attacks have come only from the ultra-Left; on the contrary, the latter have recently joined the attacks that were normal from “establishment” scholars. See the excellent critique of the latter, relative to the allegedly “alien” character of socialism by Prof. Kenneth McNaught (of Canada) in the *Journal of American History*, Dec. 1966.

of the passages in his work are so permeated by the sickness as to be obscene. And his work was the single most consequential apologetics for slavery and for white supremacy—precisely because of its “scholarly” guise and the distinguished posts held by Phillips—produced prior to World War II.

It is of this man and his work that Professor Genovese speaks and writes now with the highest possible praise. I do not at this point wish to enter into the details of this matter,* though I must express my appreciation of the masterful way in which Professor Kenneth Stampf and—somewhat less completely—Professor David Potter demolished his paper. But from the paper on the Civil Rights movement, delivered at the Socialist Scholars Conference, to the eulogy of Phillips delivered a few weeks later is a straight line; and it is a line—no matter how convoluted the prose and subtle the nuances—that can only gratify the very powerful, rapacious and brutal Bourbons of today.

The text of the comments on Genovese’s paper follows:

* * *

American radicals have not been imprisoned by the notion that the masses are necessarily both good and revolutionary. This is a travesty and a caricature. American radicals have insisted that radicalism is not alien to the United States; that radicalism has been present among the Negro people of the United States; that there existed valid reasons for such radicalism, and that insofar as this radicalism sought an end to exploitative and oppressive relationships it was “good.”

American radicals have not been imprisoned by the “pernicious” notion that if the masses have not been or are not “good and revolutionary” they should be. There is nothing pernicious in the idea that it is the masses rather than the elite who represent a superior morality and a revolutionizing potential. American radicals have believed that with good reason. The history of the United States and of the Negro people in the United States, and the realities of life in this country today offer convincing substantiation of such views.

That these views do dominate the Negro liberation movement today is one of the happiest and most significant realities and is the result of many decades of effort. That effort was not simply or mainly the work of “white radical historians” who allegedly have in this one respect set the ideological pace for their liberal colleagues. First, the

*Years ago this writer offered a fairly detailed critique of Phillips in the last chapter of the book, *Toward Negro Freedom* (N. Y., 1956); of course the entire work, *American Negro Slave Revolts* (1943) may be considered as an effort to refute Phillips.

views of these white radical historians have not yet triumphed among their liberal colleagues—nor, from the evidence of the Paper just presented—among some radical colleagues. Second, some note should be taken of the fact that many of the historians and professors are neither radical nor liberal, as the gubernatorial candidate just selected by the New York Conservative Party makes clear. Third, the white radical historians followed and learned from Negro historians; this is of great importance for the record and is directly pertinent here since in the paper just presented and in the book, *The Political Economy of Slavery*, there is no reference to the work of Du Bois or Woodson, Wesley or Johnston, Franklin or Jackson or Greene . . .

The point is not that in slavery, “whites and blacks lived in harmony as well as in antagonism.” Any social system, as a system, functions and hence contains within it “harmony”—i.e., is viable. But the point is, is its existence based upon invidious features, is it parasitic in character, antagonistic, filled with contradictions? Do these features reflect themselves in who benefits and who suffers under the system, who rebels and/or endures; where lie the dynamics of the order, the seeds of change and of challenge? The historian—certainly the radical historian—should interest himself particularly in these seeds and challenges; not only in what is but what is coming about—without which, of course, one cannot understand what is.

There is massive evidence of significant organized resistance to the slave regime. This has been offered in the work of those mentioned above and of many others, including this commentator. As for the latter, this appears not only in his *American Negro Slave Revolts*—more often alluded to than studied—but in many other books and papers and in other contemporaneous scholars, as Stamp. . .

The main problem is not to discover the reasons for the widespread accommodation—that is the business of historians of the status quo, such as U. B. Phillips. Furthermore, it was not accommodation; it was domination, enforced subordination. The domination was planned, deliberate and required constant attention. There was not so much accommodation as there was an elaborate “machinery of control,” as it is called in one of the longest chapters in *American Negro Slave Revolts*; and an examination of the longtime effects of that machinery of control would have the greatest relevance to an understanding of “The Legacy of Slavery and the Roots of Black Nationalism.”

There is no “legend of armed black resistance to slavery.” It is not a legend—though the use of the word “armed” is disarming. There is the fact of Negro resistance to enslavement—armed and unarmed; that is the great fact and it is not legendary at all.

Describing the Turner revolt as a “cataclysm” is correct; when examined closely it does not “recede in importance or magnitude.” On the contrary, it appears as one of the seminal events in the history of Negro slavery and anti-slavery in the United States.

It is not true that “most of the 250 revolts probably never occurred,” that are described in *American Negro Slave Revolts*. The latter book very carefully affirms that it is considering not only actual uprisings, but also plots and conspiracies. It makes very clear that it considers only those referred to by two or more contemporary witnesses; that they must have described the events as slave plots or uprisings; that at least ten slaves were involved; that at least two plantations were involved. Dozens of events that were mere rumors or (probably) the result of panic are carefully described that way in that book; further the point is made that censorship existed and that it is entirely likely that genuine plots and perhaps even uprisings never were recorded.

That there were three major insurrectionary efforts in the first sixty years of the 19th century—Genovese omits reference to the preceding century which was filled with unrest—argues against the Phillipsian view; the more so when it is understood—and Genovese misses this crucial point altogether—that each of these major outbreaks was the climax of several years of heightened unrest. Indeed, that is characteristic of the history of American Negro slavery; i.e., *periods* of intensified unrest, namely, 1720-1740, 1790-1802, 1820-1831, 1850-1860.

It is not true that Aptheker was able to find no evidence of significant slave unrest and uprising from 1831 through the Civil War; the evidence is contained on pages 325 through 367 of *American Negro Slave Revolts*, and in several other publications. Indeed, perhaps the highest point—qualitatively as well as quantitatively—of slave unrest came in the decade immediately preceding the Civil War, and without understanding that one can neither understand the meaning of John Brown, the movement of Abolitionism towards greater militancy, nor all the sources of the slaveholders’ counter-revolution, quaintly called—twice—by Genovese, the War for Southern Independence!

There was—and to a large degree there is still—an absence of a tradition of rebellion; but the reasons therefor are not those offered by Genovese. I find remarkable his failure to mention racism itself as the source of such an absence but I think that is decisive. Ruling classes guard their past only somewhat less fervently than their present and a racist society will have, of course, a racist historiography; denial of a history on the part of racism’s victim is a central element in racist ideology. This fundamentally explains, I think, the absence of a tradition of rebellion among the Negro people in the United States.

There is no good evidence that from 1785 to 1860 the conditions of the slaves improved. There was a "liberal" movement among some slaveowners, especially in the Border States and especially just after the intense slave unrest of the 1820's and the rise of a national anti-slavery movement, but this was weak at best and all its proposals were defeated. Genovese confines the phenomenon of maroons to the Caribbean and South America; in this he is wrong for maroon settlements existed throughout the slave States.

Professor Genovese fears that historians are too prone to read militancy into acts of the slaves—such as breaking tools, etc.—which might as easily be explained as acts of carelessness or stupidity or venality. I do not live in Professor Genovese's world and do not find the state of historiography in the United States such as to require correction from the Right; or that a significant problem is exaggeration of the militancy of Negro men and women. The same consideration applies to Genovese's quite remarkable discussion of the distinction *which the slaves themselves made* between stealing and taking; a distinction that seems to me to have much force and much illumination. Of course, there is a world of difference—or an era of difference—between a slave and a wage-worker; even in the latter case, however, surely there is a moral distinction between the stealing by a worker and the wholesale and institutionalized plundering by a General Motors or General Electric. Striking, too, in the rather elaborate discussion of this matter of taking and stealing by slaves was the ignoring of the fact that slavery itself was a system of wholesale theft; the slaves, however, did not ignore this fact and so, I think, their moral acumen was more acute than Professor Genovese's.

In noting impact upon personality, it would be well if Genovese had paid more attention—or some attention—to the devastating impact of racism, of holding others in subjugation, upon those who dominate. Professor Genovese's paper not only omits this crucial point but generally *assumes* that the practices and rules and codes of the dominant ones were equivalent to civilized behavior.

There is, incidentally, a contradiction in Genovese's estimate of the impact of the slaves' "stealing"; at one point he finds it to have been one of the "more irritating" habits of the slaves, while at another he finds that "few masters got upset" over the thievery. I am afraid he will have to pick between these two and I suggest that the first is the more accurate.

Obsequiousness may have the debilitating effects noted by Genovese, and by many, many other writers. But there is much more present and not so many have noticed this. There is the fact of outwitting

the white boss; of surviving; of just being around so that one can continue bothering Charlie; and there is the fact of hating while yielding. Richard Wright, when operating an elevator, did bend down so that a particular white man might kick him in the buttocks; Wright did this because he needed the 25¢ the gentleman paid for his hilarious entertainment. But this was not simply obsequiousness; first of all, it was getting an extra quarter, and second, every kick was a hot iron to the rebelling genius within Wright. Need we comment upon the morality of the monster who paid the quarter?

The whole weight of Genovese's paper is in the direction of denying militancy on the part of American Negro slaves. This is not saved by his statement, at one point, that he sees in the slave period "the formation of a tradition of recalcitrance but not revolution." I think I understand the point—as developed in his ideas of a lack of politics, "a dim awareness of oppression" or the alleged absence of group consciousness.

First, if as Genovese says most high-spirited slaves became accommodationists, how could a tradition of recalcitrance develop? And, second, there was not a dim awareness of oppression; on the contrary, everything about the history of the slaves—songs, folk-tales, religious heroes, and deeds—cry out that the awareness was vivid.

Of course, in slavery there was not politics in any traditional sense; rather Genovese says there was action. But in slavery and for a slave, action against slavery was politics; that was political behavior and of a very high order.

The separation of domestics from field hands is reality and not myth. The enforced prevalence of Protestantism no doubt had a moderating influence, but even there nothing is said of the particular kind of religion developed by the slave, and this was far from a religion of repose or accommodation.

It is not true that local police power in the South was reduced during the Civil War; the contrary is true. And somehow, Genovese gives the impression that the mass flight of slaves during the Civil War reflected accommodationism. On the contrary, it demonstrated discontent and such flight was quite difficult for most of the years of the War and most of the areas of the Confederacy. Du Bois' characterization of this mass flight of scores of thousands as a kind of mobile general strike is very much nearer the mark than Genovese's treatment.

Of course the former slaves assumed the support of Lincoln's government; they constituted about 12% of its Army and 25% of its navy. Their condition had been decisive to the war; the transformation of that condition had been decisive to winning the war and preserving

the government. That betrayal followed is another matter and certainly the onus therefor in no way may be placed upon the former slaves.

It is not true to say that no black movement and no black leadership emerged from the Civil War. On the contrary, there emerged a militant movement for enfranchisement, civil rights, land; all this was the heart of radical Reconstruction, it succeeded to significant degrees in several states for several years, and was crushed only after years of terror, chauvinism and after the complete betrayal by the federal government under the domination of the Republican Party. Even so, the crushing was partial and in twenty years the whole effort at full emancipation was renewed with fierceness.

The hegemony of the slaveowners not only was not "virtually unchallenged"; a central feature of the history of the pre-Civil War south is exactly that challenge, from the slaves and from the non-slaveholding whites. I do not find "innocence of organized effort and political consciousness" as plaguing black people in the U.S. until well into the 20th century. On the contrary, organized effort was massive and political ingenuity was extraordinary.

Certainly the Negro masses were told incessantly to despise themselves but I am much less certain than Professor Genovese appears to be that this message succeeded. Surely the literature is self-critical, but the literature also shows that it is the white—especially the white boss—who is despised; and there is a decisive thread in the literature and thinking of the Negro people which holds—correctly—to the moral and ethical superiority of themselves as compared with a racist-infected white population.

I do not find an "enormous influence" exerted by Booker T. Washington upon black nationalists. And Genovese's acceptance of Mr. Washington's own public rationalizations for his program of acquiescence is extraordinary. Thus, Mr. Washington justified his insistence that Negroes avoid political activity on the grounds that they were not experienced in such activity; but this was not why he put forth the program of acquiescence. He put forth that program because of the insistence of Baldwin of the Southern Railroad and Carnegie and Rockefeller who subsidized the Tuskegee machine. And they insisted on that program for obvious reasons.

The differences between Du Bois and Washington were basic and not simply tactical and no single quotation from a 1903 essay will change that. Du Bois rejected subordination; Washington accepted it. Du Bois rejected colonialism; Washington assumed its continuance. Du Bois was intensely critical of capitalism, long before World War I; Washington worshipped it.

Professor Genovese asks: how do you integrate into a nation that does not want you? This is not and has not been the point. The point is that through integration one transforms. The effort is not simply to integrate *into* the nation; the demand is to transform a racist nation into an egalitarian one. Hence to battle for integration is to battle for basic transformation.

Further, integration is necessary to this nation exactly because the Negro is integral to it; the nation depends upon him and consists of him as surely as it depends upon and consists of those who are not Negro. Decisive here, too, is the class character of the nation and the class character of the Negro; considerations that are basic for a radical analysis but which are notably missing from the Genovese paper.

The realities of black nationalism are exaggerated by Genovese; the power and force of Negro-white efforts are minimized by him.

I join in Genovese's appeal for enhanced power in localities. I do not see this in any way, however, as contrary to enhancing power nationally, or of enhanced Negro-white unity and common action; or the development of an increasingly radical and independent *national* politics in the United States.

I reject the "states rights" plea of Genovese. I deny a naive dependence upon central power by the Left. And federal troops need not be merely guardians of the status quo, if the status quo is jim crow and if the law is anti-jim crow and if the executive office is sworn to carry out that law and uses—as it is supposed to do—all its force, including federal troops, to enforce the law—i.e., to extirpate jim crow.

No problem is a problem of the whites and not of the blacks. Whoever says this is in error. *Central* to this nation is the so-called Negro question. The facts of white people and of black people in this country are inextricably bound together.

If this nation is to be spared fascism, it will be by the efforts of blacks and whites together. If this nation is to reverse its present foul foreign policy it will be because of black and white struggle together. Genuine democratic, progressive and radical advance in this country has depended in the past and most particularly depends in the present upon popular mass power united and that means Negro-white mass power together.

Without that, slavery would not have been destroyed in the United States. Without that, jim crow will not be destroyed in the United States. Absolutely fundamental to real radicalism in the United States is the building of that mass, popular, Negro-white political power.

On the Jewish Question

JACK KLING

Further Probing Needed

The draft resolution on the Jewish question is a document of great importance. The resolution raises many ideological and political questions that require further discussion and deeper probing. Among these questions are the following:

a) While it is correct to say that since the end of the Second World War the dominant trend in Jewish life in our country has been identification (the reasons are given in the resolution), it seems to me that it is not enough to say so and leave it at that. For while most major Jewish organizations have shown signs of growth, all face the problem of keeping their own membership intact. In fact most organizations have developed activities, in trying to hold on to their membership, which have nothing to do with Judaism or Jewishness (bowling leagues; card and bingo games; lectures, often by non-Jewish speakers; etc.). I raise this not because I feel this to be wrong, but because merely to mention growth, without discussing problems, creates the impression that the Jewish people are automatically flocking into these organizations.

b) While the dominant trend has been identification, a second trend exists which the resolution has nothing to say about—that is, assimilation. The resolution refers to linguistic integration, but it is more than that. If this is so, then some practical conclusions have to be drawn from such a fact.

c) More discussion is required on the problems and work amongst the English-speaking Jews, who constitute the overwhelming section of the Jewish population.

d) More probing is necessary on such matters as the changing composition of the Jewish population, on problems relating to class questions, on the role of the Right-wing and on bourgeois influences in Jewish life.

e) Much more thought is necessary on how to meet head-on the challenge of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism in the Jewish community.

f) There are many questions relating to Israel as well as other problems that can be posed and discussed.

I am aware, however, that the resolution cannot go into all questions that bother people, and much

ON THE JEWISH QUESTION

45

less try to answer them. The discussion that is unfolding brings to light differences of opinion on estimates of various questions and how to meet problems facing the Jewish people. This should not be surprising for they reflect the differences that appear within the Jewish community itself. The resolution cannot undertake to resolve all matters where such differences exist. They will continue for some time, and as the discussion unfolds we will have to have a great deal of patience and tolerance toward one another, while striving to achieve unity on the most decisive questions.

The resolution correctly focuses attention on the main problems facing the Jewish people at home, and the need of mobilizing all Americans in the struggle against anti-Semitism and Nazism. In my comments, I should like to deal with only a few questions.

Involvement of the Jewish People

Close to six million Jews live in the U.S.A., the largest Jewish community in the world. While the Jewish people live in many parts of the country, including small towns, they are mainly concentrated in New York City, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Chicago, Cleveland, Boston and Detroit.

Large numbers of them are involved in the struggle for peace, against U.S. aggression in Vietnam, against the growth of Nazism and Nazi-influence both here and abroad, for civil rights, and in struggles on a host of other

issues. Their involvement is through individual participation and often through many of the mass organizations of the Jewish people. We are proud of the positive contributions made in these struggles by progressive Jews, including Communists.

New opportunities for winning even greater participation of the Jewish people in struggles on all fronts are constantly emerging. To carry on successful work in this direction requires proper evaluation of both possibilities and problems. It cannot be denied that often many progressives, including Communists, tend to gloss over many problems faced in the Jewish community. Speeches and articles often create the impression that the Jewish community is united on all questions. Sometimes people speak about "unzer folk" (our people) as though it is a homogeneous people. Often they gloss over the vicious Right-wing forces, the bourgeois leadership and influence, and the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet forces (Dubinsky, Lovestone, Jewish Labor Committee, *Daily Forward*, some sections of the leadership of the Jewish War Veterans, etc.).

We must not minimize the positive contributions of the Jewish people. At the same time we dare not underestimate the nature of the struggle we face against the anti-progressive, Right-wing nationalist forces in Jewish life.

The resolution points to the need of mobilizing *all Americans*, Jew and non-Jew, in a struggle against anti-Semitism as part

and parcel of the struggle against racism, for greater democratization and against the ultra-Right.

At the same time, it makes clear that *especially* Jewish progressives, including Communists, can and in fact *must* help win greater participation of the Jewish community in the struggle for peace, against U.S. policy in Vietnam, etc.

Progressive Jews often place the question: Where shall I work—in the peace organizations, the civil rights movement, the Human Relations Committee, the labor unions, etc., or in the Jewish organization and community? To place it in this way is wrong. No Jewish person should weaken his ties or activities in the labor unions, peace, civil rights movement or in other general fields of activity, although at times he may have to modify the scope of his activity.

The real problem that has to be tackled is, how can the Jewish community be more effectively won over to greater participation in all of the people's struggles—and by so doing would it not be easier to win the entire community, Jew and non-Jew, in the struggle against anti-Semitism? Any other approach means deserting the Jewish masses and leaving them under almost exclusive influence and pressure from the Jewish bourgeois, Right-wing and nationalist leadership.

The Soviet Jews

The last point I want to deal

with, if only briefly, relates to some questions concerning the Soviet Union and the Jewish people. A major anti-Soviet drive has been on foot, inspired, organized and led by the Right-wing in Jewish life, by certain bourgeois, nationalist and Zionist leaders. Alleging a Soviet policy of anti-Semitism, of Jewish persecution and discrimination, these forces have initiated petitions, placed ads in newspapers and organized numerous anti-Soviet meetings and picket lines. By spreading lies and distorting the actual conditions of Soviet Jews, these anti-Soviet provocateurs have been able to confuse and mislead many decent-minded people. It is extremely important that we fully understand the meaning, purpose and forces behind this anti-Soviet campaign and meet it head on.

To be most effective in combating the smear campaign, we have to be clear on some matters. Have mistakes, even crimes, been committed against Jewish people in the Soviet Union? The Communist Party of the Soviet Union was itself first to expose these and to admit that, yes, crimes had been committed in the USSR, especially during the latter part of the Stalin period. But to make things clear, the CPSU said such crimes were committed against the Soviet people *as a whole*, including the Jewish people. Now it is true that this does not make it easier for the Jewish people, but to speak about the mistakes and crimes as having been only or primarily against the Jewish people

feeds the idea that the source was anti-Semitism.

What is most important, at least to me, is that while six million Jews were wiped out by Nazism, while the Jewish community of Poland was almost completely destroyed, and while the Jewish communities in other parts of Eastern Europe, as well as in France and other Western European countries were seriously weakened, we can speak of the second-largest Jewish community in the world being in the Soviet Union. And since this is so, does not the Soviet Union deserve highest praise and respect for its policy of saving the Jews from the same fate, let us say, of Polish Jewry?

Coming back to the wrongs against the Soviet Jewish people, it is generally conceded that since the 20th Congress of the CPSU,

a process of rectification has taken place. Some people may be unhappy with the scope or tempo of this rectification. Some can argue for a Yiddish newspaper or a theatre. I am not against people having their opinions and expressing their thoughts on such matters. I would, however, prefer leaving these matters to be decided by the Soviet Union and its Jewish people.

What concerns me is how we are meeting the anti-Soviet campaign. Often I feel that because of the pressure of the Right-wing, some people take a defensive position. They will tell you the good things about the USSR, and then add a "but—" I feel that this section of the resolution needs strengthening, so that it takes a very positive position with no ifs or buts about the USSR.

D. N.

The Jewish Community Is A Reality

It would be unfortunate if the methods of work proposed in Irving Potash's criticism of the draft resolution were to gain wide acceptance. The position he takes would completely cut us off from the thinking of organized American Jewry. Thus the field would be left wide open for the nationalists and chauvinists.

Potash's Rejection

Potash rejects the concept of a

Jewish community as a distinct cultural entity in the U.S., although as the draft resolution correctly points out, it is a highly organized community, "possessing over 200 national organizations and thousands of local groups" as well as 20 Yiddish, 7 Hebrew and 144 Anglo-Jewish periodicals. He will not admit that this "Jewish Community" plays a significant role in the fight for peace and progress

"Which current, which trend or class pressure plays that role?" he asks, as though nothing has changed since the 30's and 40's.

History does not stand still and there have been significant changes in the class structure of the Jewish community in recent decades. The resolution makes that point clear when it states:

Members of the Jewish middle class who themselves, as workers, had participated in class battles in the past, are today allied with workers in current progressive struggles. Moreover, the existence of the menace of fascism and Nazism, which perils *all* Jewish people, and the memory of the slaughter of six million Jews—one-third of the world's Jewish population—create a deep impression among all sections of the Jewish community. This, together with the long history of persecution of the Jews, as well as the progressive traditions of the past, impels American Jews to participate in a high degree in the struggles for progress.

Yet Potash refuses to recognize a community as a community unless the overwhelming majority of people that make up that community are workers or socialists. Zionists—among whom are many workers active in civil rights and other struggles—are automatically excluded as "national chauvinists."

He writes: "The over 200 national Jewish organizations which include, on the one hand, such organizations as the Workmen's Circle and similar organizations

with a socialist background and, on the other hand, Zionist and other organizations with a national chauvinist outlook, do not constitute a 'community' even if all of them are also against anti-Semitism." It is sometimes hard to follow Potash's involved and illogical reasoning.

In Italy there is a powerful Catholic community (all classes—rich and poor are part of it). Yet I know of no statement by an Italian Marxist challenging the concept of an Italian Catholic community on grounds that among the great many Catholic groups there are some with a socialist background and others with a national chauvinist outlook, and arguing that such politically disparate organizations do not constitute a community even if all of them are also against anti-Catholicism.

The fact that there are classes within a community in no sense negates the existence of a community—Potash to the contrary notwithstanding. To deny the existence of a Jewish community is to reject among other things the 2,000 year-old Jewish cultural heritage which all Jews, irrespective of class, have in common.

In these critical times when it is essential that Marxist and progressive Jews develop dialogues with non-Marxist and even anti-Marxist Jews, and become more deeply involved in the political, social and cultural life and struggles of the Jewish community, it is incredible to find the "Jewish community" termed a

"false concept," "a throwback to historic national chauvinism reflected in such expressions as 'Jewishness' and 'Jewish spirit.' . . ."

A Liberal Community

The Jewish community, Potash goes on to say, has no "realistic meaning to the Jewish workers in the fur shops or garment shops where there is a daily sharp class struggle with their Jewish bosses or to Jewish workers in more basic industry controlled by big banks with rich Jews on the boards of directors." This is an over-simplification that will not bear close scrutiny. The assumption that Jewish shop or industrial workers are not participating in the peace and civil rights movements through their religious or secular mass organizations is false.

The Jewish community—widely acknowledged as one of the most liberal communities in the nation—includes the 100,000 member Zionist Organization of America which recently launched a nationwide campaign against neo-Nazism and the ultra-Right, pointing out that "the danger of assimilation and cultural disintegration which still looms large on the Jewish horizon must take a secondary place in the fight against bigotry."

It includes the Union of American Hebrew Congregations which calls upon Reform Jews and others not to allow the controversy

over "black power" to deter them from continued active participation in the civil rights struggle. It includes the American Jewish Congress which condemns the Rightist turn in West German politics, and the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations (representing 20 major Jewish organizations) which charged the other day that the Johnson Administration was complacent over the rise of neo-Nazism in Germany. It includes the Central Conference of American Rabbis which opposes the war in Vietnam.

Potash seems to have all the answers to all questions, but they are the answers of 1933 (harmful even at that time, and rejected by Dimitroff in 1935 when he warned progressives against national nihilism) not 1966. They are designed to help one stew in his own juice. They are hardly calculated to win friends and influence people.

The Ecumenical Spirit

Compare Potash's dogmatic assertions on the Jewish question with the ecumenical spirit present to a high degree in the thinking of the French Communist leader Roger Garaudy in relation to Christian affairs. "Christians and Communists constitute two of the major forces shaping the world today, and there is much they can learn from each other," he was quoted as saying in the *New York Times* of December 1.

"In an age when mutual extermination is possible, we must abandon the spirit of the crusades, the urge to convert the world to our own position. Instead we must learn to accept each other as we are," and to reject claims to have "unique, definitive and absolute truth." Dr. Garaudy called for a continuation of current Marxist-Christian dialogues. "A Christian can become a better Christian and a Marxist a better Marxist if we can learn from each other how best to develop our own beliefs," he said.

It is not difficult to identify with Dr. Garaudy's deep and astute remarks. (Note that unlike Potash who sneers at the idea of "Jewishness" and the "Jewish spirit," Dr. Garaudy has only the profoundest respect for the "Christian spirit.")

Clearly, Marxist and non-Marxist Jews—both religious and secular—also have much to teach and much to learn from one another. And there is no question that dialogue such as this will strengthen the forces of peace, democracy and progress.

Therefore, I support the draft resolution's entire section on the Jewish community, as I share Paul Novick's concern with the "wrong, harmful, nihilistic approach" to Jewish work on the part of some progressives (*Political Affairs*, October 1966). They seem to know so very little about our Jewish community of nearly six million, concentrated in the major cities, exerting an influ-

ence politically, economically, culturally.

Jewish Culture in the USSR

Potash has a theory—a very narrow and wrong theory about the Jewish community. Very often when the reality fails to fit his theory he makes it fit, as when he makes the ridiculous charge that there is no Yiddish theater in the U.S. or Israel and that the *Morning Freiheit* does not campaign for Yiddish theaters. Thus he makes the fantastic statement that there is "more Jewish culture in the Soviet Union than in any country, including Israel." How I wish it were true. Then there might not be a Soviet Jewish problem. Further, he criticizes the draft resolution for "re-affirming its agreement with the approach in the editorials of *Political Affairs* of June and July 1964 with reference to combatting remnants of anti-Semitism in the USSR, the approach to religion and anti-religious propaganda." The situation today, he writes, is quite different from 1964. How is it different? Among other things Potash states that the Schaknowitz anti-religious pamphlet has been withdrawn. But this pamphlet was only recently published. It has not been withdrawn. Remnants of anti-Semitism persist. The Soviet Jewish problem is still very much with us. The *Political Affairs* editorials of June and July 1964 still apply.

The Jewish community is a living reality. It is highly organized. "Shall it be left to the nationalists, the chauvinists, the obscurantists to hold sway over it?" Novick asks. "Or should progressives try to exert their influence by building progressive Jewish culture in Yiddish and in English, by keeping alive progressive Jewish traditions of the Jewish labor movement, of heroic figures in Jewish history, in the freedom struggles and revolutionary movements over the generations down to the fighters of the Warsaw Ghetto?"

The section of the draft resolution on Soviet Jews is on the right track, despite Potash's insistence that there is no Soviet Jewish problem and that the

writers of the draft resolution "reflect national chauvinist tendencies" for calling for the "full restoration of the administratively suppressed Jewish cultural institutions."

The resolution of course needs strengthening. I recommend incorporating Novick's call for a "broad, theoretical evaluation of the national and colonial questions existing in 1966, taking into consideration of what transpired after the October Revolution, during and after World Wars I and II and as a result of the historic upsurge of the nations and nationalities in Asia and Africa, etc."

Until this evaluation is made, I am afraid the Soviet Jewish problem will continue to hurt.

The coming together of the different groupings of the ultra-Right and their increased use of racism has increased the danger of both the ultra-Right and of racism. This union also adds a new dimension to the use of anti-Semitism as a tool of reaction. It points to the inherent unity of the struggles for civil rights and civil liberties, of the struggles against ultra-Right, racism and anti-Semitism, and the key role of these struggles in the overall battle for democracy.

Gus Hall, *Toward a Peace Ticket in 1968*, p. 18.

WILLIAM WEINSTONE

An Evaluation of Gompers

Jim West invited further discussion of his June pre-convention article which H.K. criticized in the November issue of *Political Affairs*. I think there is much validity in H. K.'s view that Jim's article gives support to the concept of spontaneity in relation to the trade union movement. Unfortunately, it is also apologetics for the infamous role of Samuel Gompers who headed the A.F. of L. for decades.

This is seen particularly in two quotes from the *Federation News*, Labor Day, 1965, which Jim cites approvingly. One quote is from William A. Lee, President of the Chicago Federation of Labor - Industrial Union Council - which attacked the Socialists of the early years of the A.F. of L. for their attempts "to capture the Labor Movement" and for "their profound dislike of the trade union philosophy of men like Samuel Gompers whose goals for labor were immediate and tangible." The second quote is from the tilt of Samuel Gompers with Morris Hillquit, leader of the Socialist Party, before the U.S. Industrial Commission in 1914. Gompers is quoted as saying that he was for the unlimited advance of the workers and that his policy for

the trade union movement and for the working people was "to obtain a better life for themselves and for their wives and for their children and for humanity."

Jim adds the comment that "for all the criticism and disagreement with Gompers by Socialists, Communists, and other radicals, this is one policy in which he should have won full and complete support. Clearly he did not; and to this day, advocates of socialism are reproached by labor leaders and are still paying for the syndicalist sins of the past."

As we will see, there is ground for criticism of the sectarian policies of the socialists and others, but this account is one-sided history which denigrates the part played by socialists and other militants and it is wrong about Gompers' actual views and deeds. Jim took Gompers at his word. The old fox was capable of fine-sounding sentiments when occasion required them. The fact is that Gompers' paramount interest was to secure gains for a relatively small strata of the workers—the skilled craftsmen—and this at the expense of the many millions of severely exploited semi-skilled and unskilled workers, particularly those in the mass production

industries whom he stubbornly refused to organize, whom he neglected, sabotaged and in many cases even scabbed upon.

Gompers sabotaged the steel strike in 1919 which was under A. F. of L. auspices and led by William Z. Foster, and contributed to its defeat. He fought desperately against every Left-wing suggestion of industrial unionism. He opposed social insurance, made rabid attacks upon the socialists and kept the workers tied to the two-party system. He was a rank chauvinist, a supporter of imperialist World War I and relentlessly pursued class collaborationist policies, even to the point of joining in an alliance with the manufacturers in the National Civic Federation. Progress was made by the A. F. of L. despite his leadership. The complete bankruptcy of his policies was proven in the crisis of 1929-1933 when several years after his death the A. F. of L., led by the Gompersite William Green, sank to its lowest post-war membership. It was unable to hold the vast numbers that spontaneously swept into its ranks in 1934-1935 causing a split in its leadership and compelling the formation of the C.I.O. which led the powerful organization drive that followed.

Socialists and other militants played a prominent part in the organization of the A. F. of L. in the eighties, in the fight for the eight hour day in the 80's and 90's, in the organization of the needle-trades and many other workers in the 1900's, and in putting forward and winning many economic, so-

cial and political gains for the working class. The I.W.W., despite its erroneous syndicalist policies and tactics, also carried on militant struggles, organized workers in important industries and spread the ideas of industrial unionism. They were unable to maintain their gains and disappeared as an organization because of their syndicalist views and policies and the intense repression they suffered, but they left a heritage of indomitable struggle.

Many socialists and other militants made serious mistakes in their efforts to advance the labor movement. Daniel DeLeon and his followers in the Socialist Labor Party were extremely dogmatic and pursued a disastrous splitting course. The Left Socialists, after 1905, and the syndicalist leaders of the I.W.W., were guilty of underestimating the importance of immediate issues, carried on dual unionist policies, attacked and antagonized rank and file AFL members, and served by their tactics to isolate themselves. They made many correct criticisms of Gompers but drew wrong sectarian conclusions, many of which leftist elements today tend to repeat and which are deserving of sharp criticism. But such criticism cannot be effective if the reactionary policies of Gompersism and like leaders today are overlooked or smothered.

Lenin, in his work "*Left-Wing Communism—An Infantile Disorder*", criticized the tendency of Left elements to stand aloof from the mass trade union movement and

to advocate little revolutionary movements, stating that these policies only played into the hand of the reactionary labor leaders. But at the same time, he condemned the attitudes and policies of the labor aristocracy in the trade union movement and the Right-wing labor officialdom as "narrow-minded, selfish, hard-hearted, covetous, petty bourgeoisie elements," who were "imperialistic-minded, bribed and corrupted by imperialism." In this same pamphlet he referred to Gompers as carrying on a "despicable policy." (International Publishers, 1934, pp. 35, 38.)

It is argued that the labor aristocracy has undergone changes since this was written by Lenin—a matter requiring separate discussion. But was not this characterization of the top leaders of the A. F. of L. true for the time it was written—the period to which Comrade West refers? And do not the Right-wing Meany-Dubinsky forces play the same despicable role today? Gus Hall in his report to the 18th National Convention of the CPUSA, made a severe indictment of this leadership on many counts and stated, among other things, that:

The single most weighty factor retarding the trade union movement is the reactionary Meany-Lovestone-Dubinsky type of top leadership. This bureaucracy follows a policy of mild lip service to the struggles of the workers coupled with subservience to the whims of big business.

The ultra-Right and this top AFL-CIO leadership are almost the only forces who consistently and publicly support the aggression against Vietnam. . . .

Not unusual, but most shameful, is the treacherous role of the main section of the top AFL-CIO leadership in world affairs.

Jim is correct that the union movement is not the same as in the period before the big upsurge. It has moved forward and to a limited extent concerns itself with political and social questions. In this advance, the Communists played a big part; not only because they rejected and overcame sectarian policies of the past but also because they opposed the reformist, do-nothing, class partnership policies of Samuel Gompers, William Green, Matthew Woll and similar misleaders.

Space does not permit discussion of other wrong views in Jim's article. Let me say, that what the labor movement needs today more than ever are conscious efforts by Left militants and progressives in behalf of the everyday needs of the working class and to enable labor to play a more forward role in behalf of its economic needs and also for peace, democracy, Negro freedom and social progress generally. This requires, in my opinion, both a struggle against sectarianism and also Right-opportunist views which are present in the trade union and Left and Communist movements.

Labor Faces New Problems

The November elections revealed a widespread discontent with the Lyndon Johnson Administration and his policies, especially those arising as a result of the war in Vietnam.

The coming session of Congress will be the arena of sharp legislative struggles. Johnson has already indicated that he intends to ask for more funds to wage the war and will propose reduction of funds bearing on the vital needs of the people. Some AFL-CIO sources estimate that there will be 29 fewer advocates of open housing and 40 less supporters of rent supplements for low-income families in the House.

The difficulties facing labor and the Negro people in the coming Congress can better be understood if one bears in mind what transpired in the last one, many of whose members were elected in the anti-Goldwater landslide of 1964. Repeal of Section 14b, for instance, was defeated by 18 votes. The \$1.60 minimum wage passed by just 11 votes. And Medicare, as popular as it was among the great mass of Americans, won by 45 votes over efforts to water down its provisions.

Labor is confronted with the danger of new legislation to place additional curbs on its activities, especially on its right to strike. In the wake of the New York transport strike at the start of

1966, Johnson proposed new anti-strike legislation. Following the November elections it became known that he had set up a special committee to consider such measures. The administration was upset by the significant wage movements that took place in 1966. In a number of industries the workers succeeded in nullifying the efforts of the administration to limit wage increases to the 3.2 per cent wage guideline. The administration fears that the year ahead will see hundreds of thousands of additional workers joining the battle to achieve substantial wage gains to counter the increasing living costs, mounting taxes and large-scale profiteering by the big monopolies.

As everyone will remember, a major, dramatic 12-day strike of transport workers, under the leadership of the Transport Workers Union took place in New York City at the beginning of 1966. Despite the anti-union interventions of the federal, state and city governments, despite the efforts to create an anti-TWU hysteria, and despite court injunctions and jailings of leaders, the transport workers went on to score a 15 per cent wage gain spread out in three stages.

Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, denounced the TWU settlement as "clearly in-

flationary," claiming that it "contrasts sharply with the action of other labor unions, which, in the past five years, have been willing to act with restraint in the public interest."

A major break-through in the struggle against the President's wage-policy formula was the strike of the airline mechanics, members of the International Association of Machinists, against five large airlines. Their 43-day strike showed that the airline mechanics would not be cowed by the Johnson Administration, by the President's special board headed by Senator Wayne Morse and by the threats made in Congress to enact special anti-strike legislation. They went further and rejected the recommendations of the IAM leadership which had, under government pressure, negotiated an unsatisfactory wage settlement. As a result of their militancy, they succeeded in winning a 5 per cent wage gain and giving a powerful body blow to Johnson's wage guidelines.

Another very important wage movement in 1966 that helped to shatter the Administration's arbitrary wage policy was the struggle waged by the IUE against General Electric in which the workers won a 5 per cent pay raise. Two significant things stand out about that struggle: 1) The degree of unity achieved among eleven international unions with members employed by GE and the creation of a united multi-union negotiating committee; and 2) As a result of unity

and militancy, a death blow was given to the company's twenty-year-old basic policy which is known as "Boulwareism," a policy whereby the company would present its final terms on a "take-it-or-leave-it" basis and refuse to bargain any further.

In the first 9 months of 1966 the median wage increase amounted to 3.8 per cent compared to 3.3 per cent in 1965, 3 per cent in 1964 and 2.3 per cent in 1963. These figures show the growing discontent and determination by large sections of the labor movement to break out of the vise that has kept wages down while prices rise and profits grow by leaps and bounds.

Negotiations affecting over three million workers will take place in 1967, more than twice the number affected in 1966. Included among them will be workers in such industries as auto, teamsters (employed in the long-haul and local drivers in the freight trucking industry), railroads, construction, farm equipment, rubber, food processing, glass, non-ferrous metals, petroleum and chemical. In New York City, contract negotiations will involve the needle and newspaper publishing industries.

All signs point to the fact that high up in the demands of labor will be the fight for substantial wage increases. It is with this in mind that the administration is moving to head off the coming wage struggles by way of new anti-labor moves, especially anti-strike legislation. Labor's strug-

gles for substantial wage increases is bound to have a significant bearing on the very important elections of 1968.

The New York Times, in an editorial entitled "Trouble On the Labor Front," expressed the fears of Big Business and the Johnson Administration in the following words:

Signs are piling up that 1967 will be a year of turmoil in labor-management relations. Soaring living costs, the high industrial profits and tight labor markets make it certain that union pressure for outside pay increases will grow. A menacing new wage-price spiral is beginning to whirl upward, and next year's strike losses are expected to run substantially above the level of any year since 1959.

The perspective for 1967 is one of sharp struggle on the economic front, a struggle that will have an

important bearing on the crucial 1968 Presidential elections. The successful outcome of this struggle will depend in a large measure on the degree of unity achieved—among the various unions within each industry, between Negro and white workers, and in the efforts to bring large sectors of the unorganized workers into the ranks of organized labor. It necessitates building and extending the alliance of labor with its natural allies among the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American people. It calls for greater clarity and understanding of the issues involved and a heightened militancy to overcome all barriers in labor's path. Leadership to attain these objectives is the special role that falls upon Communists, Left-wingers and other progressive-minded people, inside and outside the labor movement.

An objective base exists for the realization of the Negro-labor alliance on a new level. Labor cannot resolve the mounting problems of automation, job security, the threat of compulsory arbitration and the restoration of anti-labor measures, to say nothing of legal terror, without the active assistance of the Negro people's movement. The Negro people cannot attain the elimination of the ghetto, one of the root causes of Watts and other explosions, without achieving the closest ties of unity with the labor movement. Demonstrations and picket lines, which largely characterized the struggles of yesterday, must now be implemented with new forms which will carry the battle into the factories and mills, into every community of the country, into all areas of government in a manner not witnessed before.

Resolution On the Negro Question,
18th National Convention, CPUSA.

BOOK REVIEWS

JOAN BELLAMY*

A Valuable Study of Neo-Colonialism

*Neo-Colonialism, The Last Stage Of Imperialism*** by Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, was published on the eve of the Heads of States Conference held in October 1965. Its message of the need to continue the struggle against imperialism and build maximum unity was timely then and is, in the light of subsequent events, even more urgent now.

The book deals with those factors which, the author says, "make(s) up the hard reality of this world in which we are trying to live, and in which Africa is emerging to find its place." (P. 200.)

Since it appeared, Dr. Nkrumah's Government has been overthrown and the Convention Peoples Party banned. The best, most devoted and most principled elements in the C.P.P. who have refused to denounce their President and renege on their own political past, are still in prison without charge or trial. It is vitally important

that the progressive movement should remember them and do everything possible to win their release. These men and women are true Ghanaian patriots who, although in jail, resist the efforts of the new regime to get them to collaborate with neo-colonialist forces inside the country. This book serves to remind us how important their resistance is.

There are now 39 independent states in the African continent. The independence trickle, beginning in 1956, has grown into a flood since 1960, when 29 of the states won their independence. Ghana, until the February coup, was one of that group of African states which formed an important anti-imperialist bloc inside the Organization of African Unity. She worked, along with the United Arab Republic, Guinea, Mali, Tanzania, Algeria and Congo Brazzaville, to create a strong alliance which would, through economic, political and social co-operation, help the new states, most of them small and weak, to defend themselves from imperialist pressures.

The members of this group are the advance guard in the fight to break the imperialist stranglehold on the African continent. They are trying to develop new trading relations to free them from the domination of the capitalist world

*The author of this review spent nearly three years in Ghana, leaving the country after the February 24th coup. She is now working in the International Department of the Communist Party of Great Britain.

**Kwame Nkrumah, *Neo-Colonialism, The Last Stage of Imperialism*. International Publishers, 1966. \$7.50.

STUDY OF NEO-COLONIALISM

59

market. They aim to create a balanced highly productive agriculture and set up modern history.

This line of development is diametrically opposed to the interests of the imperialist powers. Though always reluctant to concede independence, when forced to do so the colonial rulers hope to keep the ex-colonies tame through control of their economic life, by aid schemes, by military bases and the use of other devices which Dr. Nkrumah calls "the mechanisms of neo-colonialism."

Imperialist Counter-Offensive

It is to counter the success of this group of independent states, working hard to achieve their full economic and social independence, that imperialism in the past two years has again resorted to violence, assassination and military coups in the African continent.

The paratroop invasion of Stanleyville in November 1964 opened this phase. The year 1965 saw the assassination of the prime minister of Burundi and of three important Congo Brazzaville officials, also the murder of Pio Pinto, an outstanding nationalist and socialist in Kenya. In November Ben Barka was kidnapped and murdered. There have been military coups in no less than seven African states since June 1965. While each has its own specific features, in general they have resulted either in the overthrow of progressive governments or in the forestalling of radical forces which would have introduced programs of planned development.

But these temporary setbacks, serious as they are, should never blind us to the tremendous significance of the winning of independence on a world-wide scale since the end of World War II.

Dr. Nkrumah sets out in this book to expose the obstacles to African unity. This unity he sees as the means of liberating the whole of the continent and ensuring the success of the kind of development programs which his government adopted. "To this unity there are still powerful obstacles but they are no greater than the obstacles already overcome and, if their nature is understood, they are clearly surmountable." (P. 24.)

The book discusses four main features of present day Africa: its appalling poverty and the reasons for it; the division of Africa into small non-viable states to keep then in subjection and conversely the need for unity to overcome domination; the character of the monopolies which control Africa's economy; and the nature and techniques of neo-colonialism.

The book's title declares its author's links with Marxism-Leninism, echoing Lenin's great work, *Imperialism The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Once, in a discussion at which I was fortunate to be present, Nkrumah told us that he was preparing this book for publication, and expressed the hope that it would be a contribution to the understanding of African problems, adding with a smile: "After all, we are having experiences that even Lenin didn't have."

It is characteristic of Nkrumah that in the last few years he has contributed to the application of scientific socialism to African experiences and conditions.

Lenin's *Imperialism* underlies the whole work. Part of the third chapter of this book, "Imperialist Finance," describes its main features, monopoly, the merging of bank and industrial capital, the export of capital, the division of the world between the major imperialist powers, uneven development and the consequent attempt to re-divide the world leading to world war.

It is important to have this summary. Even in Africa, there are people for whom imperialism and colonialism are synonymous. Consequently they assume that the ending of colonial rule means the end of imperialist control. They believe the propaganda from the United States which denies there is any such thing as American imperialism and which "proves" this by recalling its own past colonial status and then asserts that anyway the U.S. has no colonies. Similarly West Germany refutes the charge of "imperialism" by saying, quite rightly, that she has had no colonies in Africa since 1919. This same argument which obscures the essential nature of imperialism, leads some Africans to accept the lie of "Soviet imperialism." Perhaps for this reason most of the book is devoted to describing the economic basis of neo-colonialism.

But all this indirect subversion is as nothing compared with the brazen onslaught of international

capitalists. Here is "empire," the empire of finance capital, in fact if not in name, a vast sprawling network of inter-continental activity on a highly diversified scale that controls the lives of millions of people in the most widely separated parts of the world, manipulating whole industries and exploiting the labor and riches of nations for the greedy satisfaction of a few. Here resides the mainspring of power, the direction of policies that stand against the advancing tide of freedom of the exploited people of Africa and the world. Here is the adamant enemy of African independence and unity, braced in an international chain of common interest that regards the likely coming together of the new nations as a major blow at its continued domination of the resources and economies of others. Here, indeed, are the real workings of neo-colonialism. Here indeed are the economic ramifications of the monopolies and combines. Their financial and economic empires are pan-African and they can only be challenged on a pan-African basis. Only a united Africa through an All-African Union Government can defeat them. (Pp. 35-36.)

This passage contains the essence of the book. Its passion and vigor are characteristic of Nkrumah's fight for the unity of the continent as the guarantee of the defeat of imperialism.

Imperialism's Economic Grip

It is the systematic dismantling of the African continent carried through by the monopolies that has condemned the people to poverty, hunger, illiteracy, ill health. The people of Africa make up a considerable proportion of that

two-thirds of the world's population which has never had enough to eat. Their per capita income is the lowest in the world. The valuable raw materials and primary crops are taken out of the continent at below their true value, while manufactured goods are imported at high prices and even basic foodstuffs are expensive for the African worker and farmer. In addition the people are burdened with the repayment of high rates of interest on loans and capital for infra-structure, military aid and development projects.

The gap between the developed and the newly independent states is widening and the book reminds us forcibly of the problem by quoting the opinion of the Commission for Aid to Development of The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to the effect that if the developed nations continue to increase their gross national product at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and if the under-developed achieve a growth rate of 5 per cent per annum (which is highly unlikely), it will still take at least 200 years for the gap to be bridged. Perhaps this simple fact is the answer to those who have accused the Nkrumah government of impatience in trying to advance economic development in Ghana. As Dr. Nkrumah frequently reminded his fellow presidents, the African people want to see the fruits of independence now. In a continent as rich as theirs it is surely not too ambitious to demand enough to eat now, not two centuries hence.

The people are poor, their continent is rich. The book gives a staggering account of Africa's known mineral resources. The continent is still virtually uncharted, though a new scramble is at present being promoted, with extensive prospecting by international monopolies. It is, for example, utterly typical that Africa has large deposits of phosphates and yet agriculture is in general conducted at the lowest level of technique. The phosphates are shipped out of Africa, processed, packed and shipped back to the continent at prices too high for African farmers to buy. The material resources of the new states are being physically taken away in increasing quantities year after year.

In addition to describing the resources of the continent, the book devotes considerable space to the description of some of the most important monopoly capitalist firms, banks and industries, which control the economy. This provides a rich quarry of information on the size, the complex links and interlocking directorships of many firms. One example is the extensive list given of no less than 30 enterprises connected with Union Miniere.

The African countries are faced with the need to turn subsistence economies into organisms that will generate viable and improved conditions of living for their populations. However, many African governments, instead of getting together in united action which would stimulate maximum capital accumulation and the construction of a solid over-all African economy, are

granting concessions for the working of mineral, agricultural and forestry resources whose purpose is the drawing off of output to sustain and enlarge the industries and economies of the imperialist countries. Not one of the investing syndicates has any intention of founding in any one of these countries an integrated industrial complex that would give impetus to genuine economic growth. Nor are the returns on the export of primary products from mining, agriculture and forestry likely to provide to any important extent the looked-for capital for investing in industrial foundation. (P. 234.)

Neo-Colonialism Defined

The detail given about the economic grip of imperialism on the life of the African people and the resources of their continent is extremely impressive, but it is a pity that alongside this it was apparently not possible to describe the methods of neo-colonialism to the same extent. The book bears the signs of hasty writing presumably to ensure its appearance in time for the Organization of African Unity Conference and as a result there is a rather perfunctory discussion of neo-colonialism as a *stage* of imperialism. Definitions are scattered through the book and all the evidence produced tends to point to neo-colonialism not as a *stage* of imperialism but rather as a *tactic* of imperialism. There is no evidence to show that *essentially* new features of monopoly capitalism have emerged. It is true that the general crisis of capitalism is sharpening, bringing militarization and

increasing political instability in the imperialist world and the areas it dominates, but this does not necessarily produce a new stage of imperialism. The arguments in the book tend to emphasize that neo-colonialism is the method which imperialists now have to use to maintain their grip in the period after the winning of political independence by a significant section of the former colonial peoples. They can no longer enjoy the privileges of direct rule, and new means are required to guarantee their investments, sources of raw materials and markets.

At one stage of the book, this is how neo-colonialism is in fact defined:

Faced with the militant peoples of the ex-colonial territories in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America, imperialism simply switches tactics. Without a qualm it dispenses with its flags, and even with certain of its more hated expatriate officials. This means, so it claims, that it is "giving" independence to its former subjects, to be followed by "aid" for their development. Under cover of such phrases, however, it devises innumerable ways to accomplish objectives formerly achieved by naked colonialism. It is this sum total of these modern attempts to perpetuate colonialism while at the same time talking about "freedom" which has come to be known as *neo-colonialism*. (P. 239.)

The final section of the book is devoted to "The Mechanisms of Neo-colonialism." It describes the many ways in which imperialist states combine with their monopoly capitalists to create a wide

variety of organizations, or to support existing ones, which will serve to keep the new states "tame," so that the old exploitation can continue and even intensify.

As the United States is the most powerful imperialist state in the world, and as it has already developed neo-colonialist techniques in Latin America over almost a century, it is only to be expected that this all-too-brief section should concentrate mainly on its methods.

Dr. Nkrumah emphasizes that the intelligence network is very important and he quotes the Wise and Ross book *Invisible Government*: "By 1964 the intelligence network had grown into a massive hidden apparatus, secretly employing about 200,000 persons and spending billions of dollars a year." (P. 241.) The United States Embassy staff in Ghana was very big and one could only assume that some of them were employed by the intelligence services, perhaps even watching each other!

Loans with strings, aid with stringent conditions, assistance in return for political concessions are familiar aspects of neo-colonialist techniques. Dr. Nkrumah lists among other organizations, the Peace Corps, Moral Rearmament and the United States Information Agency as working for U.S. imperialist interests.

The Social Democratic parties, such as the British Labor Party and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, also help to keep the world safe for imperialism. The control of propa-

ganda, newspapers, radio, television and news agencies are important means of controlling men's minds in the new states, so that they acquiesce in continued exploitation and inequality.

The Need for Unity

The argument for unity as the effective way to fight imperialism runs throughout the book. Unity is not confined to African states but is seen as necessary for all the anti-imperialist forces on a world scale; the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the peoples of the socialist world and the progressive forces within the imperialist world are urged to unite to defeat the world imperialist system.

It would have been interesting to see how Dr. Nkrumah sees the forms of unity developing, both at the state level and at the level of the mass popular organizations.

The book lacks balance between the economic and political sections. Although, correctly, the book emphasizes the external forces of neo-colonialism, expressly devised or encouraged by imperialist states and monopoly enterprises themselves, we can see from experiences such as the coup in Ghana, that internal forces too are required to act as imperialism's fifth column inside the new states.

The old state apparatus is handed on from the colonial rulers to the new states. Some administrators, officers of the armed forces, teachers, specialists, lawyers and others, as well as the

local business elements who want independence to go no further than their immediate interests dictate, are prepared to try to halt steps to real independence and to prevent the development of a significant state sector of the economy or the growth of new relations with the socialist states. What is clear from Ghana's experience is that the very moves to create unity with the socialist world and the progressive newly independent states precipitate acute internal struggles. This developed in Ghana when the Minister of Finance toured the socialist countries and arranged favorable trade pacts which would have partially freed Ghanaian cocoa sales from domination by the capitalist market. Tremendous resistance was put up by sections of the petty bourgeoisie in state, party and business life who refuse to sever links with imperialism and advance to the next stage of independence. After prolonged crisis, the new trade arrangements were incorporated into the Ghana budget. This was presented to Parliament on Tuesday, February 22; the military coup took place on Thursday, February 24. Hardly a coincidence!

Neo-colonialism is, as Dr. Nkrumah emphasizes, a reflection of the weakness of imperialism. It brings with it increasing economic and political instability as the exclusive control of one metropolitan center over the colony gives way, after independence, to penetration by the capital of many countries—the United States, Britain, France, West Germany,

Japan, the Scandinavian countries, Israel and others. Each jockey for position and security, each tries to guarantee the safety of its investments by bribery and corruption, business deals with local people, propaganda campaigns, scholarships, jobs. A small section of the indigenous petty bourgeoisie becomes the servant of the foreign monopolies. Their way of life reflects the concessions they extract from their masters; they get richer, indulge in ostentatious consumption, while the masses get poorer. The next stage of the independence struggle looms up. As the working class grows in experience and numbers, it will be able to attract to itself the genuinely nationalist sections of the petty bourgeoisie, farmers, intellectuals and traders, to throw off the economic domination of the monopolies. In some cases, the leadership of the national independence movement will change hands and the parties will develop as revolutionary parties without such sharp setbacks as have occurred in Ghana. In other conditions, new parties formed by the working class, giving rise to a new broad alliance, will have to be created.

The struggle to defeat imperialism and its neo-colonialist tactics is certainly complex, and as Dr. Nkrumah says, “. . . the faint-hearted might come to feel that they must give up in despair before such an array of apparent power and seemingly inexhaustible resources. Fortunately, however, history furnishes innumerable proofs of one of its own major

laws: that the budding future is *always* stronger than the withering past. This has been amply demonstrated during every major revolution throughout history." (Pp. 251-252.)

* * *

This is an important book. It has been written by an outstanding leader of the national liberation movement, by a President, by a leader of African unity, by a statesman who has made the opportunities to contribute to revolutionary theory. The book is a broad base from which to continue our examination of neo-colonialism, explain its dangers, and develop the opposition to it which will destroy it. Though perhaps descriptive, rather than sharply analytical, it is imbued

with a deep passion for the freedom of the African continent whose situation it so fully describes. It is inspired by the desire to see the ordinary man and woman free from the rapacity of those who exploit and oppress them.

"For, when all is said and done, it is the so-called little man, the bent-backed, exploited, malnourished, blood-covered fighter for independence who decides. And he invariably decides for freedom." (P. 254.) It is the so-called little man who must seize the leadership of the next round of the struggle to win, as he surely will, the next stage of independence with which he can build a richer, fuller life.

We have completely run out of the April and August 1965 issues of *Political Affairs*. If any of our readers or accounts have these issues laying around we would appreciate getting them. Will you look through your files—and send them.

READINGS ON NEGRO AND AFRICAN HISTORY

•

CHALLENGE OF THE CONGO, Kwame Nkrumah \$7.50

Recent diplomatic history of the Congo by one of the Heads of State mostly closely involved. Sheds new light on Katanga's secession, the murder of Lumumba, the failure of the UN operation, and foreign intervention at Stanleyville.

NEO-COLONIALISM: THE LAST STAGE OF IMPERIALISM, Kwame Nkrumah \$7.50

"The most abundant factual concrete expose of the operations of neo-colonialism in Africa . . . will likely prove the classic and most authoritative book on the subject."—R. PALME DUTT.

THE WORLD AND AFRICA, W. E. B. Du Bois
Paperback \$1.95

An inquiry into the part which Africa has played in world history. "Here is the mature thought of a deeply delving and widely ranging scholar . . . the publishers are to be congratulated."—*Freedomways*.

JOHN BROWN, W. E. B. Du Bois
Cloth \$5.50; Paperback \$2.25

"Du Bois's JOHN BROWN is the real one, there is no doubt about that."—TRUMAN NELSON.

AMERICAN NEGRO SLAVE REVOLTS, Herbert Aptheker
Paperback \$2.25

"A thrilling saga of black men's fight for freedom."—*Chicago Defender*.

ESSAYS IN THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO, Herbert Aptheker
Cloth \$3.50; Paperback \$1.65

"It is powerfully written."—*Inter-Racial Review*, Catholic Inter-racial Council.

RECONSTRUCTION: THE BATTLE FOR DEMOCRACY, James S. Allen
Cloth \$5.00; Paperback \$1.85

"Scholarly, praiseworthy and enlightening."—*Liberator*.

•

At your bookshop or from

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

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