

SEPTEMBER, 1970

# political affairs

**Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis**

**BLACK AMERICANS AND THE MIDDLE EAST**

Henry M. Winston

**YSA: TROTSKYITE ROADBLOCK**

Michael Zagarell

**THE BLACK PANTHERS AND BLACK LIBERATION**

William L. Patterson

**BOURGEOIS "FUTUROLOGY" AND MAN'S FUTURE**

I. Bestuzhev-Lada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Editorial Comment*

Against Genocide 1

*Henry M. Winston*

Black Americans and the Middle East Conflict 4

*Michael Zagarell*

The YSA: Trotskyite Roadblock to Progress 16

*William L. Patterson*

The Black Panther Party and the Black  
Liberation Struggle 26

*I. Bestuzhev-Lada*

Bourgeois "Futurology" and the Future of  
Mankind 37

*P. S. Petrov*

America Reads Lenin (1917-1919) 51

BOOK REVIEWS

*Erik Bert*

Burns on the Business Cycle 55

*Ben Levine*

Robert Owen, Utopian Socialist 62

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

## Against Genocide

Twenty-five years ago, in San Francisco, the United Nations was born. Among other things, its founding reflected the determination of countless millions throughout the world that the criminal aggression of the Axis Powers, and above all the bestial mass extermination of peoples by the Nazis, would never be repeated.

Three years later, in 1948, the fledgling UN brought forth two notable documents: the Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide. These documents called for unequivocal defense of the fundamental rights of all human beings without exception, and they condemned and outlawed genocidal actions in whatever form they might take. As such, they were hailed by all who stood for humanism and social progress.

Both documents were signed by the U.S. representatives in the UN. But they have never been ratified by our government, and all efforts to have them ratified have been consistently rebuffed. Those who have blocked ratification are those who have been the authors and upholders of the genocidal racist oppression practiced against Black, Brown, Red and Yellow peoples in the United States—the giant monopolies and their political spokesmen.

There are some who hesitate to use the term "genocide" to describe the racial and national persecution which has so disfigured the United States throughout its existence. After all, here there are no gas chambers, no organized mass slaughter, no declarations of intent literally to exterminate entire peoples, such as existed under Hitler. But such people take too narrow a view of the meaning of genocide and would confine it to only its most extreme manifestations.

The UN's Genocide Convention defines genocide as "killing members of the group and any intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, racial or ethnic or religious group," and further as "causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group." That the oppression of Black Americans does indeed fall within this definition was forcefully demonstrated nearly two decades ago in the petition *We Charge Genocide*, prepared by the Civil Rights Congress. This petition was presented to the UN General Assembly in Paris in December 1951 by William L. Patterson, and simultaneously to the UN Secretariat in New York by a committee headed by Paul Robeson. Its documentation is irrefutable.

Nor has racial and national persecution in the U.S. lost its genocidal character since 1951; only the forms have changed—and for the worse. The police murders of Black Panther leaders; the murderous assaults on Black youth in Chicago, Illinois, in Orangeburg, South Carolina, in Jackson, Mississippi; the shooting in the back of Black citizens in Augusta, Georgia; the elaborate plans for military “containment” of the Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican ghettos in the name of “law and order”; the innumerable frameups and beatings of Black, Brown, Red and Yellow youths; the deliberate starvation of masses of “superfluous” Black farmers and farm workers in the South—all these and other actions, sanctioned and carried out by agencies of government, are clear violations of the Genocide Convention.

That this genocidal persecution has not gone further is a tribute to the heroism of the Black liberation movement, as well as to the mounting struggles of the Chicano, Puerto Rican and Indian peoples. Growing out of all these struggles, today a new movement for the enforcement of the Genocide Convention is taking shape in the United States.

*We Charge Genocide*, out of print for many years, is scheduled to appear this month in a new printing, with an introduction by William L. Patterson. It deserves to be read by all who have not seen it before and to be reread by all who have. It will undoubtedly enjoy wide reception and distribution.

Particularly noteworthy is the recently initiated circulation of a mass *Petition to the United Nations*, sponsored by the Emergency Conference Committee. Among its initial signers are such well-known figures as Shirley Chisholm, Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, Dick Gregory, William L. Patterson and Bobby Seale. The Petition states in part:

We assert that the Genocide Convention has been flagrantly violated by the Government of the United States. We further assert that the United Nations has jurisdiction in this matter; to hold otherwise is to repudiate its position regarding apartheid in South Africa and as well its universal Declaration of Human Rights and its Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide. . . .

On the basis of simple justice, it is time for the United Nations to call for universal action, and to apply economic and political sanctions against the United States until such time as the United States Government shall abide by the Genocide Convention and the Declaration of Human Rights.

By the beginning of August, according to the sponsoring committee, some 25,000 petitions, each with spaces for 50 signatures, were already in circulation. Additional requests for petitions were pouring in from all parts of the country. New prominent supporters were coming forward, among them Mrs. Coretta King and Reverend Ralph Abernathy. Numerous organizations of Women Strike for Peace were circulating the petition, and it had been endorsed by the recent National Peace Conference held in Milwaukee and by the National Rank-and-File Conference of trade unionists held in Chicago. The *Black Panther*, newspaper of the Black Panther Party, has run the petition in its pages, for readers to sign and send in to the sponsoring committee.

Here we have the beginnings of what bids fair to become a truly mass campaign, one which possesses the potentiality of collecting signatures numbering in the millions, not to speak of the development of surrounding activities. Most important, it holds forth the possibility of mass involvement of white Americans, and especially of white workers. Within the trade union movement, this campaign becomes by its very nature an integral part of the fight for black-white unity which is basic to the advance of the rank-and-file movement.

Undoubtedly this Petition will have a tremendous impact not only in the United States but on a world scale. It is a significant part of the continuing upsurge of democratic struggles in our country, and within the context of these struggles it can contribute greatly to the advancement of the liberation struggle to a new level, as well as to the closer integration of all fronts of struggle into a broad people's coalition against the assaults of monopolist reaction.

Every Communist and progressive, every reader of *Political Affairs*, should be involved fully in this campaign.

(Petitions may be obtained from the Emergency Conference Committee, 33 Union Square West, Room 907, New York, N. Y. 10003.)

## Black Americans and the Middle East Conflict

The *Statement on the Middle East* adopted by the Political Committee of the Communist Party on April 9, 1970 declared: "The situation in the Middle East is a grave one." Noting that a virtual state of warfare exists between Israel and the United Arab Republic, this statement warned that: "The danger of a flareup into full scale warfare grows daily, with the attendant peril of escalation into world nuclear war." The Statement further declared that "the primary source of the growing war danger is the continuing aggressive, expansionist policies which led to the Israeli aggression in 1967."

### *Nixon's Middle East Policies*

Nearly three months later, President Nixon approved Phantom jets, Skyhawks and other military material for Israel. At almost the same time, in an interview with news analysts of CBS, NBC and ABC he stated that he was for "peace" and the "integrity of every country in the area." These Phantoms and Skyhawks will be used to replenish the arsenal of the Meir-Begin-Dayan government for stepped up military actions against the UAR, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan, for increased raids on civilian targets, for greater use of napalm.

There is already talk about the use of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean. In the same interview, Mr. Nixon laid the basis for this imperialist action when he asserted that "Israel is not desirous of driving any other countries into the sea—the other countries do want to drive Israel into the sea."

There is not a single Arab government which subscribes to this idea nor is such a position held by the Arab masses. This fact Mr. Nixon knows very well. This falsification is needed to deceive the people of the United States lest there develop a movement in opposition to his policies in the Middle East similar to the great outburst against the Cambodian invasion extending the war in Indochina.

The President attempts to cloak the policies of U.S. imperialism by talk of "balance of power." Says he, "it is in the interest of the United States (read U.S. imperialism—H.W.) to maintain the balance of power—and *we will* maintain that balance of power." (Emphasis mine—H.W.) Here is the brandishing of the iron fist! The "balance

of power" concept reveals two things at once: anti-Sovietism and racism.

What Mr. Nixon is now saying was formulated in our statement in these words: "Today U.S. imperialism, seeking to offset the defeat of its efforts to overthrow the anti-imperialist governments of the UAR and Syria, and to counteract the growing strength of the Left and anti-imperialist forces throughout the Arab world, is using Israeli military power as its instrument. For this purpose it is supplying Israel with offensive military aircraft, despite her already overwhelming air superiority."

Mr. Nixon consciously and deliberately avoids mentioning the U.N. Resolution of November 22, 1967. This resolution calls for a peaceful settlement and, in the words of the Statement "is based on both withdrawal from the occupied territories and recognition of Israel's right to exist in peace and security."

Everyone knows that the UAR, Jordan and Lebanon support and fight for the implementation of this resolution. The Soviet Union upholds these efforts for a peaceful settlement and consistently gives support to the peoples fighting for liberation from imperialism.

A special dispatch from Cairo to the *New York Times* (July 4, 1970) quotes a Western observer as stating: "It's not easy for the Egyptians to proclaim it at this time—but they have done everything except run up the Israeli flag and salute it to make it clear that the annihilation of Israel is no longer their objective." Their actual objective, as stated in the dispatch, is to "regain territories lost to Israel in the 1967 war and to gain a settlement for Palestinian refugees." Such reactions were general, and the Egyptians answered this calumny of President Nixon with great indignation. The stumbling block to implementing the U.N. resolution is its rejection, in any meaningful sense, by the Israeli government. This rejection, which is fully backed by the Nixon Administration, stems from the Zionist-inspired annexationist policy of Israel's rulers.

The real struggle for peace and national liberation is "transformed" by Mr. Nixon through a sleight-of-hand. To him, the immediate danger in the Middle East is now a struggle between capitalism and socialism, or put in his language, the danger of confrontation between "the two superpowers." This is imperialist arrogance with a vengeance. The existence of Israel as an independent state, the role of other powers in the Middle East and Africa—in particular, Britain, France, West Germany, Belgium—are here viewed in the light of catspaws supporting policies of U.S. neo-colonialism and its dominance in a system of continuing imperialist oppression.

Boiled down, this is the essence of Nixon's present-day Middle East policies.

The dangers facing our people today are far greater than those which came from the soil of Nazi Germany and led to World War II. The greater danger of today, emanating from the soil of the United States, sharply poses the threat of thermonuclear war. Nixon's policy is the very opposite of the struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation, the rights of the Jewish people in Israel and the existence of Israel as a state, and it fundamentally contradicts the national interests of the people of the United States as well.

There is still time to check and reverse such a policy, leading in the direction of military collision and disaster. However, some leaders have drawn quite different conclusions. Many of them speak of peace, but are in reality supporting policies which knock at the door of world conflagration.

For example, I recently spent several weeks in the Democratic Republic of The Sudan and witnessed first-hand how the Revolutionary Council is building a national democratic state. I saw how it is leading the nation at a quickened pace in liquidating the crimes of British imperialism and unfolding a program of national reconstruction corresponding to the real needs of the people. Later I visited the Republic of Uzbekistan in the U.S.S.R., and there studied how socialism had rescued a people from Czarist oppression and brought about phenomenal developments in industry, agriculture, education, health, culture, the sciences, etc.

The march of the people of the Sudan toward political and economic independence from imperialism could lead to the same results. This was one of the greatest developments in the Middle East and on the continent of Africa. The realization of the age-old dream of the peoples in their fight for freedom from imperialism was moving from dawn to daylight.

#### *The New York Times Ad*

Upon my return I read in the *New York Times* on June 28, 1970 a full-page ad with the following heading: "An Appeal by Black Americans for United States Support to Israel." It was sponsored by the A. Philip Randolph Institute, headed by Bayard Rustin. This ad is a distinct service to the imperialist policies of the Nixon Administration in the Middle East. At the same time it is a distinct disservice to the Black people of the United States, as it is to all proponents of peace and lovers of democracy in the U.S.

And this happens at a moment when the racist policy of the Administration is openly showing its fangs. Bishop Stephen G. Spots-

wood, Chairman of the National Board of Directors of the N.A.A.C.P., in his keynote address to that organization's annual convention held in Cincinnati at the end of June 1970, was right when he declared:

For the first time since Woodrow Wilson, we have a national administration that can be rightly characterized as anti-Negro. This is the first time since 1920 that the national administration has made it a calculated policy to work against the needs and aspirations of the largest minority of its citizens.

Nonetheless, the contents of this appeal for support to Israel should be read and studied, for mirrored in it is the true face of social democracy in general, and especially its adaptation by Mr. Rustin, who has the task of presenting it in such a way as to make it palatable to Black people. Of interest is the fact that Mr. Rustin succeeded in establishing a united front with the main integrationist current of Black reformism. And on the basis of opportunism, of a conscious omission of basic facts and a partial statement of truths, he was able to publish this appeal with the signatures of 64 Black men and women as a partial list of sponsors. Among the 64 are these 31: 10 representatives of unions, 5 from churches, 5 congressmen, 2 mayors, 3 state senators, 1 judge, 2 educators and 3 journalists. Some of these people are eminent fighters for peace and equal rights, and are active participants in the struggle against imperialism in general.

As I read this ad I recalled that Bayard Rustin had been concerned with sharecropping over a considerable period, and the following thought came to me:

Some sharecropping remains in the Black Belt of the South, even though sharecropping as a system no longer exists. The fight against the impoverishment of the tenants is an economic, political and social struggle whose character is objectively anti-feudal and anti-imperialist. The working class and all democrats must give unstinting support to this struggle.

Mr. Bayard Rustin might also be said to be a "sharecropper." But he is a different kind of "sharecropper," living in an urban community. He is a "political tenant" of a certain section of the bourgeoisie, and not of a plantation owner supervised by the riding boss. The share of the crop for this "political tenant" is the permission to give the appearance of developing a real struggle against the Nixon Administration, but in reality only shadow-boxing with it. The share of the crop for the master is "Phantom jets for Israel." What an exchange! An examination of the contents of the ad will suffice to show how Bayard Rustin performs his difficult feat.

First, in its 800-word statement on Israel and the Middle East the word "imperialism" is completely absent. Any serious student of the Middle East would be interested in knowing about the nature of the struggle, especially about the fight against imperialism, not only in the use of concepts like "colonies" and "neo-colonialism," but also about the stage of development of the struggle against imperialism, which varies from country to country.

It may be difficult to believe but the name of Nixon is not even mentioned, although the demand for Phantom jets can be implemented only by the Nixon Administration. The one point that is raised is anti-Sovietism. I shall refer to this later in a different context.

The first sentence of the ad reads: "The crisis in the Middle East is a cause of great concern to all Americans, non-Jew as well as Jew, black as well as white." The second sentence expresses the "concern" of Black people over this danger. The "motivation" for this "concern," the ad declares, is "not only . . . the threat to world peace which is posed by the Arab-Israeli conflict. We are also moved by the ideals which we have struggled to achieve in this country and which we firmly believe the U.S. should uphold in the Middle East."

The reader would expect to find issuing from such a pronouncement, conclusions which would give a true estimate of the situation in the Middle East, and would help to rally the masses, black and white, in struggle for a just solution of the conflict. But the ad completely avoids this question. The reason for this is evident. To give such an estimate would require, on the one hand, an exposure of Israeli aggression, of its support by U.S. imperialism, of national oppression inside Israel and the occupied territories, of the class struggle inside Israel, and of the mounting opposition to the policies being pursued. On the other hand, it would necessitate an honest presentation of the just struggle of the Arab peoples against imperialism. This is a difficult and complicated fight, within each of the Arab countries, against the comprador capitalists and other domestic reactionaries who are the mainstay of imperialist rule.

The oppressed millions understand that the impoverished position of the masses, the prevalence of illiteracy, ignorance, disease, and economic and social backwardness in general, are the bitter fruit of centuries of imperialist rule. The beautiful rhetoric in the ad conveniently covers up these facts of life. The ad states: "In our opinion the U.S. can best stand by these ideals by unequivocally guaranteeing Israel's security." Instead of a call to the people to compel adherence to the U.N. Resolution of November 1967, there is an appeal for greater U.S. involvement in the war in the Middle East.

There is no danger to the "security of Israel." This danger could arise only if there is a continuation of present Israeli policies, which cannot but lead toward thermonuclear war. The danger increases in direct proportion to the extent to which this kind of false appeal is made. For shame!

### *Racism in Israel*

Acknowledging that Israel has its "shortcomings," the ad then asserts: "It is by far the most democratic country in the Middle East." Let us say, for the sake of argument, that this is true. Can this be a justification for Israeli aggression in the Middle East? Should not such aggression be condemned just as U.S. aggression in Indochina is condemned?

The ad does not tell us that Israel is not and has never been a colonial country. Israel is a capitalist country, and the ruling class directs the affairs of state under conditions of capitalist democracy.

In the Sudan, as I have noted, I encountered a higher type of development, that is, the growth of national democracy. This is not a democracy serving the interests of a ruling class, but of the entire people fighting for complete liberation from the vestiges of imperialism, and marching along the path toward socialism. The achievement of this goal will put an end to exploitation and national oppression, and will serve the interests of the nation as it continues to fight for peace in the Middle East and the world.

Then we encounter this gem: "What is remarkable is that the high degree of political freedom has not diminished despite the constant need to maintain military preparedness." What is overlooked in this tribute to "political freedom" is the fact that within Israel there exists widespread national and racial discrimination and oppression—economic, social and political. This stems directly from the Zionist conception of Israel as an exclusively Jewish state and as a "Western" state—a state in which non-Jews and non-Westerners are looked upon as outsiders.

I shall quote an observation made by Dr. Hyman Lumer, editor of *Political Affairs*, in a pamphlet entitled, *Which Way Israel?* (New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1966). He writes:

Israeli society suffers from the widespread existence of national discrimination and oppression within the country. Most notorious is the oppression of the Arab minority, numbering some 270,000.

Indeed, the Arab question in Israel plays a role in many ways comparable to that of the Negro question in the U.S. . . .

Continuing, Dr. Lumer says:

The powers of military rule have been used as a political weapon against Arabs daring to struggle against their oppression. They have been used also as an instrument for confiscating the lands of Arabs.

He goes on to say:

National oppression in Israel is not confined to Arabs; it is also the lot of the darker-skinned Jews of Asian and African origin. These have migrated to Israel in large numbers lately, chiefly from Yemen and Iraq, and are now about half of its total population. . . .

Their housing density is three to five times that of other groups. They are likewise crowded into the most unskilled, lowest-paying jobs. In 1964 their per capita monthly income was less than half of that of Western Jews and native-born Israelis. And they lag far behind in education. They are subjected to all sorts of insults and indignities. "‘Cushi,’ the Biblical term for Negro," says a *New York Times* story (January 29, 1965), "has taken on the same pejorative meaning in Israel as ‘nigger’ in the United States."

Or read this passage from a forthcoming pamphlet by Dr. Lumer:

Illustrative of the attitude towards "Orientals" is an article by Yael Dayan in the Israeli newspaper *Yediot Aharonot* (March 22, 1968) in which she tells of her difficulties in selling a house. "It's the neighborhood," the real estate agent tells her. She explains:

"The house's only neighbors are 'Orientals.' It borders on a Yemenite quarter called Morashah, and actually forms the borderline between the respectable neighborhood of Naveh Magen, which boasts of Israeli army commanders, and the Yemenite quarter, with one-story houses and nice gardens whose sons serve in the army of the Chief of Staff who lives on the right side of the neighborhood—a matter of two to three hundred meters. . . . It was thus that ghettos were formed. Thus grew the Negro, the Puerto Rican and the Jewish slums. Would you want your daughter to marry a Negro? Would you want to have a Jew as your neighbor? . . .

"I don't know what is more insulting—the fact that the whole phenomenon exists, or the total lack of shame implicit in openly admitting it. 'I would have paid 5,000 more for the house had it been in another neighborhood,' a respectable lady told me. Five thousand Israeli pounds more so that Rabinovitz's children won't play with the children of this quarter. Five thousand pounds more so that they won't mix, God forbid, with those who have dark eyes and black hair"

I should think that this is certainly "remarkable." But is it not strange that we are not told about this?

### *For or Against Imperialism?*

The ad, nonetheless, hastens to tell us about the limitations of democratic liberties in the Arab countries, and correctly exposes the role of the Sheikdoms. But it never mentions that these are the creation of imperialism, and that their share of the take, which is used for their own enrichment, is but a small share of the riches extracted by foreign imperialism, which goes into the banks of London, Brussels and Wall Street. It never tells us that the most reactionary of these Sheikdoms, such as Saudi Arabia, are closely tied to the United States.

Neither does the ad tell us of the growing struggle of the masses in the Arab world for greater clarity, to put an end precisely to this state of affairs. The writers of the ad are learned men, and cannot be ignorant of these facts.

For example, we are told that the struggles in the Sudan and Biafra are not racial in character, but we are not told *what they are*. This cannot be done without explaining the role of imperialism which inflames racial strife and incites separatist movements all over Africa. This was the meaning of Biafra, Katanga, and now the policies of imperialism in the southern region of the Sudan. It is inseparably related to the overall policies of imperialism against the movement for national liberation. We are given a partial truth, only for the purpose of deception, only to hide the real essence of things.

The crocodile tears, shed in the form of "concern" for the "Arab refugees" and the "concern" about "the continuation of the conflict" as being against the interests of the people, becomes once more nothing but rhetoric, and meaningless when an appeal in the name of Black Americans is made to grant Phantom jets to Israel.

Growing tens of millions throughout the world recognize the role of the Soviet Union in its quest for peace and its support of the peoples struggling for freedom from imperialism. The ad states: "We believe that the United States has a vital role to play in ending the crisis. If it does not stand firm in the Middle East, the Soviet Union will be encouraged to increase its intervention, thereby escalating the conflict still further."

What do they call "intervention"? Against what does the ad call upon the President to act? The fact is that the reference in the ad to "Soviet intervention" is designed simply to conceal the true nature of Soviet aid to the developing countries of Africa.

From a pamphlet by D. Chertkov, entitled *Time-Tested Friendship* (Novosti Publishing House, Moscow, 1969), we extract the following facts which show the kind of aid given by the Soviet Union in Africa

and the Middle East:

The Soviet Union is helping Algeria to build nearly 80 projects. . . . The biggest is the steel plant with a designed capacity of 300-350 thousand tons of rolled stock a year [which] will provide a basis for the country's industrialization. . . .

On March 17, 1965 a Soviet-Iraqi protocol was signed for building a power station and water reservoir on the Euphrates and the construction of a tractor assembly plant. . . .

When the enterprises now being built with Soviet assistance are commissioned, power production will increase 2.5 times in the United Arab Republic, steel production, 4-5 times, and cable production, 3 times. It will reduce or completely cut down the import of ships, coke, fine steel sheets, forgings, machine tools, instruments, electrodes, pharmaceutical preparations, radio sets, lubricants, etc.

While I was in the Sudan I learned that the Soviet Union had helped that country to work out a five-year plan whose goal is to build industry, mechanize agriculture, carry out electrification, extend transportation and communication facilities, and develop educational, health and cultural facilities. I saw with my own eyes, in the upper Nile Province in the South of the Sudan, how virgin lands, many thousands of acres never before touched by a plow, are now being cultivated on a cooperative basis. The tractors used for this come from the Soviet Union. The first phase of this program will be funded with internal Sudanese resources from nationalization of foreign-owned banks. The other sources of funds for the plan will come from the socialist countries, primarily from the Soviet Union. The old government in the Sudan limited Soviet aid to the building of two elevators, a milk cannery, two fruit and vegetable canneries and a few other such enterprises. But this changed sharply after the revolution of May 25, 1969, when a new relationship developed.

The pamphlet also states:

A considerable part of goods from developing countries comes to the U.S.S.R. in payment for Soviet plant, machinery and expertise. Developing countries acquire a stable and expanding market in the U.S.S.R. for their goods, which serves to maintain stable prices for these goods on the world market and reinforces their position vis-a-vis international monopolies which seek to reap extra profits from price cuts on raw materials and foods imported from tropical countries.

These are but a few examples out of the many countries receiving aid.

Every state rightfully has its own army, which is a pillar of state power. The question is, what kind of state and what kind of army, what kind of state policy and what kind of military policy? If the policy of the state is one of national democracy, the policy of the armed forces must also take on this character. In the newly-liberated countries the role of the army is, in keeping with this, objectively anti-imperialist.

With the rise of the socialist world, and particularly of the Soviet Union, something new has developed in this respect. Previously, in states under the domination of imperialism, the armed forces could be built only in reliance on the imperialist powers, which took care that they would serve the interests of imperialism and the perpetuation of colonial or semi-colonial status. They were designed to be used against the people in these states, and in support of the aggressive policies of imperialism.

What is new is that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries pursue a diametrically opposite policy, one which flows from the very nature of socialism. Its aim is freedom from imperialism, and in this there is a complete correspondence of interests between the socialist countries and the newly-liberated countries. The aid which is given to a country in building its armed forces is designed not for aggression, not for use against the people, but for working with the people in the development of the country and in wiping out the crimes of imperialism.

The attack on Soviet aid to the Arab states as an act of "intervention" is a conscious and deliberate piece of propaganda by imperialism, which social democracy helps to spread. It is a shield for the policies of the Nixon Administration. The concept of "balance of power" in the Middle East is in reality a device for maintaining the status of U.S. imperialism in that area. For how can one speak of a "balance" between imperialist rule and independence? One or the other must prevail. The ad places itself on the side of the perpetuation of imperialist domination.

The slogan of "no right of Israel to exist" is the propaganda of imperialism. The healthy national sentiment among the Jewish masses is being monstrously distorted, and by confusion and falsification of fact is transformed into the nationalism of the Jewish bourgeoisie, into adherence to its most reactionary expression, Zionism. The attempted cleverness in the writing of the ad miserably fails to conceal this simple truth. That is why all progressives and lovers of peace, black and white—all who are anti-fascist, anti-monopoly, and anti-imperialist—cannot remain silent in the face of attacks which would attempt to separate the anti-imperialist movement from their greatest friend,



the Soviet Union, which renders them all-round assistance in their quest for freedom.

### *A Regrettable Editorial*

It is with regret that I read in an editorial appearing in the *Morning Freiheit* (July 1, 1970) the following: "The call of 64 Black leaders to support Israel in the fight for her existence *must be strongly greeted.*" (Emphasis mine—H.W.) The *Morning Freiheit* observes that the call is "a very good answer" to the "extremists" who "want to present the war in the Middle East as part of the struggle of the Black people in this country and in Africa against white imperialism." The issue is not fairly posed. If the editorial writer is referring to the struggle of the Arab people against classical colonialism and neo-colonialism, there can be no doubt that such a struggle is an inseparable part of the fight of the whole of the African people for liberation from imperialism. And this is indissolubly linked to the struggle of Black people in the U.S. for complete and unconditional equality.

However, the expansionist policies of the Israeli government, its occupation of Arab lands, its military attacks which flow from an aggressive war policy, are in the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the U.S. and the Israeli ruling class which is subservient to it. This is a war against the liberation movement in the Middle East, in the whole of Africa, just as it is a war which undermines the struggle for equal rights for Black people in the U.S. The *Morning Freiheit*, nevertheless considers the call to be a "very good answer."

The *Morning Freiheit* restates some of the arguments in the ad and expresses agreement with them. I have discussed these arguments above.

The *Morning Freiheit* is incorrect when it writes: "But the call of the Black leaders is not only important because of its correct attitude toward Israel." And it is incorrect when it says that the issuance of such a statement is "also very important for Jewish-Black relations in our country."

When one speaks Black-Jewish unity the question is: unity for what? The unity expressed by the supporters of the ad is apparently unity against a danger to Israel's existence—a danger which is actually non-existent. But in reality it is quite definitely unity in support of U.S. imperialist policies in the Middle East.

These policies are threefold:

1. Continued control by U.S. imperialism of the oil riches in the Middle East.
2. Support of puppet regimes which are obedient to the will of im-

perialism, in order to check and reverse the advances made by the people in the Arab countries toward political and economic independence.

3. Strengthening and reinforcing the imperialist ramparts in the Mediterranean, including NATO, and enhancement of the position of imperialism for struggle against the socialist world.

Jewish-Black relations can never be based on support of such policies.

The *Morning Freiheit* is absolutely right when it notes that: "The 'establishment' has done everything it could to divide the two minorities—Jews and Black people—and to try to create hatred between them." It is further correct in saying: "The racists who fight against full equality for Black people and who also hate Jews incite both and try to spread anti-Semitism among Black people." And it correctly concludes "that the two minorities which suffer most from racism, Black people and Jews, should be united among themselves in the fight against racism. They must see who is their common enemy and must fight with united forces against the racism which is the blood brother of anti-Semitism. A great number of Jewish leaders also see the great importance of such a struggle. The quicker and the more broadly the united struggle develops the better it will be for both minorities and for American democracy in general."

This is not only good, but very good—if it is understood that such unity in the fight against racism and anti-Semitism must be a unity which includes all democratic forces in the country, and in the first place the labor movement. Such unity must first of all clearly identify the enemy (the racists and anti-Semites) and the allies in the struggle as well. And it must be based on struggle against racist trends among the Jewish people, such as the crusade which is now developing in some quarters against an alleged "anti-Semitism on the Left."

The massive concentration of the ideologists of imperialism must not derail the *Morning Freiheit* from the glorious role it has hitherto played and must continue to play in the fight against imperialism. The entire progressive movement has a right to look forward to the paper's unfolding of an ideological and political struggle against imperialism's two main weapons: anti-Sovietism and racism. A very good beginning would be the complete rejection and renunciation of the view that there exists a universal Arab insistence on the "non-existence of Israel," which is but a hoax of imperialism.

# The YSA: Trotskyite Roadblock to Progress\*

We are at a critical moment in the struggle for peace. The invasion of Cambodia has unleashed a tremendous movement against the war. The ruling class is hard at work trying to smash this movement. It centers its efforts on trying to split black-white unity and student-labor unity. To such attacks we must respond by working toward building the broadest national front against war, racism and repression.

In pursuing this goal, growing numbers of people are becoming aware of the consistent opposition offered by the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance. Trotskyism, which has for some years been worming its way into the peace movement, has now emerged as a major obstacle on the path to progress.

## *Black-White Unity*

Unity in our country must begin with black-white unity. On this the YSA states:

It is among black and other third world peoples that opposition to the Vietnam war is deepest and most massive. As the most oppressed section of the American population, blacks and browns face the brunt of the draft calls, the welfare cutbacks, and the deaths due to the war. Blacks and browns struggling for liberation in the U.S. see no interest in dying to suppress the Vietnamese liberation struggle. Thus it is not surprising that opposition to the Vietnam war is predominant in most every sector of the black and brown communities, including the more conservative elements.

This massive opposition to the war has hardly been tapped in action. (*Introduction to the Young Socialist Alliance*, p. 36.)

No one can have any quarrel with this. These are facts. But given these facts, how can we explain the fact that black-white unity stands at a relatively low point in the fight for peace?

YSA is at a loss to explain this. The only explanation they offer is that:

\*The following article is part of the text of a lecture presented at the Center for Marxist Education in New York City. The full text will be published as a pamphlet by the Young Workers Liberation League.

Although almost every black and third world organization opposes the war, no third world organization or group of organizations has either the strength or the political understanding to be able to tap this opposition in action. (*Ibid.*, p. 37.)

But this statement is an insult to oppressed peoples, who have shown by their leadership in struggle after struggle that they can and do build powerful movements. The problem of Black participation in the peace movement is not some shortcoming of Black people, but the weaknesses of whites. On many campuses throughout the nation, Black students are refusing to take part in strikes against intervention in Cambodia and against the murder of the Kent four. These students demand to know why it is that the peace movement has reacted so strongly to the murder of four white students but has shown only a token reaction to the earlier murder of Black students at Orangeburg, South Carolina and to the more recent killings of Black people in Augusta, Georgia and at Jackson State College. These Black students demand that unity be achieved on the basis of equality, on the basis of a fight against war *and* racism. Unity achieved on this basis is in the interests of both black and white.

We are not for this abstention of Black people from the peace struggles. But can anyone deny that their grievance is just?

The failure of the peace movement to incorporate the fight against racism has made the peace fight more vulnerable to attack and has built a schism between black and white. To most participants in the peace movement, this is a weakness. For YSA, however, refusal to take a stand on this question is a solidified position defended as a principle and backed by mobilization of its "troops." Thus, the YSA states:

The Vietnam war cuts deeply into the fabric of society, raising a multitude of fundamental questions about racism, inflation, taxes, anti-labor legislation, cutbacks in welfare spending, etc. All are intimately tied into the war, which the YSA is the first to explain. But it would be a different matter for the entire anti-war movement to adopt a political program which speaks to all these problems of capitalist society. Would such a program be reformist or revolutionary? In either case it would exclude those who disagreed and introduce as the basis of the anti-war action the political differences that are at the basis of competing parties and tendencies.

We are against the imposition of a reformist political program on the anti-war movement, smuggled behind a facade of talk about becoming more "radical" by dealing with other issues. To those individuals who are interested in taking steps beyond anti-war activity and are ready for a "multi-issue" organization, we present

the revolutionary program of the YSA and urge those who agree with us to join the YSA. But we do not try to impose the YSA's program on the entire anti-war movement. (*Ibid.*, p. 39.)

This defense of a refusal to take up the fight against racism in the peace movement is a weak one indeed.

YSA argues that taking up the fight against racism in the peace movement would split the unity of that movement. Whose unity are they concerned about? Certainly not the unity between black and white, for this unity can never be achieved by submerging the fight against racism. What they really mean is that taking up the fight against racism would split *whites*, that unity with Black people must be weakened so that unity with those who accept racism can be achieved.

What more glaring capitulation to racism can there be than this? Not only is the YSA sacrificing the needs of the Black community, but it is also weakening the unity among whites. For what weakens anti-imperialist consciousness among whites more than anti-Communism and racism?

Does not racism rationalize the build-up of the police? Do not pro-war candidates unable to defend their pro-war policy get elected on the basis of racist appeals? Is not the strongest base of the Nixon Administration among racist Southerners who are elected time after time? Are there not Birchite cells in many shops today because they were organized during the Wallace campaign, and is not the peace movement suffering from this today?

How can these whites be united against the war unless they come to reject racism, unless they mobilize millions against it in mass struggle?

YSA claims that by bringing in other issues we smuggle reformist politics into the peace movement. But what is more revolutionary than black-white unity? What leaves the people more at the mercy of the ruling class, the reformists and the reactionaries, than refusing to challenge racism and refusing to build black-white unity of all the anti-war forces? Does YSA's position not come closest to Senator Eugene McCarthy's, who wanted to fight the war but hesitated to raise anti-racist issues for fear that it would alienate the masses?

Black liberation is so central to the direction of this country that black-white unity and the fight against racism must be brought into every movement, every struggle. Without this, there can be no victories in the trade union movement, in the student movement, in the women's liberation movement, and in the peace movement. Is it also

YSA's view that all these movements as well should not raise such questions for fear that they will divide these struggles? This is the logic of their position.

To raise today the idea that fighting racism will narrow the movement is a denial of reality. So broad, so sweeping, is the fight against racism that even the Congress was forced to vote against two presidential nominees for the Supreme Court because of racism. Can the peace movement, then, justify not raising this issue?

Can the continued imposition of this narrow position on the peace struggle be described in any other way than as a capitulation to racism and as cowardice before the enemy?

### *Student-Labor Unity*

The second area of unity which must be achieved is that between students and labor.

The ruling class is now doing its utmost to portray the peace movement as a student movement and to portray the workers as hawks. They know that the workers will decide the question, and they are trying to polarize them in a pro-war direction. Therefore, what more pressing question exists today than building the unity of students and labor, what more pressing question confronts the peace movement than building rank-and-file trade union committees against the war?

It is precisely this task that Young Workers Liberation League has singled out as a central aspect of its program. But the YSA repudiates this goal and heaps scorn on those who aim to accomplish it. Speaking of the League, they state:

This "new" organization is supposed to reflect the CP's current turn towards "industrial concentration" (sending its members into heavy industry) by being a "working class" organization. The statement of principles published in the name of the "Temporary Organizing Committee for a New Marxist-Leninist Youth Organization" contains no mention of either the war in Vietnam or the student movement, although it does detail many programmatic points. This "turn" towards the workers represents nothing more than a retreat by the CP and its youth from the living struggles of today, and an attempt to remove themselves from a movement in which the overwhelming majority of the activists have totally rejected the CP's reformist line. (*Ibid.*, p. 11.)

What kind of revolutionary movement, what kind of working-class organization is it that talks of working among workers as a retreat from struggle?

The YSA says that the living struggle of today is among students. So middle-class are they in their composition, so far removed are they from the yearnings of the working class, that they cannot see what is before them. Throughout the nation, strikes are exploding. These strikes are for more wages. They are a direct reaction to the rising cost of living resulting primarily from the war policy. The General Electric workers went out for three months, living from hand to mouth and trying to feed their families without pay. Is this any less militant than students on strike? The teamsters are now on strike, the auto workers will probably go out, the rubber workers will probably go out.

Throughout the country there is literally a revolt against the new tax burden imposed upon the workers to pay for the war. There are growing movements against the cuts in spending in education, housing, welfare. This is how the war is directly affecting the working class.

What more important task is there than for those in the peace struggle to work among workers in order to show the tie between these struggles and the peace movement? Even liberals on the campus see this as a necessity. But the Young "Socialist" Alliance talks of this as a "retreat" from the living struggles of today.

It demands that the peace movement not relate the war to the direct ways in which it is affecting our people. They say that to do so would split the movement. But who can fail to support the fight against the war "austerity" program? Millions of workers are already in this fight, and now it is only a question of linking these struggles up.

If the peace movement refuses to tie the fight against the war with the fight for improved living conditions in the U.S. then what meaning can be given to the concept that this is a war which hurts all the American people, that it is a rich man's war fought at the expense of the workers?

### "Transitional Demands"

The Trotskyites say that to tie the fight against the war with the day-to-day needs of the people is reformist and would be exclusionary. What they really mean is that it would exclude *them* because they fear the fight for all but a few very advanced reforms, which they call transitional demands. Trotsky enumerated what he meant by transitional demands when he said:

The Trotskyites say that to tie the fight against the war with the day-a well elaborated transition program, i.e. on a system of measures with which the workers' and peasants' government can assure the transition from capitalism to socialism. (Trotsky, *Whither France*,

cited in: *Fascism: What It is, How to Fight It*, Merit, 1969.)

Thus, the unity of the movement is only legitimate when it is established on the highest level on demands which have one foot in socialism. All other levels of unity are incorrect and lead to helping the liberals.

Thus Pete Seidman states in an article in the *Young Socialist*, November 1969:

The Stalinists of the Communist Party advocate multi-issue demonstrations which can serve as a bridge to support for the programs of reform Democrats. They are hostile to the left-wing of the movement, the Student Mobilization Committee, because they do not want to see the anti-war movement develop in the direction of mass independent political action; they have long abandoned that perspective.

(This is truly an incredible statement when one considers that only before we were told that multi-issue demonstrations will narrow the peace movement. Now we are told that even the reform Democrats want it. It is clear from all this duplicity that the real ones who cannot support a multi-issue peace front are the Trotskyites themselves.)

Thus, in the view of the Trotskyites, raising the way this war affects the people, bringing in demands against racism, inflation, taxes, anti-labor legislation, cutbacks in spending, all strengthen the reformists. Only "transitional demands," in their opinion, cannot be co-opted.

Of course, such a position is nonsense. The reformists do not want to expand the issues of struggle, and do so only when under extreme pressure. Quite to the contrary, they want to limit them to as few as possible, like the YSA. This is why the people have had to push the McCarthys to take a clearer stand on racism. For he also refused to link racism with the war, just like the Trotskyites.

By tying the nitty-gritty problems of the people with the war, we are expanding the front, broadening and deepening the struggle, uniting black and white, student and worker. The reformists fear this as much as do the Trotskyites.

The Trotskyites and the reformists attempt to narrow down the issues because both have a liberal understanding of capitalism.

The liberals believe that capitalism can solve the problems of the people. This influences their style of struggle. They want to stay on safe grounds, within safe bounds. They fear mass unity which might get out of hand, they fear raising too many issues so that no one can conclude that the whole system is at stake. They fear unity of black

and white, student and worker, for they fear that it will build such a strong alliance that they could not control it.

The Trotskyites, like liberals, also believe that capitalism really can co-opt and meet many of the just demands of the people. To overcome this, they try to single out only a few demands that they believe to be unco-optable. To carry this out, they make sure that they dominate any united front. The net effect is the same as the liberals. They refuse to tie the demands of workers with those of students, the demands of the Black liberation movement with those of the peace struggle. In this way, they inhibit the development of socialist consciousness, they narrow and split the unity of the people, and rely mainly on the students.

Thus, the "Leftism" of the Trotskyites is only a new form of liberalism.

### *Electoral Tactics*

We are now entering an important election campaign. It is important because it is an opportunity to give a rebuff to the hawks and racists. It is important because it is an opportunity to smash the false notion of a silent pro-Nixon majority. A rebuff in this election, especially considering the present maneuvers going on in Congress such as the amendment to end the war, will improve the possibilities of forcing the ruling class to withdraw from Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

To accomplish such a victory in these elections will require power, and power means unity. Indeed, a new level of independence and unity is one of the most significant things that could come out of this election. The Trotskyites say that they are for such unity, but clearly their electoral policies do not reflect it.

During elections, millions of people are drawn into the issues of the day. They listen extra hard to different arguments. During such periods, masses often move quickly in one direction or another. During such times, alliances that will continue on afterwards can often be more easily built.

Elections are not separate from other activities. Rather, electoral tactics are reflections of general tactics and strategy.

Thus, if one truly stands for unity, then at such times particularly, we must fight for a broad alliance of the peace, national liberation and advanced labor movements based upon common agreement. That common agreement cannot today be on the basis of socialism or only on the basis of "transitional demands," but it *can* be on the basis of seeking defeat for war, racism, repression, and anti-labor attacks. Such an alliance can block fascist reaction and open up new

possibilities for the socialist movement.

During such elections, socialists must run their own socialist candidates who will present a full attack on the system. But if one truly fights for unity, then these campaigns are run in such a way as to enhance and not weaken the broader alliance. Such tactics are the living embodiment of the concept that the Left has no interests which contradict the fight for peace and against racism and reaction.

All of this is completely rejected by the YSA and the SWP. During the 1968 elections, the YSA and SWP attacked every attempt to build a broad unity against the war and racism. When some on the Left proposed a King-Spock ticket, the Trotskyites attacked it by drawing out every criticism they had of King and Spock. True, many criticisms could be made of either candidate. The question, however, was not who could be found that was free of any weaknesses. If we Communists were to search for that, we would only be satisfied with our own candidates. Indeed, every group would be most satisfied with its own candidates. But the question was: could any candidate representing a united end-the-war and end-the-repression movement be brought forward? Of course, this would mean compromises. But such compromises would in fact strengthen the movement.

If the Trotskyites thought that these two candidates were not the ones, then they had the responsibility to help find others. But they refused to do so, because they were not merely against *these* candidates but opposed *any* candidates that did not stand on socialism and the few "transitional demands" they see as being safe from co-optation. They opposed the unity of the anti-fascist movement.

In an article in the *Young Socialist* in November 1967, the Trotskyites state:

The key problem with the King-Spock ticket is that despite its "independence" from the two major capitalist parties, it does not represent a breach with capitalist politics. Neither King's nor Spock's programs challenge the capitalist system.

While the YSA likes to make it appear that they oppose only non-socialist candidates, the fact is that they oppose any united front which they do not directly control. Thus, the *Young Socialist* of October 1968 states:

Some of these people are looking to the Peace and Freedom Party as a genuine break from capitalist politics and as a revolutionary alternative to the capitalist political parties. However, we as Young Socialists think that the PFP is not a real revolutionary alternative. *Moreover we feel that it is an obstacle to building such a party.*

The article continues:

. . . the "minimum program" is designed to be a solution to the problem of keeping together the "disparate and clashing ideologies" within the PFP. It is supposed to be a statement of the points of agreement among these forces. But what does this mean in practice? Because the disagreements are so fundamental, the "minimum program" means that everyone accepts the least common denominator, i.e. the liberal Democrats' criticisms of the system's ugliest aspects.

Thus, the Trotskyites oppose a broad united democratic front, oppose a Left front, oppose any front which is not controlled by them. Not only do they oppose it, but they do their best to split it whenever it comes into being. Thus the YSA states in its 1966 resolution: "We counterpose a socialist program to any peace campaign based on a capitalist program." And it adds: "It is also extremely important that we support all campaigns for all genuinely independent socialist candidates, especially when they are counterposed to liberal politicians or peace candidates." In this fashion, the Trotskyites make their main enemy not the warmongers but the peace movement.

This Trotskyite position of no compromises, no alliances, and of splitting such alliances when they occur masquerades as Marxism-Leninism, but in fact it was repudiated by Lenin. Thus, Lenin stated:

To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie, a war which is a hundred times more difficult, protracted and complicated than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between states, and to refuse beforehand to maneuver, to utilize the conflict of interests (even though temporary) among one's enemies, to refuse to agree and compromise with possible (even though temporary, unstable, vacillating, and conditional) allies—is not this ridiculous in the extreme? . . .

The more powerful enemy can only be vanquished by exerting the utmost effort, and by the most thorough, careful, attentive, and skillful *obligatory* use of every, even the smallest "rift" among the enemies, every antagonism of interests among the bourgeoisie of various countries and among the various groups and types of bourgeoisie within the various countries, and also by taking advantage of every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable, and conditional. Those who fail to understand this, fail to understand even a particle of Marxism, or of scientific, modern socialism *in general*. (*"Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder*, International Publishers, New York, 1940, p. 52.)

The YSA and SWP hide their attacks on the united front concept by arguing that they are breaking people away from the capitalist parties and reformist thinking. But in reality, the SWP and YSA aid only the ruling class both in its extreme reactionary and liberal reformist forms.

The Trotskyites argue that the blocking of an independent third ticket, such as the King-Spock ticket, actually strengthens socialism and weakens reformism. Nothing could be further from the truth. The masses of people did not, do not today, see a socialist form as the mass form to express their opposition to the present reactionary drive. The defeat of a united front independent ticket in 1968 guaranteed that the peace and national liberation forces had no place to go except to the two parties, had no place to go except to rely on the Kennedy's and McCarthy's. Thus the Trotskyite position resulted only in tying the hands of the masses more closely to the liberals.

By removing any real independent mass form of electoral pressure, they allowed the pressure to be exerted only from the Right, thus allowing the liberals to freely move to the Right. Thus the Trotskyite position weakened the independence of the masses. But the greatest crime of the Trotskyite position was that they aided the extreme Right wing in the form of Wallace.

The Trotskyites like to charge others with a "lesser of the two evils" policy in elections. But in fact their policies promoted just such an outcome. The Trotskyites purposely contributed to the sabotage of a broad alliance against war and racism in the 1968 elections, and will do the same in 1970 if they are allowed to.

Some people think that the divisive policies of the Trotskyites may be just a mistake, a temporary error which will soon be corrected after some experience. However, a deeper look shows this to be completely untrue.

The divisive policies of the Trotskyites are not temporary qualities, but go back to Trotsky's fundamental writings, the works that the YSA and SWP base themselves upon. Thus, these policies cannot be corrected short of disowning Trotsky as a basis of political outlook.

---

#### *Other Readings on Trotskyism:*

Hyman Lumer, "The Fight Against Trotskyism," *Political Affairs*, September 1969. (Also issued as a pamphlet by New Outlook Publishers, New York, price 20 cents.)

A. Basmanov, "The Role of Trotskyism in the Modern World," *Political Affairs*, March 1970.

# The Black Panther Party and the Black Liberation Struggle

The rise and development of the Black Panther Party must be examined not only in the light of the political scene in the United States, but also in that of the world-wide impact of the socialist states on international progressive thought and action, the growing national liberation struggles in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the U.S.A., and the universal struggles of organized labor to better its conditions. It is only within this broad canvas that a clear perspective on the Black Panther Party is possible.

Struggles against the savage war-provoking machinations that brought on Korea, Vietnam and Cambodia, against racism with its murderous police terror, against the usurpation and subversion of political power that is the essence of imperialism, are sharpening, deepening and becoming more effective. They are being studied by thousands in the Black liberation movement.

On every continent progressive forces opposing the penetration of American capital are challenging its nationalism and racial chauvinism. The outlook for Black Americans grows better as the cry "Yankee, go Home" resounds around the world and reveals new allies for those fighting genocidal racism. Even in the United Nations councils, where U.S. satellites and puppets once were dominant, peace advocates are now in the ascendancy. Racism is being systematically fought in this international body.

Reaction in the U.S.A., guided by its imperialist overlords, no longer occupies the commanding heights it held when Winston Churchill invited it to play the lead in a "cold war" drama calculated eventually to crush the peace forces and governments of the socialist world. U.S. foreign policy exposes its moral bankruptcy, political cupidity and economic instability.

On the home front, U.S. imperialism confronts a series of deepening internal crises. For none of these can it find an answer that offers the masses any hope of a better tomorrow.

## *Growing Impact of Black Liberation*

Every phase of the difficulties imperialism confronts is aggravated and worsened by virtue of the widening scope of the Black liberation

struggles. The specific weight of this movement within these crises must be seriously evaluated. Racism weighs heavily on every social crisis in the U.S.A. Few reserves of forces for progress have advanced so rapidly to a position of such political importance as has this Black liberation struggle. It has many currents and trends, but in its totality it graphically reveals the damning hypocrisy of the fascist-minded rulers of the U.S.A. and the fact that terror dominates every feature of the government's relations with Black Americans. Now monopoly capital offers to help create a "Black Economy" and would perhaps, for disunity purposes, support a separatist movement as well.

Programmatically, ideologically and organizationally, the Black liberation movement is having a far-reaching impact on American life. Although this has always been the case, it is now more so than ever. As our Party has asserted on many occasions, "*the Black liberation movement is the Achilles' heel of American imperialism.*"

A more than superficial understanding of this truism imposes a momentous responsibility upon those who are leaders of the struggles developing within these crisis areas. They have an historic responsibility, in every instance, to make interrelationship with the Black liberation movement a center of organizational effort. These struggles will reach their most effective political levels only when black-brown-red-yellow-white unity against the oppressor is realized. This is the essence of the coalition that is needed on all fronts.

American imperialism counts on maintaining the historic split along the color-line which it has achieved through centuries of vicious racist preachment and practices in all avenues of life. From this split, it is not surprising that the illogical illusion that Black people and others of color must "go it alone" should take hold in some places. The bourgeois ideologists have drawn this monstrous further-splitting falsehood to their bosoms.

It is vital to challenge those who give voice to such false arguments at the very time that the fight for the unification of all forces of the Black liberation movement is a major factor in the struggle for "a coalition against reaction on all fronts." Without this unity no permanent victory can be attained. Knowledge of this truism adds to the desperation with which reaction seeks to widen and deepen the split by raising seemingly insoluble ideological issues, among them the role of the Communist Party.

The Communist Party occupies a place of profound historical importance in the Black liberation struggle. The facts may be distasteful to some, but they are also irrefutable. It is the Communist Party which, in the late 1920's, took the Black liberation movement out

of the morass in which it was floundering and put it on a scientific platform. That platform was based upon the science of society. Its planks were hewn out of American experiences, out of what bourgeois ideologists call the "American way of life." It was not of foreign extraction. The science was a universal science governing social development on a world scale. To deny the Black man use of a universal science is to deny him an equal place in the universe. It is to endorse the false theory of superior and inferior peoples.

It is the Communists who revealed the link that bound the freedom struggles of Black men, women and youth with all other progressive social struggles of labor and other progressive forces.

It is the Communists who exposed those machinations of monopoly capital in school, church, politics, industry and culture which gave a shadow of legitimacy to the myths of white superiority, thus turning education into miseducation and humanism into dehumanism.

It is the Communists who have exposed the fact that the myths of white superiority are of ruling-class origin, of capitalist extraction, and not of white derivation as such. It is a white ruling class that has subverted the media of education and prostituted those in high places of authority.

It is the Communists whose analysis of racism as a weapon of monopoly exposed it as a weapon of terror, of force and violence by government, leading to fascism, a police state and war.

It is the Communists who explained the historic class role of labor and the why and wherefore of the corruption of much of its leadership by the present ruling class.

Bourgeois ideologists, indoctrinated with hatred for a science they did not comprehend and the myths of white superiority which they were paid to accept, declared Communism to be extremely harmful to Black nationals in particular. At the same time, they justified the second-class citizenship of peoples of color on an anti-scientific, racist basis. Upper-class aspirations of Black intellectuals and their righteous desires to see their people living better, led many of them to espouse an anti-scientific approach to the Black liberation struggles. But the truth of American history is that the Black man has at every vital moment in the development of this social order, fought for the expansion of democracy. And in this he has, with the exception of the Civil War, always been in opposition to the position of capitalism's spokesmen on the Black question.

### *Rise of the Black Panthers*

Today the Black liberation movement, impelled by favorable objec-

tive conditions and a natural reaction to tyranny, moves as a force to a central point in the anti-racist, anti-war struggle against U.S. imperialism. It is into this picture that the Black Panthers have moved as one of the most dynamic forces for national liberation.

Emerging in the Fall of 1966 from the most depressed sections of the police-ridden Black ghetto of Oakland, California, the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense has in a remarkably short time been raised by its leadership to an extremely significant force in the political battles against American reaction. Frenzied top governmental agents have continuously sought the extermination of the Black Panther leadership and the destruction of its Party.

Hundreds of Panther leaders have been and continue to be framed and railroaded to prison. Many of these have been sentenced to long prison terms. Some thirty have been murdered in cold blood by thugs in police uniform, many in murder raids on homes and offices of Panther leaders.. A score of Panther leaders have been driven into exile.

The bail fixed for arrested militants is fantastically exorbitant, making political prisoners out of them even before they are tried and sentenced. Trials for alleged murder have been organized in all sections of the country, while the racist-inspired news media seek to prejudice public opinion not only against the Panthers but also against the righteous demands of "colored" nationals. The situation is such that men of repute in national life have declared that in their belief Black militants cannot secure a fair trial in a court in the United States.

J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI whose record of protection of murderous racists is notorious, now calls the Panthers "Enemy Number One." Thus he proclaims the intention of the forces of reaction to continue and to step up their persecution. The aim is to split the national liberation movement, alienate its friends and lay a basis for building a white racist backlash.

What social phenomena brought the Black Panther Party into being?

First of all, the complete failure of city, state and federal governments to protect and enforce those constitutional provisions which express the rights of Black citizens or to respect their dignity as human beings.

Secondly, the police brutality, unrestricted and officially endorsed in the name of "law and order," by which violation of the rights of Black citizenry was carried into life.

Thirdly, the deep emotional and political frustrations brought on by the failure of white labor leadership and white liberals to recognize



not only the political validity of the demands of Black people for equality *now* but also the inseparable relation of those demands to the entire American political scene and how white mass support to them would revitalize national morality and check the process of dehumanization.

Fourth, a determination on the part of Black youth to fight racism in its own way regardless of the price it might have to pay.

This last development had a logic of its own. It came out of the failure fully to understand that to save black, brown, red and yellow Americans from the destructive ravages of genocide and racism, the whole of the U.S. had to be saved from the menace of imperialism.

Objective conditions were ripe for the emergence of the Black Panther Party. Its birth, the development of its ideological outlook and political program are unique in the annals of the magnificent battles Black liberation fighters have waged in the U.S.A. It did not come onto the stage of history as did the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, piloted by the Black middle class and a white liberal bourgeoisie that dictated policy. The Black Panthers came from the very bowels of the ghetto's deprived and harassed youth propelled by intolerable conditions of life. This emergence testifies to the fact that the Black communities, Black ghettos, politically and otherwise warped and stunted in their growth by the foul plague racism had foisted upon them, contain unsurpassable heroic reserves for the mounting struggle against U.S. imperialism.

#### *From Self-Defense to Political Struggle*

When this youthful Black leadership moved into the arena of organized political struggle it believed that police terror, if sharply challenged, could readily be brought to an end. It was, however, to find through struggle that the police are not an independent social force. It was to find the police are, as the Communist Party has declared, an agency of government and terror, a weapon used to brutalize all who will not passively accept violation of their inalienable and constitutional rights. That brutalization is also exercised against those whites who recognize this inseparable relationship with "colored" citizenry.

Racism had been carried to genocidal proportions in Oakland. Large numbers of Black people had migrated there during World War II from Louisiana, Texas and other points South. The shipbuilding industry gave work to thousands. The end of the war saw thousands ruthlessly thrust jobless into the streets. In peacetime jobs in the aircraft factories that opened up, Black workers were the last to be hired.

Thousands of Black workers found themselves among the unemployed and almost totally ignored by city, state and federal governments when relief was doled out to the poor.

During the second World War imperialist ideologists had loudly proclaimed that American imperialism was out to destroy the murderous racial practices of the ruling class of the German Reich as well as to smash its leadership. Some Nazi war criminals, who had borrowed heavily from the best racist arsenal of America's ruling class, were condemned, tried and punished. Justice Robert Jackson, the American prosecutor, made a high-sounding condemnation of bigotry and racism in his opening remarks at the Nuremberg trials. U.S. imperialists and racists signed the Charter of the United Nations. The Government again formally committed itself to end racism, reaffirming constitutional and legislative pledges its leaders never meant to keep. American imperialism had no intention of putting an end to its genocidal racist practices. They were extremely profitable.

Millions of Black Americans who did not yet understand the rapacious character of capitalist society were once more deluded. Many believed that the American brand of racism was also to be a target of the war crimes trial. They did not realize that racism was inherent in capitalism. Nor did they appreciate how deeply racism had been rooted in American political soil. They did not understand the nature or scope of the struggle that had to be waged against it nor did they see that struggle as one for country and mankind, from which they could not abstract themselves.

The situation in Oakland was worse than in many other places because the war and the depression before it brought an influx of politically backward white southerners whose early life had literally been steeped in the myths of white superiority. White ideologists began by painting anew a picture of Black Americans as a shiftless, cowardly people with incurable criminal tendencies, as terrorists. Such a picture was even more acceptable to those whites now that the fight for jobs had been sharpened.

Labor had done little or nothing to help its rank and file understand the complexities of racial persecution and the menace of racism as a splitting force. The leadership of white labor, bought off or duped by the "Establishment," ignored the democratic demands of Blacks even though these demands clearly reflected the needs of all labor.

Communists had called for unity in struggle of black and white. They spoke sharply of the menace of racism. But reaction had launched a systematic and persistent anti-Communist crusade in the ghetto. It had effect mainly because it was picked up by Black middle-class

leaders who felt their existing organizations challenged by an approach to struggle which they did not understand, and feared. The leading Black organization on the liberation front, the NAACP, was under conscious anti-Communist leadership. It was under the leadership of white philanthropists and their Black sycophants. It was not able to wage a class battle for the rights of Black people or for labor's unity with them. The leadership of the Black Panther Party of Self-Defense stepped into what seemed to be a political vacuum.

But a program of self-defense, no matter how militant in and of itself, gets an oppressed people nowhere. The police of an oppressor class uses force and violence under the direction of business and political leaders who label that official terror "law and order."

### *Toward Marxism-Leninism*

From its contact with Marxist-Leninism, the Black Panther leadership quickly recognized this structural setup. The Party's name was changed. "For Self-Defense" was dropped from the title. The Party's outlook was broadened. It now became a more effective weapon for self-defense, precisely because it sought a line of offensive activities that could, if consistently pursued, put an end to police terror. It now began to see the historical necessity to remove the racists from the seat of power in the economic and political life of the country. That Party had taken a leap forward in its theoretical outlook. But mastery of the science it espoused is not an easy matter.

The Black Panther Party called itself a Marxist-guided organization. It made the study of Marxism-Leninism compulsory among the leading cadre. It called a Conference against Fascism. This step was unprecedented in the history of the Black liberation struggle. The Panthers did not, however, lift the Black liberation movement to an international level. The Communist Party had already done that. Black and white Communists had stood up in international bodies to proclaim the inseparable relation of the struggle of Black people in the U.S. to all freedom struggles.

The Black liberation struggle no less needs the guidance of a science than does every other liberation struggle. Social revolution is a science, as the Communists have said many times. A science, to be creatively used, has to be mastered and the science guiding revolution must of historical necessity be a universal science. That science is Marxism-Leninism, as history has proved.

For the first time in the history of the Black liberation struggle an exclusively Black-led political party had sought the aid of science in its efforts to find a solution to a problem provoked by the avarice, lust

and murderous greed of the system of society in which it functioned.

To adopt a social science as a guiding line in the struggle for liberation is a far-reaching forward step. Those who are able to take such a step at once become a menace insofar as the exploiter's analysis goes. At the same time, such a group deserves the respect and serious political attention of all who regard themselves as revolutionists. For that reason the Black Panther Party deserves the closest constructive attention and aid that can be given by all forces in the revolutionary ranks.

The vocal espousal of a science and its political and ideological application, however, are two different matters. It is not difficult to see that the police are not bosses but servants who have been given a license to murder all who fight to put human rights on a plane above that occupied by property rights. After being arrested by the police and given the customary beatings, Black Panthers were haled before the Court to get more than a birdseye view of the capitalist machinery of home warfare. Confronted by the terror of the Court, before a judge who is a legal despot with control even over the defense counsel, who is considered an "officer" of the Court, the Black Panthers did not know how, even with the science of Marxism-Leninism, effectively to strike back. The organization had not yet learned from others or through experience of its own the political power of mass action. It did not fully appreciate the necessity of relentlessly, systematically and persistently developing a united front of struggle.

### *Some Erroneous Ideas*

There were among the Panthers those who immediately argued that "liberation comes out of the barrel of a gun." Some who argued this were honest but had no serious appreciation of the relation of forces. They were moved by emotionalism, not science. Other were agents whom the Department of Justice had inspired to join the Panthers in order to destroy it, if possible, from within. Moreover, Black Panther leaders were being murdered wholesale by the police.

There is, of course, an element of Marxist-Leninist truth in the assertion that liberation can come out of the barrel of a gun. But its value and application is determined by the objective situation, the existing relationship of forces, and not by emotional fervor. A resort to arms does not mechanically apply to all situations simply because it may apply to one, or because the enemy resorts to murder. To attempt implementation of the assertion that liberation comes from guns under today's conditions in the U.S.A is to commit a provocation for which one will pay dearly. Indiscriminate use of arms is, of course, not to be confused with self-defense, which may call for resort to arms.

The Panthers have learned that neither black nor white America is ready en masse for the gun as a major instrument of freedom or for guerrilla warfare. But it *is* ready for mass demonstrative action which is, among other things, marvelous education for further political steps. For that matter, many of the Black Panther leaders recognized that an appeal to arms was not on the order of the day. Those who argued for this provocative step were voted down. But propagation of their anti-Marxist course had left its mark on the organization. It had been an aid to bloodthirsty Black-hating police and a detriment to Black Panther development and the liberation struggle. Instead of clarity, it brought confusion.

There were among the Panthers those who believed that the use of vulgar and obscene language makes the words of a platform or street speaker more effective. For a revolutionary, words are weapons that inspire, ennoble and galvanize into action. They are not something with which to titillate or to arouse to an orgy of passion. Words can alienate or educate and endear. They can sign people off or on. The Panther top leadership has come out against vulgarity when used for the purpose of securing a laugh or exciting an emotional spasm. But again an alien thesis has been introduced into their generally progressive program of action. These lessons from life are of far-reaching value if seriously studied. They add to the arsenal of liberation struggles.

The weaknesses of the Black Panther Party on the ideological and programmatic fronts are now weaknesses of growth and not of deterioration. However, if not systematically and persistently combatted they can lead to deterioration.

It has been asserted by some within the Black Panther Party that: "The world of Marxism-Leninism has become a jungle of opinion in which conflicting interpretations from Right revisionism to Left dogmatism, foist off their reactionary and blind philosophies as revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. Around the world and in every nation, people, all of whom call themselves Marxist-Leninists are at each other's throats."

American imperialism seeks to inject this line of thought into the heads of all who seek a scientifically developed program of struggle against its wars, its neo-colonialism, its racism, its exploitation of the working class. But one who wishes to be a revolutionary should mark well the celebrations around the centenary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin which so recently took place in Moscow, to say nothing about studying the theoretical conference on "Leninism and Contemporaneity" which took place in Prague late in 1969.

Representatives of Marxist-Leninist thought were present at both from most of the countries of the world. And to the dismay of world imperialism the voices of the representatives of the Marxist-Leninist Parties of the world were almost as one. Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., speaking in Moscow, said among other things:

The revisionist opponents of Marxism-Leninism have adopted the typical capitalist tactic of divide and destroy. . . . They are out to separate the national liberation struggles from their socialist source of strength. . . .

The attempt is to distort the teachings of Marx and Lenin. Then separating them, and by so doing to destroy the science of Marxism-Leninism.

Gus Hall concluded:

On this, the centennial of Lenin's birth, we can confidently say to the vulgar revisionists: your attempts are coming too late in history; your efforts may cause disruption here and there. But the very processes of life and the class struggle have condemned you to failure. Marxism-Leninism is the process of truth. It is indispensable and indestructible.

The same can be said to the "Left" sectarians of whom there are some among the Panthers.

There are among the leaders of the Panthers those who believe that the United States is already in the throes of fascist terror; they generalize their own experiences. That is wrong. Despite the fascist-like nature of the terror from which Black nationals have suffered for a century and the fascist-like racist terror now rampant, the possibilities remain to fight openly for the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and its transference into a socialist revolution. This offers irrefutable proof that this position that fascism dominates the American scene is not consistent with reality. The Court's reversal of the vicious decision that had sent Huey Newton, a founder of the Panther Party, to prison, is also proof that the trend toward fascism in the U.S.A. can be successfully fought.

Propagation of the idea that fascism now exists can only weaken the struggle to destroy fascist trends and for the development of an anti-fascist coalition. As has been said in the introduction to the *New Program of the Communist Party USA*:

Wherever one looks, there is struggle in the U.S.A. today. People are on the march. More and more are engaged in struggles for

peace, for black and brown liberation, for economic advancement. More and more are seeking fundamental solutions. There is radicalization. . . . (P. 7.)

### *Toward a Black Liberation Front*

It cannot be denied that the relentless struggle for equality of rights and human dignity pursued by the Black Panthers has both awakened and inspired millions of white youth who, until the emergence of the Panthers, paid little heed to the dehumanizing effects of racism on them or of its effect on national morality.

We will fight increasingly for the constitutional rights of the Black Panther Party for we know that:

Through immediate struggle workers organize and learn the need to battle further. They learn who the enemy is and how to fight ultimately to the socialist revolution. (*Ibid.*, p. 89.)

Class consciousness begins with recognition of the fundamental community interests of black and white workers. (*Ibid.*, p. 73.)

The Black Panther Party is in the process of growth and development at a moment when the anti-imperialist struggle sharpens and deepens. It is on a vital front of that struggle. History demands that all aid to overcome its weaknesses of growth shall be forthcoming. The position of the Communist Party USA is in support of history. A wide diversity of views exists on the American Left. We are internationalists with an awareness that the Black liberation struggle is of vital significance to the world revolutionary movement. More constructive aid must be given to the Black Panther Party.

A broad Black Liberation Front including all forces opposed to racism and the genocidal policies and practices of American imperialism must be created. It should include all oppressed minorities and should form a coalition confronting the warmongers and racists at all crisis points.

Communists must play a leading role in the development of this coalition.

## Bourgeois "Futurology" and the Future of Mankind

### *A New Term and Its Content*

The term "futurology" (from the Latin *futurum*, or future, and the Greek *logos*, or science) appeared for the first time in 1943 in the articles of the German sociologist O. Flechtheim, who emigrated to the United States long before World War II. Commenting on the growing number of works containing social forecasts, he wrote about the emergence of a new science which, he claimed, was just coming into its own—the science of the future, or futurology. It must be added that futurology was unambiguously set in opposition to scientific communism, though it is common knowledge that it was Marxism which put the study of social concepts of the future on a scientific footing more than a century ago.

As they worked out the principles of scientific prognostication, Marx and Engels carried on an ideological struggle not only against utopianism but, first and foremost, against the agnostic approach to problems of the future common at the time among the leading bourgeois philosophers, who claimed that it was impossible to make scientific prognostications of social processes. Of great importance was also the Marxists' struggle against positivism with its empirical approach to cognition and its denial of the possibility of making scientific forecasts of qualitative changes in the future development of society.

Later on, Lenin developed the Marxist principles by analyzing the specific features of the epoch of imperialism and socialist revolutions. His tremendous contribution to the theory of scientific prognostication was related to the theory and practice of socialist planning in the Soviet Union. It may not be amiss to recall here that the question of the possibility in principle of forecasting and planning concrete social processes triggered a worldwide discussion at that time. To most bourgeois scientists the very idea of such a possibility seemed fantastic. Now that we are preparing to celebrate Lenin's centenary, it is particularly appropriate to stress that it was under the direct impact of his works that the study of problems of scientific prognosti-

\* *Mirovaya Ekonomika i Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniye*, No. 11, 1969  
English translation from *Reprints from the Soviet Press*.

cation of concrete social processes as the basis of national economic planning assumed extensive forms in the USSR at that time. This evoked a wide response abroad, stimulating public interest in the problem of mankind's future.

The term "futurology" swept back into use in the early sixties when the so-called prognosis boom set in in the West. This trend arose as a result of the development of relatively effective methods of forecasting social processes and the emergence of hundreds of large research establishments and departments specializing in prognostication in the development of science, technology, economics, social relations, the state and the law, domestic and foreign policies, international relations and further earth and space exploration.

The persistent tendency to look into the future, characteristic not only of a narrow group of scientists, bourgeois politicians and economic policy-makers, but of the broad public as well, was due to a complexity of causes. The development of the world socialist system, which pushed into the foreground the question of the trends and prospects of the contest between the two world social systems; the emergence of scores of new states and their search for ways of overcoming their economic and cultural backwardness; the appearance of nuclear missile weapons threatening humanity with total destruction; the technological revolution with its many-sided and contradictory influences on the economy and social relations; the continual growth of the productive forces and the resultant state-monopoly regulation of the economy; the population explosion and the prospects of food supplies for the world; finally, the accelerated pace of social development itself and the immense scale of the changes taking place in the world—all had the effect of sharply stimulating interest in the future and the demand for social prognostication.

Today the general term "futurology" denotes both a complex combination of specific social prognoses and prognostication proper, a new, gradually developing science of the laws, methods, and ways of prognostication. The sphere of prognostication has been substantially broadened to embrace not only economics but demography, the social implications of the technological revolution, politics, etc.

The technique of working out social prognoses (in the above-mentioned broad sense of the term) has made a great stride forward in the last five or ten years. Questionnaires, mathematical-statistical extrapolation, prognosis modeling and other methods borrowed from the arsenal of contemporary sociology, economy, mathematics and cybernetics help to make more durable, accurate and reliable prognoses. These are less and less often regarded as mere attempts to

anticipate and foresee future events, although this too is an aspect of no small importance. The essence of social prognostication is increasingly determined by its special contribution to systematically raising the level of planning, programming, projecting, and control of social processes in general. This approach is extremely effective since it helps save money by optimizing plans, reduces the time spent on their development, increases the efficiency of technical-economic and military-political programs, and uses for the purposes of ideological struggle the keen interest of world public opinion in the problems of the future of the earth and of mankind.

In the present-day capitalist world futurology has a dual role to play: first, to participate in working out the economic and political strategy of imperialism; secondly, to supply new arguments in the ideological struggle against Communism. A student of futurology must take this fact into account. A profound critical analysis of contemporary bourgeois concepts of the future and their exposure are as important as is a sober appraisal of its effectiveness and a careful and systematic study of its methods and machinery. It must also be remembered that prognostication is not just contemplation of the future but a formidable two-edged weapon. Superficial criticism which does not go beyond scathing epithets can do nothing but harm here. A few serious Marxist studies have recently appeared containing profound criticisms of separate aspects of bourgeois futurology. But much still remains to be done in this field.

Opposing bourgeois futurology is Marxist-Leninist social prognostication, which rests on the solid foundation of dialectical and historical materialism, on the theory of scientific communism, and is rooted materially in the socialist mode of production, thus opening up the broadest possibilities for planned development of the economy and society as a whole. Therein lies the basic advantage of Marxist-Leninist prognostication over bourgeois futurology. What is needed is to make better use of this advantage.

#### *Some Contours of the Future*

Studies in social prognostication during the past few years have brought out some important contours of the world of the next three decades.

Judging by population prognoses, the world population will nearly double by the year 2000 and amount to from 6 to 7 billion (6,129,-734,000 according to the mean version of the prognosis drawn up by UN experts), compared with 3.5 billion at the present time.

Scientific and technical prognoses suggest that mankind will then

be consuming at least five times as much energy as today (26 to 30 billion tons of ideal fuel compared to 5.9 billion tons in 1965, according to the estimate made by some Soviet economists).

A powerful energy basis will make it possible to develop new raw material resources in new regions, including minerals to be found occurring in the deep layers of the earth's crust or on the world ocean floor. Production of all kinds of natural and synthetic materials, probably even synthetic materials with pre-determined properties, from the practically unlimited reserves of inorganic materials will grow in scope.

The further progress of automation in industry, building, agriculture, transport and communications, plus the new abundance of fuel, energy and raw material reserves, is capable in principle, as can be seen from the data of scientific-technical and socioeconomic prognosis, of bringing about a sharp increase in the production of material goods as well as a further reduction in working hours. In any case, the number of automatic production lines, shops, factories, fully automated building enterprises, transport and communications systems, livestock and crop growing farms, must grow considerably over the next few decades. All these enterprises will be able to produce several times more than at present without expanding their physical space and with a considerably reduced work force.

Agriculture especially will be in a position to produce several times more foodstuffs than today. According to estimates by Soviet scientists, if the advanced agricultural techniques of today were applied to the areas cultivated throughout the world at present, it would be possible to provide food for about 10 billion people. Even as things stand, the level of production could be surpassed several times over with existing achievements of agricultural science and technology, as may be seen from the record yields already being secured. Besides, the tilled areas can be considerably expanded. Finally, the seas and oceans contain abundant food resources that are not yet fully utilized, not to mention the very real prospects held out by experiments already under way in the production of synthetic fodder and food.

On the whole, the gross per capita national product throughout the world will grow by at least 2.5 to 3 times by the year 2000.

Such are some of the conceivable contours of the world of tomorrow in the light of contemporary prognostication data. The details of these contours continue to serve as an object of scientific discussion. But on the whole the prospects described above have been more or less accepted by the majority of experts.

The question arises, however, whether these prospects will be real-

ized. This will depend on the concrete socioeconomic and political conditions in which the world will develop in the second half of the 20th century, in other words, it will depend on the trends and prospects of development of the general crisis of capitalism, the world revolutionary process, socialist and communist construction in the socialist countries, and the competition between two social systems in the world arena. Naturally, on this score the data of Marxist and bourgeois social prognosis are diametrically opposed to one another.

#### *Basic Trends of Bourgeois Futurology*

In analyzing bourgeois futurology, the idea must be rejected that it is homogeneous and all of a piece. In the first place there are differences, if one may put it so, in the *genres* of futurology. In this respect it divides into at least three groups of works that differ radically from one another.

One group comprises works on prognostication as such—that is, the methodology, methods, problems and other theoretical questions of prognostication. Actually these are not prognoses (through they may be used as illustrations) but works about prognosis—about those who make the forecasts (i.e., scientific establishments and their output), what they prognosticate (problems of social prognoses) and, most important of all, how prognoses are made (methods of prognostication). Among the most important works in the *genre* mention may be made of books by Bertrand de Jouvenel, Daniel Bell, Olaf Helmer, Erich Jantsch, and Fred L. Pollack.

Another group includes books and articles which contain the ideas on the future of scientists and writers who are not necessarily prognostication experts. This group comprises the overwhelming majority of "futurological" works. Strictly speaking, they too are not prognoses in the most modern sense, but simply attempts to anticipate and to foresee certain social phenomena of the future based either on the experience and intuition of the authors or on information obtained from scientific and popular science literature. But it would be a mistake to underestimate these men's work on such grounds: as a rule, it contains—although often in a raw embryonic form—scientific hypotheses which later make up the nucleus of concepts of the future in comprehensive up-to-date scientific forecasts.

Outstanding among the works of this type published in the nineteen fifties and sixties are the world-famous works of N. Wiener, J. Thomson, F. Baade, A. Clarke, O. Flechtheim, J. Fourastie, D. Gabor, R. Jungk, K. Jaspers, C. von Weizsacker, and others. (We do not touch here upon the works of J. D. Bernal and other Western Marxist scientists, which merit special attention.)

Finally, the third group includes the contemporary social forecasts proper, i.e., the scientific output of specialized research establishments, which takes the form of individual, or more often collective, development of prognostic models of various social phenomena based on opinion polls taken among experts, questionnaires distributed among specific social groups, complex extrapolation of statistical information with the application of a number of theories of mathematics and cybernetics (the theory of probability, the theory of games, etc.), analyses of a mass of patent information and other documents, etc. As has already been said, prognoses of this kind are not an end in themselves but serve to substantiate plans, programs, projects, and general decisions pertaining to the control of social processes. They play a decisive role particularly in the system of "planning-programming budgeting" widely practiced in the West in the attempts to control economic development under state-monopoly capitalism.

Most of the output of this sort is intended for a close circle of experts or is kept secret. Among the published works, the best-known forecasts are those prepared by groups of prominent Western experts on the development of the economies of the United States, Britain, France, and West Germany.

Of course, any attempt to outline the anatomy, as it were, of futurology—an attempt, to my mind, necessary for the understanding of the complicated and contradictory bourgeois concept of the future—is in a sense an abstraction. In reality, the situation is much more complex because "pure" forms of any of the *genres* are seldom met with. More often one and the same work contains prognoses, the author's speculations on the future, and resumes of forecasts that have already been made.

As regards the content of the concepts of the future, three main trends may be distinguished here too. Prevailing among them is the one which unreservedly supports the thesis that capitalism will not only survive the 20th century but will be capable of overcoming its inherent contradictions in the future as well—with the aid of the current scientific and technological revolution. The authors of these theories usually portray the future of the capitalist world (in which they simply "dissolve" the world socialist system) in bright, optimistic colors. A social utopia of eternal capitalism—such is the gist of the trend which for the sake of brevity may tentatively be called apologetic. As an illustration we may take any of the works enumerated in the last group (it is no secret that all of them carry a definite propaganda load and some, particularly the forecast, *Germany, 1975*, were written especially for propaganda purposes).

The representatives of another trend are aware that the preservation of capitalism is incompatible with the socioeconomic implications of the scientific and technological revolution, but see no way out of the critical impending situation. Their concepts are usually given in pessimistic, sometimes even apocalyptic tones. Specifically, this is manifest in their prophecies on the inevitable "decline of civilization" (The tradition is traced back to the notorious *Decline of The West* by Oswald Spengler, and kindred works of the nineteen-twenties). More and more often one hears talk about the inevitability of contemporary civilization being superseded by a machine civilization, with people becoming completely subordinated to the cybernetic organisms of their own creation. Sometimes a call is heard to "go back to nature," to the idyll of country life, etc. Actually, these are the peculiar neo-eschatological views of the ideologists of a social system that is already doomed. Views characteristic of this trend may be found among Western thinkers of the most diverse political persuasions, for example, in the works of K. Jaspers and A. Clarke, already mentioned above.

The representatives of the third trend also assume that the socioeconomic consequences of the scientific and technological revolution are incompatible with the preservation of capitalism in its present form. But they believe it possible to reform capitalism, to "adapt" it to the future at all costs, even to the point of complete "convergence" with socialism (with recognition of the need for a gradual strengthening of socialist principles). This trend is strong for its criticism of the vices of the bourgeois system. Quite a few progressively minded Western scientists, men like N. Wiener, F. Baade, A. Clarke and R. Jungk, belong to it.

It is noteworthy that in contrast to the authors of the official forecasts which bear the earmarks of propaganda, nearly every prominent thinker in the West speculating on the future as a rule shows little optimism in assessing the prospects of development of the capitalist world. Their statements are usually voiced in the spirit of either the second or the third trend (and sometimes of both at once). This is a very remarkable fact, vividly testifying to the crisis of contemporary bourgeois ideology.

Of course, it would be oversimplifying matters to pigeonhole all Western thinkers by fixed categories. Features characteristic of two, and sometimes even of all three, trends are contradictorily intertwined in many works. We can point out that the second and third trends are represented somewhat more conspicuously in Western Europe, whereas the first trend prevails in North America. All this

creates additional difficulties by making it necessary to analyze every important work in the field of futurology separately, with a view to the specifics of the various *genres* and the often contradictory nature of the concept of the future, outlined in each.

That is why it is not easy to make a thorough examination of bourgeois literature on the future, all the more so since futurology as a whole is only just becoming an object of special research. The diversity and inner contradictoriness of these concepts of the future is so significant that any attempt to "tell a little about everything" inevitably leads to vulgarization in the evaluation of one of the most complicated phenomena of contemporary social thought.

It seems more expedient to pick out the most significant works among the recent publications of the bourgeois specialists, those combining the typical features of contemporary Western futurology and giving a fairly full idea about the range of studies in this field. The most suitable work for this purpose, we think, is the monograph. *The Year 2000*, by H. Kahn and A. Wiener.

We made this choice for several reasons. First, the work contains questions of forecasting methodology and speculations on the future belonging to recognized United States authorities on futurology, and also gives the results of studies in social prognostication carried out by one of the leading United States research establishments in the field (the book was written with the help of staff members of the Hudson Institute directed by H. Kahn). Secondly, the monograph is in all respects typical of the apologetic trend which prevails in contemporary bourgeois futurology. Finally, it may be considered the most significant, the "last word" in bourgeois futurology.

#### *Biased Extrapolation*

Kahn and Wiener's book is largely devoted to a particular problem of social forecasting—the methodological principles on which forecasts of military-political situations are built. It is intended to stimulate broad and intensive investigations concerning military-political forecasting for the White House, the Pentagon, and the State Department. In accordance with this purpose the authors show the advantages of a systematic approach to long-range problems of foreign policy and international relations, demonstrating methods of working out models of further development of the system of international relations according to the chief versions as they see them, and constructing on this basis prognostic scripts of the possible course and outcome of the most probable conflicts in the world arena. They base these models and scripts on a comprehensive concept of the future socio-

economic development of society. It is this concept that is of prime interest to us.

On closer examination it appears that Kahn and Wiener's concept (like those of most of the other representatives of the apologetic trend) is based on the "theory of phased development" which has won wide acceptance in the West. It was most completely expounded in the works of W. W. Rostow, Raymond Aron, and J. Galbraith. This theory, as is known, treats the history of mankind not as a succession of socioeconomic formations but as a long series of stages of socioeconomic and political development according to the growth of the gross national product (GNP) in general and its per capita ratio in particular. This approach reduces the differences between the world capitalist and socialist systems to purely political motives of confrontation between hostile groups of powers. Preeminence is given to the GNP value which is claimed completely to determine the position of any country, regardless of its social system.

It is clear that this approach puts the United States, which has the highest GNP, in the top "stage of development." Strung out behind it—depending on their GNP level—are the developed capitalist countries, followed by the USSR and the European socialist countries, with the countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa lagging far behind. From this standpoint, the sense of the socioeconomic development of every country is to move up the rungs of the "GNP ladder" and—in some more or less far-off future—to reach the present-day level of the United States, which appears as the pinnacle of creation—just as Hegel conceived the Prussian monarchy of the middle of the last century.

Kahn and Wiener divide the countries of the world into six categories: "pre-industrial" (less than \$200 of GNP per capita a year), "traditional" (\$200 to \$600), "industrial" (\$600 to \$1,500), "highly industrial" (\$1,500 to \$4,000), and "post-industrial" (more than \$4,000). They then estimate what they believe to be the most probable rates of growth of the GNP in these countries. Finally they calculate how many years it would take this or that country at its given rate of progress to pass to the next category, and eventually to reach the present-day level of the United States. The picture they get is really impressive: even the "highly industrial" and economically developed countries will require from 11 to 42 years, whereas "pre-industrial" India will take no less than 117 years, Nigeria 339 years, and Indonesia 593 years (sic) to achieve this.

However, a serious scientific examination of these figures shows that the gap between the United States and other countries is several



times less, and the anticipated rates of development of some of the countries are much higher, so that the time required to close the gap is much shorter. But the most objectionable point of principle is the concept of the future itself, which pictures the year 2000 as a greater or lesser approximation to the U.S. level in the nineteen-fifties and sixties, and the United States as having rid itself of its present-day troubles by passing into the "post-industrial" stage. But the authors do not simply calculate the average per capita income in dollars. Their theory implies that as one country after another approaches the U.S. level—irrespective of their social systems—they will come more and more to resemble the United States both economically and socially.

Any such theory is untenable inasmuch as it is a mistake to make a direct extrapolation of the data for the past few years (moreover, selected and calculated with a definite slant), and to ignore the possibility and even inevitability of serious qualitative changes. Prognostication experts know full well that any direct extrapolation into a remote future of any more or less important social process—be it growth of population, development of the economy or culture, etc.—inevitably leads to mistaken conclusions. This is so because we live in an age of scientific and technological revolution the socioeconomic implications of which, to judge by prognosis data, will far exceed even those considerable changes that are observable today. This important factor is discarded by the authors of the "theory of phased development" because it avowedly undermines their concept.

Is it really conceivable that in the year 2000—as contemporary social forecasts picture it, in a world of the successful struggle of progressive social forces, of a final transformation of science into a powerful productive force, in short, a world of the triumphant march of automation, of unprecedented productivity and, consequently, of real potential for the creation of an abundance (or at least a sufficiency) of the most important necessities—is it conceivable that in the year 2000 the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America will still be lagging behind the U.S.A. by 100, 300, 500 years, with the U.S.A. becoming a kind of never-to-be-reached ideal for all the rest of the world?

This would be possible only if we presumed (which is wholly improbable) that the world capitalist system were by some miracle to get rid of its inherent contradictions and vices while the world socialist system were also, by some miracle, deprived of all the advantages of its socioeconomic development, which now permit it to count on an early victory in the competition with capitalism, and the

developing countries were to continue meekly to bear the neo-colonialist yoke, remaining in the vice of backwardness and poverty, suffering from hunger and epidemics, from shortages not only of qualified experts but of educated people in general. In other words, this could happen only if one assumed that the world socialist system were somehow to "dissolve" in the capitalist world, that the international working class movement were to abandon its ultimate revolutionary goals, and the national liberation movement were just to wither away.

What has been said above should by no means be taken as any underestimation of the economic factor in determining the prospects of development of one country or another, including such important indices of economic growth as the increase of the GNP in general and its per capita level in particular. It is well known that the prospects of the competition between the two world systems depend largely on socialism gradually gaining the upper hand precisely in respect to labor productivity and economic potential, in respect to the per capita GNP ratio. But how the GNP is produced and distributed is also of great importance. No less important are the place and role of the goods produced in the general system of social demands, which undergo serious changes in the course of the scientific and technological revolution.

The fact that the United States has reached a relatively high per capita GNP average does not overshadow the fact that tens of millions of people in that country are deprived of their rights by the capitalist system and live in poverty or on the brink of poverty. It is a fair forecast that the situation will hardly change by the year 2000, no matter how high the GNP may grow, if the capitalist mode of production and distribution of material benefits remains unchanged. Consequently the leading capitalist country will continue to be torn by acute social conflicts which weaken its capitalist foundations, by greater class battles which undermine the outdated mode of production. At the same time we can observe a growth of opposition sentiments among the intellectuals, a growing student movement—a selfless struggle of people not only for bread and shelter but also for such social values as genuine democracy, human dignity, life with a meaning, elementary social justice, confidence in the morrow, the right to education, creative work, decent living conditions, the right to effective social security in the broad sense of the word.

Will these tendencies disappear or on the contrary grow stronger under the impact of the struggle between the two world systems now taking place in conditions of the growing scientific and technological

revolution? For the answer to be substantiated, let us examine some of the most important socioeconomic implications of this revolution.

### *Impact of the Scientific-Technological Revolution*

It is known that the automation of all branches of social production and the swift growth of labor productivity sharply accelerate the process of redistribution of labor resources: the number of workers employed in the sphere of material production is decreasing, whereas the number of those employed in the services and cultural production is growing. Not so long ago the first of the above-mentioned spheres included up to nine-tenths of all workers, even in the economically developed countries. Now the ratio approaches 50:50, and in some cases even exceeds it. If this rate is maintained, by the year 2000 further significant changes may have taken place.

It is also known that automation and the growth of productivity call for a sharp change in the correlation and content of working and leisure time. The share and importance of mental labor is growing in all spheres of work without exception. The importance of cultural leisure for the intellectual and physical training of a full-fledged worker in modern social production is growing. Under the pressure of this objective demand of modern production and as a result of the persistent struggle of the workers for shorter working hours, the capitalist employers are being forced to make concessions and to reduce the share of working time and increase the share of leisure time. Not so long ago the working year consisted of 3,000 to 4,000 hours, and the work week was 60 to 70 hours long and longer. Now working time in many countries has been reduced by 30 to 50 per cent, and it is quite probable that it will drop as much again by the year 2000. There is already talk in some places about going over to a four-day working week. In view of this, leisure time is growing into one of the most pressing social problems.

Finally, it is known that the scientific and technological revolution, which accelerates the integration of science and production, at the same time intensifies the process of intellectualization of society. The sphere of mental labor is spreading far and wide and creating a strong demand for highly qualified workers. Here too a revolution is under way. Not long ago skilled men with even a secondary education did not exceed 10 per cent of all the workers in many developed countries. In the United States on the eve of World War I, only 4 per cent of youths aged from 16 to 21 years went to college, while the remaining 96 per cent were at best only able to read, write, and do simple arithmetic. Now the share of college students in that country

has topped 40 per cent and keeps growing from year to year. The socialist countries are one after another going over to universal secondary education, and correspondingly increasing the enrollment at their higher educational establishments. The results of this process for the year 2000 can easily be expressed in simple prognostic models.

Is it conceivable, then, that the social requirements of mankind in 2000—mankind as it is developing before our very eyes under the impact of the struggle between socialism and capitalism in conditions of the scientific and technological revolution—will be reduced to the simple ambition to reach the United States level of fifty years earlier? Is it not more logical to suppose that the development of the sphere of spiritual production, the increase in leisure time, the intellectualization of society, will all prove to be mighty allies of the world socialist system, of the international working class and the national liberation movements, in their struggle against the ulcers and vices of today's moribund social system? For the socioeconomic effects of the scientific and technological revolution as they appear in the light of modern forecasting data are in irreconcilable contradiction with the further existence of the capitalist mode of production. It may be said in this connection that the principal result of the scientific and technological revolution of our time is the objective formation of the material prerequisites of the communist mode of production everywhere.

The world's Communist parties carefully keep and augment the Marxist-Leninist traditions of a determined offensive against the positions of the bourgeois ideologists along this front. It must be admitted, however, that in the ideological struggle against capitalism, the problems of the future do not always receive due attention.

### *The Marxist View*

Let us recall how passionately Lenin urged us to use every opportunity actively to oppose the manifold bourgeois concepts of the future with Marxist views. He emphasized that Marxist theory posed questions "not in the sense of explaining the past but also in the sense of a bold forecast of the future and of equally bold practical action for its achievement."<sup>1</sup> "On all sides, at every step, one comes across problems which man is quite capable of solving immediately—but capitalism stands in the way. It has amassed enormous wealth—and has made men the slaves of this wealth. It has solved the most complicated technical problems—and has blocked the application of technical improvements because of the poverty and ignorance of the

(1) V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 72.

millions, because of the stupid avarice of a handful of millionaires.”<sup>2</sup> Thus Lenin wrote about one purely “futurological” problem, the project of a tunnel to be built under the English Channel. This was how he utilized for purposes of Communist propaganda one of the sensational problems concerning the future.

The importance of forecasting has also grown in the practical activities of the Communist parties. The successful solution of the complex tasks of socialist and communist construction in the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries, of the economic, scientific and technological competition with the world capitalist system, and of the struggle against the aggressive policies of imperialism, calls for the improvement of scientific Marxist-Leninist prognostication of the long-range prospects of development of the modern world. The effectiveness of the long-range economic programs and the political strategy of the socialist countries depends on how complex and reliable these forecasts can be.

In recent years the problems of social prognostication have become an object of special study in the USSR, the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and some other socialist states. The Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet government attach great importance to the expansion of research in the field of scientific, technological and socioeconomic prognostication as a scientific basis for national economic planning. “The discussion of scientific prognoses must precede the working out of plans of development of national economic branches,” said A. N. Kosygin at a session of the USSR State Planning Committee in March, 1965. “We must have at our disposal scientific forecasts for the development of each branch of industry, so as to give, in due time, the green light to everything advanced and progressive, and we must know the direction in which the plan should be worked out.” The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers “On Measures for Raising the Efficiency of Scientific Organizations and Accelerating the Application in the National Economy of Scientific and Technical Achievements” (October, 1968) emphasized that “long-term scientific and technological forecasts (for 10, 15, and more years) should be drawn up in future in relation to the key problems of development of the national economy.” These instructions call upon Soviet scientists to carry on the investigation and to intensify research work in this field.

(2) *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 389.

## America Reads Lenin (1917-1919)\*

Aside from Lenin's contacts with the American people through interviews, talks and letters, we should emphasize the importance of his direct appeals, as the head of the Soviet government, to American soldiers and workers concerning the invasion of the territory of Soviet Russia by the U.S. army and the unleashing of U.S. military might against Soviet power. In their calls to the American and other soldiers as sons of the working class, Lenin and the Soviet government counted on their class consciousness and their internationalist feelings as representatives of the working class. Many of these appeals were republished by Left Socialist newspapers and magazines in the U.S. at the end of 1918 and the beginning of 1919.

On August 1, 1918 the Soviet government released a paper, signed by Lenin and Chicherin, the Soviet foreign minister, entitled “To the Working Masses of France, England, America, Italy and Japan,” which exposed the governments of these countries and the capitalist press as deceiving their peoples about non-intervention in Russian affairs while “they were already conducting military operations against the workers and peasants of Russia.” The paper expressed confidence that if the Russian proletariat is compelled to answer with two blows every blow of the allied invaders, the workers of other countries will see “in this not only an act of legitimate defense but . . . even the defense of their own interests.”<sup>1</sup>

At the end of October and the beginning of November, 1918, a leaflet, signed by Lenin and Chicherin, was distributed among American and English soldiers.

“Speak up! Who are you?” the Soviet government asked the American and English soldiers. “Aren't you workers? . . . Do you intend to act as bandits, as hirelings of international capital, and to carry out its criminal aim—to strike a blow to your own class when it tries to free itself? . . . Your capitalists know that if they destroy the Russian revolution, they take out the very soul of the revolutionary movement in other countries. . . . And in your country the spirit of

\* We present here an excerpt from an article appearing in the Soviet publication *Problems of History*, 1968, No. 2. References in the footnotes, unless otherwise indicated, are to U.S. newspapers or magazines of the time.

<sup>1</sup> “On the General Interests of the Proletariat of All Countries,” *The Class Struggle*, December 1919, pp. 636-637.

the times is also awakening. Strikes are happening there, demands for peace ring out, there are demonstrations in the streets. . . . You soldiers must set an example to those at home who will soon follow you. . . . We will happily welcome you in the ranks of the international working class."<sup>2</sup>

A leaflet, "Why Have You Come to the Ukraine?," also by Lenin and Chicherin was distributed in November, 1918 among British and American soldiers. It showed the universal significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution which unfolded "the beginning of a new period in the history of mankind." It explained the essence of the preceding revolutions in Europe and appealed: "Raise the red flag of freedom of the working class. Join with us and together with the revolutionary workers of Germany and Austria to liberate the world for the workers."<sup>3</sup>

Aside from these appeals and statements to the American and English soldiers which were reprinted in the American press, there were also proclamations addressed directly to the English soldiers.

In June, 1918, a leaflet, signed by Lenin and Chicherin, was distributed among English troops in Northern Russia asking: "Why Have You Come to Murmansk?" It pointed out that for the first time in history workers "had taken power in their own country," but "there are giant difficulties to conquer," that it is impossible "to build a new society in one day." The leaflet asked the English soldiers: "Do you really want to help to crush us? . . . If the Russian revolution should be crushed, then in every country capitalist power will be greatly strengthened and the struggle for economic freedom will be set back hundreds of years."<sup>4</sup> Another appeal at the end of 1918, also signed by Lenin and Chicherin, asked: "Aren't you a member of a trade union?" The social victories of the Russian proletariat are reported as well as the fact that "the people will make use of the products of their own labor." The capitalists of all countries will no longer be able to get rich "on the great natural resources from their countries." If the English soldiers carry on a war against the Russian workers, the leaflet continued, then they will go against their own fellow-workers, they will strengthen the power "of their own capitalists who will rob and exploit them."<sup>5</sup>

In the appeal, "Soviet Russia Addresses Great Britain," which was distributed in English by planes on the Vologodsk front and was also

<sup>2</sup> *Historical Archives* (U.S.S.R.), 1960, No. 5, pp. 8-10.

<sup>3</sup> *The Class Struggle*, May 1919, pp. 247-248.

<sup>4</sup> *The New Majority*, February 8, 1919, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> *The Revolutionary Age*, July 26, 1919, p. 7.

published in French, Italian, Russian and Japanese, Lenin and Chicherin shattered the excuses of bourgeois propaganda for the intervention of foreign troops against the Soviet Republic.<sup>6</sup>

Many other such leaflets were published. Some of them reached the U.S. and were reprinted there. Several evidently were brought into the U.S. by the soldiers of the interventionist armies. Thus, they were read both in the army and among the working people. The evidence of the influence of the Leninist documents, which exposed the aims of the intervention and explained the essence of the revolutionary achievement of Soviet power, was that "by the spring of 1919 reports began to appear in the press that the American soldiers in Russia were displaying little enthusiasm for the anti-Soviet military campaign. They were openly asking why they must fight in Russia when the war was supposedly over. The American 339th Infantry refused to obey orders, and mutinies broke out."<sup>7</sup>

The question of the situation among the American troops in Russia was discussed over and over again in the U.S. Senate where letters of soldiers were quoted, declaring they "did not quite know the reason for their stay" in Russia, that the expedition of American troops represents interference in the affairs of Russia.<sup>8</sup> The situation among American troops was unstable; protest demonstrations developed; there were even cases of American soldiers joining the side of the Bolsheviks.<sup>9</sup>

U.S. military headquarters feared "that public opinion would force the President to recall" the troops.<sup>10</sup> In 1920, the U.S. government was forced to do just that. The dissemination of revolutionary ideas among the interventionist troops and also in Western Europe and the U.S. had its results. In 1919, Lenin said: "We conquered the Entente because we took away their workers and peasants dressed in soldier uniforms"; "we took away their possibility of moving against Soviet Russia."<sup>11</sup>

Information concerning the situation among American troops in Russia penetrated the U.S. and news of the struggle of progressive forces in the U.S. against interference in the affairs of Soviet Russia

<sup>6</sup> *The Revolutionary Age*, February 15, 1919.

<sup>7</sup> Philip Foner, *The Bolshevik Revolution: Its Impact on American Radicals, Liberals and Labor*, International Publishers, New York, 1967, p. 170.

<sup>8</sup> *Congressional Record*, 1919. Vol. 57: Part 4, p. 3228; Part 5, p. 4735.

<sup>9</sup> *Historical Archives* (U.S.S.R.), 1961, No. 4, pp. 26-27.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

<sup>11</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Complete Works* (Russian), Vol. 39, pp. 393, 325.

became known to the soldiers. This was a great achievement of the Left forces in the U.S. and their press, sowing the seeds of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist ideas among the American people. Even during the first two years of the existence of Soviet power, aside from the works of Marx and Engels which the Left forces published and distributed, and even before the Great October Socialist Revolution, there were published in the U.S. at least fifty works of Lenin: articles, theoretical works and speeches, interviews and conversations, communications and appeals, letters, and various decisions of the Soviet government prepared by Lenin. All, whether theoretical works about the practical problems of the development of the revolution, the activities of Soviet power or defense of the victories of the working class, were further developments of the teachings of scientific communism. In the conditions of the rise of revolutionary sentiment in the U.S. and in the entire world, brought on by the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Left forces of the Socialist Party were greatly in need of Lenin's works. Therefore they published and distributed them. And, even though several works of Lenin were not published in full and the translations were not always complete, they played a big role in the ideological growth of the revolutionary forces in the U.S. They were read by tens of thousands of socialists and ordinary people.

The concentrated and "rapid influence of the depth and breadth of Lenin's works which underlined the realities of the Russian revolution, revolutionized the thinking of the Marxist forces in the United States. The Left quickly developed an understanding of scientific communism,"<sup>12</sup> noted William Z. Foster, the U.S. Communist leader. Among the Left forces there was a determined struggle against reformism, syndicalism, ultra-"Left" radicalism, for a break with the opportunist leadership of the Socialist Party of America and for the development of revolutionary tendencies.

Along with the economic results of World War I, which led to the sharpening of the class struggle, the Great October Socialist Revolution had a direct influence on the development of the revolutionary movement in the U.S. It brought enthusiasm to the ranks of the working class of the country and a wide distribution in 1917-1919 of the revolutionary ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. All of this ideologically prepared the development of the Communist movement.

<sup>12</sup> *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, International Publishers, New York, 1952, pp. 155-156.

## BOOK REVIEWS

ERIK BERT

### Burns on the Business Cycle

Since Arthur F. Burns' *The Business Cycle in a Changing World*\* was published last year he has become chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Following his appointment, however, the economy has continued its downward course, most pronounced in the stock market. Inflation has continued without letup and interest rates have reached extraordinary levels. In the light of this combination of circumstances, his views on the business cycle are of particular interest.

\*

Twelve of the thirteen essays which comprise the present volume were written between 1957 and 1968, the other in 1950. The standpoint from which he examines the ups and downs in our economy is that since World War II "no industrial country has suffered a spiraling depression" such as has occurred in the 1930's; the "expansions of aggregate economic activity tend to become longer"; the "contractions have become shorter and milder"; and the effect of these fluctuations on employment, personal income and consumption has been reduced. He expresses confidence that we shall not again experience the like of the thirties.

\* National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1969, \$8.50.

Burns' viewpoint over these years was not that economic ups and downs had ceased but that "the United States and other countries are learning how to adapt to business cycles"; that "we have made great strides in moderating the business cycle." As a result, "serious depressions are no longer the threat they once were."

But while he chalked up the victories he warned, between cheers, that the war had not yet been won. He cautioned that the mitigation of the economic downturns did not mean that business cycles have vanished, that the forces which incite them are no longer present, or that there can be no reversal of the factors which contributed to their mitigation. He cautioned that the "structural changes" in industry and employment, which he holds have been an important factor in the new economic picture, might be altered for the worse.

In our economy, he says, "the economic processes . . . themselves tend to generate cyclical movements," in the course of which "aggregate activity will in time be reversed by restrictive forces that gradually but insistently come into play as a result of the expansion process itself." (My emphasis—E.B.)

Business cycles, he states, "are found only in modern nations where economic activities are organized mainly through business enterprise." They are, in short, a product of capitalism, are inherent in the functioning of capitalism. But in defining and analyzing capitalism—which he prefers to call "business enterprise" and the "making and spending of money incomes," he consistently avoids mentioning the two categories which constitute its foundation: wage labor and capital.

That business cycles are not only born of but inherent in capitalism is confirmed by the fact that, as Burns points out, "in recent decades the Soviet Union and other nations that organize economic activity through state enterprises and governmental edicts [his notion of socialism] have... escaped business cycles."

"During the course of the nineteenth century," he writes, "the business cycle... was... viewed as centering, in the main, in activities of commerce and finance." But there was an exception he does not mention. Karl Marx viewed the ups and downs, the booms and crises, as aspects of the physiology of capitalist production. Already in 1947 Marx identified the oscillations in the economy with the rise of large-scale industry. (*Poverty of Philosophy*, International Publishers, New York, 1963, p. 63.)

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, Burns says, interest among U.S. economists "began to shift to phenomena of industry

and employment." But for half a century the international socialist movement, under Marx's guidance, had already identified the ups and downs in production and employment with capitalist relations. The interest of U. S. economists was stimulated, following the crisis of 1893, by the march of "Coxey's Army" and other elemental actions of the unemployed.

The "why" of the cyclical course of capitalist economy is usually expressed in the question: Why does a general business expansion come to an end? In Burns' words: "Why does not the process of expansion continue indefinitely?" "If the expansion must end, why is it not followed by a high plateau of economic activity instead of a decline?"

The source of the decline, he says, is internal: "*Experience strongly suggests that even in the absence of serious external disturbances the course of aggregate activity will in time be reversed by restrictive forces that gradually but insistently come into play as a result of the economic process itself.*" (My emphasis—E.B.)

The "external forces" are irrelevant to the central problem, Burns correctly points out. The question is, then, what is the nature of the "restrictive forces"? Burns sees errors in judgment (of which speculation is a distinct sector) as the reason why expansion does not continue indefinitely and contraction ensues.

The fact that "millions of business firms and households" make "economic plans and decisions...

independently"; speculation in inventories by "the business or consuming public"; and the warped judgment of businessmen "concerning the sales that can be made at profitable prices" can all cause general economic activity to contract.

Thus Burns disposes of the class content of capitalist society by transforming capitalist rubrics, such as "inventories," into all-class or non-class concepts. His depiction of "business firms and households" as equally makers of "economic plans and decisions" befogs reality. In the capitalist system, capitalists make decisions about how their capital is to be used and allocated; workers make decisions about what to do with their wages. Burns' depiction of both as equally plans-and-decisions makers obscures their basically contradictory positions in capitalist society, and specifically with reference to both economic plans and decisions. Though Burns says that the cause of economic oscillation lies in the nature of the capitalist system, he understands that system only superficially, bereft of its class essence.

Burns also sees the business cycles as a vicious circle. Thus, in describing the "cumulative process of expansion," he says that "the economy is jarred out of its depressed state," that "as the expansion continues, the slack in the economy is taken up and reduced" and that, in plant expansion, "a temporary condition of overcapacity may easily develop and require correcting." "Expansion"

is thus explained on the basis of a prior "depressed state" or "slack in the economy." Subsequent contraction is explained on the basis of prior "overcapacity."

Each phase of the cycle is explained by the existence of the previous stages. But this gets us nowhere.

The questions which are implicit in Burns' presentation, but which he does not answer are: why is contraction "bound to follow" speculation in inventories; why may overcapacity "easily develop" as a result of plant expansion; why is there an excess of inventories; why is plant expansion too rapid?

Exposition of the individual phases of the cycle is made to substitute for inquiry into the nature of the system whose *modus operandi* is oscillation.

\*

Burns ascribes the unique character of the post-World War II cyclical course to profound changes in the structure of the American economy. "The changes in economic organization... already appear to have done much to blunt the impact of business cycles." The allegedly profound structural changes have come about "partly as a result of deliberate economic policies, partly as a result of unplanned development."

The unplanned changes ("unplanned" in attempting to influence the cycle) embrace, according to Burns, the relative decline of the cyclically "volatile" industries and the relative growth of the "service industries"; the rela-

tive decline of the blue-collar sector and the relative increase in the white-collar sector; the increase in self-employment.

The unplanned changes include also the rise of consumer credit, and the emergence of the massive "defense" sector and the military industrial complex.

The main "structural" industrial change, says Burns, has been from manufacturing, mining, construction and freight transportation, the "strategic" industries, to the service and other industries; from the "highly cyclical" industries to those which "have remained relatively free from cyclical unemployment." Presumably the total shift from manufacturing, which is volatile, to merchandising, which is cyclically more "stable," would be a tremendous gain for stability, albeit there would be nothing to merchandise.

Burns does not inquire into the significance of this alleged long-range decline in volatility in respect to the creation of surplus value. He does not distinguish between the industries in which values are created and those in which values are cremated—between, let us say, public utilities and banking. Nor does he distinguish among government activities, which cover the entire range from creation of values to sheer destruction.

Burns does not claim that the shift from "volatile" to "nonvolatile" industries has effected any qualitative change in cyclical oscillation. He does contend that the stabilizing tendency, allegedly

resulting from the shift, is "being gradually reinforced by the spread of 'white-collar' occupations throughout the range of industry." He believes that the alleged stabilizing tendency of the white-collar trend "promises well for the future," that "the spread of white-collar occupations throughout the range of industry will continue and may even accelerate."

But that is only one aspect of the problem. Let us assume that the proportions of "white-collar" real estate salesmen and of "white-collar" engineers in total employment increase. The first represents a reduction in the creation of surplus value and an increase in nonproductive consumption, while the second represents an increase in the production of surplus value. This concerns Burns not at all.

On the contrary. From the contention that shifts to the service industries and to white-collar employment contribute to cyclical stability, Burns infers some kind of homogeneity within these categories. This flies in the face of the divergent nature of the industries and occupations contained within them with respect to the creation of value—to the operation of the capitalist system.

Burns warns, however, that although the white-collar group is "often sheltered by a professional code which frowns upon frequent firing and hiring," the need to cut costs during a recession might make white-collar employment "less stable than it has been." The recent cuts in white-collar

jobs in finance and manufacturing confirm this.

But the "white-collar" concept has become a major incitement to confusion. It is not an economic concept, not even a useful category in employment analysis. It is superficial, empirical and misleading.

"The emergence of a massive and permanent defense sector has already changed and is continuing to change our economic and social life," says Burns. He points out that this sector "has revolutionized government finances in our generation," that "sudden surges within the defense sector have contributed to the inflationary trend," that "the defense sector has . . . contributed to the deficit in our balance of payments" because of expenditures to "maintain our military forces abroad."

However, he does not consider what is the difference between producing "defense" commodities or civilian commodities, between producing means of production for "defense" commodities or civilian commodities. Consequently he offers no insight into whether the shift to the "defense" sector affects the business cycle and if so, in what manner.

\*

Burns seeks to replace the concept of capitalist-worker contradiction, as the essence of capitalist relations, by that of the non-class "consumer." The modern consumer, according to him, has the "power" and the "habit of initiating changes in economic activities." The implication is that

it is the "consumer" who initiates changes in the business cycle, that they do not arise from the relations of capitalist and worker in the production process.

"The movement of personal income," Burns asserts, "is no longer closely linked to the fluctuations of production." This is the result of "the vast expansion of government, the greatly increased role of the income tax, the shift of income tax collection to a pay-as-you-go basis, the rapid growth of unemployment compensation and other social security programs and other such developments.

Burns disregards here the diverse and contradictory origins of "personal income," the diverse and contradictory impacts of the cited changes on the business cycle and of the business cycle on them. He asserts blandly that these changes share the faculty of loosening the bonds between the cycle and "personal income."

Underlying Burns' methodology is a total disregard for the class nature of capitalist production, the class origin of profit, class differentiations in "personal income."

One side of Burns' coin is that the welfare measures and other changes have tended to stabilize the flow of personal income and thus reduce the impact of a downturn on individual income. The other side of that coin is that the increased stability of personal income has tended to reduce the amplitude of the cycle.

At this point he concludes that "consumer spending has emerged

as one of the active factors in arresting recession and hastening recovery." In fact, he sees a "new role of the consumer in the business cycle." Here again the non-class "consumer" replaces the real consumers, who may be workers or capitalists or in between. Burns' "consumers" are stripped of the roles in the production process that determine their crucial relation to the business cycle.

In addition to such developments, "not planned as antidotes to fluctuation," there have been the "deliberate efforts to control the business cycle." The most explicit statement of "deliberate effort" is the Employment Act of 1946. This Act, says Burns, has contributed to moderating the business cycle greatly and distributing the "fruits of industry . . . widely . . . among our people." This he attributes to the introduction of "elements of order into policymaking" and to "providing assurance to both businessmen and consumers that economic storms would not be left to themselves." But these assurances must be judged in the context of his caution that "prosperity cannot be ordered or guaranteed by government officials."

\*

Burns concedes that the achievements he cites have not been pervasive or conclusive. There have been lapses from full employment, a "series of recessions, the deterioration in the value of the dollar, the chronic deficit in the balance of payments, and the persistence of pockets of poverty in our land of plenty." These defi-

ciencies may be aggravated by the large growth of consumer and mortgage debt, he warns.

He ascribes the deficiencies, however, to "inefficiency," as the result largely of the fact that the administrators of the Employment Act "have worked with tools that are much too crude." Thus the fault lies not in our system but in ourselves.

Burns holds, as we have seen, that "the vast expansion of government" is one of the reasons why "the movement of personal income is no longer closely linked with to the fluctuations of production." But the sharp expansion of government expenditures, absolutely and relatively, means also that a downturn in the economy will have far wider fiscal and social ramifications than hitherto.

Burns cites "tax revenues that respond sensitively to changes in the national income," as the result of the "shift to a pay-as-you-go basis," as being among the "automatic devices for curbing the rapidity with which a recession cumulates. . . ."

However, "when a recession occurs, our current tax system requires the government to reduce rather promptly and substantially the amount of money that it withdraws from the private economy for its own use." But this is not likely to happen in a recession simply because tax revenues are then declining. Burns does not draw the obtrusive conclusion that the widening gap between government commitments and governmental revenues during a recession is likely to have serious

consequences.

Burns maintains that "economic instability has not yet vanished . . . in the socialist world." He states that "it is impossible to find, whether we look West or East, any final solution to the problems of unemployment. . . ."

But that is not the question at issue. What is at issue is that *under capitalism "the economic processes themselves tend to generate cyclical movements" of production and unemployment.* Whatever the economic problems in the socialist countries, none of them relates to business cycles. None of them arises from the economic processes themselves. None occurs because the economy is producing "too much." But that is precisely the nature of cyclical downturn and unemployment in the capitalist world.

Burns warns:

The old Marxist dogma that capitalism is doomed to collapse on the rocks of economic crisis has become a weapon of propaganda, used adroitly and energetically to confuse

the uninitiated and to stir discontent the world over.

At another point he talks of the "Marxist prophecy of crisis and collapse of free economies."

That is nonsense. There is no such "old Marxist dogma" or "prophecy." In fact, Burns fears something else. "We have learned," he says, "that in the course of a depression . . . some lose faith even in our economic and political institutions." That is why the "fear of business cycles which rules economic thinking is a fear of severe depressions." These, says Burns, represent a "really serious threat to our way of life."

"The crucial problem of our times," he said in 1950, "is the prevention of severe depressions." Twenty years later, as his book appears, the fear which rules bourgeois economic thinking is the fear of a severe economic depression. There is dull silence about the "automatic" contracyclical devices and the "structural" changes which were to make the present ominous situation impossible.



## Robert Owen, Utopian Socialist

On February 25, 1825, the House and the Senate, in joint session in the Hall of Representatives in Washington heard and applauded a magnificent plea to establish a socialist system in the United States. The plea was made by Robert Owen, owner of what was then the largest cotton spinning mill in Britain. In attendance at this joint session of Congress were James Monroe, outgoing President; John Quincy Adams, the President-elect; the justices of the Supreme Court; and the Cabinet. A second speech, before the same audience, was made by Owen on March 7.

Both addresses have now been printed through the research work of Oakley C. Johnson, who resurrected them from more than a century of interment in library archives. They make exciting reading.\*

In these addresses, one reads with delighted astonishment that the halls of Congress should ever have sounded with such a ringing call to introduce "a new social system" whereby "the degrading and pernicious practice in which we are now trained, of buying cheap and selling dear, will be rendered wholly unnecessary," and whereby "union and cooperation will supersede individual interest."

\* Oakley C. Johnson, *Robert Owen in the United States*, Humanities Press, New York, 1969, \$3.50.

Furthermore, as Oakley Johnson points out in his informative introduction, the newspapers of that time gave Owen's addresses to Congress the same prominence that they gave to President Adams' Inaugural Address.

How did it happen that Owen's speeches stirred such interest? Johnson suggests this was because conditions "in early capitalist America" were "far from ideal." We might also note that Marx, as late as 1852 in his *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*, talks about the U.S. as a land where "classes, indeed, already exist" but "have not yet become fixed" and are in "a constant state of flux."

De Tocqueville, the aristocratic Frenchman who visited the U.S. in 1831, was also struck by the fluid class structure. But De Tocqueville added, "I know of no country where the love of money has taken stronger hold of the affections of men, and where a profounder contempt is expressed for the theory of the permanent equality of property."

And it may be that though the Congressmen of this still fluid society were stirred by visions of classless cooperation, they were even more interested in what they must have regarded as Owen's spectacular profit-making career.

Owen's career, as outlined in a foreward to Johnson's book by A. L. Morton, the British histor-

ian, and as related in Morton's biography of Robert Owen\*, was a career in the best Horatio Alger capitalist tradition of the 19th century.

He came from Wales to London with 40 shillings at the age of 10 in 1781. He worked for clothing firms in London and Manchester, and having saved £100, he bought spinning machinery. With this machinery he was soon making a profit of no less than £300 a year.

In 1797, at the age of 27, he married the daughter of David Dale, owner of the New Lanark cotton spinning mill. Then, beginning in 1800, first with some Manchester partners and later with Quaker backing, he astounded the world by proving that sanitary community conditions, reduced hours, restrictions on child labor and educational reform could produce healthier workers and bigger profits.

Rulers from all Europe, including the Russian Czar, visited New Lanark to admire but not to imitate. But Owen's genius went beyond the art of moneymaking. He was one of the earliest to see that the new machinery, while it enriched the few, brought misery to the many, and that this would continue as long as private profit was the incentive to industrial progress.

At first he sought factory reform laws to mitigate the effects

\* A. L. Morton, *The Life and Ideas of Robert Owen*, International Publishers, New York, 1969, cloth \$0.00, paper \$1.35.

of machinery, but his efforts were largely in vain. In 1817 he proposed to establish village settlements like New Lanark, as a remedy for unemployment during the economic crisis of that period, and in 1819, an attempt along such lines was made with the aid of two dukes as well as Sir Robert Peel, Sr. and David Ricardo. But this attempt failed, as did another one in 1822.

And so, in 1824, Owen came to America, where he lectured for a year to enthusiastic audiences and finally addressed Congress.

Owen's two addresses to Congress not only contained his abstract principles but included a scale model of his village settlements which were to be models first for the American nation and then for the world. He proposed that a Congressional commission investigate his plan and his models. He also announced he was going ahead with purchasing a site in Indiana for the first such settlement in the U.S.

There is no record of Congress appointing the commission or doing anything else to help Owen beyond enthusiastic applause, but Owen undaunted, went ahead in Indiana with the community that he named New Harmony.

Johnson's book includes a Fourth of July Address by Owen to the New Harmony community in 1826, in which he calls for adding a Declaration of Mental Independence to the Declaration of Political Independence of 1776, expressing his belief that the practice of the "social system" in the Indiana community will spread

"from Community to Community shedding fragrance and abundance, intelligence and happiness."

By 1827, however, factionalism and other troubles had put an end to New Harmony. "The community," writes Morton, "was overweighted from the start with middle-class intellectuals."

With the optimism that remained undiminished throughout his long life, Owen approached the Mexican government for territory from the Gulf to the Pacific, but nothing came of this project, and in 1829 Owen returned to England.

The events that followed, including the rise of the British labor movement and Owen's part in it, are outlined in a 13-page chapter of Morton's book, in as condensed and readable a form as I have seen anywhere. Owen's enthusiasm for a cooperative society, his sympathy with the workers, demand, his breadth of vision, helped unite the separate workers' groups into a national movement. But his continued reliance on appeals to the rich and powerful and his refusal to accept the necessity of class struggle resulted ultimately in his alienation from trade union developments.

The labor movement developed more or less independently of

Owen and his followers, but the cooperative movement still traces its origin to him.

Morton concludes this chapter with the assertion that "it is one of Owen's great positive achievements to have given to the masses in Britain their first conception of socialism." Since then, of course, the theory and practice of scientific socialism have shown that leadership by the working class in the class struggle is the only road to socialism.

The lesson is taught with literary skill by A. L. Morton, an historian versed in the philosophy of dialectical materialism, whose book devotes half its pages to the story of Owen and a well-rounded analysis of the strength and weaknesses of that genius, and half to selections from Owen's writings.

These books by Johnson and Morton are well worth reading, both for Marxists who will clarify their own thinking by an exposition of what is true and false in Owen's basically idealist philosophy and for others, like the New Left, who might see in the indefatigable faith of this great and good man in the power of ideas alone a forewarning of their own errors when they ignore the slow and painful task of mass organization.

## NEW PAMPHLETS

### THE "PRODUCTIVITY" HOAX!

#### —AND AUTO WORKERS' REAL NEEDS!

A Marxist-Leninist discussion of terrorism and violence as they action program for auto workers. **64 pages—65c**

### DIG WE MUST!

#### —INTO THE OPERATORS' PROFITS!

An analysis of the coal industry and the Communist Party's action program for coal miners. **16 pages—25c**

### TERRORISM—IS IT REVOLUTIONARY?

by Gil Green  
An analysis of the auto industry and the Communist Party's relate to conditions in the U.S. today. **40 pages—50c**

### HARD HATS AND HARD FACTS

by Gus Hall  
A "man-to-man talk" by a former "hard-hat" construction worker about the real meaning of the recent actions in New York "in defense of the flag" and what construction workers must do to truly protect their interests. **24 pages—25c**

### OUR COUNTRY IN CRISIS—THE PEOPLE

MUST ACT!  
by Gus Hall  
Report to emergency meeting of Communist Party National Committee, May 16-17, 1970, on political and Constitutional crisis created by invasion of Cambodia and violent repression of dissent. **40 pages—40c**

### THE FIGHT AGAINST THE NIXON-AGNEW ROAD TO DISASTER

by Gus Hall  
Report to National Committee of Communist Party, U.S.A. January 16, 1970. **48 pages—60c**

### NEW PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

Complete official program adopted by the 19th Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A. **128 pages—50c**

### OF THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE

Pictorial highlights of fifty years of the Communist Party, USA, 1919-1969. Includes 143 photographs and illustrations, plus brief history. 9" x 12" booklet. **32 pages—\$1.00**

### BLACK AMERICA AND THE WORLD REVOLUTION

by Claude M. Lightfoot  
Five recent speeches showing the growing revolutionary character of the Black liberation struggle and its relationship to the worldwide revolutionary process. **96 pages—90c**

### LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS

by V. I. Lenin  
Centennial edition, with an introduction by Gus Hall and a history of the famous Letter by Art Shields. **40 pages—45c**

### ENTER FIGHTING: TODAY'S WOMAN

by Clara Colón  
A Marxist-Leninist view on the struggle for women's liberation. **96 pages—85c**

At bookstores or order from

### NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

32 Union Square East • Room 801 • New York, N.Y. 10003  
Orders must be prepaid (no stamps). Add 20c postage on orders under \$2.00. New York purchasers include sales tax.

WRITE FOR COMPLETE LIST

## **NEW FROM INTERNATIONAL**

### **THE SECOND INDOCHINA WAR**

**Cambodia and Laos**

**by Wilfred G. Burchett**

A full behind-the-scenes account of the latest phase of the war—the invasion of Cambodia and intervention in Laos—exposing the duplicity and double-dealing in Washington. (Special discounts to peace organizations.)

**Cloth \$5.95; paperback \$1.95**

### **AMERICAN NEO-COLONIALISM**

**Its Emergence in the Phillipines and Asia**

**by William J. Pomeroy**

Probes the roots of U.S. foreign policy in expansion across the Pacific, the origins of the anti-imperialist movement in the U.S., and their bearing on present intervention in Asia.

**Cloth \$7.50; paperback \$2.85**

### **REVOLUTION CUBAN STYLE**

**by Gil Green**

A new, first hand look at Cuba today and its problems in the socialist remolding of society and man.

**Paperback \$1.25**

### **THE EMANCIPATION OF WOMEN**

**Selections from V. I. Lenin**

Introduction by N. K. Krupskaya, including Clara Zetkin's interview with Lenin on morality and the family.

**Paperback \$1.45**

**From your bookshop or**

**International Publishers**

**381 Park Ave. South, New York, N. Y. 10016**