

DECEMBER, 1970

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE PEOPLE'S VICTORY IN CHILE

Editorial Comment

THE STEEL UNION'S 15TH CONVENTION

James West

THE PEOPLE OF CHILE WILL KNOW . . .

Orlando Millas

BANFIELD: NIXON-MODEL PLANNER

Herbert Aptheker

ON THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT

Rev. Peter J. Riga

Hyman Lumer

60¢

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Editorial Comment</i>	
The People's Victory in Chile	1
<i>James West</i>	
The Steel Union's 15th Convention	10
<i>Orlando Millas</i>	
The People Will Know How to Make Their Victory Respected	22
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	
Banfield: The Nixon-Model Planner	34
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>Rev. Peter J. Riga</i>	
Thoughts on the Middle East Conflict	46
<i>Hyman Lumer</i>	
On the Origins of the State of Israel	52
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>Erik Bert</i>	
The Road to Transcendental Marxism	57
Index	65

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

The People's Victory in Chile

The election of Dr. Salvador Allende to the presidency of Chile is an event of momentous importance. Thomas J. Spinner, Jr., writing in *The Progressive* (November 1970) correctly describes it as "a breakthrough of historic magnitude for progressive forces throughout the world."

This was no ordinary electoral victory, no mere victory of a Socialist over other candidates. Rather, in the words of the Basic Program of the six-party coalition which backed Allende, it represents a "transfer of power from the old ruling groups to the workers, to the peasantry, and to the progressive sections of the middle class of the city and country." ("A Basic Program of People's Unity," *Political Affairs*, May and July 1970.)

A People's Government

It is, as Gus Hall puts it, "a new revolutionary experience." (*Daily World Magazine*, October 11, 1970.) For the first time the democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchist will of the people has found expression in a victory at the polls. The uniqueness of this victory lies in the fact that it brings to power a united front of the Chilean people for the liberation of their country from the domination of U.S. imperialism and its domestic supporters, and lays the foundations for the advance to socialism.

President Allende has spoken of the creation of a "republic of the working class." And he has, for the first time in the history of Chile brought members of the working class into the Cabinet. Three Communists, members of the CPC Central Committee, were appointed to the Ministries of Finance, Public Works and Labor—key posts for the determination of economic policy. All three are former industrial workers. In addition, the Minister of Housing, a Socialist, is a former nitrate worker. These actions already indicate the character and direction of the new Popular Government.

Some seek to minimize the significance of the victory on the grounds that Allende received only 36.3 per cent of the vote and defeated the Right-wing National Party candidate Jorge Alessandri by only a narrow margin. But this is unfounded. Many working people expressed their opposition to the Right by voting for the Christian Democratic candidate Radomiro Tomic, whose platform contained a number of

the reforms advocated by the Popular Unity coalition, and who received 27.8 per cent of the vote. A further indication of support is the decision of the Christian Democratic Party to back the election of Allende as against Allesandri in the National Congress, guaranteeing his confirmation by a large majority in both houses. It is safe to conclude, therefore, that the great majority of the people support a policy of strengthening political and economic independence and of basic social reforms. It is not the Popular Unity forces but the Right wing that represents a minority.

Nor is the Popular Unity merely a formal coalition of political parties. It is an entity with a program and an organized mass base of its own. Its Basic Program, issued in December 1969, calls for the attainment of People's Power. Toward this end it calls for the formation of Committees of People's Unity which "will not only be electoral bodies" but will also be "interpreters of and fighters for the immediate demands of the masses" and will "prepare themselves to exercise People's Power" through a Popular Government.

Within the past year some 14,000 local committees of this type have been established. These were a powerful force in the election campaign and are today a solid base of contact between the Popular Government and the Chilean masses.

Moreover, the Popular Unity is not a narrow closed corporation of the Left. Other parties and groups are invited to join the coalition, and there are responses to this invitation. Thus, since the elections the Young Church Movement, a progressive federation of priests, monks, nuns and laymen, voted to join. They stated that they did so in the spirit of the Second Vatican Council, in order to work to "realize the kingdom of God on this earth and not by waiting for the next."

Popular Unity is therefore a mass, united front movement of the Chilean people, live and growing, and with roots sunk deep among the masses. Such is the base of the new government.

To End Imperialist Exploitation

The immediate task of the Popular Government is to end the ruinous exploitation of the country by foreign monopoly capital, in the first place the U.S. monopolies, which have waxed fat on the misery and hunger of the Chilean people.

U.S. capital has close to a billion dollars invested in Chile. More than half of it is in copper mining, chiefly by Kennecot and Anaconda. Other big investors include International Telephone and Telegraph, General Motors and Ford. The huge profits extracted by these corporations are all taken out of the country. In 1969 the amount re-

moved came to \$480 million or \$1.3 million a day—a sum equal to the daily wage of one million Chilean workers. As the copper miners put it, "They take the copper and leave us the holes."

But this is only part of the robbery. Huge sums are extracted through U.S. technological dominance, compelling Chilean buyers to pay top monopoly prices for machinery, licenses and patents, as well as through loans at usurious rates of interest and with the costly proviso that the money be spent in the United States and the goods shipped in U.S. vessels. Through such means U.S. corporations, which have invested some \$7½ billion in Latin America since 1952, have taken out no less than \$16 billion, much of it from Chile.

Chile runs a chronic trade deficit with the United States. In 1969, for example, Chilean exports to the United States totaled about \$200 million while imports came to \$312 million. As a result there has accumulated a growing burden of indebtedness to the United States. During the sixties, Chile has received more than \$1.3 billion in U.S. loans and grants (all of it, of course, with strings attached)—a sum greater than that received by any other Latin American country except Brazil. The huge financial drain on the country and the mountainous burden of government debt have led to massive chronic inflation, with prices rising at a rate of some 30 per cent a year.

This immense robbery takes place at the expense of the Chilean people, among whom poverty, hunger and chronic unemployment are rampant. While a large part of the country's productive facilities lie idle, more than half of all Chilean families do not receive enough income to maintain even a bare level of subsistence. Half a million families lack homes and another half million live in hovels which are wretched beyond description. In Gran Santiago, nearly 22 per cent of the labor force was jobless as of August 1970, and this is typical.

Especially for the masses of peasants in the countryside are living conditions intolerable. Not only do the big landowners, in collusion with the foreign monopolies, systematically rob them; in addition, Chilean agriculture under their control does not produce enough to feed the population and food must be imported at high prices.

It is to this wholesale plundering of the country that the Popular Government is now addressing itself. President Allende has announced that "the people's government is planning, first of all, to nationalize the biggest monopolies: specifically, the corporations producing nitrates, copper and coal." A start in this direction has already been made by the Frei government, which took over 51 per cent of the holdings of the U.S. copper companies. Now they will be completely nationalized.

Plans call also for nationalization of the banks and insurance companies, of large domestic monopolies, of electrical energy production, transport, oil, communications and other key enterprises. But much will remain in private hands or will be developed as mixed enterprises. In addition, extensive agrarian reforms are planned, such as expropriation of large landowners and the organization of cooperative farming. Steps are being initiated to end inflation, to raise wages and to provide jobs for all.

In keeping with these actions, political and economic ties with the socialist world are to be strengthened. Diplomatic relations are being established with Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, the Korean Democratic People's Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the People's Republic of China. And ties with the Soviet Union will be greatly broadened.

The Threat of Counter-Revolution

The forces of reaction in Chile will, of course, make every effort to topple the new government. But the gravest source of danger lies here in the United States. Needless to say, the victory of the Popular Unity forces is a severe blow to the U.S. monopolists, and needless to say, they will do all in their power to reverse it. Indeed, they are already deeply embroiled in counter-revolutionary intrigues.

To be sure, their path is not an easy one. The fact that the people's victory was won through the channels of bourgeois-democratic institutions puts the pretensions of the imperialists as upholders of democracy and freedom severely to the test. Moreover, there is some fear of taking any overt action which might precipitate more immediate and more drastic inroads on the holdings of the U.S. monopolists by the Allende government. Along with this there is apparently some hope in monopolist circles that this government can be yet diverted from its present course. Hence the official attitude is publicly described as one of "watchful waiting." And hence the State Department's decision to send a high-ranking official, Charles A. Meyer, Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, to the Allende inaugural.

But no one should be deceived by these actions. Behind the scenes the efforts to void the people's mandate go on full blast and are being stepped up. There have been a number of terrorist bombings. The assassination of General René Schneider by Right-wing terrorists in the hope of provoking a coup, is a shocking demonstration of the lengths to which reaction is prepared to go. In addition, President Allende reports, two attempts on his own life were uncovered. One of these is described in some detail in the Communist Party news-

paper *El Siglo* (September 28, 1970).

In these terrorist plots the hand of the CIA is much in evidence. *El Siglo* reports that one Joseph Vasile, an employee of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) in Santiago, had been found to be associated with certain Right-wing terrorist groups masquerading in an ultra-Left disguise. These groups, of which Vasile is described as the "brain," were engaged in plotting various acts of assault and sabotage, including the attempts on Allende's life. These things were reported also in other newspapers. Other reports noted Vasile's relations with a police organ, the *Cuerpo de Carabineros de Chile*. Following these and other disclosures in the Chilean press, the U.S. Embassy came rather ineptly to Vasile's defense, stating: "Mr. Joseph Vasile has been in Chile since September of 1964 as an official of the Economic Mission of the United States (AID) in the capacity of an electronics engineer, assisting the *Cuerpo de Carabineros de Chile* with the technical aspects of a program of improving its system of telecommunication." This exposes more than it explains.

Another employee of AID, *El Siglo* reports (October 14, 1970), is Karl Maler, formerly a U.S. diplomatic representative in Saigon who took a leading part in organizing the coup that brought Ky to power. The paper asks the obvious question: how does this qualify him for employment in an economic agency?

We cite these cases simply as illustrations of what is undoubtedly pervasive involvement of the CIA. It may be expected that there will be further CIA-inspired machinations to behead the movement by killing off its leaders. And undoubtedly efforts will be made to use the Right-wing military dictatorship in Argentina, with its long common border with Chile, to provoke border incidents as an excuse for armed intervention.

Attempts are already being made to lay a foundation for direct U.S. intervention. On September 16, according to an editorial in the *New Republic* (November 7, 1970), a high Administration official gave a "background briefing" to reporters accompanying President Nixon on a trip to Chicago. He expressed dismay that a "Communist" had been elected against the will of two-thirds of the voters, and stated his conviction that Allende's election would mean the end of free elections in Chile. In addition, the magazine reports, "the White House . . . put forward a new Latin-styled domino theory, according to which Peru, Bolivia and Argentina . . . might be the next three countries to fall."

The capitalist press is also laboring to lay a base for intervention. *The New York Times* (September 6, 1970) editorially bewails the

Popular Unity victory as "a heavy blow at liberal democracy." A later editorial (September 9, 1970) asserts that apart from a negative vote of the National Congress, "the only other means for blocking Dr. Allende would be a takeover by the Chilean armed forces." It is acknowledged that "this remedy might be worse than the illness." But the clear implication is that it may nevertheless be necessary. More recently (October 26, 1970) the *Times* expresses a more optimistic view, based on the hope that the support of the Christian Democrats will serve to dilute the Popular Unity program. It states that "there are grounds for hope that democracy can survive in Chile, despite its sharp turn to the Left." But, one is impelled to ask, what if things do not go to the liking of the *New York Times* and the U.S. ruling class generally? Then, of course, drastic measures will be necessary.

The attack has been unleashed also on the economic front. Following the elections the U.S. Export-Import Bank at once put Chile in its "worst risk" category. This means that U.S. exporters to Chile must pay higher premiums for insurance against loss, thus raising the prices of U.S. imports in that country. At the same time, within Chile new investments were halted, building projects canceled and bank accounts transferred out of the country. A near-panic developed, incited by domestic reaction with the participation and encouragement of U.S. imperialism. For the present the panic has abated as it has become evident that the fears underlying it were unwarranted. But it is certain that efforts at economic sabotage will continue and will be intensified as the Popular Unity program is increasingly put into effect.

The Character of the Struggle

The unprecedented electoral victory of the Chilean people is a product of the new historical epoch—that epoch in which "the balance of strength between the ascendent forces of socialism and anti-colonialist revolution and the declining forces of capitalism and colonialism has shifted irrevocably in favor of the former." (*New Program of the Communist Party U.S.A.*, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1970, p. 26.) It is this new balance of world forces and the greatly sharpened contradictions within the capitalist world that give rise to vastly increased possibilities of achieving a peaceful path to socialism by way of an anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist alliance of the working class and other sections of the people. The statement of the Moscow meeting of Communist and Workers Parties in June 1969 describes this path of struggle in the following words:

In the course of the anti-monopolist and anti-imperialist united

action, favorable conditions are created for uniting all democratic trends into a political alliance capable of decisively limiting the role played by the monopolies in the economies of the countries concerned, of putting an end to the power of big capital and of bringing about such radical political and economic changes as would ensure the most favorable conditions for continuing the struggle for socialism. The main force in this democratic alliance is the working class. These objectives can be achieved, above all, by diverse forms of powerful mass action by the working class and the broadest sections of the population. While making use of all the possibilities of parliamentary activity, Communists emphasize that the mass movement of the working class and all working people is the decisive factor in the struggle for democracy and socialism. (*Strengthen Anti-Imperialist Solidarity*, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1969, p. 28.)

This is precisely the character of the struggle which is unfolding in Chile. It fully bears out the correctness of the analysis made by the world Communist movement.

In fighting for this line the Communist Party of Chile has had to contend with the forces of petty-bourgeois radicalism and "Left" adventurism, such as those organized in the Movement of the Revolutionary Left (MIR). These elements call for "revolutionary" tactics—for guerrilla warfare as the only revolutionary path, for rejection of the working class as a revolutionary force, for opposition to all concepts of united front, for the "making" of revolution by a dedicated handful regardless of objective reality.

Moreover, they see the revolutionary process in Latin America only as socialist, and deny the existence of an anti-imperialist stage (a misconception widely peddled by the *Monthly Review* both in the United States and in Latin America). Today they press for "radicalization" of the struggle, for recklessly moving at once to the establishment of socialism. In this they have supporters in the New Left in this country; for the *Guardian*, for example, the chief question is whether the Popular Unity will move to the Left fast enough or whether the "conservatism" of the Communist Party will restrain it.

But the victory of the Popular Unity forces was possible only because they firmly repudiated all such "Left" adventurism, because they rooted their movement in the masses and especially among the industrial workers, because they fought to build the broadest united front of workers, peasants and middle-class groupings. And because they did so, they were not only able to win a victory at the polls but are in a very strong position to defend that victory and to make further advances.

It is clear that the electoral victory is only the initial step and that big battles lie ahead. It is by no means certain that the course of peaceful struggle can successfully be maintained. The people's victory may yet have to be defended with arms. Some will argue that this would only prove that the tactics were wrong, that armed revolt should have been organized at the start. But this is wrong. As Gus Hall points out, "Armed struggle would now have the support of the Chilean masses in support of the electoral victory. Armed struggle without the mass movement would fail. . . . An armed struggle without having moved the masses into the political arena would have ended in the isolation of the revolutionary forces." (*Daily World Magazine*, October 17, 1970.)

Some Basic Lessons

The Chilean experience demonstrates anew how varied is the course of revolution in different countries. It demonstrates the need for the utmost flexibility in tactics, for the skillful combination of different forms of struggle. And it demonstrates that whatever the tactics they cannot succeed unless they are based on the widest support of the masses—on mass movement. Only in this way can the ruling-class forces of reaction be isolated and defeated.

Finally it shows strikingly the vital role of the Communist Party. It is generally acknowledged that the Communist Party of Chile is the backbone of the Popular Unity—the strongest, best organized and most disciplined of all its component parties. It is the Communist Party which projected the idea of the coalition and fought persistently for its realization over a period of years. Its realism and its flexibility in the diverse conditions of the struggle contributed powerfully to the ultimate electoral victory.

It is the Communist Party which was the dynamic force in the organization of the thousands of local Committees of People's Unity, and which is now the main force in mobilizing the Chilean masses for defense of their victory and for further advances. It is this party, with its deep roots in the working class, with its grasp of Marxist-Leninist theory and its skill in tactics, which is the force that the ruling class most deeply fears and strives to isolate.

For our Party here in the United States the Chilean elections hold important lessons. Gus Hall sums these up as follows:

That we must build mass struggles—mass movements reflecting our reality.

That there is no such thing as skipping stages. There can be fast

and speedy movements, but no skipping of stages.

That we must never lose confidence in the masses, in the working class, and that our policies must be saved on that.

That our tactics must be a flexible combination of many forms of struggle at the proper time. And they must be based on mass struggle—*regardless of tactics*. . . .

I think it points to the need for building united front movements of all kinds. (*Daily World Magazine*, October 17, 1970.)

To these Comrade Hall adds one more lesson: to learn from the experiences of the Communist Party of Chile, and to build and strengthen our own Party organizationally and ideologically.

The Chilean people are on the march. Socialism in Latin America, initiated with the successful revolution in Cuba, will be victorious in Chile, and sooner or later in other Latin American countries. The people's victory in Chile lays the basis for closer ties between the peoples of our two countries, and particularly between their respective working classes. On our Party and on the working people of our country it imposes the task of defending that victory against all efforts by U.S. imperialism to undermine and reverse it.

(Note: In this issue we present also, in an abridged version, a report on the elections by Orlando Millas, a member of the Political Committee of the Communist Party of Chile.)

The anti-colonial revolutions aim to destroy imperialist domination, feudal bondage and political tyranny. In the struggle for such aims a broad national unity is attainable, including workers, peasants, intellectuals, middle classes, and even some capitalists restricted by foreign monopoly. The attainment of such aims, progressive and liberating as they are, is not yet socialism. . . .

Striving to leap from economic backwardness and extreme poverty to modern industry and abundance, colonial peoples are increasingly compelled to bypass capitalist economic forms, which retard their growth and subject them to imperialist penetration. Workers and peasants, who suffer most acutely from the legacies of colonialism, are therefore impelled to make the advance from anti-colonial revolution to socialist revolution. This brings them into sharpest conflict with neo-colonialism and with those social strata which derive wealth and privilege from a private profit system. (*New Program of the Communist Party U.S.A.*, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1970, p. 35.)

The Steel Union's 15th Convention

The 15th Constitutional Convention of the United Steelworkers Union, held September 28-October 2, 1970, reflected the sharpening class struggles in the United States.

On the part of the Abel leadership it was a distorted and contradictory reflection. On the part of the rank-and-file delegates, among whom there were many younger, newly-elected local union officials, it was a direct, clear and forthright reflection.

The Abel team clearly intended the convention to be an exercise in public relations which would put forward in broad terms the bargaining goals for 1971, set the stage for steelworker participation in the November elections to defeat the worst Nixonites and elect liberals to Congress (especially the Senate) and project legislative goals and foreign affairs positions.

Moving in Opposite Directions

What emerged from this effort were inconsistent and contradictory stands. Adopting a generally progressive posture on most questions of domestic policy in relation to the economy, equal rights, labor's rights, civil liberties, health, education and the environment, the convention moved in the opposite direction in matters of foreign policy.

The foreign affairs section of the resolution adopted was a backsliding into some positions of the worst days of the anti-Soviet cold war in relation to Southeast Asia and to Eastern Europe. The convention thereby cut the ground out from under its more or less progressive domestic policy positions.

It was almost as though the Abel leadership was telling Nixon: "You have our support on foreign policy provided you reverse your course on domestic policy." It was as though a plea were being made for a return to the "good old days" of Lyndon Johnson (from the viewpoint of the Abel team).

What is ignored in this attempt to move in two directions at once is that Johnson's reactionary foreign policies could only lead to reactionary domestic policies: inflation, higher taxes, growing repression, racism, etc. And the consequences led to the point where Johnson had to take himself out of a re-election bid rather than face the certain defeat which awaited him at the polls.

Where Johnson would make some domestic concessions and throw some crumbs to labor to gain its support for his foreign policies, Nixon uses threats and blackmail to whip labor leaders into line to support both foreign and domestic policy. Illusions that Nixon will trade concessions to labor in return for foreign policy support await a sad and rude awakening. Give Nixon an inch and he demands a foot.

When Labor Secretary Hodgson's attempt to picture the Nixon administration as friendly to labor was booed by the delegates, Abel justified Hodgson's appearance by explaining that it was a steel convention tradition to invite the labor secretary to speak, no matter which party was in power.

But it was deemed unnecessary to explain why the President of the United Auto Workers Union, a traditional speaker at all steel union conventions (except for a while under David J. McDonald) had not been invited to speak. This far better and more meaningful tradition of the USWA was ignored at the very time when it was most important for the steelworkers, who themselves face a difficult struggle in a matter of months with the steel trust. It was ignored at a time when the General Motors workers on strike needed a powerful demonstration of support from the steelworkers. The GM strike received only cursory mention from the platform and in the general resolution.

The appearance of Lane Kirkland, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO, instead of Meany, who usually addresses the convention of this largest AFL-CIO affiliate, would tend to confirm reports that differences exist between Abel and Meany on a number of questions concerning attitude to the Nixon Administration in general, as well as specific measures of the federal government in particular.

The chief points at which the Abel team found itself in accord with the delegates were:

1. The economic demands looking to next year's contract negotiations, with emphasis on a "very, very substantial wage increase"; restoration of the cost-of-living clause with no ceiling; a shorter work week ("which makes sense in the 70s," said Abel, and which delegates took to mean a 4-day week); and better pensions ("like the auto workers are fighting for," said delegates from the floor). But, as we shall see below, delegates went beyond these goals in their demands.

2. Abel's indictment, in scathing terms, of the Nixon administration: "I say to the employers and the Nixon administration 'we won't stand still for it; we are angry, and we point the finger of blame on the Nixon Administration for the state of the economy and the anti-labor drive building up.'"

For a large part of the delegates, the convention was looked upon

as an opportunity forcefully to bring the attention of the leadership to the anger and frustration that fills the mills and plants over inability to get grievances settled and to cope with the speedup, arbitrary job-changes and disciplines, unsafe and unhealthy working conditions, as well as to the great dissatisfaction with the steady decline in real wages due to mounting inflation and rising taxes.

Rank and File Upsurge

The more than 3,000 resolutions which had come in from local unions had undoubtedly forewarned the Abel team that something was in the wind, that rank-and-file anger was bound to spill out on the convention floor. Some measures were taken, such as tightening convention rules, to contain the discontent.

In the past, dissent and criticism were attributed by some officials to either "a handful of malcontents who wouldn't be happy unless they had something to gripe about" or to a "special interest group," meaning the 6-year old Ad Hoc Committee of Concerned Steelworkers, a national Black caucus fighting, among other things, for Black representation at all leadership levels, including top policy-making.

But the storms of rage that burst forth on the convention floor on a number of issues could in no way be dismissed as coming from a small group of malcontents. With a good half of the delegates composed of staffers and of officials of many small locals beholden to the officials for their presence there, the other part of the convention (upward of 40 per cent of the delegates as reflected in votes on key issues), unquestionably the authentic voice of the rank and file in its overwhelming majority, let loose blast after blast that shook up the officers.

The rage expressed itself on opening day and carried through the whole convention. It ranged from a demand for the right to strike on grievances to the right to vote on contracts. It included the fight against racism and for full equality and dignity of Black workers and other minorities from top to bottom, and there was a long debate over raising the officials' salaries.

Steelworkers denounced the official resolution as, in the words of one delegate, "watered-down and weak." The official general resolution, supposed to represent a composite of local union resolutions, actually was a means of making short shrift of them on the grounds that they were being referred to either the executive board, the wage policy committee or the industry conferences.

Here are the actual words of delegates demanding the right to strike on grievances:

"... without it, we have no real contract" (Allentown steelworker).
 "... we're going to get weaker instead of stronger if we don't take the no-strike clause out of the contract" (delegate from Sharon, Pa.).

"... without your (the officers') interference, we could have won the right to strike on grievances" (Allegheny-Ludlum steeworker).
 "... we also have to put grievances under the right to strike" (Jones and Laughlin delegate).

"... the company is violating the contract every day; give us the right to strike; give us back our dignity; arbitration doesn't get it on grievances..." (president of a local).

"... we're getting short-changed; the grievance procedure doesn't work; the membership must have the right to strike and vote on the contract" (Black worker, Local 1033).

In all the debates on the economic and contract demands, as well as on further democratizing the union, all Black delegates voted solidly with the substantial minority of white rank-and-file delegates. These were the high-points of black-white unity in the convention.

Fight for Equality and Dignity

The Ad Hoc Committee's resolution (read out on demand of an Ad Hoc member from the floor) called for creation of two additional vice-presidents or three directors at large "to expand opportunity for Black workers and other minority groups, as well as women, to win positions in top policy-making levels of leadership." The debate on it was cut short in a stage-managed maneuver which left dozens of speakers, black and white, stranded at the floor microphones.

But this was not before a number of delegates had spoken, sufficient to show that all Black delegates (about 10 per cent of the total), whether full-time staffers or rank-and-file, were united in support of the Ad Hoc resolution, and that they had the support of about 30-35 per cent of the white delegates as indicated by the votes.

In the debate, Aaron Johnson, Local 5014, said: "I am sick and tired of white versus black; of black frustration and white fear. We know that many civil rights laws have been passed, but they are curtailed, unenforced and otherwise nullified. We get tokenism and no real progress. If we really want democracy in the true sense, we need this Ad Hoc resolution."

The only white worker given the floor to speak in support of Ad Hoc, Robert Rospierski of East Chicago, Indiana, said: "The time has come to give our Black brothers the opportunity to sit on the executive board where policy is made."

The voice vote on whether or not to act on the Ad Hoc resolution surprised observers at the press table, among whom the estimate was about 40 per cent in favor.

The Ad Hoc Committee itself held its annual conference concurrent with the convention, organizing informational picketing of the convention, recording continued growth, strengthening its unity, planning its strategy and re-electing its officers.

"Frustration and Futility"

The vote on raising officers' salaries was so close as to leave the issue in doubt. When the chairman announced the increase had passed, about 25 per cent of the delegates arose and walked out in a demonstration of protest. They were absent when a motion for a roll-call on the issue received the "ayes" of about 15 per cent of the remaining delegates, falling short of the needed 30 per cent.

Time and again delegates fought in vain to get the convention to act directly on resolutions sent in from their locals calling for elimination of the no-strike clause, the right to vote on contracts, election of staff members and other demands. Again and again they were declared out of order or told no action could be taken by the convention, that by convention rules their resolutions were referred to other bodies for consideration.

Addressing the platform, a delegate declared, "This convention has been an exercise in frustration and futility."

The president of the large U.S. Steel Gary Works local told the officers in measured tones: "If the rank and file can't get their answers here in the highest authority of this union, if they can't get satisfaction here, they are going to take the law into their own hands." Another local president warned of the danger of local unions "pulling out if the changes we need aren't made."

The rank-and-file upsurge in steel broke through at the 15th convention on a scale that has no precedent in the union's history. While it sounded a warning to the officers that the union must go all the way in redeeming Abel's mid-sixties pledge to return the union to the membership, it served notice on the steel, fabricating, aluminum and non-ferrous industry magnates that the members of this union are determined on winning major concessions and a much stronger contract in 1971, and are prepared for a long, hard strike if need be.

The upsurge in the ranks of the steel union made possible another unprecedented event at the convention. For the first time, full-time staff people took to the floor to take issue with the officers' policies. Three Black staffers hit the floor in support of the Ad Hoc resolution.

And for the first time at a steel convention since the Vietnam war began, a white staffer spoke up to differ with the official position in support of Vietnamization and the Cambodian adventure.

Ed Sadowski of Chicago, former president of the U.S. Steel Southworks local, declared that the policy of supporting dictators was bankrupt, that the cause of U.S. economic woes could be traced to the Vietnam war. He added that, to his way of thinking, it was hypocritical to call on the Soviet Union to withdraw troops from Czechoslovakia as long as the union supports Nixon's Vietnamization policy which requires a continued American military presence in Southeast Asia.

The steel union convention brought into sharp focus the four traps steelworkers must break out of to win that degree of unity and union power to effectively defend themselves against the company onslaughts and to resume their forward march to a better life.

The Trap of Racism

All that prevents the officers of the union from opening the door to Black participation in the executive board is racism and capitulation to fears that such a step would evoke a racist reaction among white workers. On the other hand, many white staffers and those who feel beholden to the leadership, believing it is the policy of the officers to exclude Black members, respond to what they believe to be the wishes of the top leaders.

Yet the convention showed that at least 40 per cent of the delegates supported Ad Hoc, and coming in large part from many large locals, they could have represented far more than 40 per cent of the membership. The election of a Black worker as president of the 8,000-member Chicago U.S. Steel local, with a white majority, is indicative of the readiness of growing numbers of white workers to accept Black leadership.

The fight of the Ad Hoc Committee, say its spokesmen, is a fight to advance all minority groups, as well as women. In cities like Lorain, Ohio, a large part of the steelworkers are Puerto Rican. In East Chicago, Chicago and in the South west, Chicano workers are a high percentage among steelworkers. At the convention, M. R. Barraza from the Rocky Mountain area, former Mine-Mill organizer and now a steel union staff member, distributed handbills announcing his candidacy for director of District 38 (Western Region) to fill a vacancy. His election would represent the first time a Chicano worker became a member of the executive board. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee spoke of giving full support to Barraza.

The racist foreclosure of Black participation in the top leadership is justified by the officers on the grounds of "democracy" and "ability": democracy, because "officers should be elected rather than appointed"; ability because "election to office should be on the basis of ability and not color."

Ad Hoc pointed out that 1) appointments are happening all the time and Abel will be appointing a director for the Western District to fill a vacancy until an election can be held; and 2) what Ad Hoc seeks is an expansion of the *opportunity* to elect Black and other minority representatives, as well as women, by creating new officer posts to be *temporarily* filled by appointment until elections are held.

Abel himself answered the "ability" argument by pointing to Leroy Simms, who unsuccessfully ran for District Director in Baltimore with Abel's support. Abel characterized Simms as "exceptionally able, a man whom any steelworker would be proud to call his district director." But this testimonial came from Abel *after* the debate was closed and *after* the vote had been taken, too late to influence the outcome.

The strategy of the Ad Hoc Committee in calling for expanding the number of officers actually accords with one of the chief needs facing steel workers in further democratizing the union's structure and overcoming the procedure trap which freezes the membership out of the decision-making process in a whole number of industries represented by the union, which we discuss below.

White steelworkers in growing numbers are coming to learn that on every point of issue with the company, in every struggle with the company, Black workers as a whole are among the most militant fighters and strongest union members. A growing number are realizing that their own interests are bound up in the unity of black and white, and that the strengthening of this unity requires recognition and acceptance of the just demands of the Black workers.

Racism is becoming recognized as a company trap dividing the workers, making it easier for the companies to use the grievance procedure trap to profit at the expense of all steelworkers, black and white.

The further growth of the Ad Hoc Committee and of the new Steelworkers National Rank-and-File Committee (which came out of the National Rank-and-File Conference) and the growth of parallel action between these two movements and other caucuses, can provide that unity of Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican and a sizeable minority of white workers which can, in the near future, win victory for the demands of Ad Hoc as well as the demands of the other rank-and-file movements. The mutuality of their interests, especially when asserted in the course

of action for their programs, will prove far stronger than differences.

The Grievance Procedure Trap

All steelworkers, black and white, share a common, deep-seated anger at the grievance procedure trap which frustrates their every effort to overcome rotten job conditions.

Under this procedure, grievances must be processed and arbitrated in a series of steps; if not solved in the first step, they go to a higher step, etc. Knowing that the no-strike clause forbids work stoppages, the companies deliberately stall on settling grievances which, once they are filed, are like cargo on that proverbial "slow boat to China"—they hardly ever get there. It is commonplace for 500 to 1,000 grievances in a big plant to pile up unsolved in the course of a year, or for grievances to be "solved" by the book—that is, on the basis of old rulings in some other, often remotely related case, and not on the basis of their own merits.

This situation, compounded by a drastic weakening of the steward system over the years, has reduced union power on the job to practically nil. It is the chief cause of dissatisfaction among steelworkers.

What steelworkers want is the right to strike after a reasonable period of arbitration (15 to 30 days) has failed to settle a grievance. This, they justly believe, is the decisive element in breaking out of the grievance procedure trap.

Related to this effort to get grievance settlement speeded up to their satisfaction are demands for the election of staff members to make them more responsive to the membership; and for strengthening the steward system.

Steelworkers are also driving for the right to vote on contracts, for they have become impatient with settlements which always fall short of what they want.

It is around such issues that numerous local rank-and-file committees have arisen. The success of their efforts will in large measure depend on their ability to link together into a national unified effort along the lines of the recently formed National Steelworkers Rank-and-File Committee which sponsored a petition on such demands to the 15th Convention.

The Union Procedure Trap

The USWA has grown into a complex union of 1,225,700 members in over 4,000 local unions, having 3,600 contracts with 2,600 employers. It has membership in scores of industries, from basic steel to plastics, toys, lumber and leather.

In recent years, 18 industry conferences were established in the union. These are as follows (figures in parentheses are approximate percentages of total union membership):

Basic Steel (44 per cent); Non-Ferrous Metals (11 per cent); Aluminum (3 per cent); Containers (3.5 per cent); Valves, Fittings, Pumps, Compressors, Blowers, Engines (4 per cent); Foundries and Forgings (5.7 per cent); Industrial Machinery and Equipment (11 per cent); Transportation Equipment (3.5 per cent); Furniture and Fixtures (1 per cent); Chemical and Allied Products (1 per cent); Nonmetallic Minerals (1 per cent); Cutlery, Handtools, Tableware (1 per cent); Structural Steel, Boiler Shops, Nuts and Bolts (3 per cent) Sheet Metal Work and Stampings (1.5 per cent); Heating and Air Conditioning Equipment (2 per cent); Electrical Machinery and Equipment (2 per cent); Metal Warehouses (2 per cent); Miscellaneous Manufacturing, Construction and Service Industries (6 per cent).

Only the first four industry conferences have full responsibility to implement the bargaining policies formulated by the International Wage Policy Committee. Each of these four conferences has authority to reject or ratify contracts and to recommend strikes subject to the approval of the membership involved.

As for the other 14 industry conferences, the union officers say "it is a long range goal" to bring them to the point where they have the same authority and responsibility as the original four.

Neither the members of the Wage Policy Committee nor the delegates to the industry conferences are elected by direct vote of the membership. They function only when in session, with no elected leadership to operate between sessions, which are infrequent. Their actual authority and responsibility in terms of the day-to-day work and life of their memberships is extremely limited, as is their capacity to get things done. That is why groans went up from the delegates when they were told that many of their local resolutions had been referred to the Wage Policy Committee and the industry conferences.

Over this vast structure stands a 28-man executive board consisting of the three top officers, the Canadian national director and 24 district directors.

In a union where basic steel is now a minority (although the largest single section), most of the industries embraced in the remaining 17 conferences are unrepresented on the International Executive Board or the International Wage Policy Committee. Many feel like neglected stepchildren, getting far less attention than even the inadequate attention basic steel gets.

The convention graphically brought home to the delegates how

the union structure, for all the appearance of democracy, operates in a way to frustrate the will of the membership. An inexperienced observer could look at the convention and say: "The engine of democracy is running." But what is missing are the wheels, so this particular operation of democracy isn't going anywhere.

For union democracy to work in the interests of the members, for the union really to be returned to the membership, it would be necessary for the membership in each industry conference to have the right to elect delegates from their locals to the conferences, and to elect their own officers for the industry conferences, at least one of whom would sit on the International Executive Board as a vice-president representing them; and to elect from such democratically-constituted industry conferences their own members of the Wage Policy Committee.

That is why the fight of the Ad Hoc Committee for expanding the number of officers accords with the interests of all members of the steelworkers' union.

Such a democratization of the union structure would go far toward giving the membership greater voice in the affairs of their union, toward really returning the union to the members.

The Trap of Anti-Communism

Anti-Communism was one of the weapons used by the steel industry and reactionary employers generally to beat down the militant struggle of workers, to weaken unions and make them compliant.

An example of how it is used to confuse workers on the real issues, to divide and intimidate, was seen at the convention when what can only be described as a backward delegate attacked the Ad Hoc resolution as "subversive" and "in violation of the anti-Communist clause" in the union constitution. Incurable racism and anti-Communism go hand in hand. Lacking any valid or effective arguments against the right of dignity and equality of Black workers, the rabid racist resorts to anti-Communism. The measure of the irrationality of this delegate's "arguments"—one that would have gladdened the heart of an Agnew—was his statement that "even American Indians are infiltrating the unions where I come from." Rabid anti-Communism, like rabid racism, is know-nothingism.

Yet it cannot be lightly dismissed. It has done great harm in depriving the union of militant, clear-headed rank-and-file leaders, in dividing the ranks, in diluting the fighting spirit and militancy of the membership.

While a number of staffers and local-level elected officials will ac-

knowledge the great role of William Z. Foster, late Chairman of the Communist Party of the United States and of Gus Hall, its present General Secretary, and other Communists in the building of the steel union, they have not drawn all the lessons for solving the problems the union faces today.

Efforts of steelworkers to form rank-and-file committees to strengthen the union for more effective struggle against the company offensives are often met with open red-baiting or innuendo to the effect that such movements are "tainted" (1). In this way, every rank-and-file attempt to exercise union rights is subject to attack as "subversive" and discouraged or beaten down. Only the companies stand to gain from anti-Communism.

So long as the anti-Communist clause remains in the union constitution (incidentally, in violation of the Supreme Court ruling in the Archie Brown case, in which the right of Communists to union membership was upheld), free license exists for using anti-Communism against the interests of the USWA membership.

The union needs not only a removal of that clause and the full re-establishment of democratic trade union principles governing membership. It also sorely needs the integrity, steadfastness and loyalty to sound union principles, the militancy, knowledge of the strategy and tactics of the class struggle, and the devotion to the cause of the working class which Communists represent.

Until the rights of Communists are fully restored in the steel union, the membership will remain hampered and trapped in its efforts to gain democratic control over the affairs of the union and get it moving again for progress.

The years 1971 through 1973 loom as decisive ones in the life of the steelworkers and their great union. In 1971, major contracts with basic steel, aluminum, non-ferrous, fabricating and other industries come up. Big struggles are shaping up.

In 1972, the 16th Convention of the union will carry forward the fight to break out of the four traps, to further democratize, unify and strengthen their union.

In February, 1973, the elections of International officers and district directors will take place.

What happens in the contract negotiations and struggles, what happens at the 16th Convention, will have decisive bearing on the outcome of the 1973 elections.

The members of the USWA can, in these three years, transform their union to a powerful instrument for progress to rise to a new status of well-being and dignity, to become a leading force for social and polit-

ical progress in our country. But the road ahead is no easy one. It will take a determined struggle to break out of the four traps which keep the union from moving forward. It means putting four wheels on the union car so that the engine of democracy doesn't just go through the motions.

The key to the realization of these great goals is the strengthening of the unity of black and white through rejection of racism. It is the restoration of the dignity of militant, fighting steelworkers through the rejection of anti-Communism. And it lies in overcoming a purely local outlook and unifying the various rank-and-file movements into a powerful national movement, working in close cooperation with the Ad Hoc Committee

As their struggles sharpen, the masses of workers come into ever more forceful collision with the policies of "class partnership" espoused by the top AFL-CIO officialdom. These policies are based on the false proposition that labor and capital are partners, not irreconcilable foes. The more acute the crisis of U.S. monopoly capitalism and the greater the efforts to make the workers pay the costs, the more glaring is the bankruptcy of such policies.

By chaining itself to the war chariot of U.S. imperialism, the Meany leadership is now identified with the most barbarous and hated war in our history; by entering into collusion with the Central Intelligence Agency, by accepting payoffs from the military-industrial complex to provide "no revolution" insurance in other lands, this leadership has increasingly isolated American labor from the world labor movement.

By its total subservience to the parties of monopoly capital, especially to the Democratic Party, it has sapped labor of its political strength and exposed it to serious political defeats and betrayals.

By virtue of such "class partnership" policies it has greatly weakened labor's economic struggles. It has laid the unions open to anti-labor legislation, compulsory arbitration and government strike-breaking, all of which are undertaken in the name of the very war policy to which the AFL-CIO officialdom is committed.

By accommodation to tokenism and gradualism and even more overt forms of racism it sows deeper divisions in the working class to the advantage of the corporate exploiters. Against such bankrupt policies there has developed a rising resistance in the ranks of workers. . . . (*New Program of the CPUSA*, pp. 45-466.)

The People Will Know How To Make Their Victory Respected*

The people of Chile have won a victory of extraordinary importance for which they have been fighting for decades, and over many generations, and which expresses the ardent wishes of all patriots. The election of Salvador Allende, candidate of the Unidad Popular (Popular Unity) represents the coming to power of a progressive coalition including the working class, the common people of the city and the countryside, the intellectuals and the middle strata, so that Chile may be free and the master of her own destiny. Thus a hard blow has been struck at imperialism, the landowners and the financial monopolist oligarchy.

In his press conference with the foreign correspondents, President-elect Allende defined the basic task force facing the government when he said: "We are struggling for Chile's economic, cultural and political independence."

The Unidad Popular, the victorious movement, rests upon the pact, solemnly agreed to by the following parties—Socialist, Radical, Social Democratic, Communist, the Popular Independent Action and the Unitarian Action Movement. It is an alliance of political forces that are definitely anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchist. It constitutes the expression of the most important social forces of the country. Before designating its presidential candidate this movement elaborated its program responsibly, reflecting the long-held aspirations of our people.** The Unidad Popular is not a closed group but an immense open citizens' contingent that is constantly growing. The truth is that the victory belongs to the entire Chilean people. Chile has thus succeeded in initiating a revolution, or one might say a process of real social change has begun—a process of change in the relations of production and the replacement of the classes in power by others that represent the overwhelming majority.

* Report presented in the name of the Political Committee to a Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Chile on September 14, 1970. Abridged.

** See "A Basic Program of People's Unity" in the May and July issues of *Political Affairs*.

The Present Conditions Can No Longer Continue

The displacement of the current ruling classes is a vital necessity for Chilean society. In the framework of the existing regime the productive forces are strangled, with no possibility for their release. Economic stagnation has characterized a succession of bourgeois governments and ignominiously perpetuates the backwardness of the country and the misery of the masses, and it also creates dreadful deficits in education, health and housing.

These conditions cannot continue. In order to further the development of the nation, national and social liberation are indispensable. We must also eliminate the large landholdings and put an end to the parasitic exploitation by the oligarchy and the privileges enjoyed by them. The victory of Unidad Popular in the presidential elections on the 4th of this month represents an inevitable historic step. For this reason the Popular Government will be on firm ground, because it reflects a process of democratic and revolutionary transformation that is profoundly rooted in reality.

The Popular Government will nationalize the riches of Chile which are at present in the hands of imperialist enterprises. It will recover for society the financial and productive sectors which are of strategic importance for further development, will complete the elimination of the large landholdings and will make full use of the industrial resources. It will stress the solution of the problems facing the masses, holding as the main objective the welfare of the people.

The forty initial measures of the Popular Government, announced during the campaign for Salvador Allende, will attack problems that do not permit delay. They will hold back rising prices and will provide work for the unemployed. They will carry out an emergency plan for construction of housing for the homeless and will pay attention to health and education. The implementation of a plan for a half liter of milk for every Chilean child will be the first step to assure the health and happiness of the children.

For the Guarantee of Victory

Now all the efforts of the people of Chile must be centered on these great objectives to make secure the victory of September 4th, to protect it from the traps set by the enemy, to defend it to the bitter end and to fulfill the verdict of the ballot box. We Communists devote ourselves completely to this task, together with the other parties and movements of the Unidad Popular, in the front ranks of the working class and the entire people.

The enemy would like to isolate the forces of the Left, create splits

between the working class, the farmers, the students and the general public and place us in opposition to the Christian Democrats. But they will not succeed because the vital interest of every woman and man demand joint action and unity against the reactionaries.

On the other hand, as is public knowledge, the triumph of the Unidad Popular was won despite the incredulity of some elements and the discouragement inspired by the ultra-Left groups. The election is over. We suppose that in those circles some will reconsider their positions and it is hoped that there are those who will draw conclusions with revolutionary honesty. Others, perhaps, may be inclined to continue fighting the parties and movements of the working class and the whole people, confronting the popular movement with new obstacles, helping to forward, by provocation, the seditious plans of national and international reaction. We have been continuing the ideological struggle against the opportunist deviations of the Right and the "Left," and fighting for our own principles, and we shall consider objectively the behavior of each and, without prejudice, we shall judge them according to their deeds.

There are moments when the course of events is determined for a long period to come. We are living in such times. To consolidate the victory, and to assure that the constitutional mandate is placed in the hands of the President-elect—these are the irrevocable rights of the popular forces and of all patriots. Let no one misunderstand—the people of Chile are not going to retreat from these positions.

In Chile the working class is the largest segment of the population. In addition it is characterized by a high level of class consciousness, its traditions of struggle, its organization and its basic relationship to the economy. For the mass of the working class, the establishment of the popular objectives are decisive of its own emancipation. Every class-conscious worker understands that his future depends on it, and that the popular government is inextricably tied to him and his family. For the same reason one cannot give stintingly of time or sacrifice. The proletariat is ready to devote its life to this cause.

To defend the popular victory has also come to be of first importance for the masses of the countryside in the struggle for agrarian reforms, not only for those who voted for Allende but also for those who preferred Tomic, and even including those who under pressure of the landowners, were coerced into voting for the Right. In the same way the victory of the Left represents a special victory for the Chilean youth, who have emerged as a revolutionary force in the life of the nation, also for the teachers, for all cultural workers, for the various university groups concerned with the reform of higher education, for

the professionals and the technicians anxious to participate in the building of a better future, and for the large sector of small and medium sized business enterprises that have been forced to work under the conditions of enslavement imposed by the monopolies. They will receive preferential treatment and help from the government of the Left.

The women of Chile, longing for peace and well being in their homes, were convinced that the fears spread were false. Four hundred and fifty thousand of them voted for Allende, and now under the inspiration of the democratic verdict of the voters, there have been added those who voted for Tomic and many of those who mistakenly went along with Alessandri. Every section of the population has to become a united bulwark of decisive action to develop respect for the will of the people, expressed on Friday, September 4th.

The People of Latin America Greet the Victory as Their Own

On all continents, and of course in Latin America, the peoples have joyfully greeted the victory of the Chilean people. This inspires us, fills us with pride and also increases our responsibility. The information agencies in the service of the imperialists have resumed the transmission of cables with abject editorials, submitting to the most bestial tyrants and shamelessly daring to speak in the name of what they call "Chilean Democracy." So much for them!

But in Caracas they are preparing a celebration in honor of the democratic victory of Allende. In Montevideo, Buenos Aires and Córdoba the workers and the students march through the streets with the Chilean banner. In Peru official personalities congratulate the people of Chile. Everywhere in the vast and noble socialist world, in the Soviet Union and in our sister country, Cuba, as well as in the capitalist countries of Europe and even in the United States itself, the significance of our country today has been recognized.

We are gratified by the greetings we have received. Our response is to reaffirm our unchanging position of international proletarian solidarity. At the same time, with modesty and with absolute assurance we also reaffirm our faith in the people of Chile, who will not betray themselves or the fraternal peoples of the world.

The masses of the people have greeted their victory with patriotic enthusiasm and are preparing to celebrate on the 18th of the month their passionate affection for this country of ours. Creative projects are being initiated in the factories, the mines, the universities and the schools, in the fields, in the towns and in the centers of health and culture. This indicates the eagerness to move the country forward and to create a new Chile. The people are united where they work, where

they study and where they live.

Only a Few Will Be Losers

The losers are few but very powerful, and hardly an insignificant group. In the struggle for the defense of the victory, the Unidad Popular is in a position to isolate them and to reduce them to their true proportions, separating them from those who were deceived into following them.

Salvador Allende obtained 1,075,616 votes of which 631,863 were men's votes and 443,555 were women's. He obtained many absolute majorities in the provinces of Tarapacá, Antofagasta, Atacama, Coquimbo, O'Higgins, Curicó, Taica, Concepción, Arauco, and Magallanes. These voters, who were subjected to a campaign of terror, to bribery and to pressure, are of enormous significance. It is clear that Allende's percentage of the total vote—36.3 per cent—is superior to that reached by others, among them Jorge Alessandri himself in 1958, when he only received 31.5 per cent.

It cannot be denied that they voted for social change, leaving aside prejudices and customs, and were unaffected by the false values of the propaganda financed by the forces in power. They were also confronted by threats and pressures. Others who voted for Salvador Allende form part of the best organized forces of the country, the most conscious and the most dynamic, and their efforts arouse a profound response in the vast majority of the people. . . .

But the most recalcitrant enemies are not resigned and have launched their challenge. The conspiracy makes a pretense of acquiring respectability by hiding behind hollow phrases, pseudo-constitutional trickery and intrigue. . . .

We are confronted by the desperate seditious maneuvers of the ultra-reactionary sectors. Carefully weighing our words, we declare that these maneuvers are part of a plan that is anti-Chile and fascist. It is the duty of patriots to remain alert in order to crush any anti-democratic attack by those who plot in the salons of Santiago and in other burrows inhabited by CIA agents, fascists, politicians repudiated by public opinion, landowners, revanchist bankers, fanatic youth of the "Fiducia" and rowdies in their service. They talk among themselves about criminal acts, concretely about the assassination of Salvador Allende and of various other leaders of the Left. For these reasons we must raise to even a higher level the vigilance of the masses, and each Chilean is in a position to watch out for and stop the hand of the conspirators.

Anti-Patriotic Machinations

We already see the application of the first chapter of this anti-Chile and fascist plan. It consists in the machinations of a group of bankers, monopolists and landowners to destroy the national economy by means of sabotage, depending upon rumor-mongering for the purpose of creating panic. They therefore exploit the mummified and false image of the Left, which our enemies have propagated through past and present campaigns of terror. They circulate all kinds of intrigue and announce supposed appointments by the popular government. They try at all costs to cause splits.

The anti-patriots receive support, money and instructions from the CIA and from a vast network of imperialist agents. There is a conspiracy against our country that incites anarchy and if necessary even civil war and foreign intervention. The enemy works with the dollars of Anaconda and of other North American enterprises and with the assistance of Yankee experts in their disruptive activities.

The conspirators are exasperated by the patriotic position of the armed forces which, faithful to the legacy of O'Higgins, maintain a strictly professional position. The agents of the candidacy of Alessandri criticized, before September 4th, the declarations of the Commander-in-Chief of the Army, in which he reiterated his adherence to constitutional standards. And these same agents, following their devious line, now attempt to interpret these standards with their usual distortions. For the preservation of national sovereignty it is of primary importance to reject all efforts to involve the armed forces in this type of dispute. This is the dirty game of the reactionaries, whose purpose is to set the armed forces in opposition to the people. This would be an attack on the integrity of their mission. . . .

The plan of the enemy consists in attracting to their side the middle strata, also sections of the workers, white collar employees, and rural workers, leading them to act against their own self-interests and converting them unknowingly into tools of the reactionaries. This is not new. It is the application in Chile of the classical technique of the Nazis when they were preparing their *coup d'état* or their aggression against one or another country. The order of the day is to lie in the style of Goebbels. They spread discarded falsehoods with the aim that constant repetition will lead to acceptance or at least to doubt and confusion.

The Financial Campaign of Terror

The wealthy business man Francisco Bulnes, in the very portals of

La Moneda, declared to the press: "It has been announced beforehand that they are going to expropriate the Savings and Loan Associations, which they will nationalize." This of course is a lie, like other things Bulnes and his cohorts say. The program of the Unidad Popular has never included the expropriation or nationalization of even one Savings and Loan Association.

By telephone they told each person with housing savings and each person holding mortgages: "Hurry up and withdraw your savings and dispose of your mortgages because Allende is going to confiscate them and you will be left with nothing." This is also a lie. As Salvador Allende and the national leadership of the Unidad Popular explained: "In regard to the Savings and Loan Associations, they will be called on to fulfill their true functions under the best conditions in application of the Program of the Unidad Popular. The savings account depositors . . . will have their rights fully guaranteed. . . ."

Attempts have been made to get those who have bank accounts to believe that these will be confiscated by the Popular Government and that they should hurry to withdraw their funds. This is another solemn lie. Salvador Allende and the leadership of the Unidad Popular state: "The Program of the Unidad Popular plans the nationalization of the banks, which means a change in the administration and in credit arrangements, precisely to benefit the depositors and larger masses of clients who lack needed and sufficient credit. The popular government thus will strengthen the banking system. The nationalization of banking activities could not in any way affect the deposits in current accounts without which the banks themselves could not exist."

Every family living in the affluent neighborhoods was called by telephone to advise them that if they owned stocks they should sell them at once, because the Popular Government would expropriate all enterprises, leaving the stockholders in the lurch. This is another complete lie. In the first place it is certain that of the more than 4,000 corporations, only about 400 are major enterprises, and even of these only a smaller number will be nationalized, those which truly determine economic development. The others will remain in the area of private or mixed property. And with respect to even those which are nationalized, according to Salvador Allende and the command of the Unidad Popular: "With regard to the stockholders, the Program of the Unidad Popular states expressly that the rights of the small and medium stockholders will be guaranteed. That is to say that whatever may be the price reached as a consequence of stock market speculations, they will be guaranteed the real value based on

the assets of the respective firms."

There is being spread by various means the threat that the popular government will bring with it a wave of unemployment. This is another gross lie. Salvador Allende and the leadership of the Unidad Popular have said: "One of the fundamental preoccupations of the popular government will be immediately to absorb the unemployed and to increase jobs. For this purpose it will assure a market to industry so that it may make maximum use of its actual capacity. The stability of the labor force will be supported." . . .

What the New Government Will Be

In contrast to the unpatriotic attitude of the seditionists we can say that it is evident that the majority of the manufacturers, the merchants and the farmers and even the non-monopolist entrepreneurs are taking a constructive position, and as they become informed about the reality of the situation, they express their confidence that Chile will move forward. On the other hand the professionals and the technicians, with increasing clarity, see that the anti-imperialist changes will open the perspective for work which they long for.

The most important feature of the victory of September 4th is its immensely democratic character. It is our estimate that the key paragraphs of the Basic Program of the Unidad Popular are those that say the following in regard to the new government:

Through a long process of struggle, the Chilean people have won certain liberties and democratic rights for whose preservation they must remain alert and fight with no compromise. But power itself has eluded them.

The popular and revolutionary forces have not united just to battle for the replacement of one President of the Republic by another, nor to substitute one party for another in the government, but to carry out fundamental changes that the plight of the nation demands, on the basis of a transfer of power from the old ruling groups to the workers, to the peasantry, and to the progressive sections of the middle class of the city and the country.

Thus, the victory of the people will open the way for the most democratic political regime in the history of the country. Concerning political structure the Popular Government has a double task: To preserve the democratic rights and gains of the workers, deepening them and making them more effective; and transforming the existing institutions to establish a new state in which the workers and the people exercise genuine power.

The Popular Government will guarantee the exercise of democratic liberties and will respect the individual and social rights of all the people. Freedom of conscience, speech, press, and assem-

bly, the inviolability of the home, and the rights of workers and others to organize, will truly reign without the stumbling blocks now placed in their way by the ruling classes.

This is a matter of the very essence of popular government. One could not imagine such government without its strict enforcement. In his work "Two Tactics" Lenin explained that "The proletariat has taken account of the fact that political liberty is more necessary for them than anything else." There is a dialectical and inseparable relationship between the struggle for democracy, the exercise of democracy and the struggle for socialism.

One of the specific features of Chile's advance to socialism is a multiplicity of parties. Because of the concrete conditions in our country we Communists have inserted into the Program of the Party and into the reports and resolutions of our three latest national congresses, over a twelve-year period, the plan to reach socialism by way of the existence of several parties for an indefinite period. We stand for a pluralistic society and we have reiterated this for a long time. As to the Popular Government, "multi-partyism" is manifested in that the various movements constituting the Unidad Popular are solidly integrated in and share responsibility for such a government, also in that outside the movement there are parties in various degrees of opposition. This political relationship which arises out of the historical development of Chile is already being expressed in the dialogue between the Unidad Popular and the Christian Democratic Party, for the clarification of the position of each.

The Christian Democratic Party, because of its significant parliamentary and electoral role, has its own unquestionable rights. And we understand from this dialogue that there is not and could not be on the part of this party any question about the prerogatives of the next President of the Republic or any conditions imposed on the Unidad Popular or concessions to the blackmail of "Alessandrism."

However, the president of the Christian Democratic Party, Senator Benjamin Prado, in a speech last Thursday, said the following: "The political forces that support the candidacy of Senor Allende are made up, among others, of Marxist parties and in the face of this reality, one must inevitably foresee the dangers of the transformation of the democratic system of Chile into a regime that slowly could negate the existence of freedom and of respect for personal human values that characterize a pluralistic society." . . .

The Anti-Marxist and Anti-Socialist Chorus

We understand that for various reasons there are people who for-

mulate such opinions, making the Marxists appear to be anti-democratic and the socialist countries to be opposed to freedom. Nevertheless, the historical reality is that where socialist revolution has triumphed, despite the errors which have occurred, and taking into account the standards and circumstances of the country where they occurred and the national and international situation, the socialist revolution has represented a tremendous democratic advance. By eliminating the exploitation of man by man, it has reaffirmed fundamental values. Besides, the Soviet revolution freed the peoples of the old Czarist Empire from the slavery of an absolute monarchy. It was the Soviet Union that saved humanity from Nazi tyranny and the Cuban Revolution that routed one of the most abject and bloody, bestial dictatorships of Latin America. We Communists are in the front ranks of the anti-fascist fighters.

In regard to Chile, since Recabarren, we Communists have fought relentlessly for liberty. If it is a question of the guarantee of democracy, in the forefront are the people for whom we, the Communists, have great meaning.

The people's liberty and the level of democracy which exist in our country and which have made this victory possible, are not the fruit of the activity of any one party, but are the result of the long, hard struggle of the working class and of all the popular forces. Therefore no one can consider himself the exclusive guarantor of democracy.

Together! Marxists, Christians and Lay People

The Popular Government of Chile will be multi-party. The three great ideological currents will work together: the Marxists, the Christians, and the Masonic laity. Each one of these currents has a democratic tradition. In regard to our respect for each democratic party and in the first place for the parties and movements allied to us, and without belittling any of them, permit us to say that we feel, as the party of the working class, that we are the ones who most firmly stress the complete enforcement of democratic rights for the individual and social liberties for the people. This is because of our planned path and perspective toward communism. Every one of these liberties has cost the Chilean Communists and the other popular currents much bloodshed and a great deal of effort. It is these currents that have made the Popular Government possible and without them it could not exist. We depend on the living presence of the masses as the major guarantee for success of the work of this government and the complete fulfillment of its program.

Now, in order to defend and move this program forward, the pres-

ervation of our victory requires a style of work that the Unidad Popular has been able to adopt without vacillation, with confidence in the people's forces, with organization and with discipline. What most disturbs the schemes of the seditionists is the pattern of behavior and the dignity with which the masses have expressed their joy and their determination to struggle, with discipline and with a determined will. The working class and the people are familiar with the stratagems of the enemy and do not fall for provocation or for false illusions, keeping themselves mobilized for combat. . . .

When in one spot or another there appears a sectarian position, such as the belief that the assumption of power by the people means pushing aside those who hold other positions, the enemy immediately makes good use of such errors by magnifying them, in order to achieve the isolation of the Unidad Popular. But what is admirable is that these examples can be counted on the fingers of one hand. From the North to the South, the committees of the Unidad Popular are performing in exemplary fashion and are forging united action. We must continue in this way, which is the style of work of the Chilean people. We must respond affirmatively, in our daily political mass work, to the call formulated yesterday by Salvador Allende, when he said: "I call on the people to be alert, to strengthen the Unidad Popular, to build the Unidad Popular to gigantic size, to form committees of the Unidad Popular, to set these committees to work, and not to hold any sectarian position in regard to those who were not with us." . . .

The Entire People United to Continue the Fight!

The struggle today is not between those who voted for Allende and those who voted for the other candidates, nor between the adherents of socialism and those who do not share this position, but between the men and women on the one hand who respect the electoral results and who desire a democratic direction to be followed, and those who, on the other hand, fight against Chile's right to self-determination. The latter, the seditious reactionaries, are playing with fire and if they are not stopped they will drag the people into a civil war with the purpose of carrying on a brutal vendetta. We warn them that we are not going to permit them to do so. Nobody may vacillate in this hour of struggle, whatever difficulties there may be. The organized people will stop the disruption of the economy and will crush the plot to create panic and hunger. They will save Chile and will severely punish every rascal who raises his hand against our native land.

We Communists will lead in fulfillment of these tasks—selflessly,

in a spirit of unity, and with inexhaustible readiness for sacrifice to serve the working class and the people. In this Plenary Session we bear in mind with genuine pride the collective, anonymous work of tens of thousands of Communists, inspired with our line of anti-imperialist unity. We have been builders, together with our allies, of this magnificent work, where tremendous masses joined in the struggle for the Popular Government. . . . Going forward, the country knows that we will exert every effort to be worthy as always of the unforgettable Communist heroes and of our martyrs who have fallen in innumerable struggles.

The line of the Communists is to unite the majority of the country, of all the classes and social strata which are anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchy, around the working class and the worker-peasant alliance. We seek the formation of a government with these same qualities. In our judgment, a solid Socialist-Communist understanding is the cornerstone on which such a broad movement and the government to which it gives rise must be built.

The whole Chilean experience points to the necessity of a popular national government in which the working class, on the basis of such an understanding, holds the leading responsibilities. . . .

In order to arrive at the conquest of power there is only one general path: that of unity, organization, struggle, and the development of the political consciousness of the working class and the broadest popular masses.

We shall continue to do everything possible to reach this objective through non-military means. . . .

This is the point of departure. Once these objectives are accomplished, it will be necessary to develop paths to socialism. Only socialism can give us the highest tempo of economic development, can move with the necessary speed, can substantially augment the national income and redistribute it with speed and justice. Only socialism can today release the productive forces for the production of abundance and assure the massive participation of the people in the task of constructing a modern prosperous country. (Luis Corvalan, Report to the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of Chile, October 1965.)

HERBERT APTHEKER

Banfield: The Nixon Model Planner

Edward C. Banfield is Shattuck Professor of Urban Government at Harvard; he is also chairman of President Nixon's task force on the Model Cities Program. When a person holding such positions produces a book entitled *The Unheavenly City: The Nature and Future of Our Urban Crisis* (Little, Brown, Boston, 1970, 308 pp., \$6.95)—with both Harvard and M.I.T. having, as Banfield writes, "supported the undertaking generously over a considerable period"—one is compelled to take it seriously. And it is only the surrounding circumstances of this book, as just noted, which induce this compulsion; in itself the work is fantastically shoddy, often simply obtuse, and generally evil to the point of obscenity, especially since, like the force's taskmaster, its demagogic piety is sickening.

The book's first paragraph assures the reader that its author is "as well-meaning—probably even as soft-hearted—as he." "But," he bravely goes on, "facts are facts . . ."; and the last sentence in the book invokes the same image of this soft-hearted scholar hoping against hope "that facts, rational analysis and deliberation about the public interest"—presumably to which the reader has just been treated—may improve "both opinion and policy."

Philosophically, Banfield's book is idealist; that is, consciousness is primary while social reality is derived therefrom. Sociologically, the work is static; that is, its orientation *assumes* the propriety and permanence of present structural arrangements. Economically, Banfield postulates eighteenth-century *laissez-faire* concepts—such as an unfettered supply-and-demand market. Politically, his position is about that of Metternich—or Nixon-Agnew. The concoction as a whole is undiluted Social Darwinism, founded on concepts of innately and immutably depraved or degraded condition of what Banfield calls "the lower class" (the choice of word depending upon whether one's stance is religious, as with Jonathan Edwards, or secular as with George Fitzhugh).

As for the characterization of Banfield's "lower class," American

literature—aside from the lunatic Right fringe—has not seen the like since Professor Thomas R. Dew "explained" the necessity for slavery in 1832. This lower class, Banfield guesses, numbers perhaps thirty-five million Americans, of whom fifteen millions are concentrated in various metropolitan centers. To the degree that the "urban crisis" exists—and forms part of the title of his book (and one of the themes of the book is that there really is not much of a crisis)—its cause lies in the existence of this "lower class" whose nature is described in the following manner:

- ... feeble, attenuated sense of self . . . suffers from feelings of self-contempt and inadequacy . . . suspicious and hostile, aggressive yet dependent . . . no attachment to community, neighbors, or friends (p. 53).
- ... lives in the slum and sees little or no reason to complain . . . does not care how dirty and dilapidated his housing is . . . nor does he mind the inadequacy of such public facilities as schools, parks and libraries . . . features that make the slum repellent to others actually please him (p. 62).
- ... work only intermittently even if job opportunities are good. Providing for a future, even a week or two, is not part of their culture (p.112).
- ... prefers near-destitution without work to abundance with it (p. 122).
- ... the morality of lower-class culture is preconventional, which means that the individual's actions are influenced not by conscience but only by a sense of what he can get away with (p. 163).
- ... an outlook and style of life . . . which therefore attaches no value to work, sacrifice, self-improvement, or service to family, friends or community (p. 211).

As Robert A. Dentler, director of the Center of Urban Education at Columbia, and Professor of Sociology at its Teachers' College, has written in an incisive review of Banfield*: "Although I am a somewhat raw empiricist of an urban sociologist who continues to go about meeting and measuring people in cities, I confess that I have never met the people characterized by Banfield, except in books and monographs written by other social scientists."

The horror here is two-fold, and which of the two is worse is difficult to decide. It is not only that Banfield so describes thirty-five million men, women and children in the United States; it is also that he holds that these alleged characteristics of the "lower class" are induced

* *Christianity & Crisis*, October 19, 1970.

from within, not from without. That is, the source is psychological and individual, not social and collective; hence, where poverty exists it exists because there are poverty-prone people! It is the poor who create poverty; it is their psychological condition (described above) which is anterior to the social conditions in which they exist and which are the central source creating those conditions!

Since Banfield commences his book, as we have noted, with a touching appeal that he not be understood or judged too harshly and since deep in the book's text he reverts to this with the plaintive note that "there is, of course, no arguing with a reader who is determined to mistake one's meaning" (p. 212), we will quote Banfield himself as to this particular meaning, which is at the nub of his thesis.

He writes that, to use Oscar Lewis' term, there is a "culture of poverty"; "but that poverty is its effect rather than its cause. . . . Extreme present-orientedness (by which construct Banfield *defines* what he calls "the lower class"—H.A.), not lack of income or wealth is the principal cause of poverty in the sense of 'the culture of poverty.'" (P. 125.)

Again, "Lower-class poverty, by contrast, is 'inwardly' caused (by psychological inability to provide for the future, and all that this inability implies—H.A.). Improvements in external circumstances can affect this poverty only superficially . . ." (p. 126).

. . . no matter how able, dedicated, and hardworking the teachers, no matter how ample the facilities of the school or how well-designed its curriculum, no matter how free the atmosphere of the school from racial or other prejudice, the performance of pupils at the lower end of the class-cultural scale will always fall short not only of pupils at the upper end of the scale, but also of what is necessary to make them educated workers (p. 142).

Hence programmatically one must face up to the fact that insofar as the urban crisis consists of the conditions endured by the "lower class" and insofar as those conditions come about because of the nature of that "class" "the policymaker usually must take certain cultural and psychological traits as given" (p. 159). What those traits are we have already seen and we have noted that they are immutable—or appear to be. Therefore, any remedial program that is tinged with concepts of "service" or is "altruistic" (p. 249) can only be harmful. One of the difficulties reality-minded policymakers in this country face, is that so many of its people are afflicted with a belief in human equality, with a sympathy for the oppressed (so-called), with indignation at

the oppressor (so-called), with a belief in human improvement or even perfectibility. Because of these mistaken notions, one often gets wrong-headed formulations: "for example, poverty as lack of income and material resources (something external to the individual) rather than as inability or unwillingness to take account of the future or to control impulses (something internal)" (p. 250).*

Using Banfield's assumptions, then, "what can be done?" (to quote the title of one of his chapters) comes down to—not very much. It is true that as this chapter commenced Banfield urged his reader not to prejudge his argument nor to assume that it "will be used to justify a program of inaction." Rather, he wrote, "the reader is advised to wait and see." So, this reader dutifully waited; alas, however, on page 239 he read, "the range of feasible measures for dealing with the serious problems of the cities is much narrower than one might think." Furthermore, one finds "that within this range hardly any of the measures are acceptable"—in a practical, i.e., political sense. That does not leave one with much, but then when one is faced by a "lower class" whose attributes create the very problems to be remedied, the range of feasible proposals—not to speak of acceptable ones—cannot be too wide. For instance, "giving lower-class persons 'really good' jobs" is not a feasible way of inducing them to change their style of life, because that very style of life makes it impossible to give them 'really good' jobs" (p. 242).**

So, "there follows a list of measures that might well be regarded as feasible . . . the list is rather short . . . it hardly begins to solve any of the problems that have been under discussion." Indeed, writes the author with modesty: "Even if all the recommendations were carried out to the full, the urban situation would not be fundamentally improved" (p. 244). Note, however, that if the author came to any other kind of conclusions he would have falsified his analysis; hence, the modesty of the program is required and for Banfield is confirmatory—however unpleasant it may be for "the lower class" and "altruistic"

* Banfield puts forth his book as something daring and terribly original; actually of course, its essentials are as old as ideology servicing class-divided societies. For an almost exact precursor of Banfield, for instance, see William Graham Sumner's book, *What Social Classes Owe Each Other*, published in 1883.

** That is to say, one faces a dilemma—an insoluble problem. Readers will be reminded of Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma*; while the stance of this book was liberal and Banfield's is conservative, they have much in common: philosophical idealism, the heart of the "problem" lay in the culture and style of Black people, a certain Social Darwinism, intensive psychologizing and individualizing of basically social questions—all of which the present writer pointed out at the time in his *The Negro People in America* (New York, 1946).

folk.

Here is Banfield's program (pp. 245-246):

- 1) Avoid all rhetoric holding out high expectations of resolving the urban crisis or any of its aspects.
 - 2) Do not infer—let alone affirm—that society is responsible for an individual's problems (Banfield never gets beyond even hinting that anything but a classless "society" or "city" can possibly be responsible for anything; i.e., a class analysis *in the Marxian sense is never so much as whispered*, even if only to be denied).
 - 3) Try to reduce unemployment by eliminating all minimum-wage laws and by repealing all laws which give trade unions "monopolistic" powers—i.e., like the closed shop.
 - 4) Don't overpay in government jobs.
 - 5) "Cease harassing private employers who offer low wages and unattractive (but not unsafe) working conditions to workers whose alternative is unemployment."
 - 6) Eliminate child-labor laws and cut compulsory education from 12 years to 9 years.
 - 7) Encourage—"perhaps even require"—those who are "unable or unwilling" to complete college to take some full-time job or to enter military service.
 - 8) Change "poverty" definitions from those which encompass relative standards of living to a "fixed standard" (fixed by whom?—perhaps Professor Banfield?).
 - 9) "Encourage (or require)" those who fall into that "fixed standard" to live "in an institution or semi-institution (for example, a closely-supervised public housing project)"—(by whom—Professor Banfield?).
 - 10) Institute vigorous birth control measures for the "incompetent poor" and send their children to public nurseries.
 - 11) Intensify police control and specifically "permit the police to 'stop and frisk' and to make misdemeanor arrests on probable cause."
 - 12) Speed up trials and the punishment process.
 - 13) "Abridge to an appropriate degree the freedom of those who in the opinion of a court are extremely likely to commit violent crimes."
 - 14) Make it perfectly clear in advance that "those who incite to riot will be severely punished."
 - 15) "Prohibit 'live' television coverage of riots and incidents likely to provoke them."
- Proposal number 13—on abridging the liberty of those "prone" to

commit crimes—is spelled out in considerable detail. Banfield urges "abridging the individual's freedom in a degree that corresponds to the expected costs in crime to society of his being free (that is, to the probability of his committing crimes times a measure of their seriousness)" (pp. 182-183). Thus, "a boy with a 0.5 probability" would suffer an abridgement less onerous than one with a 0.9 probability. This might mean, we are told, keeping in touch with a probation officer on a regular basis; observing a 10 p.m. curfew; being prohibited from possessing firearms or an automobile; being subject to search at any time; being sequestered in a small town; being confined to "a penal village" where visitors might come at stated times but which the subject might not leave. All this, the reader is to understand, is to be the lot not of people convicted of anything at all but rather of people held to be prone towards criminality or of whom a high probability of criminal conduct may be expected. (Expected by whom; under what conditions; how is probability measured; how does one discover "proneness" toward crime; who defines crime; etc.—all such questions are not even raised by Professor Banfield.)

All this inspires me to put forward my own feasible—and perhaps even acceptable—program. All professors who demonstrate a proneness towards writing such misanthropic books as this by Banfield, or who demonstrate the probability of such criminal behavior are to suffer punishment in accordance with the following scale: 0.5 probability: to repair telephones for the wife of the Attorney-General of the United States so long as she lives; 0.7 probability: to genuflect before the person of J. Edgar Hoover three times daily prior to each meal; 0.9 probability: to explain the merits of the Banfield program to a "lower-class" audience in Harlem twice a week for one year.

Banfield, in introducing his program, himself remarked "that many of the items . . . are not 'constructive'—that is, they call for not doing something . . ." (p. 244). One reason for this is—by Banfield's own account—that what hitherto has been done by way of attacking problems of housing, income distribution, etc., has tended not to eliminate existing urban problems but to exacerbate them. Let us follow him as he elucidates this.

"At present," he writes, for example, "the cities are in effect going out of their way to place obstacles in the paths of those who might offer the public better transportation" (p. 9). But he never even asks, *why?*

Again, he notes that when mayors declare, as they so often do, that their cities must have federal and state financial aid, they really mean that important taxpayers in the city "would rather go without the im-

provement than pay for it themselves," but again he never asks, *why?*

"Strange as it may seem," he also writes (p. 14), "the mammoth programs to aid the cities are directed mainly toward the problems of comfort, convenience, amenity, and business advantage. Insofar as they have any effect on the serious problems, it is, on the whole, to aggravate them." Since this "seems strange" one would suppose an author would attempt for the benefit of his readers some explanation, but once again Banfield does not pose the question, *why?*

Referring to appropriations for transportation and housing, he notes that these account for about 90 per cent of all federal government expenditure "for the improvement of cities." He adds, however, that "neither is intended to deal with the serious problems. Both make them worse" (p. 14). Once again, a perhaps puzzled reader is offered no help as to *why?*

Although the Federal Housing Authority and the Veterans Administration programs were certainly projected as being concerned with resolving significant urban problems, Banfield writes that these "programs have subsidized the movement of the white middle class out of the central cities and older suburbs while at the same time penalizing investment in the rehabilitation of the run-down neighborhoods of these older cities" (p. 15). Paradoxical, apparently; but again, the housing policies but, in fact, Banfield observes: "Urban renewal has also turned out to be mainly for the advantage of the well-off, indeed, of the rich, and to do the poor more harm than good" (p. 16). Contradictory, it would appear; but Banfield never whispers, *why?*

In fact, the Urban Renewal Agency, as of 1965, had spent three billion dollars but it had thereby only "succeeded in materially reducing the supply of low-cost housing in American cities" (p. 16). Fantastic, you say; perhaps, but Banfield does not inquire, *why?*

The existence of poverty in rural areas and the worsening of conditions there obviously are related to the problems within cities for they help account for the continued city-ward movement of impoverished people. But, as Banfield notes (p. 17), Professor Theodore Schultz* of the University of Michigan has called attention to the fact that the policies and programs of the Department of Agriculture "do not improve the schooling of farm children, they do not reduce the author does not ask *why?*

The plan for "urban renewal" was heralded far and wide as aimed at solving the human problems created by slums and by discriminatory

* Theodore Schultz, *Economic Crisis in World Agriculture*, Ann Arbor, 1965, p. 94.

inequalities in personal distribution of wealth and income, they do not remove the causes of poverty in agriculture, nor do they alleviate it. On the contrary they worsen the personal distribution of income within agriculture." Once again, such data fairly scream the question, *why?* But, again, Banfield does not pose it.

How shall one account for such continued and—necessarily—deliberate abstention on the part of Professor Banfield? There are, I believe, two aspects to the answer: 1) The data cited above demonstrate the class character of the U.S. social order and the anti-colored, anti-poor, pro-rich bias in the administration and enactment of law by the U.S. government and local governments. 2) Given the above data and explaining them would make the program urged by Banfield—and summarized above—absurd, in terms of having any possible impact upon urban problems, since Banfield leaves the implementation of his program in the hands of that class and that government which has in fact done what his own book affirms they have done.

Logic compels one to conclude, therefore, that Banfield's program is not one aimed at resolving urban problems—even with the very modest limits he imposed upon himself—but that it is, on the contrary, a program for repression and intensified oppression. It is a program which rejects the liberal orientation of a bourgeois state and replaces it with a reactionary orientation; it is a program of blood and iron. In the second half of the twentieth century and in the United States—with its intensely monopolistic structure and its imperialist essence—this means it is a program preparing the way for fascism.

A program preparing the way for fascism must be one whose ideology is anti-human, whose ideology explicitly rejects the postulates of Enlightenment and the Age of Reason, whose ideology produces concepts of *Untermenschen* and *Uebermenschen*. The programmatic logic of such an ideology serving such a system and class is not merely preventive arrest and "no-knock" laws and "stop-and-frisk" provisions and the emasculating of trade unions; the programmatic logic of such an ideology is in the United States what it was wherever fascism came into being—mass slaughter in institutionalized form. Projecting this, apparently, is not (yet) either feasible or acceptable; but a few more books like this one from Banfield and a few more heads of state like Nixon-Agnew and a few more "incursions" like that against Cambodia, and the ovens here will be working overtime.

In a certain sense, Banfield's racism, while deep and pervasive is, as it were, almost pre-capitalist in some of its quality. That is, one of his main points is that the problems of cities arise from deficiencies in

class, rather than race; deficiencies, that is, in the poor as such. The poor are poor because they are no good; that is, they are "lower-class" and *therefore* belong to the lower class.

It happens, says Banfield—just happens—that many of the urban "lower-class" in the United States are Black and they *think* that they are subject to special oppression because of racism, and they are encouraged in so thinking by professional organizers whose careers depend on the continuation of such thinking, but in reality their condition stems from class considerations. And what Banfield means by the latter is *not* that their condition stems from the fact that they are overwhelmingly of the working class but rather that they are of the "lower class" psychologically—with the attributes which we enumerated earlier in this essay—and that therefore they *cannot* be anything other than more or less impoverished.

Banfield explicitly denies holding to a genetic concept explaining "inferiority"—although he does refer with marked respect to the work of Arthur Jensen, who does hold to such a concept. He insists, however, on a Social Darwinist approach and in this connection affirms the conditioning impact of slavery and peonage in inducing a kind of "Sambo," very much as does the school of Tannenbaum-Elkins-Genovese. Jensen's work is contrary to all serious psychological and anthropological findings of the past thirty-five years and the "Sambo" version of U. B. Phillips has as much validity to it as the Streicher-Goebbels version of the "Jew."

Banfield actually writes of Black people possessing "animal" spirits; he refers repeatedly to their living in "enclaves"—as though he were writing of zoos. And his explanation of the ghetto outbreaks of the 1960's is, quite literally, as the title of his chapter on this reads: "Rioting Mainly For Fun and Profit." Such obscenities are beneath discussion; I only call attention to them and note that their author is a professor at Harvard and heads the Model Cities Program of the President of the United States!

Factually, something may be said as to the reality of the impact of racist discrimination on the socio-economic position of the Afro-American people. Data confirming this in numerous categories are perfectly available and well known in all professional circles. Thus, Lester C. Thurow, in a study published in 1969 by The Brookings Institution in Washington (*Poverty and Discrimination*), commences: "Both qualitative and quantitative investigations of poverty reveal that racial discrimination is an important factor" and, "Insofar as Negroes are concentrated at the lower end of the distribution they are victims of economic discrimination" (pp. 1, 3).

Detailed studies have demonstrated that Black and white workers similarly employed and in similar areas receive significantly different pay; thus (as of 1959) the difference in favor of white workers who were bakers was 28 per cent; carpenters, 46 per cent; elevator operators, 10 per cent; welders, 13 per cent; automobile mechanics, 27 per cent; tinsmiths, 15 per cent; etc.*

Other studies have shown that Black and white people with similar education had sharply dissimilar incomes; thus, Black people who were elementary school graduates had earnings which were 64 per cent of whites with that level of education; 60 per cent if both were high school graduates and 50 per cent if both were college graduates. Professor Paul M. Siegel, in *Sociological Inquiry* (Winter, 1965, Vol. 35, No. 1) distinguished between differences in Black and white earnings in terms of those possibly accountable on the basis of regional or occupational differences and those accountable only on the basis of racism and found the latter to explain almost 40 per cent of the differential that does exist.**

The plain fact that, as the Brookings study said, "racial discrimination is an important factor" in the special exploitation of Black people, is indubitable; that its denial is basic to the theme of Banfield's book is another illustration of the shoddiness and viciousness which characterize it. But in a book which opens and closes with an appeal that "facts" must be faced, this contempt for basic and significant facts is especially reprehensible.

Again, to face up to this reality undercuts the premise of the Banfield study and demonstrates the existence of socially-induced injustice and exploitation; that demonstration in turn makes imperative an entirely different set of priorities, programs and aims.

*

It is to move the argument to where it belongs. As the reviewer of Banfield's work for the Catholic weekly, *Commonweal*, wrote: "The argument is no longer between Banfield's conservatism and the do-

* R. Fein, "An Economic and Social Profile of the American Negro," in T. Parsons and K. B. Clark, eds., *The Negro American* (Beacon Press, Boston, 1965), pp. 102-133.

** The literature is extensive. In addition to that cited above, see: Thomas F. Mayer, "The Position and Progress of Black America" in *Radical Education Project*, Ann Arbor, 1968; R. Raymond, in *Western Economic Journal*, March, 1969 (VII, pp. 57-70); E. Rayack in *Review of Economic Statistics*, May 1961 (LXIII, pp. 209-214); R. D. Weiss, in *Review of Economics and Statistics*, May, 1970 (LII, pp. 150-159) and, in particular, L. L. Knowles and K. Prewitt, eds., *Institutional Racism in America* (Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1970).

gooders. . . . It is between his stand and those who reject the confines of capitalism, who look to socialist models. That's where it's at now in New York City, Chicago, San Francisco, Washington, D.C. and, yes, even in Mather's Boston.*

We feel impelled to offer a few final words on Banfield's methodology. This includes not only a contempt for data, as we have shown; not only the embracing of discredited work, as that of Jensen in psychology and Phillipsian work in history; not only the projecting of key terms never defined—as "criminality" (whose and ascertained by whom?), and "proneness to commit crime" (how determined, how defined, how measured?). It includes a passage which affirms in so many words that the author's central concepts are highly dubious to *himself*.

As one approaches the end of this work—based, remember, on the concept that the psychological nature of the "lower class," its present-mindedness, *causes* their being of the "lower class"—one reads this passage:

Statements about the relative importance of one or another type of present-mindedness in the city should be regarded as highly provisional. It may turn out that the lower class that has figured so largely in this book does not exist (that whatever present-orientedness exists is neither cultural in origin nor cognitive in nature) or that it exists among so few persons as to be inconsequential. Moreover, no matter what tests show, time may tell a different story. Powerful opportunities and incentives may over two or three generations produce changes that theory and observation now declare to be impossible. (P. 223.)

Further, not only does the author tell us on page 223 that the foundation for his preceding pages perhaps "does not exist"; he also tells us on page 233 that at least half of the population that are "lower class" in his concocted definition of that term "very often behave in ways that are not characteristic of that class"—having reference to the women of the "lower class." Surely there has never been another book, with pretensions to scientific effort, which affirms that the base of its premises perhaps does not exist and that for half the people whose alleged characteristics constitute that base they do not exist.

Appropriately, this precedent-shattering example of scientific endea-

* Ruth Beinhart, *Commonweal*, September 18, 1970, p. 467; Miss Beinhart is editor of *Tenant News*, published in New York City.

vor belongs to one of the chief advisors for President Nixon. Let it be added that the confessed tenuousness of the argument does not lead its creator to be tentative about the program he projects. One may be certain that with the encouragement of Mitchell's Department of what is marvellously called Justice and Hoover's FBI and Agnew's pathological hatred of scholars and Nixon's paranoid contempt for people of principle there will be—there already has been—nothing tentative about the "stop-and-frisk" and the shoot-first, whitewash-later and the preventive-arrest policies of Professor Banfield's employers.

The work's shoddiness does not make it import less serious. On the contrary, the Banfields and their bosses know well what they are projecting. Thus, our author is worried because "disaffected people who live in huge enclaves may develop a collective consciousness and sense of identity." He admits that there may be something desirable in this, but:

In the short run, however, they represent a threat to peace and order, and it must be admitted that even in the long run the accommodation that takes place may produce a politics that is less democratic, less mindful of individual rights, and less able to act effectively in the common interest than that which we have now. (p. 12.)

That long-run "accommodation" is called fascism; to prevent it, all of us "low-class" people must enhance our "collective consciousness" and our "sense of identity" so that the domestic disaster and the international catastrophe, which will flow from the programs of people like Professor Banfield and those for whom he concocts his theories, may be prevented.

November 2, 1970

Coming:

The January 1971 issue will feature an article by Gus Hall on the 1970 elections. Also, this issue, Volume 50, Number 1, marks the opening of the 50th year of continuous publication of a Marxist-Leninist monthly magazine in the United States. The occasion will be noted with an article on the origins and early history of the magazine.

The February issue will contain articles marking Black History Month, also the 90th anniversary of the birth of William Z. Foster, for many years chairman of the Communist Party.

The March issue will be a special number on the subject of women's liberation. Details will be announced later.

COMMUNICATIONS

REV. PETER J. RIGA

Thoughts on the Middle East Conflict

The following are some thoughts related to the article by Hyman Lumer ("The Middle East: War or Peace," *Political Affairs*, May 1970).

It does little good for Golda Meir to be saying inflammatory things such as "There is no one to return the occupied territories to." Unfortunately, Israel foreign policy is presently predicated on precisely such presuppositions. The viciousness of this policy—instigated and encouraged by the guilt-ridden Western nations at the UN in 1947—was a flat denial that there already existed an organized people, a cultural Palestinian entity, before 1947, who were simply expropriated by the fiat of the UN in the very creation of the State of Israel. It is this fact, continually denied by Israel and hotly contested by Arabs, that forms the very nucleus of both the policy and moral problem presently obtaining in the Near East today. Unless this reality can be faced by all (Israeli foreign policy is geared precisely to deny this), then there can be no peaceful solution in that area.

Such a situation, of course, will also mean the intervention of the super-powers, with unforeseeable

results for the whole world. Therefore, it must be clear that any projected military solution to this problem will never really solve it and will project an even more dangerous future for the whole of the human race. Conflagration in this area must be seen as infinitely more dangerous than even Vietnam, since it is exactly at this point that the American Sixth Fleet and the Russian navy meet. Indeed, when the Israelis extended their bombing to the very heartland of Egypt, this left no other course of action for Moscow than to take a direct hand in the defense of Egypt. It was truly an Israeli-induced escalation which called for a Russian response which, in this vicious circle of violence, now calls for additional F105 fighter planes from the U.S. to be sold to Israel.

There are more than enough injustices for all parties concerned. The American press commentators have been almost obscene in portraying Israel as an innocent little nation, threatened by big thugs as neighbors, as if Israel has been guilty of no wrong. Yet, with the growing violence since the June 1967 war, particularly on the part of Israel, the con-

MIDDLE EAST

47

science of the Arab world has been awakened. In the words of Kennett Love, in his impressive book, *Suez: The Twice-Fought War* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1969):

Just as the fact of the Jews in the Nazi holocaust Judaized the conscience of the Western World and made possible the Zionist establishment of Israel, so the dispossession, dispersion and the sufferings of the Palestinians at the hands of the Jews Palestinized the conscience of the Arab world . . . and is beginning to Palestinize the conscience of more than the Arab world.

* * *

It is simply a fact that the very creation of the state of Israel by the British was accomplished by the expropriation, with or without compensation (mostly without) of hundreds of thousands of innocent Palestinians. Before 1947, 95 per cent of present-day Israel was owned by Arabs. Certainly no group of people can be expected to sit idly by while another confiscates its land and forces it to live for years in refugee camps.

No civilized nation would permit it, and yet the American press can hypocritically sit back and simply condemn the Arabs as "aggressors" when—in their own way—they are simply trying to recover what was rightfully theirs. This makes a great stumbling block for American liberals. Any criticism of the State of Israel seems like treason to the six million Jews murdered by the Nazis while these liberals were mostly silent. Every criticism of Israeli

policy now is met with the charge of anti-Semitism, so that one fears and hesitates to make such criticism.

But past injustices done to a people do not justify present injustices done to other peoples. The whole idea of bringing 2½ million Jewish immigrants to Israel, and thereby displacing Arabs from their lands and homes which they occupied for over 1,000 years, seems to be morally problematic indeed, no matter what partition the UN enacted back in 1947. This is not to mention the incipient settlement by Jewish settlers on the occupied territories taken from the Arabs in the June, 1967 war. There is a vicious circle there. Israel must defend her borders, so she must extend her territory by settlement which further necessitates more safe zones.

We have long ago ceased believing that just because a decision has majority approval, it becomes *eo ipso* moral as well. At least this is unacceptable to Christian morality and justice. The fact remains that in order for a Jewish state to be established, a whole Arab community had to be displaced and most of its residents scattered into squalid shanty towns of hate and hopelessness. Nor can the argument be made moral or correct by saying that these people have been held in such squalor by the implacable hatred and illusion of their Arab leaders. This might well be true, but it still does not eliminate the act of injustice done initially to these people by Jews and the great

powers under a great sense of guilt with respect to the Nazi holocaust.

Nor must it be forgotten that although Israel vigorously attacks the UN, it never allowed UN peacekeeping troops on its soil, but only on that of the Arabs.

* * *

In the U.S., the propaganda has been heavily for the Israelis without examining the root of this festering injustice. Of all the great powers, only France has been the most consistent: She broke with Israel as the first party actually to begin hostilities in June, 1967.

This is understandable since any criticism of Israel is taken to be a latent form of anti-Semitism. Yet it must be said clearly that the same canons of justice are applicable to Israel as to any other nation and she must be judged by the same standards as we judge ourselves.

This becomes very clear in the case of terrorism on both sides. El Fatah of the Arabs has carried out some egregious raids on border settlements of Jews and against civilian life and aircraft in Athens and Jerusalem as well as tragic attacks on school children. Yet when the Israelis destroyed the aircraft in Lebanon, by invading that country, this was done with official government sanction. One can indeed doubt the moral correctness in international law of one nation officially sanctioning and carrying out terror raids (Lebanon, Czechoslovakia, Cambodia) as

against acts by an unofficial group of men operating clandestinely. To disregard such canons of international law is to endanger the peace of the whole world and not simply that of the Middle East.

The creation of El Fatah is a response to this total lack of confidence in other nations recognizing the right of existence of the entity called the Palestinian community. It is ironic that it is now El Fatah which employs the same tactics of terror which various Jewish groups (Irgun and the Stern gang) applied against Arabs during the British occupation. The only difference is that today the Arabs are called "terrorists" in the Western press (the Arabs call them "freedom fighters," of course).

The response of the Israelis has been greater violence, administrative detention without trial, torture of prisoners, destruction of civilian homes, bombing of villages, curfews of a most restrictive nature, etc. Even the Amnesty International had to admit that its finding disclosed "prima facie evidence of serious maltreatment of Arab prisoners under interrogation in Israel." (One recalls the massacre of Deir Yassin in 1948 with photos of mutilated bodies of women and children with the caption "This is what awaits you if you do not run away.")

On the other hand, what is disturbing is the total intransigence of Arab leaders who refuse even to discuss these matters with the Jews who in fact are presently in Palestine, particularly with

those Israelis who are most open to such discussions. The intransigence is also on the Israeli side, as witness the recent rebuff given to Nahum Goldmann, head of the World Jewish Congress, on his peace mission to Nasser.

Nor can we overlook the forms of the conflict. Terrorism is condemnable by any standard whatsoever whether perpetrated by Jew or Arab. Yet, retaliation by Israel has to be branded as simply outrageous from a moral point of view. In response to guerilla raids, whole towns are bombed, shelled and raked with machine gun fire in Jordan by the Israelis. This is simply resorting to officially sanctioned total war against civilian and guerilla alike and, as such must be condemned by any religious or humanistic thinker.

When the Americans in Vietnam use napalm, its use is condemned by the "liberal" press in no uncertain terms as a "cruel weapon"; when it is used by the Israelis against Jordanian towns, it becomes "self defense," or we are greeted by silence from these same "liberal" sources. There cannot be two standards, one for the Israelis and another for the Americans.

We see such hypocrisy in former Senator Wayne Morse who almost daily called for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam but who, just before the six day war in 1967, wanted to send an American battleship up the coast of Aqaba, blasting everything that got in its way. The blindness of the liberals is evident for all to

see.

* * *

Nor have the Arabs been without fault in the struggle. The threats to the very existence of Israel have been frequent and fervent; the deliberate fomenting of refugee frustration by doing nothing has been all but shameless politicking; the many terroristic attacks on Israeli territory, culminating in the closing to Israeli shipping of the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran, have posed a direct threat to the very viability of the state of Israel. There are few—including the Russians—who want to see Israel "thrown into the sea."

Does the compassion we feel for the Jews and the admiration we feel for Israel mean we must harden our hearts against those Arabs who have truly been victimized by the creation of the State of Israel? Are not these dispossessed people also human beings, with all the rights of human beings? Do we justify Arab refugee camps by reference to Dachau? This is a strange sense of justice.

First of all, it must be stated that in human justice the state of Israel has a perfect right to a viable existence even though many of us have doubts as to the justice of the origins of Israel as a separate Jewish state. Yet, 2½ million Jews are presently in Israel and we cannot pretend that they do not exist. I say "viable" since this implies the means necessary for a healthy economic, social and political life. This certainly im-

plies freedom of the high seas (Suez, Aqaba), freedom from all acts of terrorism (Athens, Jerusalem) and, most important, recognition of this right by her Arab neighbors. This is hard to say for some Arabs but it must be said in the interests of peace, for there can be no peace at the price of genocide.

There is, however, another urgent problem which must be faced by the state of Israel if it wishes to have true peace and tranquility with its neighbors. It must attempt as a gesture of good will to solve the problem of the 1.3 million refugees who have been directly expatriated from their homes. It must be clearly stated that from the natural law, these refugees too have a right to exist and possess their own homes and lands in the place of their birth which their fathers, and their fathers before them, bequeathed to them. They have a right to do this as first class citizens in the State of Israel.

This, of course, implies a great risk on the part of Israel as the Jews are afraid that if they make both the Arabs presently in Israel and those who for one reason or another have been expatriated, full citizens, Arabs will in turn be a sort of fifth column in the midst of the state. They fear that in time they will actually numerically outnumber Jews because of their higher birth rate. The Israeli fear is that, once again, Jews will become an ethnic minority, subjected to others for their political life.

This is a legitimate fear and risk but one which Israel must be willing to undertake as a necessary first step in the direction of a new fraternity in the Near East. The state *qua* state must become secular in nature, a state whose only requirement before the law is that the person is a citizen.

* * *

It is at this crucial point that we meet the greatest difficulty. Israelis today are absolutely agreed on one thing: the State of Israel must remain Jewish, that is, it is based on a racial determination. Minority groups (Arabs) will be allowed to live within Israel but always as a minority group within the framework of Jewish racialism. We can see this clearly today in Israel where Jew may not marry non-Jew and where all non-Jews are clearly made to understand that they are and will be treated as second-class citizens.

It is an exclusive society. In the words of David Ben Gurion to an Israeli Arab: "You must know that Israel is the country of the Jews and only of Jews. Every Arab who lives there has the same rights as any minority citizen in any country in the world, but he must admit that he lives in a Jewish country." All non-Jews are therefore automatically second-class citizens and this poses a crucial question for democracy as well as for peace in the Middle East.

This will pose even more problems in the future when these second-class Arab citizens of

Israel become the majority (since Arabs in Israel have a much greater population growth). Will we then see control of a whole country by a determined minority based on racism as is presently the case in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia? Or will Israel simply "solve" the problem by actively deporting all Arabs from her territory as already has been done to a limited degree on the West Bank of the Jordan? In either case, we have an incursion into the elemental canons of social justice.

This was clearly seen by I. F. Stone in his now famous essay in the *New York Review of Books* (August 3, 1967):

Israel is creating a kind of moral schizophrenia in world Jewry. In the outside world, the welfare of Jewry depends on the maintenance of secular, non-racial, pluralistic societies. In Israel, Jewry finds itself a society in which mixed marriages cannot be legalized, in which non-Jews have a lesser status than Jews, and in which the ideal is racial and exclusionist. Jews must fight elsewhere for their very security and existence—against principles and practices they find themselves defending in Israel. Those from the outside world, even in their moments of greatest enthusiasm amid Israel's accomplishments, feel twinges of claustrophobia, not just geographical but spiritual. Those caught up in prophetic fervor soon begin to feel that the light they hoped to see out of Zion is only that of another narrow nationalism.

For his illuminating words, Stone received only intense abuse from his fellow Jews but none

of them came anywhere near answering the substantive issue which he raised and which I here raise. As presently constituted, Israel is a racist society by definition and no amount of charges of anti-Semitism must impede us from seeing this clearly and condemning it forthrightly. A non-racial society must be one of the sacrifices which Israelis must be willing to make if there is to be peace in the Middle East. This is indeed a difficult saying for the Israelis, but it must be said for the accomplishment of peace.

It is understandable why Israelis would have great hesitation in this area since their whole history has been one of persecution as a minority group in all societies of the Diaspora. Now in Israel Jews have their own society where they are the majority, thus guaranteeing their own political and social security.

In a non-racial state, no preferential treatment would be given to any ethnic, racial or religious group, but simply the promotion of justice based on the dignity of the human person. In this way, Jew and Arab will be full members and citizens of the state of Israel with no discrimination because of race or creed.

This will necessitate positive action on the part of the present government of Israel in actively repatriating those Arabs who wish to be repatriated and paying full indemnities to those who wish to go elsewhere. By so welcoming them back as full citizens in a fully secular state of Israel, the

first gesture of brotherhood would be extended and there would be a beginning of erosion of the huge glacier of hate between these two brothers in the Near East.

There seems to be no other solution open to Arab and Jews in the Middle East today. Unless the

willingness to sacrifice is present and unless there is some hope and trust for the future made to blossom with such suggestions as we have presently made, not only the peace of the Middle East but the peace of the whole world is problematic.

HYMAN LUMER

On the Origins of the State of Israel

We publish Father Riga's communication as representative of the views of a section of the Christian clergy on the Middle East. With what he says we can mainly agree; there are, however, points of difference.

The chief of these has to do with the origins of the state of Israel. Father Riga denies the moral validity of the UN's action in 1947 as being an outright expropriation of the Palestinian Arabs. Elsewhere he describes the state of Israel as a creation of the British, again through expropriation of the Arabs. And he regards this displacement of Arabs as the inevitable consequence of Jewish immigration and the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

* * *

First, it is not true that Israel was a creation of Britain. To be sure, British imperialism encouraged Jewish settlement in Palestine through the Balfour Declaration. But it did so only to set Jews and Arabs against one an-

other for the purpose of perpetuating British rule. In the later years of the Mandate the British sought to restrict Jewish immigration and at no time did they support the formation of an independent Jewish state.

The British ruling circles opposed the partition of Palestine. Their UN representatives abstained from voting on the partition resolution and all related questions, and they announced that Britain would do nothing to implement the resolution if either the Jews or the Arabs objected to it. What they hoped was that because of Jewish-Arab antagonisms partition would fail and that in the resulting chaos the UN would find no alternative other than the continuation of British rule in one form or another.

Furthermore, it was British imperialism which used the Arab states to attack the new-born state of Israel in 1948. These states were at that time governed by puppet rulers and their armed forces were commanded by Brit-

ish officers taking orders from London. The war fought by Israel was in fact a war against British imperialism. "The objective of this military action by British imperialism," writes Bert Ramelson, "was to frustrate the implementing of the UN resolution, to hang on to the whole of Palestine, and by parcelling it up among Arab stooge rulers, to retain indirectly what Britain previously held directly as the mandatory power." (*The Middle East: Crisis, Causes, Solution*, Communist Party, London, 1967, pp. 13-14.)

The main initiative leading to the UN action came from the Soviet Union, supported by the other socialist countries. In a speech on May 14, 1947, Soviet representative Andrei Gromyko called for "the creation of a single Arab-Jewish state with equal rights for Jews and Arabs . . . as the solution most deserving attention, of this complicated problem." But if this should prove unrealizable because of sharpened Jewish-Arab hostility, "then it would be necessary to consider an alternative solution which . . . consists of the division of Israel into two states—one, Jewish, and one, Arab."

Was the partition morally indefensible? We think not. Among the reasons given by Gromyko for his proposals was the need to find a haven for the many Jewish refugees who had been left stranded (thanks mainly to the refusal of the capitalist states to admit them). But he also gave a more cogent reason, namely, that there *already* existed a significant Jewish community in Pales-

tine. He said:

. . . We must bear in mind the incontestable fact that the population of Palestine consists of two peoples, Arabs and Jews. Each of these has its historical roots in Palestine. That country has become the native land of both these peoples, and both of them occupy an important place in the country economically and culturally. Neither history nor the conditions which have arisen in Palestine now can justify any unilateral solution of the Palestine problem, either in favor of the creation of an independent Arab state, ignoring the lawful rights of the Jewish people, or in favor of the creation of a Jewish state, ignoring the lawful rights of the Arab population. . . . A just settlement can be found only if account is taken in sufficient degree of the lawful interest of both peoples.

In 1946 there were in Palestine some 608,000 Jews out of a total population of 1,973,000, or nearly one-third. Whatever the distribution of land ownership, this represented a substantial and distinct Jewish community in Palestine. True, these were in the main comparatively recent immigrants. The bulk of them came, however, not as Zionist usurpers of Arab land but rather in the face of great difficulties, as refugees from the horrors of Nazism, most of whom had literally nowhere else to go.

Under the circumstances that prevailed in 1947, it would have been wrong to have agreed to complete Arab dominion just as it would have been to have acceded to the Zionist demand to make all of Palestine a Jewish homeland. The course proposed by the Soviet Union was therefore

the only realistic and just one available.

At the end of World War II there existed both Jewish and Arab independence movements in Palestine. Had the two formed a common front against British imperialism, the natural outcome of their victory would have been a binational state. In fact, it was such a possibility that the Soviet proposals envisaged. But this was not to be, and there remained in the end only the alternative of partition.

The considerations which led to partition in 1947 apply all the more strongly today, when there exists a Jewish community of close to 2½ million, much more advanced in its development as a nation. Indeed, Father Riga himself recognizes this existence when he says that "the state of Israel has a perfect right to a viable existence even though many of us have doubts as to the justice of the origins of Israel as a separate Jewish state." But it is, we believe, necessary to see that the "right to a viable existence" was a consideration with regard to the Jewish community also in 1947.

* * *

To be sure, the gross injustices and crimes against the Palestinian Arab people of which Father Riga speaks cannot be denied. But these are not inherent in the existence of a Jewish state as such; rather they stem from the racist Zionist conception of a Jewish state as one which is *exclusively* Jewish and which is the state of the Jews not only in Israel but everywhere in the world. Such a state could be es-

tablished only at the expense of the Arabs and only with the support of their imperialist oppressors.

Zionism aimed from the outset to convert all of Palestine into a Jewish state. Initially the Zionists sought the support of the Sultan of Turkey and later of British imperialism for the launching of this project. They were opposed to any idea of a binational state. In 1947 they accepted partition only as the best to be had at the moment, and in the 1948 war Israel's Zionist rulers seized more than half of the territory allotted to the Arab state by the UN. Subsequently they embarked on a further expansionist course in league with one or another imperialist power, highlighted by the invasions of neighboring Arab states in 1956 and 1967. And, as is only to be expected, these policies have earned them the bitter, undying hatred of the Arab peoples.

The validity of Israel's existence as a state derives from the UN partition resolution. But the state envisioned by that resolution is not the anomaly created by the Zionists. This is evidenced by the flood of critical or condemnatory resolutions with relation to Israel which the UN has adopted in the years since 1947. These the Israeli government has simply ignored; indeed, its policy has been one of demanding adherence to those UN actions which please it and refusing to recognize those which do not. Thus the course pursued by the Zionists is not a fulfillment of the 1947 UN resolution but rather represents its negation.

But a different kind of Jewish state is possible (and indeed is vital to a solution of the conflict), as Father Riga himself notes. In fact, a different kind of state was possible in 1948. Had the Israeli government refrained from seizing territory beyond that allotted to it, had it aligned itself with the countries striving for national liberation and not with imperialism, had it dealt with the Arabs within its boundaries as full, equal citizens, had it permitted the refugees to return, then relationships with the Arabs could have developed quite differently and the present conflict would not exist. But this would have meant abandonment of the entire Zionists concept.

Moshe Dayan puts this very bluntly from his point of view. He says:

If Israel were to take back the refugees, in keeping with the recent proposals that every Arab refugee be given the choice between returning or not, and assuming that they would say that they wanted to return . . . to Acre, Jaffa, Ashdod, Ashkelon, etc., we would no longer have a Jewish state. It may well be that our image among the Arabs would improve tremendously, but we would be left without the State of Israel. ("Jewish-Arab Coexistence," *Midstream*, June-July, 1969.)

However, it is precisely Dayan's concept of the state of Israel that must be abandoned today if Israel is to have any assurance of a viable existence. In this connection it is necessary to differentiate sharply between the Zionist ruling circles of Israel and the Israeli people, who have been misled

into supporting the Zionist-inspired racist policies in the mistaken belief that the Arabs are motivated only by an irrational desire to destroy them. At the same time it must be recognized that the rights of a people are not conditional on the conduct of its rulers.

Dr. Emile Touma, editor of *Al Ittihad*, the Arab language organ of the Communist Party of Israel, sums up the situation in these words:

But the understanding of the motives of these forces (the Zionist and imperialist forces—H.L.) does not change the following outstanding facts:

1. Historical development turned Palestine into a binational country; the fact that imperialism and Zionism took a part in this does not change the existing situation.

2. The solution of 1947 based itself on the recognition of the right of each of the two peoples to self-determination and to establishing its state.

3. The aggressiveness of the Israeli rulers cancels neither the rights of the Palestinian Arab people nor of the Israeli people.

4. The recognition of the rights of the Jews to remain where they are now necessitates the recognition of their right to independent political existence.

5. It is of course possible to think about future forms of various economic and political relations between Israel and the Arab world, under conditions of the liberation of the region from the influence of imperialism and of independence from it under conditions of equality and free, sovereign determination. (*About the Idea of a Palestinian State*, New Outlook Publishers, New

York, 1970.)

Today the Palestinian Arab question lies at the heart of the Israeli-Arab conflict. Among the Palestinian Arab people (whose existence the Zionist leaders seek vainly to deny), a powerful national movement has arisen, seeking the exercise of the right of self-determination hitherto denied them. No real solution of the conflict is possible without the guarantee of that right, without rectifying the grave injustice done to this people. But as Dr. Touma stresses, this cannot be achieved without simultaneously recognizing the existence of this right also for the Israeli people.

* * *

Lacking in Father Riga's communication, we feel, is recognition of the role of imperialism in the Middle East. But this is fundamental to an understanding of the conflict. It is the drive of the imperialist powers, above all of U.S. imperialism, to exploit the oil-rich, strategically situated Middle East and the rebellion of the Arab peoples against that exploitation that constitutes the central struggle in that area. In this struggle Israel's Zionist leaders have committed themselves to the side of the imperialists, and in turn it is the support of the imperialists which has enabled them to commit their crimes against the Arab peoples.

Thus it was the collusion with British and French imperialism that made the 1956 Sinai invasion feasible, and without the collusion with U.S. imperialism the 1967 aggression could not have

been undertaken. Today U.S. imperialism is supplying arms and aid to the Israeli government as its instrument against the anti-imperialist forces in the Middle East, and especially against the government of the U.A.R. Indeed, President Nixon has made clear his intention to provide Israel with all the arms needed to "maintain the balance of power"—that is, Israeli military superiority—in the area.

To resolve the Israeli-Arab conflict requires not only a readiness of the Arab states to accept Israel's existence; it requires even more a fundamental change in Israeli foreign policy. And this demands a determined struggle to wipe out the pernicious influence of the reactionary, racist ideology of Zionism, both in Israel and in the United States. In this country such a struggle must go hand in hand with opposition to the aggressive policies of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East, no less than in Southeast Asia and every other part of the world.

One final word: We cannot agree with Father Riga's inclusion of Czechoslovakia among those countries that have been victims of officially sanctioned "terror raids" by other countries. The action of the Warsaw Pact countries in Czechoslovakia was taken to prevent counter-revolution and the intervention of U.S. and West German imperialism in that country. Its was not an attack on the people of Czechoslovakia but an action in defense of socialism. As such it has nothing in common with the other examples given by Father Riga.

BOOK REVIEWS

ERIC BERT

The Road to Transcendental Marxism

The nature of the so-called dialogue between Christians and Marxist-Leninists is examined by Dr. Jan Milic Lochman, Czech Protestant theologian, in his recently published *Church in a Marxist Society* (Harper & Row, New York, 1970, \$5.95). The discussion ranges over the struggle for world peace, the building of socialism in a "Marxist society," the so-called Czechoslovak Spring of 1968, and ideology. The first three subjects were discussed in a review of the book which appeared in the *Daily World Magazine*, Oct. 10, 1970. The present article is devoted to the philosophic character of the Christian-Marxist dialogue.

Our purpose is not to establish that Dr. Lochman is not a materialist, that he is an idealist. That would be falling through an open door. Our concern is with the philosophic conditions he sets for the Christian-Marxist dialogue on the ideological front and, more importantly, with the fact that some Marxists have accepted those conditions, surrendering dialectical materialism to religion.

Appeal to the "Young Marx"

Marxists must "transcend" Marxism, Dr. Lochman holds, if they are to be able to deal with "the question of man," "personal

history," the "meaning of life," the "goal of history" (pp. 182-183). As we shall see, however, the issue which he poses is not "man," not "personal destiny," as he says, but God.

To short-circuit what he calls the "dogmatic and sterile form of orthodox Marxism," Dr. Lochman enlists in the "young Marx" brigade, to discover "Marxism's human, original, and authentic face" (p. 179).

"It is interesting to note," as Dr. Lochman says, "that the theologians started this study" of the "young Marx" as a "challenge to [the] Stalinist form of Marxism." "We did it . . . as a presupposition for future dialogue" (p. 179).

The attempt was to fashion the views of the "young Marx" into weapons against Marxism-Leninism. This campaign was prosecuted world-wide.

Dr. Lochman cites twice the following quotation from Karl Marx: "To overthrow all conditions under which man is an oppressed, enslaved, destitute, and despised being" (pp. 193, 197).

Dr. Lochman says that, as a Christian, he could "hardly find a better formulation" than this as a "tentative outline of the common program of humanization" (p. 195). However, in quoting Marx, Dr. Lochman decapitates him. The

"criticism of religion is the premise of all criticism," Marx says at the outset of the essay from which Dr. Lochman quotes. ("Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right," in: Marx and Engels, *On Religion*, Moscow, 1957, p. 37.) Furthermore, the section which Dr. Lochman quotes is tendentiously truncated further. Marx wrote:

"The criticism of religion ends with the teaching that *man is the highest essence for man*, hence with the *categoric imperative to overthrow all relations* in which man is a debased, enslaved, abandoned, despicable essence. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 45.)*

Dr. Lochman's excision eliminated two crucial points: 1. Marx was dealing with the "criticism of religion"; 2. Marx held that "*man is the highest essence for man.*" Eliminating these ideas which reflect the materialist foundation of Marx's views and with which Dr. Lochman does not agree is deplorable.

Atheism

Dr. Lochman says that "in view of the misuse of religion in the course of history Marxism has solid grounds for its atheism" (p.

* All italicized quotations throughout this article are italicized in the original. The divergence between the translation used by Dr. Lochman and the one from the volume *On Religion* is inconsequential. The original of the essay is reproduced in Marx-Engels *Werke*, Vol. 1, Berlin, 1958, p. 385.

177). "Marx's atheism," he says, "was a passionate protest against

a religion and a church which had placed under a bushel the prophetic and apostolic light and example, neglecting especially man's social life. Religion and the church supported oppressive rulers and deceptively comforted the oppressed" (p. 166). Dr. Lochman thus "accepts" atheism, but for the wrong reason. "Atheism can be understood as a reply to the historical unfaithfulness and guilt of the established church" (p. 166). But, none of this has anything to do with Marx's atheism which was first, last and all the time an expression of his materialist world outlook; it was anti-religious not because the church was evil, but because religion is idealist.

Dr. Lochman welcomes atheists, but only in relation to the existence of God. He acknowledges atheism only in its "theological relativity" (p. 159). "Atheism is not a hopeless ultimate step but is something penultimate, and in that sense, relative" (p. 161). Dr. Lochman's concession of the "solid grounds" for atheism's existence is made in the context that atheism is irrelevant to the "transcendental" issue, the existence of God. "The gospel remains sovereign over faith and unfaith," Dr. Lochman says (p. 160). In this sense not only atheism but faith is relative. God's existence does not depend on faith.

The relativity of faith in respect to the existence of God becomes, however a stepping stone to a far more fundamental doctrine: the relativity of man in

respect to God. Dr. Lochman says:

". . . the beginning and ground of human existence does not lie within us (not even in our faith!) but lies instead in the reality which is the basis of faith—in the reality, action and history of God . . ." (pp. 159-160).

The decisive difference between "Marxism and the Christian message" is, according to Dr. Lochman, the "*question of God*" (p. 176). Some theologians have become uncertain about God, he notes, but this defection is offset, more or less, by the fact that some Marxists have also defected; they have become uncertain about the non-existence of God. Some theologians say "God is dead" and some Marxists reply, "maybe not." While "Marxism disavows the question of God" Dr. Lochman says, the "saying that 'God is not entirely dead' is heard from Marxist quarters, and from conversations with them we learn that the concern for transcendence is taken quite seriously by many present-day Marxists" (p. 176).

Marxism-Leninism cannot accept such an ideological quid pro quo: doubt among theologians about the existence of God reciprocated by doubt among Marxists about the non-existence of God. Such doubt among Marxists is a signal that materialism has been abandoned; that they have surrendered to idealism in general, and to deism in particular.

Dr. Lochman protests that he does not have such a deal in mind. Marxists are not being asked to accept the old-fashioned God, he

asserts. He says that "in the 'question of God'" he does not "refer to a metaphysical concept of God . . . as an absolute boundary over against the historical, dynamic, and social orientation of Marxist thought. . . . God is not the God of a metaphysical scheme but the God of history, of society, of the future. . . ." (p. 176). God, as Dr. Lochman recreates him, is virtually the God of historical materialism, a thoroughly confused conception.

More important, Dr. Lochman assures the Marxists that there is no boundary between his God and what Miles Prucha, Czech Marxist, called their "appetite for transcendence" (p. 189), that is, for God.

Ideology

Dr. Lochman expresses enthusiasm for what he calls the Marxist positive view of ideology. "In the realm of history there exist not only wrong ideologies but also right ones," he says. "Wrong ideologies," he explains leaning on Marx, reflect a "false consciousness" (p. 143). His enthusiasm leads him to an important conclusion:

"Thus, against the background of intellectual history alone an exclusively negative evaluation of the concept of ideology appears as one-sided and not justified." Then he adds: "*This is also true with respect to theology*" (p. 143).

Thus, enthusiastic agreement with Marxists about "right" ideology becomes a means for establishing, by analogy or what-not,

that "an exclusively negative evaluation" of theology is "one-sided and not justified"; that a "positive" evaluation of theology, the study of God, is justified. Dr. Lochman argues, in effect, that since theology parallels ideology the possibility of a "positive" ideology, established by Marxists, establishes the possibility of a "positive" theology.

But this is based on a misunderstanding of ideology in general, and of "right" ideology in particular. Dr. Lochman's enthusiasm for "right" ideology is not based on the fact that "right" ideology, in contrast to "wrong" ideology or "false consciousness," reflects the material world accurately, but on some vague notion that it "corresponds to the interests of the future," and so, to, may theology.

But theology can not be "right"; it reflects the world wrongly, falsely, not correctly nor accurately nor adequately. It is wrong with respect to this world, it is "right" only with respect to the non-existent other world.

Ideology, says Dr. Lochman, is a "part of human reality, an element of human life" (p. 45); a "function of being human" (p. 148); a "significant . . . part of human existence" (p. 164). "Man is an ideological being"; "he lives thinking" (p. 145).

The point that Dr. Lochman wants to establish here, however, is that ideology is "not the whole of human existence" (p. 164)—that there is a place for God, that God is part of human existence.

Christianity and Ideology

Dr. Lochman considers Christianity, variously, as an ideology (pp. 67, 136), as not an ideology (pp. 61, 62), as simultaneously an ideology and transcending ideology (pp. 147, 151). Underlying these apparently contradictory viewpoints is the doctrine that Christianity is akin but superior to ideology. Dr. Lochman puts religion, Christianity, beyond ideology, establishes a special preserve for Christianity as Revelation. The kingdom of the gospel "is not the kingdom of ideologies" he says (p. 147). "Revelation is not ideology, and ideology is not Revelation" (p. 151). Revelation is not only absolute, but enjoys a monopoly on "absoluteness." Christianity's "claim to absoluteness legitimizes no claim to absoluteness by ideology," he asserts (p. 151).

Dr. Lochman holds not only, as we have seen, that ideology is a "part of human reality," an "element of life," but also that it is "no more than that" (p. 145). The purpose of this thesis is to establish that there is another "part of human reality." That is, "a man is not exhaustively contained in his ideology. He is more than what he thinks. He is more than an '-ist,' a the-ist, athe-ist, or any other kind of -ist" (p. 164).

The other "part of human reality" is not the material world external to man, but God. The "transcendence of grace"—the existence of God—is, according to Dr. Lochman, a "condition of

being human" (p. 178). It is in this sense that man "transcends all his -isms" (p. 164), that is, all ideology. The other part of "human reality" is, then, that both "man in his nature and history" and Christianity have a "transideological dimension" (p. 118), an other-worldly extension.

The conclusion, in the words of "Jiri," a friend of Dr. Lochman, is that "Christian convictions" are "incompatible with Marxism-Leninism" (p. 93).

The implication is clear: "The real task of Christians in their encounter with Marxists . . . especially in a Marxist society" is to contend for the view that "the condition of being human" embraces the "reality . . . of God" (pp. 178, 160). That is the program of the Christian camp, as Dr. Lochman sees it, in the Christian-Marxist dialogue on the ideological front.

To this end Dr. Lochman calls for a general offensive on ideology, a campaign for "deideologization." "Theological efforts" for "deideologization of modern life" have as their goal that humanity may "cross all ideologies" (pp. 139-140). But in the real world, especially in a socialist society, that means to "cross," or cross out, Marxism-Leninism.

The method which he recommends is to show that ideology is "theologically dubious." It is that, Dr. Lochman says, "because it tends to transfigure "the reality of the world and man in an illusionary way . . . tends to cover up . . . the real distress of society,

and interferes with necessary remedial action. . . . Christianity, wrapped in ideology, became the opiate of the people and of the people" (pp. 140, 29). (Marx used the word "opium.")

Dr. Lochman's purpose here is to establish that Christianity is not ideology, especially not "false consciousness," that it becomes pernicious when it is "wrapped in ideology." "Deideologization" in general is not the central thrust of Dr. Lochman on the ideological front. The target is actually materialism, as the following makes plain:

"If God is ideologically denied, man is threatened to become dissolved in his history, his society, and his future, and he becomes imprisoned in his immanence and his world projects. The penultimate becomes the ultimate for him. His total destiny then depends on his accomplishments."

But, "his future is greater than the future of his accomplishments . . . our salvation is not related to our efficiency or the failure of our attempts. Our accomplishment is not what is ultimate. . . . The ultimate, the proper future of man, is grace" (p.177)—that is, God.

Dr. Lochman argues that there are other-worldly "projects" about which man, "imprisoned" in this world, should concern himself; for this world is "penultimate," there is an "ultimate" world beyond this one; man's destiny depends not on what he does but on what some other-worldly fate has in store for him; man's fu-

ture, in short, lies in God. The "transcendence of grace [is] the ultimate dimension of human existence" (p. 177). The other world is the special preserve of the theologians; the "'ultimate concern' and radical vision [is] entrusted to . . . theologians," though "sometimes sadly neglected" by them (p. 13). In vulgar terms the theologians are the management of the "absoluteness" monopoly represented in Revelation.

Marxism holds, on the contrary, that "man is the highest essence for man," that the material world is not penultimate, but inclusive and ultimate, that even superstition is part of this world, not a peephole into another.

Neither the concept of materialism nor that of idealism is dealt with substantively by Dr. Lochman, although these constitute the two main streams of philosophy going back over two thousand years. Materialism is impinged on only in its facet of atheism. Idealism is not dealt with because to defend idealism against materialism would mean to subsume God under idealism. To subsume idealism under God would have corrosive consequences also.

"Mutual Interpellation"

The philosophic implications of Dr. Lochman's view of Christian-Marxist dialogue are illuminated by his resort to "mutual interpellation" to define the "meaning of dialogue" (pp. 185, 191). This "catchword was coined by a French Marxist . . . Roger Gar-

audy, in his effort to characterize a hopeful and meaningful form of dialogue" (p. 185).

Garaudy was expelled in 1970 by the Communist Party of France, of whose political Bureau he had been a member. The French Communist party indicted Garaudy, in part, for having "renounced . . . dialectical and historical materialism . . . as the universal method and conception of the world, as the philosophic foundation of the party." ("Communiqué of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party," *Information Bulletin, World Marxist Review*, No. 1-2, 1970).

"Mutual interpellation" effects a division of labor. "The special contribution of Marxists is to remind Christians of the importance of historical and social 'immanence'" (p. 186), that is, the "historical and social dimensions of human life" (p. 187). The "special charisma of Christians," on the other hand, "is to bear witness to the Marxists about the relevance of 'transcendence'" (p. 186). The purpose is transparent, if not transcendent. "Such an interpellation should lead [Marxists] to a greater attention to the motive of transcendence," Dr. Lochman says, "and consequently to a differentiated approach to the problem of the church and religion" (p. 188). That is, Marxists should be led, as the result of "mutual interpellation," into a receptive attitude toward religion, without surrendering their justifiably negative view of the role of the "Con-

stantinian church." Briefly stated: the Christians get an insight into this world, the Marxists into the other.

Dr. Lochman spells this out in the context of the symposium of "representative Marxists, Protestant, and Catholic thinkers" at Marianske Lazne (Marienbad), Czechoslovakia, in 1967. The Christian theologians either were or became converts to a vaporous historical materialism. A comparable softening, a complementary sogginess was evident in the "Marxist camp." Dr. Lochman notes with satisfaction that a tendency to pay "greater attention to the motive of transcendence" was "apparent in a number of Marxist contributions" (p. 188). He assays the developments in the "Marxist camp" as a "fundamental creative process of reorientation" (p. 182). The word which should have been underscored is "fundamental."

The problem of *transcendence* . . . was presented very strongly in the contributions of Czech Marxists" (p. 188-189). Dr. Lochman cites, specifically, the "remarkable attempt" of Milan Prucha "to develop a new Marxist approach to the problem of man" (p. 189).

"Prucha clearly refused to reduce the anthropological problem to the historical and social dimensions of man. It is true that man is a historical and social being, but these important dimensions of human life do not represent the full range of humanity. In

this connection, the question of real transcendence was posed.

"Prucha answered it by a reference to the concept of being, which must not be fixed prematurely either through the concept of matter (as in the case of traditional materialism) or through the concept of God (as is the case in religious tradition) . . ." (p. 189).

Prucha agrees with Dr. Lochman that it would be "premature" to fix "the concept of being" by either the materialist "concept of matter" or the idealist "concept of God." The "mature" issue, however, is where one ends—fixing the "concept of being" from a materialist or an idealist viewpoint. For Marxists, being is material; for idealists, being is God. Dr. Lochman agrees that that is the contradiction: the decisive difference between Marxism and the Christian image . . . [is] . . . the *question of God*" (p. 176); "Christian convictions" are "incompatible with Marxism-Leninism" (p. 93). The only purpose for dialogue about it is to bring the Marxists around to God, that is, to the abandonment of Marxist materialism. Dr. Lochman could chalk up some success.

"Prucha . . . confessed that, in the course of the Marxist-Christian dialogue, 'our Christian friends have awakened in us the courage and appetite for transcendence'" (p. 189).

Prucha complained, however, that the Christian theologians "immediately 'define' transcendence by the concept of 'God.'" "

He, the Marxist, insisted that, to "keep the problem of transcendence in its true profoundness," the question be "radicalized" by the theologians (p. 189). Prucha's injunction to the Christians to "radicalize" God to the "appetite" of the "Marxists" is truly an abomination.

Responding, Dr. Lochman said that "in the future it might be its [Marxism's] task not . . . to apply the brake on the Christian hankering after transcendence but, on the contrary, to free it from its religious trammels" (p. 189). Marxists are called on, thus, to denude "transcendence" of its traditional religious raiment, to provide Christians with a non-religious version of "transcendence." In return for abandoning materialism, the Marxists will get a radicalized idealism.

Dr. Lochman rejects this implication, that the result of "mutual interpellation" will be a theological-materialist mulligan stew. The "eventual outcome of the dialogue" is not to be "an amorphous mixture of something like a semi-Marxist Christianity or semi-Christian Marxism" (p. 191).

But if not that what? Dr. Lochman explains: "When the Marxist tries to take the problem of transcendence more seriously he does not convert to religious transcendentalism" (p. 191).

But if taking the "problem of transcendence more seriously" does not mean converting to religious "transcendentalism," what does it mean? It must mean, at least, that maybe Christianity is

right about "transcendentalism."

What less can it mean? But if it means even that little bit, that is the beginning of "transcendental Marxism," and the end of Marxism. That is implied also in Dr. Lochman's suggestion that there exist, on the ideological front, "potentialities of theoretical convergence" (p. 178) between Christianity and Marxism.

In Conclusion

Dr. Lochman complains that "Marxist ideology" postulates, "even when it proclaims the principle of peaceful coexistence on the international plane, that there cannot be any coexistence in the field of ideology" (p. 149). He implies that "peaceful coexistence on the international plane" should be complemented by "coexistence in the field of ideology." For Marxist-Leninists, however, neutrality on this front would mean surrender to bourgeois ideology which the capitalist system produces as inevitably as it produces surplus value. Neutrality would mean the betrayal of the revolutionary struggle of the working class.

The issue of peaceful coexistence in ideology cannot be considered usefully in the abstract, or from a liberal point of view. The issue is Marxist-Leninist ideology and capitalist ideology. The issue is neutrality in respect to capitalist ideology. Dr. Lochman has presented the conditions for peaceful coexistence on the ideological front—abandonment of materialism by Marxists, the surrender to idealism.

Index 1970

- Aptheker, Herbert**—Violence in the United States, Feb., 49, Mar., 52; Lenin, Science and Revolution, April, 58; Racism and Historiography, May, 54; Falsification in History, June, 53; The Nixon Administration: Liars Incarnate, July, 48; Aug., 43; The Politics of History, Oct., 53; Banfield: The Nixon-Model Planner, Dec., 34.
- Basmanov, M.**—The Role of Trotskyism in the Modern World, Mar., 38.
- Bert, Erik**—Reformism in Disguise, Jan., 33; Burns on the Business Cycle, Sept., 55; The Road to Transcendental Marxism, Dec., 56.
- Bestuzhev-Lada, I.**—Bourgeois Futurology and the Future of Mankind, Sept., 37.
- Chilean Parties**—A Basic Program for People's Unity, May, 58, July, 35.
- Colón, Clara**—A Rejoinder, June, 62.
- De Leon, Benjamin**—Marxism, Science and Idealism, Nov., 53.
- Editorial Comment**—Lenin's Place in History, April, 1; Farewell, Betty, May, 1; About the April Issue, May 5; Cambodia, Nixon's New Aggression, June, 1; A Brave Voice is Stilled, June, 6; The New Program of the CPUSA, July, 1; Against Genocide, Sept., 1; Happy Birthday Gus!, Oct., 1; On the 150th Birthday of Frederick Engels, Nov., 1; The People's Victory in Chile, Dec., 1.
- Ellis, Ray**—The Massachusetts Peace Movement, July, 15.
- Flory, Ishmael**—World Seminar on National Liberation, Feb., 20.
- Foley, Tom**—Lenin on Imperialism, June, 8; Revolution in the Arab World, Aug., 26.
- Font, A. W.**—The New York Teachers Union, Mar., 63.
- Galitz, Bernard E.**—New Left Closer to Marxism, Feb., 55.
- Ginsberg, Alan W.**—Some Questions on Trotskyism, Nov., 57.
- Hall, Gus**—Class Approach to Women's Liberation, Feb., 10; The World Scene, Mar., 3; Use of Objective Factors in Hastening Revolutionary Crises, April, 2; The Rank-and-File Upsurge: A New Page in Working-Class History, Aug., 1; Crisis of Petty-Bourgeois Radicalism, Oct., 3; History Has a Direction, Nov., 8.
- Hallinan, Matthew**—The Ideology of the New Left, Feb., 57; Lenin on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, April, 48.
- H. C.**—Science and Ideology, Mar., 56.
- Hudson, Hosea**—Thoughts on a Scientific Convention, July, 60.
- Industrial Workers of the World**—Letter from American Workers to the Soviet Government, Mar., 27.
- Jackson, James E.**—Lenin and National Liberation, May, 6; The Socialist Countries and the Class Struggle in the Capitalist Countries, Aug., 15.
- Johnson, Oakley C.**—Walter Lowenfels: Poet, Jan., 61; The Rebel Thirties, Aug., 55; The Guardian of Boston, Nov., 61.
- Krchmarek, A.**—The Cleveland Majority Elections, Jan., 27; Coal: The Industry and the Union, July, 26.
- Kuddes, Ernest (José Ristorucci and)**—The New York Mayorality Elections, Mar., 18.
- Kurzweil, Jack (and Al Richmond)**—State Monopoly Capitalism and the Anti-Monopoly Alliance, Jan., 49.
- Lenin, V. I.**—Frederick Engels, Nov., 14.
- Leroy, Gaylord C.**—Christopher Caudwell: A Marxist Critique, Aug., 63.
- Levine, Ben**—Robert Owen, Utopian Socialist, Sept., 62.
- Lightfoot, Claude**—Lenin Illuminates the Path to Black Liberation, June, 29; Black Power to People's and Working-Class Power, Oct., 20, Nov., 22.
- Lumer, Hyman**—"Dangerous Scott": Story of a Communist Leader,

- Mar., 60; The Middle East: War or Peace?, May, 40; Imperialism and Militarism, June, 40; A Reply, Nov., 59; On the Origins of the State of Israel, Dec., 51.
- Mason, Daniel**—U.S. Imperialism and Latin America: The Rockefeller Report, July, 2; The Philippines and Neo-Colonialism, Oct., 60.
- Meyers, George**—Lenin on the Trade Unions, April, 14.
- Millas, Orlando**—The People Will Know How to Make Their Victory Respected, Dec., 22.
- National Committee, CPUSA**—On the Lenin Centenary, Feb., 1.
- Otegbeye, Tunji**—Africa and National Liberation, Feb., 24.
- Patterson, William L.**—Scottsboro No "American Tragedy," Feb., 61; The Battle Against Racist Wars and Terror, Mar., 11; The Black Panther Party and the Black Liberation Struggle, Sept., 26.
- Perlo, Victor**—The U.S. and Japan: Economic Rivalries, Jan., 13; Lenin's Research Methods, May, 28; U.S. Imperialism Today, June, 18.
- Petrov, P. S.**—America Reads Lenin (1917-1919), Sept., 51.
- Phillipoff, Robert**—Monetary vs. Fiscal Policy, July, 63.
- Pittman, John**—Laos: Testing Ground for the Nixon Doctrine, Oct., 30.
- Political Committee, CPUSA**—Resolution on Gus Hall's 60th Birthday, Nov., 5.
- Resnikov, A.**—Sectarian Distortions of the National-Colonial Question, Feb., 20.
- Richmond, Al** (Jack Kurzweil and State Monopoly Capitalism and the Anti-Monopoly Alliance, Jan., 49.
- Riga, Rev. Peter J.**—Thoughts on the Middle East Conflict, Dec., 46.
- Ristorucci, José (and Ernest. Kuddes)**—The New York Mayoralty Elections, Mar., 18.
- Rothstein, Andrew**—A Correction, Mar., 59.
- Rubin, Daniel**—The Leninist Party: Vehicle for Revolution, April, 36.
- Shields, Art**—The Story Behind Lenin's "Letter to American Workers," Jan., 1.
- Smith, Rudolph**—Is the Family Revolutionary?, June, 61.
- Staff, The**—A Grievous Loss, Mar., 2.
- Steigerwald, Robert**—Critical Remarks on a "Critical Theory," Aug., 33.
- Steinmetz, H. C.**—Churchill Revisited, Aug., 59.
- Tormey, James J.**—The Need for a National Defense Organization, Oct., 30.
- Ulyanovsky, R. A.**—Lenin's Concept of Noncapitalist Development, Oct., 41, Nov., 41.
- Weinstone, William**—Lenin and the Struggle Against Opportunism, April, 24.
- West, James**—Lenin on Petty-Bourgeois Radicalism, May, 19; The Crisis of Collaborationist Labor Leadership, Nov., 32; The Steel Union's 15th Convention, Dec., 10.
- Winston, Henry M.**—Black Americans and the Middle East Conflict, Sept., 4.
- Zagarell, Michael**—The YSA: Trotskyite Roadblock to Progress, Sept., 16.