

JANUARY 1971

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

OUR FIFTIETH YEAR

Editorial Comment

THE 1970 ELECTIONS

Gus Hall

ABOUT THREE PHILOSOPHERS

James E. Jackson

THE GENERAL MOTORS STRIKE

Roscoe Proctor and Art Shields

STRUGGLES IN PUERTO RICO

Felix Ojeda

"SEXUAL POLITICS"

Carmen Ristorucci

60¢

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Editorial Comment</i>	
Our Fiftieth Year	1
<i>Gus Hall</i>	
The 1970 Elections	9
<i>James E. Jackson</i>	
About Three Philosophers: Frederick Engels, Herbert Marcuse, Angela Davis	23
<i>Roscoe Proctor and Art Shields</i>	
The General Motors Strike	35
<i>Felix Ojeda</i>	
Struggles in Puerto Rico	47
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>William J. Pomeroy</i>	
Neo-Colonialism: A Reply to Criticism	51
<i>Daniel Mason</i>	
Neo-Colonialism: A Rejoinder	56
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>Carmen Ristorucci</i>	
"Sexual Politics"	59

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.

Our Fiftieth Year

This issue is Volume 50, Number 1 of *Political Affairs*, undoubtedly the longest-lasting Marxist periodical in the history of the United States. It bears witness to the stability, vitality and growth of Marxism-Leninism and the Communist Party in this country.

As one ruffles through its multitudinous pages, it is possible to think of *Political Affairs* and its antecedents as merely a record of the many-faceted struggle for Marxism-Leninism and the building of the Communist Party as the vanguard organization of the working class. But *Political Affairs* and its forerunners are much more than a recital of history. Each of the magazine's pages—at its moment in time—has been the living embodiment of the continuous battle to make the Communist Party the firm and steadfast instrument of Marxism-Leninism in the United States, to make Marxism-Leninism the property of the American working class, the working masses and the oppressed peoples. In its pages there have developed the ideological struggles for industrial unionism, for the realization of the immediate needs of the working class, for Black liberation, for internationalism, for peace. Its pages have charted the course to socialism in the United States.

Many of those who wrote for this publication are dead now. But in these pages there still remain alive their never-ending fight for Marxist-Leninist theory and practice.

Others who wrote for it have since become renegades from Communism and joined the ranks of enemies of the working class and the American people. But these pages reveal the evolution of their decay and dissolution as Marxist-Leninists and the struggle against their distortions, their revisionism and sectarianism, that helped to purify the theory and practice of the Community Party, U.S.A.

Numerous Ancestors

Of Homer, it has been said that he was claimed by three thousand Grecian cities. Of *Political Affairs*, it can be said that it had numerous antecedents. It was born in the period of the imperialist World War I, of the great October Revolution of 1917 in Russia.

That was a time of great ferment in the American working class, among the Black people and the people of the United States gen-

erally. The horror of the imperialist war and the perfidy of U.S. imperialism, which had sucked the United States into that war, had shocked the nation. The great October Revolution, led by the Bolsheviks with V. I. Lenin at their head, and the birth of the Soviet Union had shown that it was possible to end capitalist exploitation and oppression of peoples by taking the revolutionary path to socialism.

This last was of particular significance to the advanced sections of the working class who had been battling for some years to force the Socialist Party to take the revolutionary road. They and the scores of thousands of workers outside the Socialist Party but responsive to its leadership saw in the theory and practice of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, which had brought success for the working class and oppressed peoples in Russia, the direction for the working people of the United States. They were eager to learn more of that theory and practice and to struggle for their application to the United States. The establishment of the Communist International on March 4, 1919, accelerated the struggle of the Left-wing forces to move the Socialist Party onto the revolutionary road. These forces were encouraged by this formation of such an international center, and a key point in their program was affiliation to the Communist International.

At first, the Left wing sought to achieve this through the Socialist Party. (In a national referendum of the Socialist Party, the proposal for disaffiliation from the Socialist International and joining the Communist International carried by a 10-to-1 vote and the Left wing won 12 seats out of 15 on the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party. But this was nullified by the middle-class leadership of the Socialist Party by means of mass expulsions. As a result, the forces of the Left wing were split on the next steps to be taken. Some advocated remaining in the Socialist Party to continue the battle for its affiliation to the Communist International. Others were for an immediate break and organization of an American Communist Party. But among these, too, there was a split concerning tactics and program. All these groups based themselves on Leninism, but with varying interpretations and rivalries.

To enlighten the advanced workers concerning Leninism and to carry on the ideological struggle among themselves for the development and unification of a Communist Party, these various groups established periodicals. The need for these periodicals became even more urgent with the institution of a reign of terror by the national,

state and local governments, which drove the various Left-wing groups underground.

Among these periodicals can be found the progenitors of today's *Political Affairs*. Some of them were a cross between newspapers and magazines; others were full-fledged magazines.

Here we shall not deal with the many differences among the Left wing in the Socialist Party, the Communist Party of America, the Communist Labor Party, the United Communist Party, the Workers Councils, the United Toilers. Nor shall we deal with the steps that led to the formation of a unified Workers Party in that early period. This is dealt with in the September 1969 issue of *Political Affairs*, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the CPUSA, and is a subject for a definitive history of the Communist Party of the United States. Here the only point to make is that it was in the periodicals issued by the various organizations that a great portion of the struggle over these differences took place.

One of the earliest of the ancestors of *Political Affairs* was the *Ohio Socialist*, the organ of the Ohio Socialist Party and other Midwest state parties in the struggle of the Left wing within the Socialist Party before the Communist Party was organized. It was started in 1917 and its last issue was dated November 19, 1919.

Another was *Revolutionary Age*, which was published in Boston and New York between November 16, 1918 and August 23, 1919. Originally it was the spokesman of the Left-wing Socialists of the Northeast. With the formation of the Communist Labor Party in September 1919, it became that party's organ until it merged with the Communist Party of America to become the United Communist Party. The *New York Communist* was another organ of the Left wing in the Socialist Party, which existed only from April 19 to June 21, 1919 and then became a part of *Revolutionary Age*.

Class Struggle was another of these early periodicals, published in New York between May, 1917 and November, 1919. In this magazine appeared for the first time some of the significant theoretical writings of Lenin. Originally, it proclaimed itself to be the theoretical organ of the Socialist Party. In its last issue it had become the "organ of the Communist Labor Party."

The *Voice of Labor*, which existed between August 15, 1919 and July 10, 1920, originally was published by the Labor Committee of the National Left Wing of the Socialist Party. Later it became the organ of the Communist Labor Party. Its last few issues were under the aegis of the United Communist Party.

Another was the *Workers Council*, which came out somewhat later—between April 1 and December 15, 1921—and was published by the Committee for the Third International.

Communist Labor, which appeared irregularly between December 6, 1919 and May 15, 1920, was also an official organ of the Communist Labor Party.

In this first period of the development and unification of the Communist Party there were a number of periodicals that had the name *The Communist*. Bringing order out of confusion concerning these is difficult, because rival groups within the Communist parties of the early period published organs under that name and also because the governmental reign of terror which began at the beginning of 1920 forced the publication of these periodicals underground.

The first *Communist* to appear was set up by a "National Organizing Committee" to establish "the Communist Party of America." This periodical, which was sponsored by the language federations which had been expelled by the Socialist Party leadership, and by the Michigan Socialist Party and other groups, lasted from July 19 to August 30, 1919. It was published in Chicago.

After the organization of the Communist Party of America in September, 1919, a new *Communist* was established, which was published in Chicago between September 27, 1919 and April 1, 1921. (There was another *Communist*, published in New York for three issues in the spring of 1920, which claimed the auspices of the Communist Party of America. But this was the organ of a minority group led by Charles E. Ruthenberg, who later became the general secretary of the United Communist Party.)

This was followed by another *Communist*, published between June 12, 1920 and April, 1921 in Chicago as the organ of the United Communist Party, which resulted from the fusion of the Communist Party of America and the Communist Labor Party.

Complicating matters further was the publication irregularly of a *Communist* between July 1921 and January 1923 in Chicago as the "organ of the Communist Party of America, Section of the Communist International."

While the various tendencies among the Communists contended in their periodicals, the very serious question of securing legality for the Communist movement in the United States developed. The government, by its harassment, persecution, jailings and deportations, had driven the Communists underground. It was necessary to set up a legal organization. This became the Workers Party, along with an

underground Communist Party.

The Workers Party published in New York a new *Communist*, which lasted from February to June, 1922.

At the same time a *Communist* was published in New York by the United Toilers, a Left Opposition group, which opposed the formation of the Workers Party.

As far as can be determined now, these were all the periodicals under the name of *Communist* that were published in that early formative period of the Communist Party in the United States.

Immediate Forerunners

Three other magazines must be listed here, even though they had no official connection to the various Communist parties and groups, because they played a significant role in the history of what is now *Political Affairs*.

The first of these was the *Liberator*. This was established by a group of writers and artists in March 1918, following the suppression in December 1917 of the *Masses* for its forthright struggle against the imperialist war. But while the *Masses* had been primarily a magazine of literature and art, the *Liberator's* emphasis was more political. It became at first a sort of unofficial organ of the Left wing in the Socialist Party and later of the Communists.

Another was the *Labor Herald* which was established in March 1922 in Chicago as the organ of the Trade Union Educational League, led by William Z. Foster.

The third was *Soviet Russia Pictorial*, which was the organ of the Friends of Soviet Russia.

All these early periodicals displayed varied forms of immaturity, sectarianism, opportunism, misunderstanding. Yet they all played a determining role in the development of the theory and practice of Marxism and its spread among the American masses; and they helped to set the foundations for the growth of the Communist Party.

In addition, they were instrumental in spreading Marxism-Leninism among the other countries of the Western Hemisphere and elsewhere. An example of this can be found in the early history of the Italian Communist Party.

In his book, *Antonio Gramsci and the Origins of Italian Communism* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1967), John M. Cammett writes:

Knowledge of Lenin and the Russian Revolution was not easy to come by in 1917-18, for wartime censorship was so strict in Italy

that very little news from Russia reached the country, especially after the October Revolution. . . . Immediately after the war, Gramsci began receiving copies of the *Liberator*, an American pro-Soviet publication edited by Max Eastman; until the founding of the Third International this was an important source for Gramsci of news from Russia, Hungary and Germany. (P. 59.)

By 1923, the activities of the Communists, the broadening of their ties among the masses and the pressures of the times had changed the political climate in the United States, making legality possible. As a result, the underground Communist Party was dissolved in April, 1923, and the Workers Party became the only Communist organization in the United States. (In 1925, the party name was changed to Workers [Communist] Party, and in 1929 to Communist Party.)

A reflection of the unity of the Communists in this period was the establishment of the *Workers Monthly* in New York in November 1924, as a consolidation of the *Labor Herald*, the *Liberator* and *Soviet Russia Pictorial* as the "official organ of the Workers Party and the Trade Union Educational League."

This first issue of the *Workers Monthly* is numbered Volume IV, Number 1. Apparently this numbering was taken from the *Labor Herald*, whose Volume I, Number 1, was dated March 1922 and its last number was Volume III, Number 8, for October, 1924. Therefore, *Political Affairs'* serial lineage appears to have its beginning in the *Labor Herald*.

The cover of Volume I, Number 1, of the *Workers Monthly* displayed a bright, colorful and spritely cartoon of a Soviet sailor and soldier marching together. Page 3 emblazoned an announcement that "not only will the *Workers Monthly* bring you each month the best thought on the fields of industrial and political struggle in the United States, and the productions of the best revolutionary artists. It will also receive and publish regularly the current writings of the outstanding writers of the Communist International and the Red International of Trade Unions."

In its editorial columns, it declared:

Amalgamation of craft unions along industrial lines into organizations powerful enough to fight effectively, remains a first demand of the militants. This demand is a prerequisite, also, to the effective application of any program of organizing the unorganized; the unorganized millions must be drawn into the unions on pain of severe defeat for the labor movement. To this end all racial discriminations must be removed, especially those against the 12,000,000 Ne-

groes, to organize whom labor must exert itself, standing firmly upon the demand for absolute equality of all races. The menace of unemployment must be combated, and the labor movement must fight for unemployment relief, nationalization of idle factories and industry, unity of the unemployed, unity of the employed and unemployed, the organized and unorganized. . . . American imperialism, enemy alike of labor in the United States, in Central and South America, in China, in Europe, must be fought against by the labor movement with all its strength. . . .

In its first period, the *Workers Monthly* still reflected the contents of its three progenitors. It contained poems, cartoons and travelogues. But by its last issue, that of February, 1927, it had become completely the theoretical organ of the Workers (Communist) Party.

In March, 1927, the name of the magazine was changed to *The Communist*, which proclaimed itself as "a theoretical magazine for the discussion of revolutionary problems published by the Workers (Communist) Party."

The Communist, whose first issue was numbered Volume VI, Number 1, began rather inauspiciously. This was a period of extreme factionalism in the Communist Party, with one faction led by William Z. Foster, the other by Charles E. Ruthenberg. The petty-bourgeois Right opportunists and followers of Trotsky took advantage of this factional struggle to spread disruption in the Party. As William Weinstein declares, in his unpublished "Lecture Notes on the History of the CPUSA":

Aside from the fact that the factional struggle impeded the energy of the two strands of the movement, factionalism had a shattering effect on the discipline and authority of the Party. It turned the Party inwardly and prevented full mobilization of its strength for mass work. Above all, for the young Party it prevented the proper Bolshevik training of its membership because the factions covered up the weaknesses and mistakes of factional adherents and leading forces and because one-sided distorted factional criticism replaced Marxist party criticism and self-criticism.

The first issue of this new *Communist* contained articles by Jay Lovestone, the Right opportunist who later became the AFL leadership's anti-Soviet, anti-Communist "expert" and State Department agent, and by Max Schachtman and W. F. Dunne, both later expelled from the Party as Trotskyites.

It wasn't until after the Party's Sixth National Convention in 1929, and the expulsion of the Right opportunists and Trotskyites that *The Communist* could become an effective instrument in the struggle for

the application of Marxism-Leninism in the United States. From then on until its last issue in December, 1944, the Communist played a determining role in the struggles of the working class and the working masses during the Great Depression, in raising the fight for Black liberation to a nationwide issue, in the battles against fascism and for peace, in strengthening the Party ideologically for these struggles.

Political Affairs: The Postwar Years

With the January 1945 issue, Volume XXIV, Number 1, the name of the magazine was changed to *Political Affairs*. This occurred in another very difficult period for the Party.

During World War II, the revisionist concept of "American exceptionalism" and illusory notions about a new type of capitalists were brought into the Communist Party by Earl Browder. Unfortunately, they were widely accepted—even if reluctantly by some. As a result, in 1944 the Communist Party became the Communist Political Association and the Party was completely liquidated in the South. In 1945, the Party recovered from this madness and the first task of *Political Affairs* became that of carrying on an ideological struggle against these revisionist distortions of Marxism-Leninism and to rebuild the Party for the pressing political battles that followed World War II.

The twenty-five years since World War II have been strenuous years for *Political Affairs*. It has been a time of witchhunts, of repression and intimidation, of drives to destroy the Communist Party. It has been a period of cold war and hot war carried on by U.S. imperialism at the head of the world imperialist forces.

It has also been a period of increasing struggle by the working class, of the advance of the Black liberation movement to a qualitatively new level, of the rising struggles of the Chicano and Puerto Rican peoples, of the mushrooming of the student movement, of the upsurge of the struggle for women's liberation.

In all these struggles, *Political Affairs* has always sought to be a motivating force, to apply the science of Marxism-Leninism to them, to gird the Communist Party and the Left for participation in them.

As *Political Affairs* begins its fiftieth year, the one important fact that needs to be stressed is that—unlike most other magazines—it has always been a part of the struggles of the masses and will continue to be in the future.

The 1970 Elections*

The 1970 elections were of unusual significance, including the fact that in many ways they were the dress rehearsals for the 1972 presidential elections. But more important, they were of significance because the issues, the trends, the main forces, the opportunities, and the great dangers all emerged into sharp focus. We must study these elections in a special way, giving much attention to the trends and forces that lie beneath the act of voting.

The Nixon-Agnew Blitzkrieg

The central element that gave the elections a special character and significance was the attempted blitzkrieg by the most reactionary ultra-Right forces led by Nixon and Agnew. It would be an unforgivable error to underestimate the serious nature of this attack. It would especially be a mistake because the elections were an important battle in the new offensive of reactionary capital.

While seeing the dangers it is also essential that we confront the pessimism created by a section of the mass media, insisting that our nation is moving headlong to the Right. In the overall sense, we must fully appreciate that the 1970 elections were a defeat of the Right-wing grab for power.

It was the best-financed reactionary campaign in history. The estimates are that the Republicans alone spent in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000. Even the most extreme Right-wing candidates such as Buckley, Reagan, Rafferty and other Birchite candidates this time had no difficulty in raising tens of millions of dollars. In this sense, there is a significant shift within the top financial circles toward supporting ultra-Right candidates and forces. The fund-raising affair for Buckley represented the emergence of a new financial base in the very top monopoly and banking circles for Right-wing policies. It would be naive to think that Nixon and Agnew went out to purge Charles E. Goodell because of subjectivity. Agnew's election rhetoric reflected the shift in the top monopoly circles towards the more conservative political groupings. It would also be naive not to recognize that this has added a new dimension to the ultra-Right, fascist danger in our

* The following is a section of a report presented to the National Committee of the Communist Party USA on November 21, 1970.

country.

The nature of the blitzkrieg to purge specific senators and congressmen exposes the aims of this new reactionary alliance. It was not mainly directed against senators who differed on domestic issues and it was not even based on their differences on the issue of law and order. A week before the elections these same senators voted for and helped to pass Nixon's police-state bill. It was not based on differences over civil rights and racism. Most of those on the list to be purged had either totally retreated or else they did not have to retreat, because they never were for civil rights. What, then, was the central issue?

It was the differences over the long-range, basic policies pursued by the military-industrial complex. It was differences over the coming \$100-billion-plus military budgets, over policies of military aggression—that is, whether to continue the aggression in Vietnam or to retreat. The differences over domestic issues emerged only as they are related to policies of militarization and military aggression. Here I am not speaking about differences between the Nixon policies and the electorate but rather about differences within ruling-class circles as reflected by members of Congress. These differences have appeared within the senate Foreign Relations Committee and therefore the central focus of the purge was chairman J. W. Fulbright and the members of that committee.

Nixon's major goal in seeking control of the Senate was to remove the restraints which that body has imposed on his militarist policy and to erase the image of a Constitutional crisis from his Administration. His "game plan" or rather his "plot," as it deserves to be called, sounded plausible. The election of seven Republicans would have made it possible for him to control the Senate, and so to topple Senator Fulbright who has been a prime obstacle in Nixon's attempt to dominate foreign policy.

A second aim of the blitzkrieg was to purge the senators who had blocked Nixon's efforts to take over the Supreme Court. What he has sought is a Court that will legalize his racist policies and uphold his police-state measures.

The intensity of Nixon's ambitions led him to go all-out to obtain his objectives. He assumed "battlefield command" and threw all the reactionary resources and troops into the fray. It is in this sense that we must assess the success or failure of this political move.

Setbacks for Reaction

The truth is that, if anything, the composition of the Senate and

the House moved away from support of many of the extreme Nixon policies. The defeat of some more moderate candidates is balanced by the election of others and by the defeat of some reactionary candidates. And if anything, Nixon has created the conditions for stronger Senate opposition to his policies, including the fact that during the campaign 22 Republican senators signed a statement in support of Goodell, one of those marked for purging.

Most of the congressmen who have taken a forthright position on peace and most of the new candidates who came through the primaries and who are for peace won election. This includes the militant Bella Abzug, also Don Dellums, a militant progressive Black candidate in California, and other candidates such as John Seiberling in Ohio, James Abourezk in South Dakota, Teno Roncalio in Wyoming, R. L. Mazzoli in Kentucky, and—very important—the first Puerto Rican congressman, Herman Badillo. The list includes Robert Drinan in Massachusetts, Sarbanes and Mitchell in Maryland, and Ella Gross in Connecticut. Nor can one overlook the defeat of many reactionary and conservative office holders: Burton of Utah, Kleppe of North Dakota, Kramer of Florida, Ayres of Ohio, Adair of Indiana and many others in that category.

A poll taken on the attitudes of the 56 new congressmen indicated that whereas only 8.6 per cent of the old House members favored immediate withdrawal from Vietnam, 23 per cent of the newly elected members favor immediate withdrawal. Among the older group 58 per cent favored Nixon's Vietnamization. Among those newly elected the proportion has dropped to 41 per cent.

The election of Wilson Riles, a progressive Black candidate, as Superintendent of Schools in California is a very significant victory, as is the election of Milton B. Allen, a Black Democrat, as State Attorney General in Maryland. Riles' defeat of the ultra-Right incumbent Max Rafferty embodies real political drama. A Black candidate defeats a white racist in a state-wide election. This dramatizes the role of the Black liberation movement in the struggle for democracy and shows that it is a force against reaction in general.

In Texas the newly formed La Raza Unida Party's candidate, Rodriguez, won the post of County Commissioner. While the total is still all too small, it is important that three additional Black congressmen were elected. The election of Dellums, Collins and Mitchell with the help of a sizable number of white working-class voters adds a new dimension to the possibilities of destroying the racist restrictions against Black office holders. This is also the lesson from the state-

wide elections in California, Maryland and Michigan.

While the returns are not complete, it is estimated that some 200 Black candidates from over 600 running were elected. In the South there are 100 newly elected Black officials of the 300 that entered the contests.

Also significant are the victories, in San Francisco and Detroit, of the anti-war referendums calling for withdrawal of the troops in Vietnam, as well as the big vote for "immediate withdrawal" in Massachusetts.

While the overall results are a rebuff to the blitzkrieg, the picture, of course is not all victories. The Nixon-Agnew forces won a number of important contests in the defeat of Senators Gore and Duffy and in the breakthrough election of the conservative candidate Buckley in New York.

The defeat of a number of Republican governors in key states, and especially in industrial states, carries its own significance. These governors were a key element in Nixon's long range "plot." They served as the power base for the reactionary coalition.

The loss of Republican control in a number of state legislatures, especially in California, Florida and Illinois, opens up new possibilities for struggle on reapportionment that will make it possible to elect new working-class Black and Chicano congressmen.

Problems and Weaknesses

We would be naive if we did not take warning from the nature of the reactionary blitzkrieg. The style was McCarthyite and fascist-like. It was the most demagogic within memory. Vilification and slander had no bounds. The attempted San José provocation is without precedent in modern times. The main ingredient of this campaign was fear, slander and confusion. The aim was to panic enough of the electorate to swing the country to the Right. The Nixon-Agnew rhetoric also contained a new level of red-baiting. There is no question that the red-baiting against Duffy in Connecticut and against Metzenbaum in Ohio had its effects. All this is part of the necessary background for a correct evaluation of the results.

Thus the first key problem area one must place on the scales is the nature of the blitzkrieg organized, inspired and directed by the executive branch of the federal government.

The second negative factor was the retreat and confusion in the ranks of liberals. In many cases it was not this time just a question of wavering. It was a retreat. Most of the liberals dropped the Viet-

nam issue. They themselves took up the "law and order" theme. And none of the liberals really took on Agnew. In their retreat most of them not only failed to take on the Nixon policies, but presented no positive programs of their own.

The third problem element is the unpleasant fact that the forces on the Left were dispersed and confused. Some retreated to cover up their right flank. Others had become victims of the petty-bourgeois radical virus of withdrawing from the electoral struggles.

In this period the small and insignificant group of anarchistic elements, including the police agents among them, behaved as perfect foils for reaction. They spaced their bombs and headlines very well. Because of their actions, it is difficult to say which bombs were set off by police agents and which were set off by anarchists playing at revolution. Once the doors are opened to police and individual terror it is easy for reaction to play with it and instigate Reichstag fires.

The fourth factor we must consider is the role of the labor leadership. In a general sense, the political impotence of the leading core of the leadership of organized labor was established at the Labor Day political castration party at the White House.

While the last-minute statements by Meany and others no doubt had their positive effects, they were, however, diffused by their support for the reactionary policies of the Nixon Administration in the preceding period.

These are some of the problems, weaknesses and negative factors that emerged during the campaign. We must not overlook them. But they were by far not the most important factors.

Progressive Grass-Roots Trends

The most important—and positive—new factor that emerged in this election was the appearance of profound progressive trends in the grass roots and especially in the ranks of the working class, black and white. This most significant development overshadows all other features of the elections.

In key districts when the liberals—especially the Democratic Party liberals—retreated and panicked, it was the working class that became the main barrier to reaction. When sections of the ruling class withdrew their financial support to the victims of the Nixon-Agnew blitzkrieg, the trade unions moved in. Within the context of this campaign I think it is of some significance that in 23 of the Senate campaigns the unions outspent the Democratic Senate Campaign

Committee, which is the major source of funds for candidates, by a margin of 5 to 1. For example, Stevenson in Illinois received \$5,000 from the Democratic Committee and \$22,300 from the unions. Tunney in California received \$5,000 from the Democratic Campaign Committee and \$40,000 from the unions. Hartke of Indiana received \$16,000 from the Democratic Committee and almost \$40,000 from the unions. And so on down the line. The role of the working class in this situation has historic connotations for its future class role.

In another context, I shall go into more detail about labor's role in this election.

The other really significant positive factor in these elections was the role of the Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican communities. The racist policies of the Nixon Administration as they existed before the elections and as they emerged in its electoral tactics together with the retreat of the more liberal forces—especially in and around the Democratic Party—set the stage and marked out the difficulties for Black and Chicano participation in these elections.

As if by agreement, in many areas the candidates of the two parties not only avoided the issue of racism, but boycotted the Black communities. For example, the forces in Tennessee around Gore, who had a good position against the aggression in Vietnam and voted against the confirmation of Haynesworth and Carswell, expected the Black voters spontaneously to rally for him while his committee ran a campaign geared to win over the racist Wallace supporters in the eastern part of the state. Such an electoral tactic is fast becoming out of step with the political realities in many states. It is to the credit of Black voters that many of them overlooked this crass opportunism of Gore and, as a matter of choice between evils, voted for him anyway. The Chicano voters faced a similar dilemma with the Tunney and Unruh campaigns in California. In spite of all these difficulties, wherever it was possible they expressed their sentiment against racism, against the war in Vietnam, against Nixon's economic policies, against the ultra-Right challenge. The Black voters registered heavily in the progressive column.

In view of the serious problems the overall positive outcome of the elections is all the more striking. These positive results can be explained only by adding one more factor to the assessment. This factor is the level of political understanding, the deep awareness of the nature of the basic issues in the confrontation on the part of a large section of the electorate.

As the election campaign progressed, increasing sectors of the

people began to see Nixon and Agnew in their true light. Their reactionary "overkill" methods touched a deep nerve. At such moments masses drew on experiences and even on traditions. And defense of the democratic structure is part of that experience and tradition.

It is of the greatest significance that the center of the popular forces that withstood the onslaught of the ultra-Right reactionary offensive is based in the industrial working classes and among the Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican peoples. This is the most solid base for further struggles and victories.

It was, by and large, a spontaneous rank-and-file grass roots reaction. The positive activity by leading people in the trade unions during the last days of the campaign was in itself a response to this upsurge in the grass roots.

Was this a response only to economic issues? There would be nothing wrong if it were so. But to attribute it only to the economic issues in the narrow sense would miss the mark. Other sections of the people have the same problems of taxes, inflation, rents, insurance costs, and so on.

The vote was actually against the economic effects of the war policies. It was against the continuation of the war in Vietnam. It was against the racist policies of the southern strategy. It was a reaction against the ultra-Right direction of the offensive and to the sharpening class confrontation. In a sense, it was a reaction to the monstrous "overkill" character of the Nixon Agnew campaign. The reactions of the last days of the campaign represented a backfiring.

I think there was a period when a danger existed that the blitz would succeed. It is in this sense our Party's warning about the ultra-Right danger in the elections was necessary and timely. In the last days this theme was picked up by important liberal and progressive forces.

It is necessary to say something about the student participation in the elections, if only to reject the concept that they were not a factor. As we recall, the Cambodian invasion stimulated a massive student drive to participate in the 1970 election campaign. Dozens of organizations were formed all over the nation, among them organizations like Referendum 70, The Movement for a New Congress and Coalition for a Responsible Congress.

True, the founders of these organizations, in many cases, had in mind diverting the students from mass demonstrations to electoral activities. But many of these movements have continued as important instruments for bringing students into electoral politics. While many

withdrew from campaign activity after Nixon was forced to pull out ground troops from Cambodia, tens of thousands remain committed to using the electoral process as a method of struggle.

Most of the student efforts were coordinated through the Movement for a New Congress. It has branches in some 450 college campuses. It is estimated that 75,000 students took an active part in many of the campaigns. Often they were the margin of victory. Most of the students active in the elections supported peace, Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano candidates.

The Role of the Communists

The assessment of these elections would not be complete without some words about the work and role of our Party.

First, we should congratulate our comrades in Minnesota, New York and Chicago for their foresight and determination in fielding Communist candidates. In a sense, this praise is a two-edged sword because it is also a criticism of our comrades in the other districts who did not show the necessary understanding and did not struggle for Communist candidates. In the leadership of some districts the policy of no Communist candidates continues as a matter of principle. We want especially to congratulate Betty Smith and the Party in Minnesota for the 13,000 votes that she received in the elections. If we had done as well on a national scale our vote would be in the vicinity of 750,000. To get over 100 votes in a small iron mining town, as Betty did in the Mesabi Range, I think, is a very significant achievement. And knowing that many towns posted no votes for the Communist candidates, I think it is correct to assume that most likely as many votes were ignored as were counted. In this sense, the Minnesota vote stands as a measure not only of the growing influence of the Party but of the possibilities that exist in the electoral arena.

In New York Comrades Storey, Johnson and Stevens spoke directly to more New Yorkers on radio and television than ever before in the history of the Party in that state.

But there are some serious political shortcomings we must examine, more extensively than is possible in these remarks. For example, why is it that we were not able to be a more effective force in uniting and mobilizing the Left spectrum in these elections? And, in a sense even more important and serious, why do we not have examples of cases where we tried, where we took initiatives but failed? What are the influences in our ranks that prevent us from taking such initiatives? I will discuss separately the hangups in the Left ranks but I am

now talking about weaknesses in our Party.

During the last three weeks of the campaign the dangers of a reactionary victory and the nature of the challenge presented by the Nixon-Agnew onslaught became very clear. In the Political Committee of our Party we took note of the practical problems involved in this challenge, especially as related to a number of senatorial races. We took a number of practical steps to influence the campaigns and the outcome of some of the races. Because of the closeness of many of these races, I think it is correct to assume that in some cases we did influence the results.

These actions by our Political Committee were correct and very necessary. As a matter of fact, these actions plus the early criticism of the retreat of liberals and our alert on the dangers of provocations, as well as the signaling of the nature and dangers of the blitzkrieg were important contributions to the election campaign.

The Nature of Our Weaknesses

But we must take note of the fact that there was stubborn resistance and widespread hesitation about becoming practically involved, whether in Left or broader campaigns or even in Communist Party campaigns, and we must ask why. Is it because some think we should not have been concerned with the outcome in the senatorial races in New York, California, Illinois, Ohio, Connecticut and Tennessee? What is the source of this hangup?

I think it is related to more basic weaknesses of theory and policy in our Party. I think we have to distinguish the bases of the weaknesses in our Party from those of the weaknesses in the non-Communist Left. When we have difficulty in moving our Party into activity on any level in the elections, it is because of passivity—of no-fight, conservative Right opportunism. It is a softening of the Party's fighting fiber.

There seems to be a sense of uneasiness about united front tactics in our Party. Or maybe the word should be "unsureness." This results in a lack of boldness. It results in not taking the political bull by the horns.

In fact, there seems to be a curious confusion. It seems permissible for us to be interested in and even become excited about the struggles within broader circles. And it even seems proper by inference (but *only* by inference) to approve or even applaud slightly—though quietly—when more liberal or moderate elements win in elections. But while this interest is permissible, somehow or other we should

not become involved in any practical sense. Such a confusion arises only because of erroneous basic concepts.

This weakness is based on past mistakes. It is a shyness based on past one-sidedness.

To be a political factor—to become involved—that we must! Some don't become involved because it means struggle and work. I don't know what to say about such Communists. One cannot be a Communist in the party sense without working relationships with organized masses.

How to become involved? What is the content of our involvement? These are very legitimate questions. But we cannot meaningfully discuss them until we *are* involved. Therefore the question of becoming involved is a priority question. To correct some of these weaknesses I think we must re-examine our relationships from a basic Leninist position. We must clearly establish the two sides of this concept and the fact that these two sides or phases must operate simultaneously. One phase of this policy Lenin stated as follows:

. . . The more powerful enemy can be vanquished only by exerting the utmost effort, and by the most thorough, careful, attentive, skilful and *obligatory* use of any, even the smallest, rift between the enemies, any conflict of interest among the bourgeoisie within the various countries and among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie within the various countries, and also by taking advantage of any, even the smallest, opportunity of winning a mass ally, even though this ally is temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who do not understand this reveal a failure to understand even the smallest grain of Marxism, of modern scientific socialism *in general*. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 70-71.)

The other side, in a general sense, is contained in the following words of Lenin, written in 1906:

Liebknrecht teaches us that a Social-Democrat must be able to expose the dangerous aspects of every ally in the bourgeois camp and not conceal them. . . . Only bad Social-Democrats can make light of the harm done to the working class by the liberal betrayers of the cause of the people's liberty who ingratiate themselves with them by means of electoral agreements. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 11, pp. 402, 403.)*

* This was written before the term "Communist" came into use. The people Lenin calls Social-Democrats are those we would today call Communists.

One, our policy is clearly a policy of involvement. But two, it is a policy of involvement with one's eyes open. It is a policy of agreements on principle and disagreements on principle. It is a policy of unity but it is also a policy of independence. It is a policy of agreements and a policy of criticism. It is a policy of working unitedly but a policy of exposure of those who are liberals only when it is politically convenient. In these relationships the class question is paramount. In these relationships our Party must be the champion, the defender, the mobilizer and the organizer of the working class.

It is this special contribution that we bring into these united front relationships. We have other problems, but I think the number one problem is to put an end to the hangups that keep our Party from being the bold initiator of united front movements in which it carries through its revolutionary tasks. We cannot afford to be bench warmers and spectators while the fight goes on.

What Is Needed

What does this approach mean in the concrete terms of today's reality? Let us put it all together:

1. The people of the United States face a sharpened confrontation and new dangers because of the enlarged scope of the ultra-Right reactionary drive inspired and led by the President and the cutthroat gang around him.

2. The dangers have become more serious because new sections of monopoly capital have moved toward supporting more reactionary and ultra-Right positions. Some have obviously concluded that U.S. capitalism in trouble cannot afford the luxury of democratic rights.

3. The problems have become more serious also because many of the bourgeois liberals have retreated and are wavering.

This is one side of the picture. But on the other side is the political upsurge of masses who stood up and blocked the ultra-Right racist grab for electoral power. And what is even more significant is that this upsurge at the polls has its base in the working-class, Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano communities.

Such are the factors in this movement. What is our plan of action?

The answer to the problem is obvious. The outlines were clearly etched by the voters in the elections. What this country needs more than anything else is the crystallization of the trends and currents that were expressed in the voting booth. The forces of reaction were

held back in the elections. With organization and struggle they can be defeated. I think that is the message of the elections.

In broad terms, what this country needs, and what is now possible, is a massive people's movement, a *coalition of people's movements*, a coalition geared to the problems and currents expressed by the working-class, Black and Chicano movements working closely with the students and other sections of the population. It would be a coalition that does not replace or take over the role of specific movements.

Such a coalition will not emerge as one immediately challenging the two-party electoral system. This is an obstacle on which many new formations have floundered before they were able to build political strength. More important than challenging the forms is to challenge the political essence of the two-party system. It is also obvious that while there must be national coordination and national forms, these people's political formations must take root in the communities, in Congressional districts. While this movement will not ignore the two-party forms it is more important to build movements of concerned people than of concerned Democrats, though they will include Democrats who are concerned. This concept is not new but the need and the possibilities are new. There is an urgent need for bold initiatives by our Party in this direction. This concept should result in people's conferences, people's congresses, people's committees and clubs. This was the scope of the electoral upsurge. It is the politics of the anti-monopoly concept. The moment calls for a broad front against reaction—against repression, racism and wars of aggression.

It is a coalition through which the working class, the Black liberation movement, the Puerto Rican and Chicano movements, the peace movement, the women's liberation movement, would conduct their political campaigns and elect their representatives to political office.

The next lesson the election results point to clearly and urgently is the need for Left-progressive political forms. In this connection it seems to me there is a very legitimate question the forces on the Left must answer. Very concretely, what role did the Left play in the efforts to defeat Buckley in New York, Murphy and Rafferty in California, or Smith in Illinois. And it would be important for us to know what role the Left played in the election of the three new Black congressmen. I know there are some very interesting experiences in the election of Dellums in California. What role the Left played in this campaign would be of great interest.

It is true that the Left was not totally absent in these elections. But it is also true that, in general, it was disoriented and was not a vital enough force. It seems clear the Left was laboring with a number of political millstones around its neck. There is still the influence of petty-bourgeois radicalism. It is an attempt to apply the counter-community concept to electoral politics, to apply the concept of "doing one's own thing" on the Left. It is unbelievably infantile—but the results are damaging.

Left Formations

Because we on the Left have not stated what went wrong in the efforts that resulted in the formation of the Peace and Freedom and Freedom and Peace parties and a dozen other Left electoral organizations two years ago, the Left is saddled with the ghosts of those past efforts. Therefore, even at this late date, in order to clear the air we must state that it was not wrong to organize these Left electoral formations. In fact, these efforts were very necessary and were important historic acts.

What went wrong is that in many cases these new and weak efforts were influenced or taken over by elements which had the counter-community concept of the Left. The difficulties only multiplied when the national movement and the Presidential campaign were taken over by such counter-community elements. They remained small because of Right, conservative influences, but petty-bourgeois radicalism more than any other factor destroyed these movements.

What were some of these wrong concepts? 1) That these formations had nothing to do with the rest of the progressive or liberal community or movements. 2) That it was not possible or necessary to win the working class or the Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano communities to support these Left efforts. 3) That their main task was to attack the liberals. It is *our* weakness that we have not fully explained and exposed these weaknesses. As long as masses on the Left think that this is what we have in mind when we speak about Left formations we are not going to succeed.

We must project a Left that from the very beginning takes a principled position on basic questions and presents radical solutions but rejects petty-bourgeois radical concepts. Many Left forces are not now joining in such attempts because they don't think it is possible to build a Left without such concepts or hangups. Nobody has publicly stated differently. All experience indicates, however, that wherever a correct concept of the Left is presented there is a

good response. Therefore, we must again boldly take initiatives to set into motion new Left-progressive formations. There is no reason why, at least in the big cities, we should not take such initiatives. The need for them is manifold, including that we need them as forms through which we can further break through the wall of fear and hesitation about running and campaigning for Communist candidates. There is a need for such formations because the working class cannot break through its old patterns of political action without them.

These formations or parties cannot be Communist, but neither should they be anti-Communist. They should not try to be an alternative to broader coalitions. They should have independent candidates, especially working-class, Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano and youth. Such formations could be more meaningful to the radicalized youth.

These two of the three prongs of our electoral policy—Communist candidacies and candidacies of independent formations—are not miles apart; they overlap and complement one another. In fact, the three prongs are not three policies; they are three sides of one electoral policy.

There is a growth in the number of Black Americans being elected to public office. This progress should convince all that it is possible to make a major breakthrough on this front. In most cases they are elected as Democrats. But experience already shows that there are limitations and difficulties along this path. Some of the limitations are created by the reactionary control of the party machines. This has become a sharp issue, for example, in Gary and Cleveland. There the need for broad people's and Left organizations has become urgent. We must state that without such formations Black representation can suffer a setback.

Finally, it is also a lesson from these past elections that without such intermediary organizations we Communists are not a very strong force in determining the course of events—even during a critical election campaign. We must take the necessary steps now so that we can be a force in the 1972 elections.

I have dealt extensively with the elections because they are an important mirror of most of our problems. In a basic sense, these are not narrow electoral problems. They are political problems that were sharply reflected in the elections.

About Three Philosophers: Fredrick Engels, Herbert Marcuse, Angela Davis*

Comrades!

Allow me, first of all, to convey the warm fraternal greetings of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States and the personal best wishes of Comrades Gus Hall and Henry Winston to all delegates and participants of this significant international conference marking the 150th anniversary of the birth of Frederick Engels.

In the name of our Party permit me to express the deepest appreciation to the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and its foremost leader Comrade Walter Ulbricht for the preparation of this most important meeting and for our invitation to participate.

I join with all comrades who have expressed esteem for the richly informative opening address of Comrade Friedrich Ebert and for all the valued contributions which have followed from this podium.

"A Torch of Reason"

Quoting from a poem by Nekrasov, Lenin's memorial tribute to Frederick Engels referred to him as "a torch of reason." ("Frederick Engels," *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 19.) "After his friend Karl Marx . . . Engels was the finest scholar and teacher of the modern proletariat . . .," Lenin said. (*Ibid.*)

Inseparable in their friendship from first encounter as young men in their twenties till Marx's death in 1883, the great duo who introduced to the workers of the world the true path of struggle for a workers' world shared in inseparable measure in each other's creations.

Epitomizing their service to the march of man in history, Lenin wrote that "they taught the working class to know itself and be

* The following article is based on a speech presented at an International Scientific Conference held in Berlin, G. D. R. on November 12 and 13, 1970 on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Frederick Engels.

conscious of itself, and they substituted science for dreams." (*Ibid.*, p. 20.)

Karl Marx's son-in-law and Engels' friend, Paul Lafargue, wrote that "Marx always admired the universality of Engels' knowledge, his quickness of mind which enabled him to switch with ease from one subject to another, while Engels on his part was amazed at Marx's remarkable analytic powers and his capacity for generalization." (Quoted in Y. Stepanova, *Frederick Engels*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1968.)

It is a good fortune of history, and of the role of the working class in its making, that these moral and intellectual giants met and merged the great talents of their genius in a lifetime of working collaboration and common purpose. The working relationship between Engels and Marx is history's most creative partnership, and the story of their friendship will always remain a model of inspiration for fostering those selfless relations of true brotherhood which ought to obtain between comrades.

"His (Engels') love for the living Marx and his reverence for the memory of the dead Marx were boundless," Lenin wrote. His devotion to Marx was as a testament and measure of his boundless love for and devotion to the cause of the working class. It was the workers, the primary revolutionary class, whom Marx and Engels disclosed to be that social force which, in the revolutionary action of emancipating itself, was destined to liberate the human race "from the jungle of necessity" and set it upon the ever-ascending high ground of genuine freedom.

In these days when there is much talk of "model building," I think it germane to our needs as Communists, as members of the great leadership vanguard of the changers and remolders of the earth and the age, to pause before the personality of Frederick Engels and take note of that special distinguishing feature of his personality—his working class modesty, his complete absence of self-centeredness and vainglory. Though his close friends sometimes referred to him as "The General" (in admiration for his gallant military role in the uprising of 1848 and his continuous expertise in military science and events), Engels never held or sought a title or a rank. He never brooded over the fact that his name was often absent from the identification or designation of the science which they—Marx and Engels—had jointly brought forth and elaborated. It was never a problem to Engels to play "second fiddle" to that towering genius of Marx whom Engels characterized as "the greatest head of our

time" and "the strongest heart I have ever known. . . ." (Y. Stepanova, *op. cit.*)

Engels was always in battle with the enemies of the working class at Marx's side but he never joined in contention for any honor of the field in the role of rival. Engels abjured flattery and boasting and was merciless in deflating the puffed-up postures assumed by such big ego-figures of the workers' and toilers' movement as Lasalle, Proudhon and others, who went about basking in the adulation of cults of admirers and hero worshippers. He was ever the scourge of fanaticism and blind loyalty.

Engels had absolute conviction and faith in the capacity of the working class to think and reason in accord with the dialectical process and to act out their judgements and conclusions in accord with historical science and the compulsions of social necessity.

Engels sublimated any personal ambition he might have had to the great cause of the revolution. His unselfishness, the absence of ostentation and pomp in his public deportment, and the generosity of his unheralded contributions to the totality of the work of the collective, was designed to aid and encourage and maximize the contribution of all the colleagues around Marx. In so doing, he did not lessen but enhanced the personal satisfaction which he derived from his services to the revolutionary struggle.

History shows that the esteem for and appreciation of Frederick Engels' great revolutionary works grows with the rise of every new generation of fighters in the workers' cause. There is something Engels tells us about developing the art and method of collective work as a means of multiplying the leadership cadre in keeping with the ever-growing requirements for leadership for the rising forces of revolution. He stands forth as one of the most popular and esteemed leaders in the whole of working-class history and it could never be said of him that he ever once traded principle for popularity.

Engels, like Marx and later Lenin, counted it his business to rally the advanced forces of the Party of the working class to confront and give battle to every attack or maneuver by the enemy or its dupes against the ideological foundations of the Party, its program and the practical daily survival struggles of the class.

"It seems," Engels noted, "that every workers' party of a big country can develop only through internal struggle, which accords with the laws of dialectical materialism." (*Selected Correspondence of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1968, p. 425.) In any event, "contradictions can never be glossed over

for long, they are resolved in struggle." (E. Stepanova, *op. cit.*) (From this idea of Engels and his own considerable organizational experience, Lenin evolved the concept of *criticism and self-criticism* as a law of development of Communist parties to be elaborated alongside that of the maintenance of the structured practice of democratic centralism.)

Engels, whose writing style reflected the spirit of revolutionary passion and arduous involvement as an activist or partisan publicist in all the tempestuous events of his time, wherever people rose against misery or tyrants added some new outrage to the infinite catalog of their crimes against humanity, was at the same time one of the most knowledgeable thinkers and theorists in philosophy and the natural sciences of modern times. Yet this man, whose erudition matched that of the brightest stars of the Renaissance, had to end his formal schooling before completing the high school level. His acquisition of such vast areas of knowledge is an evidence of the marvels of self-discipline and personal organization which he attained. Still, Engels was no stuffed shirt or intellectual effete. There was no air of the snob about him. He had a great sensitivity for the hurting of humanity and a profound love of the people. He would indeed say with Marx: "Nothing human is alien to me."

On Herbert Marcuse

We live at a particular time in history when the general crisis of capitalism descends to its third and final stage, and, accompanying this fact, there arise on a global scale new opportunities for the acceleration of the world revolutionary process and for registering vital new democratic and socialist victories by the working class, the national liberation movement and associated progressive social forces. Yet at the same time the forces of reaction, mindful of their diminishing strength, desperately seek to stay the verdict of history and to acquire new resources to arrest the growth of the balance of strength favoring the side of the world working class and the anti-imperialist strata and sectors. It is at just such a time as the present that the revolutionary parties need to rear cadres purposefully striving to acquire and emulate the qualities of character, the appetite for learning, the revolutionary ardor, the political courage and personal commitment that are our heritage from the sterling leadership models constructed in the life and works of a Frederick Engels, a Karl Marx, a Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

World imperialism, particularly U.S. ruling circles, are presently

embarked upon a massive, extensive, and multi-tiered ideological campaign to divert the minds of revolting and rebellious masses from the revolutionary alternative to the deepening misery and threatening catastrophe of capitalism's worsening general crisis.

This ideological campaign of the U.S. imperialists reflects some of the sophistication of its neo-colonialist programs. That is, it stands prepared to seek partial advantages, to chip off bits and pieces of the leadership of the newly radicalized forces of the peace, Black people's liberation, and trade union rank-and-file movements. It patiently persists in identifying and encouraging deviant tendencies in the genuinely revolutionary organizations, that is, of the Party, the militant youth, and radical student organizations. While not letting up on its use of police terror, brutal midnight raids, and police-courtroom frame-up conspiracies against revolutionary forces, the ruling-class strategists are now going in heavily for "mixing up the minds" of the Leftward leaning masses.

The most prestigious, influential and skillful producer and circulator of counterfeit "revolutionary" doctrine is Professor Herbert Marcuse who lauds the "heroes" of the black flag of anarchism while heaping scorn on the bearers of the red flag of communism. His name has even appeared on signs carried in demonstrations by guileless youth proclaiming fidelity to "Marx, Marcuse, Mao."

Like a big city hustler at a country fair, Marcuse sustains an almost hypnotic pattern of words that sound softly sybillant and satisfying to the ears, while he works to pick the pockets of the minds of his youthful audiences of any Marxist, scientific revolutionary concepts which may be lying loose there. As a revolutionary philosopher, Marcuse is a mountebank and fakir. In truth, he is planting counter-revolutionary attitudes including scorn for the Soviet Union and all Communist parties which proclaim their loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and international proletarian solidarity.

Thousands of the most thoughtful and daring of the anti-establishment youth are probing their own path toward the Communist Party and the victorious ideology of Marxism-Leninism. Marcuse is a detour sign on their route of march. He is involved in the exhuming and the reincarnation of the "thought" of the father of American anarchism Johann Most and the Russian anarchists Bakunin and Kropotkin.

"The slogan of the Three M's" (Marx, Marcuse, Mao) is a false banner, an impossible amalgam. One cannot reconcile the ideas of Marx with the Marcusean conception of the industrial society," write

the Chilean scholars, Carlos Maldonado and Sergio Vuskovic in their recent book entitled *Lenin o Marcuse?* This excellent polemical critique of *The One-Dimensional Man* and other Marcuse "standards" itemizes the list of Marcuse's pretentious inventions in revolutionary theory and strategic concepts, and lays bare their counter-revolutionary soul and service to the strategists of imperialist survival.

In his small book entitled *An Essay on Liberation* (Beacon Press, Boston, 1969), Marcuse squeezes together his main thoughts into his own "Little Red Book." This *Essay* is a veritable catalog of sophisticated slander of Marxism-Leninism, the world working class, the world-wide revolutionary process and its greatest achievements—the Communist parties, the Soviet Union and the community of socialist states.

Marcuse declares that the working class is no longer a revolutionary social force. He sees "the integration of the organized (and not only the organized) laboring class into the system of advanced capitalism." (*An Essay on Liberation*, p. 14.) Therefore, he argues, "the search for specific historical agents of revolutionary change in the advanced capitalist countries is indeed meaningless." (*Ibid.*, p. 78.)

With the working class integrated into the establishment and no "historical agents of social change" present, how will Marcuse's "world of human freedom" be delivered out of the revolution or, as he terms it, "The Great Refusal?" He tells us:

The new radicalism militates against the centralized bureaucratic Communist as well as against the semi-democratic liberal organization. There is a strong element of spontaneity, even anarchism, in this rebellion. Therefore, the aversion against pre-established leaders, apparatchiks of all sorts, politicians no matter how leftist. The initiative shifts to small groups widely diffused, with a high degree of autonomy, mobility, flexibility." (*Ibid.*, p. 89.)

Marcuse is here fathering factional disintegration in the advanced organizations of the "Communist as well as against the semi-democratic liberal organization" of the masses.

Revolutionary Adventurism and Anarchism

It must be noted that now Herbert Marcuse has a rival, coming up fast for the anti-working class, anti-revolutionary ideological leadership in the U.S. He is Charles Reich, the author of *The Greening of America*.

Charles Reich is being sold to the young generation by the media as the truly "in" and "with it" revolutionary teacher. If Marcuse's "thing" is to exploit the militant mood of the youth, to breathe new life into the dry bones of anarchism and, like a Pied Piper of Hamelin, to lead the boldest kids of the New Left into the sea, to waste their revolutionary energy and their precious lives, Charles Reich's mission is to foster an anticipated non-social activist backlash. The advertisement heralding this new Messiah for the "youth rebellion" describes his message as follows:

There is a revolution coming. It will not be like revolutions of the past. It will originate with the individual and with culture, and it will change the political structure only as its final act. It will not require violence to succeed, and it cannot be successfully resisted by violence. This is the revolution of the new generation.

This is an admixture of the Paulist Christian doctrine of fishing for the individual souls of men and the pseudo-psychiatric mumbo-jumbo of "Scientology." It is a total abnegation of social action because the revolution is an act of personal, individual conversion. That is, change the world by first changing the hearts of men. Amen!

Whatever danger to the clarity of the youth Reich may come to represent, at the present it is the petty-bourgeois revolutionariness of Marcuse and his like which are the main ideological agents of confusion on the Left.

The Guyana People's Progressive Party journal *Thunder* carries in its June issue an article entitled "The Police and the Anarchists" written by Engels' friend Paul Lafargue near the turn of the century. But in it he speaks to and illuminates an aspect of the political reality in the U.S. today. He writes:

The capitalist class . . . in the first class of the propertied which has made of the police the most solid pillar of its State and society. Without haggling or counting the cost it spends money for that purpose; it covers all the blind and unlawful brutalities of the police with the mantle of Christian charity. . . .

The police, treated like a pampered, spoiled child, imagines that it is permitted to do almost anything. . . .

A former prefect of police, M. Andrieux, in his memoirs garrulously revealed that the police furnished the money needed for the foundation of the first anarchist paper published in France, which for the information of all and sundry published recipes for the manufacture of explosives and bombs. . . .

But in the eyes of the capitalists the police is so sublime and

sacrosanct an institution that whatever it may do can never be bad. . . .

Eagerly they spread among the public the falsehood that between anarchism and Socialism there was no essential difference. Anarchism, they said, is the logical sequence of Socialism, the anarchists are courageous people who have the consistency to translate their theories into practice; the Socialists, however, are hypocritical anarchists.

The Socialists, however, proved that the anarchists' theories were the results of the economic laissez-faire, the legitimate offspring of bourgeois individualism; that the anarchists would operate only through individual action, while the Socialists expected success only through the action of the organized proletariat; that the anarchists fulminated against the suffrage, while the Socialists utilized it in order to penetrate legislative and administrative bodies to the great terror of the bourgeois politicians; that the anarchists preached the propaganda of the deed and the murderous action of the autonomous individual, while the Socialists would sanction only the propaganda of the idea and disapproved the bloodthirsty speeches as much as the dynamite-filled cooking pots, because . . . dynamite outrages would not aid in the solution of the social problem but, on the contrary, would retard it for the reason that they excited the indignation of all the efficient members of the proletariat.

The social, class roots of anarchistic theories and deeds are dealt with by Lenin in "*Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder*" in 1920. There he wrote:

. . . Bolshevism grew, took shape, and became steeled in long years of struggle against *petty-bourgeois revolutionism*, which smacks of, or borrows something from anarchism. . . . The petty bourgeois, "furious" over the horrors of capitalism, is a social phenomenon which, like anarchism, is characteristic of all capitalist countries. The instability of such revolutionism, its barrenness, its ability to become swiftly transformed into submission, apathy, fantasy, and even into a "mad" infatuation with one or another bourgeois "fad"—all this is a matter of common knowledge. But a theoretical, abstract recognition of these truths does not at all free revolutionary parties from old mistakes, which always crop up at unexpected moments, in a somewhat new form, in entirely new vestments or surroundings, in peculiar—more or less peculiar—circumstances. (*International Publishers, New York, 1934, p. 17.*)

Writing on "Revolutionary Adventurism" in 1902 in old Russia, Lenin said:

The Social-Democrats (Communists, J.J.) will always warn against adventurism and ruthlessly expose illusions which inevitably end in complete disappointment. We must bear in mind that a revolutionary party is worthy of its name only when it guides *in deed* the movement of a revolutionary class. We must bear in mind that any popular movement assumes an infinite variety of forms, is constantly developing new forms and discarding the old, and effecting modifications or new combinations of old and new forms. It is our duty to participate actively in this process of working out means and methods of struggle. (*Collected Works, Vol. 6, p. 45.*)

We must take note, Lenin taught, that "anarchism was often a sort of punishment for the opportunist sins of the working class movement." ("*Left-Wing Communism*, pp. 17-18.)

Notwithstanding this truth, "the attitude of Marxism to anarchism in general stands out most definitely and unmistakably," Lenin emphasized. (*Ibid.*, p. 20.) He further referred to "acts of terror and attempts at assassination" as "tactics we Marxists emphatically rejected." (*Ibid.*, p. 18.)

Furthermore, in his work "Revolutionary Adventurism," Lenin wrote:

We shall always expose people who in word war against hackneyed dogmas and in practice hold exclusively to such moth-eaten and harmful commonplaces as the theory of the transference of strength, the difference between big work and petty work and, of course, *the theory of single combat*. (*Collected Works, Vol. 6, p. 46. Emphasis added.*)

And again:

. . . shots fired by the "elusive individuals" who are losing faith in the possibility of marching in formation and working hand in hand with the masses also end in smoke. (*Ibid.*, p. 47.)

Contemplating the consequences of ultra-revolutionism, Lenin wrote in 1921 in "The Importance of Gold Now and After the Complete Victory of Socialism" as follows:

The greatest, perhaps the only danger to the genuine revolutionary is that of extreme revolutionism, ignoring the limits and conditions in which revolutionary methods are appropriate and can be successfully employed. . . . True revolutionaries will perish . . . only if they abandon their sober outlook and take it into their heads that the "great, victorious world" revolution can and must solve all problems in a revolutionary manner under all circumstances

and in all spheres of action.

We must estimate as soberly as possible which problems can be solved by revolutionary methods at any given time and which cannot. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 110-111.)

Angela Davis—Philosopher in Transition

Comrades,

News comes today that the judicial co-conspirators with the police and their political masters of the monopolist ruling circles have placed their stamp of approval upon the extradition to California of Angela Davis. There she could be quartered in the death row of the California prison while awaiting the trial in which the state may demand her life.

Angela Davis is the innocent victim of a monstrous frame-up crime of police and government agencies to execute her in order to strike terror into the breasts of rebellious youth and the Black liberation movement. They want to paralyze these movements through invoking mass fear of continuing revengeful lynchings.

Angela Davis is a young Black woman of wide cultural attainments. Already a celebrated veteran of struggle in behalf of inhumanly abused and unjustly incarcerated prisoners of the infamous Soledad prison of California, Angela Davis is well known for her work in support of prison reform. Two years ago she came to the attention of the nation and world public as the principal in an effort of the reactionary California Governor Ronald Reagan and the neo-fascist former member of the University Regents, Max Rafferty, to violate canons of academic freedom and ban this young professor of philosophy from her classroom at the University of California. Responding to the latest blow against her freedom Angela Davis has said: "Reagan and reaction tried to take away my job, now they want to take my life. I do not believe the people will permit them to succeed."

It is the conviction of our Party that the confidence in the triumph of justice in this case, born out of the militant strength, activity and solidarity of the anti-imperialist people, will be sustained, and that the demands of world public opinion will force open the prison gates and free Angela Davis.

There is a bond of connection between Angela Davis and the meaning and message of the life and heritage of the great Frederick Engels.

Frederick Engels and Angela Davis both begin their social awaken-

ing to the necessity for helping change the world in the interest of the advancement of humanity as young students of philosophy. Both Engels and Angela Davis were precocious students of the most prominent philosophers of their day. Engels along with Marx thoroughly mastered all the works of Hegel—a discipline which uniquely equipped them to subject Hegel's philosophical system to profound critical appraisal and to abstract from it its rational kernel. They rescued its dialectical method from Hegel's idealist philosophical system for the service of the working class—the truly dynamic and historic social force for the forward march of man. Both Engels and Angela studied in Germany. Engels broke through the restricting bourgeois idealist boundary of Hegel; indeed, he joined with Marx in elaborating dialectical and historical materialism as the scientifically verified philosophical negation of Hegelianism and all bourgeois philosophical systems. The young student of Hegel, Frederick Engels, went beyond his master to arrive at Marxism.

The lovely young woman philosophy scholar, Angela Davis, unhappily did not have the good fortune to discover a professorial master of the caliber of Hegel. She became the aptest pupil of the most publicized and romanticized "radical" philosopher in the West—the German-born Herbert Marcuse, of whose role we have already spoken.

Like Engels, who went beyond the idealism of Hegel to dialectical materialism, Angela Davis likewise goes beyond her teacher along a path from Marcuse to Lenin.

From Hegel to Marx was not an easy journey even for the co-founder of Marxism to make. Certainly there is much that is personal testament in the brilliantly lucid and compassionately appreciative analysis that Engels made of Ludwig Feuerbach. Ludwig Feuerbach was a philosopher *in transition* from Hegel to Marx. I don't know how far Feuerbach went on the scale that separates these two positions, but how passionately Engels wished that he would make it!

Angela Davis is a young philosopher. An honest scholar and dedicated partisan of the freedom aspirations of her people—the segregated, racially persecuted, super-exploited, discriminated-against Black folk of Alabama, the South and the nation. She is a philosopher in transition from Marcuse to Marx and Lenin. She heralded her commitment to traverse that distance when she refused to deny that she had joined the Communist Party, despite all careerist blandishments and despite all threats by the authorities.

Angela Davis discovered and extended her hand towards the work-

ing class, the only true social lever for the elevation of all oppressed humanity, and the class base and focus for all human progress in our epoch. I believe it is certain that the workers of the whole world will grasp her hand in a mighty grip of international solidarity and will make the cause of her freedom from prison and the shadow of the executioners' chamber their very own cause!

After the events of 1849, the youthful Engels was compelled to leave his homeland and build a new life among strangers. But he found compassion, fraternity, understanding and honor in those distant places where he journeyed, for Engels was always one of the family, the great family of the international working class which he never left and which never abandoned him.

Neither police agents-provocateurs nor the old peddler of philosophical "revolutionary" junk will succeed in putting Angela Davis in the "trick bag" of the anarchists. Angela Davis is a *Communist* and the demand of the masses will set her free. As a Communist the commitment of Angela Davis is to the reasoned revolutionary science of Marxism, not to the nihilist tactics of anarchy.

Lenin quotes Engels as saying that "the historical theory of Marx is the fundamental condition of all *reasoned* and *consistent* revolutionary tactics. . . ." It is because of her identification with the cause of Marx, Engels and Lenin that the bourgeoisie hates Angela Davis. And that is why the world's toilers love her and will demand her freedom.

In closing I wish to address this proposal to our dear Comrade Walter Ulbricht. Here, in this capital city of the German nation, here on the freedman's soil of the workers, where each man shows concern for the other and no man exploits his brother, can there not be raised from an international fund subscribed to from delegations in this hall a worthy statue to that modest man Frederick Engels, fighting son of Germany and a brother and founding father to us all!

"What childish innocence it is to present impatience as a theoretically convincing argument!"

—FREDERICK ENGELS, Program of
the Blanquist Communards"

The General Motors Strike

Every strike is a battle between the working class and the capitalist class. And the long strike of 400,000 automobile workers against the General Motors Corporation was one of the biggest class battles the U.S. has seen.

In this battle General Motors was also fighting for the other automobile companies, who were expected to accept the main terms of the settlement reached by the industry's leader.

The Relationship of Forces

General Motors, with its 15 billion dollars of assets, is the world's biggest manufacturing company. Nearly 150 plants were on strike. The battle fronts extended over thousands of miles in the U.S. and Canada. And the battle news was eagerly followed by tens of thousands of other G.M. workers in Great Britain, West Germany, Australia, Latin American and other lands.

In this battle the United Automobile Workers union was fighting labor's most powerful industrial foe. General Motors is the chief pillar of the National Association of Manufacturers, an irreconcilable enemy of the working class. And G.M.'s directors represent the biggest and most dangerous monopolists. These include the du Ponts, the oldest and most fascist-minded industrial dynasty, the Morgan bankers, the Mellons of Pittsburgh, and both branches of the Rockefeller family.

Nevertheless the motor kings were weaker than they seemed to be. They did not dare to use the violent tactics of former years. The hooded killers of the Black Legion, for example, were discarded after the UAW was firmly established. Some other weapons had vanished as well. No scabs were available. And it was impossible for company stooges to start a back-to-work movement.

Nor was President Nixon ready to help his class brothers by federal intervention. The political price was too high at this time.

These factors put the union in a strong position. The strikers, black and white, were determined to get a strong contract. They had suffered sorely from wartime inflation. They must have more dollars. But they wanted *more than money*. They wanted most of all to lessen the inhuman speedup that was shortening their lives. They also wanted to end compulsory overtime that requires them to work 58 hours a week

—sometimes more—in rush times. This demand was urgently pressed by the young men, who are a majority in the plants. Strikers also wanted more stewards and plant committeemen. General Motors allows only one steward to every 200 to 250 workers. This makes a farce of grievance procedures.

Men wear out early on production lines. So the strikers demanded an early retirement provision. The slogan “500 at 30,” that is, a pension of \$500 after 30 years’ work, regardless of age, was widely acclaimed—especially by older men.

The fighting spirit gained added fire from the rebellion against racism. Some 300,000 Black workers are UAW members. Another 100,000 are Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other Latin Americans. They are the UAW’s most militant members. They have the dirtiest jobs, the most dangerous jobs and the most unhealthy jobs in the foundries, stamping, painting and other departments. And they are insisting on equality in the industry and in the union today.

The strikers’ strength, however, was not fully used. Unfortunately, little effort was made to mobilize the full strength of the UAW’s members during two months of struggle. Thus the rank and file was told nothing about the progress of negotiations with the exploiter. The strikers did not know what demands were being dropped under company pressure. Had they known this they could have brought counter pressure against G.M.

The rank-and-filers were kept in the dark while their future conditions were being decided. In contrast one remembers how rank-and-filers and leaders worked hand in hand in the great sitdown strikes at the G.M. plants that won the first UAW contract in 1937. The sitdowners’ wives formed a wall of living flesh in front of the embattled Flint plants while the men inside armed themselves with steel hinges and other weapons against an expected military attack. The wives were teargassed and came back to defend their men again. John L. Lewis, the CIO leader, knew G.M. would not talk to him, if it was not afraid of the rank and file. So Lewis took the rank and file and its Communist leaders into his confidence during the negotiations that won victory.

The odds against the sitdown strikers seemed overwhelming to capitalist observers when the struggle began. The fascist-minded du Ponts, who dominated G.M., had never signed a union contract and said they never would. And victory would never have been won had rank and file and leaders not teamed up together.

That victory was decisive. The U.S. Steel Corp., which is closely

linked to G.M., signed its first pact with the CIO steel workers soon after. Other big industries were unionized quickly. The fruits of the automobile workers’ unity reached far and wide.

But the UAW negotiators did not take the strikers into their confidence during the parleys with General Motors this fall. This lack of confidence weakened the union’s bargaining position. In the end some gains were won by the strikers’ solidarity. But the men’s most important demands were sacrificed in closed bargaining sessions.

What Was Won

We’ll deal with the gains first. In the old days G.M.’s hard-boiled directors would throw an elderly worker on the social scrap heap after his body wore out on the production line. But G.M.—with all its power—could not prevent the union from winning one of the highest pensions in American industry this fall. The strikers did not win “500 at 30.” But 30-year men will be able to retire at \$500 a month at the age of 58 next year. If they retire at an earlier age the 30-year men will lose \$8.00 a month for each year they are under 58.

The age limits drops to 57 in 1972 and to 56 in 1973. Efforts will doubtless be made to lower the retirement age in the next contract. This is important, because many production men wear out before 56. Medical benefits for pensioners are also increased. But retirees have no cost-of-living protection. Men who retire with \$500 a month in 1971 will be able to buy only \$470 of goods in 1972 and \$442.20 in 1973 if costs go up 6 per cent a year, and even less with 7 per cent inflation. This must be corrected.

A fourth vacation week with pay was given men with 20 years service. Some improvement in medical allowances was gained. But the demand for dental care at the expense of G.M. was lost.

A modest wage rise was won. Nixon calls this “inflationary.” But Nixon’s war policies—not wages—are fanning inflation. And workers fear that the Nixon-Wall Street inflation will leave them no better off than before. In any case G.M. will come out ahead with its higher car prices. But on the whole the settlement was a set-back for Big Business and Nixon.

Most of the money gains come in the first year of a three-year contract. An immediate rise of 51 cents an hour brings hourly wages to \$4.51. Only 18 cents of this is new money. Another 33 cents is a cost-of-living catch-up from the previous contract.

The 18 cents is roughly a 4 per cent rise. This will be beefed up a little in the two last years of the contract by an extra 3 per cent yearly.

The 3 per cent is allegedly based on higher productivity.

Many people were misled by press yarns that a cost-of-living provision will make up *fully* for inflated prices. This is not so. The cost-of-living guaranty only meets three-fourths of the price rises. This may cost a worker about 22 cents an hour in buying power in three years, according to Victor Perlo, the chairman of the Communist Party's economics committee.

The cost-of-living adjustment is based on the consumer price index of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. But the BLS habitually understates living costs. This helps employers. And Perlo warns against the danger of further BLS distortions.

In one case UAW negotiators actually accepted a direct wage cut—to the surprise of the strikers. In the past, new workers got 10 cents an hour less than their fellows until they completed a 90-day period. But new hirees will now get 20 cents less. During the 90 days they will continue to be denied medical and insurance benefits and all union protection. They can be fired at will—as many have been. This tempts G.M. to use new hirees as pace setters to speed up other men.

The shelving of the important job demands brought big "No" votes from important local unions. Those "No" voters—and many others, who reluctantly went along with the negotiators—thought they could win a better contract by fighting longer. And we'll come to the rejected demands after dealing with the strikers' ability to hold out for what they wanted.

The strikers' families had been getting weekly allowances of \$30, \$35 and \$40 from the UAW strike fund. This fund was about to run out, but there were large, untapped resources from friendly unions. Offers of a 10-million dollar loan from the United Steel Workers and a 25-million dollar loan from the Teamsters were waiting to be turned into cash and groceries. More help was promised by other unions and by friends in the motor car cities. And a glimpse of further fund-raising possibilities was given in a full-page appeal in the *New York Times* by the newly-created National Citizens Committee to Aid the Families of G.M. Strikers, headed by Paul Douglas, the former Senator from Illinois.

This appeal for strike funds was signed by many dignitaries, who said: "We do not want the hunger and misery of the strikers' families to be a deciding factor in the strike's resolution."

The main support for strikers always comes from the working class. But the names of the men and women who signed the fund-raising appeal indicate the broad opposition to greedy corporations that exists

in important middle-class circles. The signers included well-known politicians, who believed most voters would back them. There were also many prominent churchmen, labor officials and other leading personalities, with many Black men on the list.

Among the signers were Senators Edward S. Muskie (Maine), Edward M. Kennedy (Massachusetts), George McGovern (South Dakota), Birch Bayh (Indiana), and Senator-elect Hubert Humphrey (Minnesota).

Members of the House of Representatives also put their signatures on the fund-raising appeal. Among them were John Conyers, Jr., Louis Stokes, Shirley Chisholm, William S. Clay, William B. Ford, and Bella Abzug, Congresswoman-elect.

Important clergymen on the list included Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, vicar general of the Archdiocese of Detroit; Rev. Francis B. Sayre, Dean of Washington Cathedral; Bishop Stephen Spottswood, NAACP leader, and Monseignor Charles Owen Rice.

Labor signers included George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, Cesar Chavez, heroic farm workers' leader, and Frank Fitzsimmons, president of the Teamsters' Union. Other well-known signers included Julian Bond, Georgia state representative, Mayor Richard G. Hatcher of Gary, Indiana, A. Philip Randolph, president of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, and Roy Wilkins executive secretary of the NAACP.

General Motors was in difficulties meanwhile. The giant company could not stay out of the market indefinitely. It was in a weaker strike position than the copper companies, who three years ago held out eight months against the copper unions, with the help of their Latin American mines.

Overseas workers were bringing pressure to bear on G.M. Thousands of workers were demonstrating in France and other lands. Soviet workers showed which side they were on when men and women in three Soviet automobile plants raised \$50,000 for the strike. The UAW thanked the Soviet unionists for this proof of solidarity in a warm letter, while saying that the money was not needed at the time.

Solidarity demonstrations also went on in American cities with the help of the Communist Party, whose members were among the strikers. The Party made the strike a major issue. And the *Daily World* was mobilizing strike support day by day.

The *Daily World* was passed out by the thousands on many strike fronts. A huge distribution was also given to a four-page flyer that reprinted a *Daily World* exposé of G.M.'s greedy directors and carried a solidarity statement by the Communist Party. And strikers were

often heard to say how much they missed the paper when distributors didn't appear. Sometimes strikers took bundles of *Daily Worlds* and distributed the papers themselves.

Even vocal anti-Communists welcomed it as the only daily paper in the English language that supported their struggle against General Motors. And Ken Newcomb, the *Daily World's* business manager, tells the following story from a G.M. picket line in New Jersey. He was passing out the paper from a car window when a burly, blue-coated policeman stopped a striker who had a *Daily World* in his hand. Newcomb could not hear the conversation. But next day this worker asked him for the *Daily World*, and said: "I hear you are Communists. Well, I hate the goddamned Communists. But I must say they are getting out a goddamned good paper during this strike."

What Was Not Won

We now turn to what the strikers didn't get. The Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican workers are most disappointed. They not only suffer from compulsory overtime, exhausting speedup and neglect of job grievances. They also suffer acutely from a racist policy that confines them to dirty, dangerous and unhealthy jobs. They made appeals to union leaders through Black caucuses and other organizations. But when the settlement was announced they were left out of the contract. Nothing was done to correct the racism that disgraces the automobile industry.

Racism has always cursed the motor car industry. Only a small percentage of Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican workers get skilled jobs. G.M., Ford, Chrysler and American Motors use racist tactics to divide the workers and weaken the union. Unfortunately, the workers of these oppressed groups are poorly represented in the higher echelons of the UAW. It is still more unfortunate that union negotiators did not give priority to the special needs of their most oppressed members. But the oppressed peoples are on the march today. The Black, Chicano and Puerto workers in the G.M. plants have the solidarity and experience of good union members. And they have made it plain that they will not accept the conditions they are suffering from.

One of the main complaints of G.M. workers is about the endless delay in solving job grievances. A worker may be unjustly suspended. He may be asked to stay on the production line after an injury. Water from a leaky roof may be running down his back. He may have any one of a hundred just grievances. But in the first place he will find it difficult to contact a steward when there is only one steward to every

200 or 250 men, and that one may also have his own production job to do. In the second place a year may pass before the umpire acts on the case after it has gone through the foremen-and-plant mill. The new contract gives no real relief. Grievances will still pile up. And one remembers the admission of G.M.'s vice president, Earl Bramblett, that there were 50,000 unresolved grievances in the company's plants in the U.S. and Canada when the strike began (*Daily World*, October 15, 1970).

Many of the hardest industrial battles of the working class were fought for the shorter work day. This was true the world over for a century and more. Labor began by demanding the 10-hour day when 12 to 14 hours were customary. This seemed ultra-radical to capitalist observers. And a Pennsylvania militia general once reported with alarm that Susquehanna River sawmill strikers were marching under banners, saying: "10 Hours or No Sawdust." That was in 1872.

The 8-hour struggles came next. In 1886 tens of thousands of American workers staged May Day marches for the 8-hour day. In 1887 four leaders of the 8-hour day movement were hanged in Chicago. In 1889 the Second Socialist International asked world labor to demonstrate for the 8-hour day on May 1, 1890. This declaration was made at the request of the young American Federation of Labor. After that the struggle was carried on in hundreds of strikes and demonstrations. And the fight was finally won—so workers thought—when the basic 8-hour day and the 40-hour week were fixed as the standard labor time for American workers during Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration.

The basic 40-hour week was written into the first UAW contract with General Motors in 1937. But what has happened to this 40-hour week victory? Any automobile worker can tell you that nothing is left of the great 40-hour success except in slick times. Compulsory overtime is the rule today. The companies save money by it, in spite of overtime rates. They do not have to make insurance payments for additional workers. They have no extra overhead charges. And the worker who tries to save his health by sticking to 40 hours and refusing overtime may be suspended or fired by G.M., Ford, Chrysler or American Motors.

Local unions have protested frequently against this evil ever since compulsory overtime was accepted by the UAW some years ago. But the new contract leaves the rule intact save for one concession. It gives an overtime worker a Sunday off if he has already put in 13 days straight. He gets this one day off in two weeks, if he applies for it on the preceding Friday.

The overtime evil is almost universal. Workers in G.M. put in an average of five hours overtime a week—or more—the year around. This means an average work week of 45 hours or more—although many G.M. workers toil much longer much of the year. And the days will be especially long in the next months while G.M. is catching up.

Compulsory overtime is not only hard on the worker's health. It also weakens the union's bargaining power. Overtime creates unemployment. The employer has a bargaining advantage when there is a surplus of labor—with jobless men outside the doors. And though overtime seems to give the worker more money he could sell his labor power at a higher price without it.

Compulsory overtime is especially hard on men who make long trips between work and home. Thus most of the Black and Puerto Rican workers in the big Chevrolet assembly plant in Tarrytown, N.Y., travel to and from New York City by car. Tarrytown is dominated by the Rockefellers and other families. It's hard for Black and Puerto Rican workers to get homes near the plant. So they lose extra hours in travel time in the car of another man, who may charge them eight dollars a week. And there is little time for anything but supper and sleep after an overtime day in the plant.

This means they have no social life until the weekend. By then they may be too tired for anything but rest.

Men often try to ease aching muscles by taking days off. "Hell no, I'm not working tomorrow," we heard a tired young Black worker say as he left a G.M. plant in Detroit on a Thursday. The day off is usually taken late in the week when men are "all in," but sometimes exhausted workers prolong the week-end by taking Monday off.

This is called "absenteeism." G.M. is making a lot of fuss about it. And financial journals noted with satisfaction that the union agreed in the new contract to help the company fight absenteeism and to help give young workers more sense of responsibility towards production.

This is not well received by tired men.

Speedup

All other evils fade before the speedup system that takes years out of every automobile worker. Men fall asleep after they settle down in the bus on their way home. And they lie down again for an hour or two or three after reaching home.

The auto speedup system is notorious. It has been denounced in countless articles and many books since Henry Ford introduced

straight line production. It was pictured in film art in Charley Chaplin's "Modern Times." It eased a little after the UAW won recognition. But old-time production line workers find it worse than ever today. And both G.M. and Ford promise still more speedup.

Thus 8,000 G.M. workers at Lordstown, O., near Warren are told they must turn out 100 Vega cars an hour instead of 60.

General Motors may not get away with this, however. Lordstown has an ultra-modern plant and its machines have met the engineers' expectations. But the Lordstown workers have given G.M.'s personnel department some big surprises. These workers were carefully screened when the plant was opened recently. They were drawn from the farms and small towns in a radius of 50 miles. Their average age was only 23. They were supposed to be made of pliable material with not an ounce of "trouble" among them. But the young workers found that the modern machines didn't displace muscles. They simply made the muscles move faster. The men began rebelling after the first exhausting shift. And they learned trade unionism quickly. "The company soon discovered that it had a bear by the tail," said Anton Krchmarek, in a report to the *Daily World*. "Today there is more militancy in Lordstown than in any other G.M. plant. The young workers there were the first to hit the picket lines in the strike."

Such men deserve all the confidence that union leaders can give them. They are the hope of the future.

At the same time Ford—the father of the speedup system—is planning further speedup. Ed Lock, a leading member of the giant River Rouge local, told about it in an interview with William Allan of the *Daily World*.

"The word we get at River Rouge," said Lock, "is that the company has alerted supervision to get ready for a 10 to 20 per cent increase in output after the new contract is ratified."

Ford and G.M. can do this because the contracts keep hands off the speedup system. They cannot prevent local strikes and job action, however. And proof that speedup can be curtailed was given in Flint last January.

G.M. had attempted to increase the number of production units by 25 per cent at Fisher Body Plant No. 2—with 900 less men. The company argued that the new cars were smaller. This didn't make much difference in the work load, the men found. And 2,700 members of UAW Local No. 598 went on strike on September 24, 1969.

Black and white pickets held the line in winter weather. The strikers were ably led by Sam Duncan, the Black local president.

The UAW local unions in Central Michigan backed the strikers. Ken McCardle, the local union's negotiator, kept reporting back to the men. And on January 29, 1970, after four months the company agreed to slow the line, retain part of the 900 men and negotiate about the rest.

Workers tell many stories of men's physical inability to keep up with the speed of G.M.'s production line. Often cars go out with parts loosely put together. This isn't the men's fault. They did what they could. But some months later there may be another death on the road. The speedup in the plants is behind Ralph Nader's slogan that G.M. cars are "Unsafe at Any Speed."

The older men, who try to hang on to the job until pension age, find it hardest to keep up the speed. A production line inspector said that he can tell where old men were working when he finds loose parts.

"Production" is the favorite word of James M. Roche, the \$794,000-a-year chairman of the motor giant. Production comes before men. And workers often tell how foremen pressure injured men to return to the production line after their wounds are stitched together. This brutal practice is sanctioned by company doctors. "We call the doctor 'the butcher,'" said an assembly worker in the Tarrytown plant. He cited the case of a worker who was felled by a falling truck part that was passing overhead. The victim's scalp was badly torn. The "butcher" took several stitches and bandaged the head. And the injured man was about to leave for home and bed when the foreman put him back in the line.

Sometimes men stubbornly insist on going home. In such cases plant bosses prefer to list them as "sick." This prevents them from recording a lost-time accident that might affect insurance rates.

Many job injuries are not apparent to casual observers. Many men suffer from hernias and bad backs. Many also have bad stomachs and kidneys. This can be understood when one sees workers rushing long distances to cafeterias in a half-hour lunch period, or doing without drinking water or toilet needs because it's hard to get relief from the line.

The Auto Companies—Competition and Collaboration

There is active sales competition between the motor giants. This was shown in the strike when Ford and Chrysler fattened at the expense of General Motors. But there is also close collaboration against labor. This was seen when the other companies agreed to

sign similar contracts to the one signed by G.M. And this agreement can be understood when one looks at the automobile companies' financial connections.

Thus several members of the boards of directors of General Motors and Chrysler have common financial links. There are common Rockefeller ties, for example, and we will cite one. In the board room of the Rockefellers' Chase Manhattan Bank one finds G.M.'s director, Lloyd D. Grace sitting at the same table with Joseph Richardson Dilworth, the Chrysler director. Dilworth has offices at 30 Rockefeller Plaza and represents the Rockefeller family on several other companies.

Both companies are also linked to the billionaire Mellons of Pittsburgh, whose power ranks next to the Rockefellers and the Morgan bankers. Thus John A. Mayer, the chairman of the Mellon Bank and Trust Company—the heart of the Mellon empire—is a G.M. director. George H. Love of Chrysler is another Mellon Bank director. And both Mellon men met in the same Pittsburgh clubs.

Both companies also have close Morgan ties. The G.M. directors sit on the board of the powerful Morgan Guaranty Trust Company. And two Chrysler men are directors of companies under Morgan control.

This does not mean that G.M. and Chrysler are Siamese twins. The du Ponts, who have the leading interest in G.M., may not have any money in Chrysler. And the two companies compete for the consumers' dollars. But other G.M. investors have their fingers in the third member of the Big Three. And—while the two companies are not brothers—it can be said that they have strong family ties.

The Ford Motor Co. is primarily a Ford family affair. And it is ruled by the agents of Henry Ford II. But this eight-billion dollar giant is not big enough to do all its own financing. And one of Henry Ford II's trusted representatives is also a director of General Motors. This is Stephen D. Bechtel, Jr., who is also a director of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company and senior director of the giant Bechtel Construction Company of California that enriches itself on defense contracts.

Mr. Bechtel is a trustee of the Ford Foundation that controls about three billion dollars of Ford investments. And he is a natural go-between when Ford and General Motors discuss policy.

General Motors makes a wide variety of products. It also does several hundred million dollars of business with the Pentagon yearly. But the great bulk of its gross revenues of 24 billion dollars in 1969

came from the sale of cars and trucks to private buyers at home and abroad.

A substantial minority of this revenue comes from G.M. plants in more than 20 foreign lands—where lower wages are paid. Even Canadian workers have not won full wage parity. And G.M.'s Black assembly workers in South Africa get only a small fraction of American workers' pay.

The strongest overseas base of this international giant is in West Germany where G.M. took over the Opel plants in the late 1920's. This German subsidiary helped to put Hitler's armies on wheels. And G.M.'s German tanks were shooting it out with G.M.'s American tanks in the critical Battle of the Bulge.

G.M.'s next strongest overseas base is in Great Britain. There its Vauxhall affiliate makes many of the compact cars invading the U.S. market.

In one foreign land G.M. is the automobile king. That is Australia. G.M.-Holden makes most of the continent's cars and trucks. Every part is made under the Australian flag. And we are indebted to Alf Watt of Socialist Publications, Sydney, for the following summary of the hardships, struggles and gains of Australia's G.M. workers.

"Overtime is compulsory. Speedup is a big issue here. . . . Last incident I remember is when they put the cars a few inches closer on the production line. That was years ago. There is a spy system, but no gunmen. There were big strikes in 1962 for a morning tea break. The line was not stopped for this break; the men had to drink the tea while working. The strike was successful. Latterly there have been a number of 'scrimmages.' One, centered in South Australia, forced the company to provide and launder overalls weekly. There have been others."

The tea break victory sets an example for American automobile workers.

Production workers are in the Vehicle Builders Employees' Federation. And we learn from R. E. Wilson, the federation's secretary, that no employee can hold his job without paying union dues, although there is no checkoff. And shop stewards represent approximately 100 workers each.

The time must come when G.M. workers in all lands will help each other's struggles against the common foe.

Struggles in Puerto Rico*

Comrades Henry Winston and Gus Hall, comrades of the National Committee, comrades all:

I bring you from the Puerto Rican Communist Party the most fraternal and sincere greetings, inspired by proletarian internationalism.

The fraternal relations between our parties grow ever closer as declining capitalism and imperialism lost battle after battle. In their desperate efforts to subsist they use the most brutal and inhuman methods against all progressive forces, especially against the Communists in the colonial and semi-colonial countries and those leaders that fight honestly in defense of their oppressed class. This is true even in these United States, as we can see from the cases of Comrade Angela Davis, the Young Lords and the Black Panthers.

The Puerto Rican Communist Party, as you know, has been organized for 36 years. In these years it has had many difficulties in its struggle for the advancement of our working class, but it has never lowered the red banner of justice, liberty and human equality in its struggle for national liberation and socialism. The same road has been travelled by your courageous party, the Communist Party of the United States, which is fighting with great militancy and confidence in its final victory.

Some months ago our party suffered one of those incidents that have kept us from advancing at the pace we should have liked in the way of political progress. By this time our membership had already learned the lessons of past experiences.

As you already know, the ex-general secretary of our Party tried for the second time to liquidate it and to incorporate its members into the Movement for Independence (MPI). His intentions to liquidate the Party were opposed by the sincerity and ideological convictions of all the Party members. The whole membership unanimously rejected his liquidationist proposals.

To put his plans into effect he gave an excuse similar to that which he used to dissolve the Party in 1954: to integrate our Party into the Popular Democratic Party. We are still suffering the consequences of that so-called integration. At that time the argument was that the Popular Democratic Party had a program identical with that of the

* Text of a speech presented by Felix Ojeda, general secretary of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico, to the National Committee of the Communist Party USA on November 22, 1970.

Communists, a program of "Bread, Land and Liberty," that it was a mass organization and that this was the moment to build the working-class vanguard that our Party was unable to build.

In the same way, at this late date the ex-general secretary argued that the MPI, having leaped from a patriotic vanguard to a revolutionary vanguard, and having declared that it is a Marxist-Leninist organization, left the Communist Party no other choice than to integrate into it. Any person who reads the basic documents of the MPI and the Puerto Rican Communist Party can see the difference between such a Marxist organization and a Communist party.

When the question went to discussion during three consecutive meetings of the Central Committee of our Party, and later in a general meeting of all the members, the ex-general secretary's vote was the only one in his favor. He stated that he would quit the Party to enter the MPI. He went alone. Nobody followed him.

Now we are in the stage of reorganizing all Party bodies. On the positive side there is a new enthusiasm for continuing the struggle for independence and socialism in Puerto Rico. Some comrades who have not been active are coming back, offering their cooperation and taking part in all the activities of the Party. All, working collectively, have rallied around the new general secretary.

The present political situation in Puerto Rico is very complicated. We can say that there exists a political crisis created by the colonial conditions. The millionaire governor Luis A. Ferré, whose capitalist interests are linked to those of the U.S. monopolies, was elected by a very slight majority as a candidate of the New Progressive Party. This party is affiliated to the Republican Party of Nixon in the United States.

The new party of millionaire governor Ferré won control of the House of Representatives, and demagogue Muñoz Marín with his popular Democratic Party won control of the Senate. As a consequence there is a virtual boycott in both houses of bills for the benefit of the people. This is creating economic chaos.

Unemployment has increased more rapidly than in the U.S. In spite of this the cost of living is also rising rapidly with no effort of the government agencies to stop it. It is well known that in Puerto Rico the cost of living is about 25 per cent higher than in many parts of the United States, while wages are one-third of those in the United States. High rents and skyrocketing food prices, and inflation of property values and other aspects of the economy, have created a very dangerous situation, especially within the working class, whose wages are very low.

During the past 28 years Muñoz Marín's administration began to change Puerto Rico from an agricultural to an industrial country. The industrialization program was put into effect by importing subsidiary factories from the United States. The peasants lost their love for the land and migrated to the big cities looking for jobs in the factories, and the city slums grew rapidly.

As one way to fight unemployment, the government began to recruit peasants to be sent to farms in the United States. Then 1,800 runaway factories, subsidiaries of big enterprises in the United States, arrived on the Island. They were attracted by the cheap hand labor and by the 10-15 year tax exemptions. Once they finish the 10-15 year period these concerns either come back to the United States or declare bankruptcy.

The government of Muñoz Marín thought that the investments of capital from the United States could develop Puerto Rico industrially, introducing the most modern production techniques and in that way developing new investments that would help the economy of Puerto Rico. But the results have been to the contrary. The only ones who have benefitted have been the investors from the United States.

All these experiments reduced agricultural production to an alarming degree. Now the country has to import farm products from Santo Domingo and other Latin American countries, and mostly from the United States. A victim of this situation has been coffee, one of the basic agricultural products. For example, in 1967 Puerto Rico purchased from the United States \$1.5 billion worth of goods, placing it fifth among importers from the United States on a world scale and first in the Western Hemisphere. All this signifies more jobs for U.S. workers and less jobs for Puerto Rican workers.

Unemployment in Puerto Rico is an enigmatic question. The government statistics always fluctuate between 13 and 14 per cent. But other bourgeois economists reject the government figures and declare that the level of unemployment is about 29 per cent. Some put it as high as 30 per cent. According to their statistics there are 299,000 unemployed in a work force of 900,000. The factories established in Puerto Rico by U.S. capitalists do not employ Puerto Rican executive and office workers but bring them from the United States. They use only unskilled labor. Thus there are more than 50,000 people from the United States who live segregated from the rest of the people, in nice residential areas.

We have in Puerto Rico 25,000 Cuban exiles. Many of them are rich people who buy big businesses and fire the Puerto Rican employees to give their jobs to Cuban gusanos.

The national liberation movement is growing in the same proportion that the repression and persecution by the imperialists and the native forces of reaction increase. The celebration of El Grito de Lares (The Cry of Lares) on September 23 showed that the pro-independence forces have grown considerably. The reactionary papers admitted this.

The fight to remove the U.S. Navy from the small island of Culebra is a part of the struggle for independence and it has become an international issue. This abuse by the powerful U.S. Navy of a tiny island with some 2,000 inhabitants has awakened the Puerto Rican sentiment for independence. Every time there are maneuvers by the Marines their target is this little island where civilians are constantly being killed.

The victory of the progressive forces in Chile, led by the parties of Popular Unity, has also had a great impact on the struggle for national liberation in Puerto Rico. During the election period in Chile all the reactionary newspapers of the Island were the very aggressive against Chile. Their editorials were directed against Allende and the Communists. But as soon as the National Congress confirmed him as President of Chile the attitude changed and there were very soft editorials, friendly to Allende.

In the past our Party had very few fraternal relations with other parties of Latin America and gave very little attention to questions related to their principles and programs. Today, with the changed conditions in Chile, our Party is taking another point of view and we are establishing fraternal relations with different parties in all of Latin America.

We are trying to create our own Marxist-Leninist literature based on the objective conditions of Puerto Rico. It will bring to the working class the reality in which the workers are living but have never understood. We will, of course, continue to welcome the internationally known classics of Marxism-Leninism, reports of world conferences and other literature.

For propaganda material, we had always been depending on that sent from other countries. We are also discussing plans for publishing, two or three times a year, a small ideological magazine. Some intellectuals who are not Communists, but are acquainted with all the Puerto Rican problems and are friends of the Party, can collaborate in this kind of publication.

We are trying to build our Party. We are having many difficulties of all kinds, but we are sure that our Party will go on fighting against imperialism and colonialism, for peace and socialism.

COMMUNICATIONS

WILLIAM J. POMEROY

Neo-Colonialism: A Reply to Criticism

The review by Daniel Mason of my book *American Neo-Colonialism: Its Emergence in the Philippines and Asia* that appeared in the October 1970 issue of *Political Affairs* included a variety of statements and arguments that, in my opinion, are both misleading and erroneous, particularly those that have to do with the nature and historical development of neo-colonialism.

I would like to mention, to begin with, that for his chief criticism Mason has selected a point which he refers to as the "main thesis" of my book but which is not really the book's main thesis. He says: "Pomeroy claims that U.S. imperialism learned a lesson from its occupation of the Philippines as a colony, namely, that it was unprofitable to proceed with colonialism as a policy and therefore turned to 'neo-colonialism' to achieve its aims." Further on he says: "Pomeroy claims that U.S. imperialism made a voluntary shift from colonialism to 'neo-colonialism' as a result of having become convinced by its own experience with 'unprofitability.'" The reader will find no such information in my book, the main thesis of which is that an American neo-colonialist policy, especially in regard to the Philippines,

was the product of a complexity of contradictions and conflicts in American relationships both at home and abroad. In overall organization and in detail, the book seeks to disentangle and to discuss the forces and factors involved in those contradictions. There was no doubt about this in the mind of the publisher, who states this on the book's jacket: "The author focuses his study upon the conflicts over U.S. foreign policy at the turn of the century, affecting the Philippines and the Far East."

At no point are changes and adjustments in policy described as "voluntary," but as the consequence of conflict and sharp struggle. "Voluntary" is Mason's word, and the phrasing into which he fits it is Mason's, not mine. It is like charging a Marxist with believing that American capitalism "voluntarily" introduced a Bill of Rights, social security, collective bargaining, a minimum wage, and other working-class gains.

When the question of profitability is assessed, in summary, in the final pages of the book, it is raised in order to compare the profits of the period of colonial possession of the Philippines with the profits of neo-colonial domin-

ation, showing convincingly, I believe, that the latter have far exceeded the former.

In many ways, however, the question of unprofitability certainly did figure in the prolonged debate on American colonial policy. The very reason for the seizure of the Philippines in the first place was the expectation of great profits from the China market, which, for the reasons I discuss, never really materialized, thus scaling down the profitability of having colonies in Asia in the eyes even of those responsible for the Philippine acquisition. Also, the adverse effect on the profits of U.S. domestic producers from colonial "free trade" with the Philippines was a major and eventually a decisive factor in creating pressures for granting independence (a neo-colonial independence) to the Philippines.

Mason, in the way in which he uses terms, seems to regard American imperialism as a monolithic phenomenon, making decisions, policies, and shifts as if it were a single-minded body of men sitting down in a board room and deciding on the steps it will take. One of the main purposes of my book was to show, in a dialectical way, that there have been and are varied and contradictory forces at work in and upon the imperialist process. Not to view it in this way is not to understand properly American history and historical processes themselves. For example, how is one to understand today the dissensions and differences within American imperial-

ist circles over the Vietnam War—between, let us say, Eugene McCarthy and Richard Nixon—if we are going to use the word "imperialism" in a monolithic sense? And how are Communists to arrive at alliances around issues with such an approach and understanding?

Mason tends to shrug aside the debate and conflict over colonial policy as unimportant and irrelevant. He insists (my underlinings): "The whole record of U.S. imperialism since 1898 has been one of aggressive expansionism, *seeking colonies wherever possible*—and being thwarted by other imperialisms." It would be interesting to know to what colonies and to what thwarted attempts he is referring. One trouble is that Mason evidently doesn't regard neo-colonialism as expansionism, and fails to see that it *is* imperialism. He apparently confuses policy, with which I dealt, and system.

While disagreeing with the issue of "unprofitability" which he has set up as my "main thesis," Mason then turns to say that I "slight the reasons for that unprofitability," thus leaving the impression that he does after all believe that it was unprofitable. The reasons that he gives are "the vast resistance of the Filipino people to American occupation," and "the tremendous changes in national and class relationships that resulted from the October Revolution and the establishment of the Soviet Union, including the formation of the

Communist International."

In fact, I dealt at great length with Filipino resistance to American conquest and showed how it influenced the character of American colonial rule. However, resistance as such did not interfere with profits in the long run, since they began to rise after the crushing of resistance early in the century (and soared in the neo-colonial period after the defeat of the Huk armed struggle in the 1950s). What is significant is how Filipino resistance was handled by American imperialism. Although Filipinos in general desired independence, the independence movement was channeled to and appropriated by the collaborationist Filipino ruling classes, who demagogically raised the slogan of "immediate, unconditional and absolute" independence in order to deceive the masses while they worked out neo-colonial terms with the Americans behind the people's backs. In other words, American imperialism turned resistance to its own uses.

A genuine revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle did not revive and begin to mature until the neo-colonial independence arrangement was nearly settled; indeed, the betrayal of real independence by Filipino ruling-class leaders was one of the factors that generated it. The Communist Party of the Philippines was not founded until 1930, and was promptly illegalized; it developed its significant mass following mainly after independence was agreed upon. The impact of the

October Revolution was of course an important factor in the emergence of a Philippine Communist Party, but to say that it rendered the Philippine colony unprofitable to the point of the colonial relationship being discarded is stretching it more than somewhat.

The nub of Mason's argument lies in his concluding statement that "in this reviewer's opinion, neo-colonialism is a unique phenomenon resulting from World War II. It is the involuntary response of the imperialist powers to the loss of their colonies and the winning of independence by the national liberation forces of the countries of Africa and Asia." He states further that: "It is a situation in which the losing imperialist power in each colony now finds itself in competition with other imperialist powers. It is a situation in which the governments of newly liberated countries and their people have—despite all interference—the chance to make a choice."

This viewpoint lumps together *all* countries newly independent since World War II, indistinguishably and without regard to the manner of acquiring independence. American imperialism has never lost its dominance in the Philippines and has never looked upon the Philippines as a "lost colony." As to the "chance to make a choice," it is to be wondered how the people of South Africa, Malaya, Ghana, Guyana, Congo and innumerable other countries besides the Philippines would feel about that.

Mason apparently has the impression that Philippine independence came as a result of a liberation struggle during and after World War II which forced the U.S. to relinquish the colony. This is not true. Philippine independence was provided for in an act passed by the U.S. Congress in 1934, The Tydings-MacDuffie Act, which set the independence date at that time, to follow a ten-year Commonwealth period. The Act was passed as the culmination of the conflicts and contradictions that I describe in my book. A similar Act would have been passed two years earlier if not for the rivalry and infighting among Filipino collaborationist politicians over who was to head the subservient future government.

The Bell Trade Act, which was introduced in the U.S. Congress in 1945 and passed prior to independence, defined the neo-colonial economic relationship to exist during independence. Such a definition was provided for in the Tydings MacDuffie Act.

The Independence Act was a conscious and deliberate piece of neo-colonial legislation. It was attacked and exposed then by the Communist Party of the Philippines as a "phony independence" that would perpetuate American imperialist domination under the disguise of an "autonomy" headed by traitorous Filipino capitalists and landlords.

In the issue of the Communist International's *International Press Correspondence* (*Inprecor*) for

August 10, 1935 (Vol. 15, No. 34) can be found an assessment by an American Communist, Helen Marcy (who gave valuable assistance to the Philippine people's movement), of the Commonwealth Government of transition created by the Act:

"That the so-called independence for the Philippine Islands, engineered by the American sugar and dairy interests, was a mere sham and mockery of the aspirations of the Filipino people for real independence, resulting only in the tightening of the grip of American imperialism, is becoming more evident daily."

The American sugar and dairy interests referred to were part of the anti-colonial possession sector in the United States that I describe in my book.

Those to whom independence was handed were the Filipino collaborationist ruling-class elements who had been carefully and deliberately nurtured for their neo-colonial role throughout the period of American direct occupation. That was the substance of the "education for self-rule" policy announced early in American occupation. From the beginning of the second decade of the century, one of the main questions in the debate between the conflicting forces in the U.S. over whether or not to grant Philippine independence was the estimate of the degree to which these Filipino collaborator elements had been "educated" or prepared to protect and preserve imperialist investment.

It is impossible to understand the nature of the independence handed to the Philippines in 1946 without understanding the long preparatory period of contradiction, debate and colonial ruling-class alliance prior to World War II. Neo-colonialism did not spring fullblown out of the postwar circumstances; it had a dialectical development, long in the making, as I sought to show.

Lenin pointed out in his *Imperialism* that there were even at the time of his writing "a variety of forms of dependent countries which, officially, are politically independent but which are, in fact, enmeshed in the net of financial and diplomatic dependence." What Lenin's work does not and could not contain is a description of the conscious shaping of the type of dependent country that the Philippines became in 1946; this is simply because the example was not at hand in the spring of 1916 when Lenin wrote his work, which, as Lenin states, was intended as "a composite picture of the world capitalist system in its international relationships at the beginning of the twentieth century—on the eve of the first world imperialist war." Can anyone imagine that Lenin would not have dealt with developments since then if he were alive and writing his work today? Lenin's whole method bequeathed to us indicates how he would have done so.

It must be pointed out that the tactics of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the true fight-

er for a genuine independence, were shaped in the immediate postwar period by the fact of an already scheduled independence date. A sharp liberation struggle did not take place then (1945-46): the CPP, in fact, dissolved the Hukbalahap armed force that it led against the Japanese and participated in the election campaign that preceded independence, held to determine the composition of the government that would receive it. American imperialism directly intervened to make certain that the moderate bourgeois elements backed by the CPP were defeated and that its hand-picked collection of neo-colonial puppets was put in power. It was only after independence, when neo-colonial policies came ruthlessly into play, that an armed liberation struggle against the "imperialist puppet regime" broke out, spearheaded by a revived Huk movement.

Mason's definition of neo-colonialism as "an effort by the imperialist powers to regain the resources and means of exploitation in the lost colonies" and as a situation in which free governments have "the chance to make a choice" bears no relation to what happened in the Philippines or to the processes that created the system that has persisted there unchanged ever since 1946 (today it is even worse).

In my book I do not in any way claim that I describe neo-colonialism in general or as it developed in all other cases (although it must be kept in mind that the

Philippine independence grant preceded all other cases of independence after World War II and could be studied as a model). I dealt with the specific case of American imperialism and with the contradictions and conflicts in the American experience of colonialism, which gave rise to policies peculiar to that experience. It does no service to the anti-imperialist forces in the United States to fail to recognize the contradictions that have affected American imperialism in

the past and that affect it in the present. It does no service to the people's forces for genuine national liberation in the Philippines to fail to recognize the nature of their situation, the problems they face, and their historical background. It was to serve those forces that my book was written. In doing so, I sought to go beyond generalization and sloganizing, to the concrete analysis of concrete situations that Lenin demanded.

DANIEL MASON

Neo-Colonialism: A Rejoinder

A critical review always faces the probability of a critical reply from the author. This, as the above response make clear, has happened to my review of William J. Pomeroy's *American Neo-Colonialism*.

Pomeroy claims that I am guilty of not understanding what his book is really about. It is very difficult to make any defense against such an accusation that will be satisfactory to the reader of my original review and Pomeroy's answer. But I must say that I am not persuaded by his arguments, despite his discourse on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. I therefore think that the best way to judge the correctness of my review will be to read the book, especially now that the

reader will have Pomeroy's cautionary remarks against it.

However, some points in Pomeroy's rebuttal, I feel, require an answer from me, if only to clear the air.

He asserts that I assign a thesis for his book that does not exist. He declares that his "main thesis . . . is that an American neo-colonialist policy, especially in regard to the Philippines, was the product of a complexity of contradictions and conflicts in American relationships both at home and abroad."

In the conclusion to the introduction to his book (which I quoted verbatim as "Pomeroy's thesis" he is not quite so modest. He writes:

The present study has concerned

itself mainly with the Philippines because in the policies arising from American relations with that country can be seen most clearly the evolution of concepts and trends that have come to be known today as neo-colonialism. It is felt that there is no better way of demonstrating the American neo-colonial thesis than to show its emergence from the problem of maintaining a colonial possession. (P. 12.)

It seems to me that in this paragraph Pomeroy has set himself the ambitious task for his book of proving that U.S. imperialism long ago—before World War II and perhaps even World War I—had abandoned colonialism as a policy of conquest and adopted what is now called by Marxist-Leninists neo-colonialism and that it emerged "from the problem of maintaining a colonial possession."

The basic problem, in my opinion, is Pomeroy's conception of neo-colonialism. He apparently does not believe that there is anything new in the concept of neo-colonialism or that it developed as the result of the catalysmic change in the relationships of the imperialists with their former colonies after World War II.

The crux of Pomeroy's confusion can be seen, I think, in his concluding chapter, where, under the heading "Questions of Cost and Profits," he writes:

From 1898 onwards, this great debate was over whether the expansion of American trade and investment outside the borders of the United States should occur with or

without the customary imperialist possession of colonies. Involved essentially in the outcome was the development of what has come to be known as "neo-colonialism," a system in which all the advantages and pertinent features of colonial domination are maintained in an exploited country without its outright possession as a colony. (P. 219.)

According to Pomeroy, the pattern for this was established away back in 1898. He writes:

It is not always realized that the Spanish-American War . . . produced a model of neo-colonialism at the same time that it brought traditional-type colonies under the American flag. The neo-colonial model was Cuba, where American monopolies (especially the sugar monopoly) gained a protected sphere of operations masked by a form of independence subject to U.S. intervention and control. (P. 220.)

The question is whether or not this is neo-colonialism. In my review I say it is not.

In his rebuttal to my criticism, Pomeroy claims that "at no point are changes and adjustments described as 'voluntary,' but as the consequences of conflict and sharp struggle."

But the only "conflict and sharp struggle" he offers in his book is a "great debate" over which road U.S. imperialism shall take, that of colonialism or what he calls neo-colonialism, with the advocates of neo-colonialism winning a long time ago.

The publisher's blurb, which Pomeroy presents as proof of my misinterpretation of his book, makes this abundantly clear. In

the sentence which follows the one he quoted in his rebuttal, the blurb asserts:

He holds that the conflict between the "imperialists" (favoring the seizure of colonies) and the "anti-imperialists" (most of whom today would be known as "neo-colonialists") initiated the struggle between two variants of U.S. policy in which neo-colonialism emerged as the dominant feature.

Pomeroy's confusion about neo-colonialism and the history of U.S. imperialism causes him to make such statements as this:

... Cuban policy was a forerunner of what has come to be known as "neo-colonialism," the creation of which actually lay at the heart of the controversy early in the century. In simplified terms, the anti-imperialism of that time is the neo-colonialism of today. (P. 10.)

Pomeroy's misconception of "neo-colonialism" also leads him to this amazing linking of it to the struggle for reform in the U.S. He writes:

Certain significant parallels can be seen in the development of colonial policy and the peak periods of reform in the United States. . . . The welfare state at home and neo-

colonialism abroad become twin supports of the contemporary imperialist framework. (P. 224.)

In the determination of a correct concept of neo-colonialism perhaps it would be worthwhile to quote from Ali Yata's article in *World Marxist Review*, January 1967, entitled "Neo-Colonialism in Africa":

One can hardly obtain a full idea of African reality if phenomena stemming from the classical type of colonial rule are not taken into account. On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that neo-colonialism makes a deep imprint also on the classical colonial structure, imparting to it some of its specific features and thereby modernizing it.

The replacing of the traditional imperialism by a neo-colonialism—a process epitomized by the Eisenhower doctrine of "filling vacuums"—has acquired considerable dimensions. In a number of cases it has led to sharp conflicts both between the imperialists of different countries and between competing imperialist groups in the same country. . . .

But why continue. Let the reader of Pomeroy's book determine who is right.

Have you made your contribution to the Betty Gannett Memorial Fund? Your contribution will help to assure the continued appearance and improvement of *Political Affairs* as a vital Marxist-Leninist publication.

BOOK REVIEWS

CARMEN RISTORUCCI

"Sexual Politics"

Kate Millett's *Sexual Politics** has received much praise by reviewers of varying political viewpoints, who have regarded it as a highly competent exposition of the ideas of the women's liberation movement. What it actually presents is an elaboration of the feminist view that the central conflict in present-day society is that between men and women. It is a complete rejection of any kind of class approach to the question of oppression of women.

She defines "sexual politics" as "power-structured relationships, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another" (p. 23). Characterizing today's society as patriarchal, Millett holds that every avenue of power lies in the hands of men. Patriarchy's chief institution is the family, and the family's chief contribution is "the socialization of the young into patriarchal ideology's prescribed attitudes" (p. 35).

Although these are defined concepts put forth by Millett, there is a certain unclarity throughout as to their substantiation and a

*Kate Millett, *Sexual Politics*, Doubleday & Co., New York, 1970, \$7.95.

sidetracking of other interpretations of American society. Referring to her sketch of patriarchy, Millett says, "Something of a pioneering effort, it must perforce be both tentative and imperfect. Because the intention is to provide an overall description, statements must be generalized, exceptions neglected, and subheadings overlapping, and to some degree arbitrary as well." (P. 24.)

Used throughout are such terms as race, caste, class and sex, again never really defined. The clearest of the author's thinking is that "through this system a most ingenious form of interior colonization has been achieved. It is one which tends moreover to be sturdier than any form of segregation, and more rigorous than class stratification, more uniform, certainly more enduring. However muted its present appearance may be, sexual dominion obtains nevertheless as perhaps the most pervasive ideology of our culture and provides its most fundamental concept of power." (P. 25.)

The Marxist interpretation of the nature of capitalism as a system of the exploitation of the many for the profit of the few, of one class by another, is rejected by Millett. Nor does she see the

special oppression of women as being in any way related to the class struggle. The struggle then becomes one of man against woman.

Flowing from this concept of the patriarchy is the tendency to see the psychological aspects of the oppression of women as divorced from their economic, social and political framework, the end result of her analysis being that the oppression of women is the result of male dominion. This concept flows throughout the book.

Millett refers to women as being in a castelike status within class, saying: "Economic dependency renders her affiliations with any class a tangential, vicarious and temporary matter" (p. 38). Much of this thinking is accepted by many in the current "women's liberation movement." What it boils down to, whether it be called caste or class, is that women do not cut across class lines and in effect constitute a class unto themselves. Later on, in discussing Engels, she argues that the relationship between the sexes is like that of one economic class to another. In support of this she quotes Frederick Engels' *Origin of the Family* as follows: "In the great majority of cases the man has to earn a living and to support his family, at least among the possessing classes. He thereby obtains a superior position that has no need of any legal special privilege. In the family he is the bourgeois, the woman represents the proletariat." (P. 126.)

Such thinking draws little dis-

tinction between the degrees of oppression faced by women of different classes. Can the Josephine Kennedys, the women of the du Pont family, be said to be oppressed in any degree similar to the oppression of Black or white women workers? Is not their wealth dependent on the exploitation of the mass of working women?

The concept which gives equal or greater importance to the struggle for women's rights than to the struggle for the liberation of Black people is prevalent in Millett's book. She says: "Traditionally the white male has been accustomed to concede the female of his own race, in her capacity as 'his woman' a higher status than that ascribed to the Black male. Yet as white racist ideology is exposed and begins to erode, racism's older protective attitudes toward (white) women also begin to give way. And the priorities of of maintaining male supremacy might outweigh even those of white supremacy . . ." (P. 39.) The end result of this thinking is no struggle against racism.

Marxists cannot be satisfied with any movement that does not attempt to draw into its leadership and its rank and file Black and other minority women, and which does not tackle concretely the problems that Black people face in this country. Marxists view the struggle against racism as a priority for all struggles, as part and parcel of the struggle for working-class power. One cannot compare the oppression of Black peo-

ple with that of women. We have to ask ourselves, can less importance be given to the struggle against racism than the capitalist class gives to perpetuating it?

Many on the Left fail to see this, accusing Marxists of pitting one struggle against the other. They fail to see how much stronger the struggle for women's rights would be, if the struggle against racism were an integral part of its demands and activity. Millett gives much attention to Engels. She says that "Engels' *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State* provided the most comprehensive account of patriarchal history and economy—and the most radical, for Engels alone among the theorists attacked the problem of patriarchal family organization" (p. 108). She states further: "A revolutionary, he was necessarily at odds with fatalistic or 'biological' versions of the origins of human institutions (such as those of the patriarchal school), preferring instead to regard institutions as man-made and hence capable of radical, sudden, even violent alteration, should a conscious revolutionary humanity so desire" (p. 110).

Throughout her discussion on Engels, Millett sidesteps his main proposition: "The first class opposition that appears in history coincides with the development of the antagonism between man and woman in monogamous marriage and the first class oppression coincides with that of the female sex by the male." She prefers to deal with Engels' writings on the pa-

triarchal takeover, arguing that such factors as religion and the discovery that the male had a relationship to conception contributed to the advent of patriarchy.

Again sidestepping Engels' main point, she refers to a statement by him that women preferred the limited sexuality of paired marriage as compared to the demands of communal sex. In opposition to him she says, "One is tempted to see an absurdity in such confident assumption that women dislike sex. . . . In view of recent research in this subject there is little reason to imagine woman would have welcomed . . . a form of sexual association which, in limiting the demands upon her sexually, also involved the subjection of her sensuality, and by extension, of her self, to the will of another." (P. 116.) Millett continues by comparing the number of orgasms women can sustain and the "supremacy" of the clitoris to the penis. In other words, it is a contest between men and women; women are "supreme" and therefore Engels is wrong. One can see Engels turning in his grave at the absurdity of such an argument.

By distortion and misinterpretation of Engels on marriage and the family, Millett concludes: "The radical outcome of Engels' analysis is that the family, as that term is presently understood, must go" (p. 127).

Engels said that the monogamous relationship was established to insure that the private property was controlled by the male,

by inheritance by none other than his own children. But Engels also said: "The supremacy of the man in marriage is the simple consequence of his economic supremacy." It was not the man's nor the woman's superiority or inferiority which determined the status of women. Flowing from this misconception of Engels by Millett is the idea that marriage and family means male dominion.

Class divisions throughout history have not been based on sex. There never was a time when all men were masters and only women were slaves. In slave society the great body of slaves consisted of men as well women. Under feudalism, the serfs were both men and women, and under capitalism men as well as women are exploited. Although property relationship remained the main basis of marriage and the family among the propertied classes, Millett ignores the advent of individual love.

Chapter Four, entitled "The Counterrevolution 1930-60" opens with a section titled "Reactionary Policy: The Models of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union."

The first phase of the sexual revolution (1830-1930) ended in reform, says Millett. To be completed, it required the "alteration of marriage and the family as they had been known throughout history" and an end to the patriarchal order. According to Millett, a counterrevolution ensued, expressed first of all in "official experimentation with the family" in Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia.

Her examination of Nazi Germany reveals the subjugation of women, a disintegration of women's organizations, increased and deliberate propaganda of male supremacy with emphasis on motherhood and dedication to the family. But one almost senses throughout this section that if Nazism had allowed women to engage equally in its crimes, then Nazism would have been acceptable.

She says: "One may find economic reasons for the exclusion of women from participation in higher level work in the hypothesis that the Nazis may have felt the need for that cheap labor force which all other twentieth-century states have enjoyed from women's employment; and as long as is reserved military service for males alone it could hardly staff the munitions plants with men." (P. 162.) One can almost feel the author's resentment toward not being allowed to participate in the Nazi military.

Again, separating the oppression of women from its economic and political framework leads to this thinking. Millett says: "Yet the most basic motivations behind the Nazi manipulation of its female subjects were neither economic (related to male unemployment) nor dictated by population policy (related to imperialist expansion). The final reasons for the male supremacist temperament of the Nazi state are psychological and emotional." (P. 163.)

The extreme open terrorist rule of the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital is reduced to psychological and emotional motivations. Nazism's need for subjugation and immobilization of all sections of the German population, including women, to insure its success becomes a simply psychological matter.

Speaking of the Soviet Union, specifically ten years after the October revolution, in the same breath with Nazi Germany is as hard to digest as the reasons put forth by Millett. She speaks of 1919 when decrees guaranteeing political and economic equality for women were issued. Acknowledging the efforts toward the establishment of nurseries, collectivized housekeeping, maternity leaves, and the opening up of educational facilities and jobs, she says, however: "With all this, the Soviet experiment failed and was abandoned. Through the thirties and forties Soviet society came to resemble the modified patriarchy of other Western countries . . ." (P. 169.) She gives only slight acknowledgement to the fact that this was a period of great difficulties in the construction of socialism, in which the main aim was to protect the revolution.

But Miss Millett's main gripe is that the family was not abolished. ". . . Marxist theory had failed to supply a sufficient ideological base for sexual revolution and was remarkably naive as to the historical and psychological strength of patriarchy." (P. 169.) It is interest-

ing to note that the references used to document the above statement are all United States scholars writing on the family in the Soviet Union. Millett charges that the communal housekeeping and creches did not materialize and that the Soviet Union moved to reinforce concepts of the family.

But one cannot view the construction of socialism and the fulfillment of all its goals as instantaneous. It will take many years to wipe out the centuries of male supremacy as an entrenched concept. The wiping out of the family was never the aim of Marxists.

To see the progress made by the Soviet Union we need only to look at some statistics. Fifty-eight per cent of all women work. One-third of all engineers are women, three-fourths of all doctors, 63 per cent of all economists, 68 per cent of all teachers, 58 per cent of all professionals and 50 per cent of all factory and office workers. Women have been elected to 425 seats in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and to 3,000 seats in the Supreme Soviets of the republics which make up the Soviet Union. They are 43 per cent of the delegates to local Soviets. Equal pay for equal work is the law. All women receive 56 days leave before the delivery of a child and 56 days afterward at full pay and with allowances for even more time when medically necessary.

In the remaining sections of the book Millett takes on the theories of Sigmund Freud and

the influence of psychoanalytic thought on contemporary literature, examining the writings of D. H. Lawrence, Henry Miller, Norman Mailer and Jean Genet. She also opens the book by presenting selections from Mailer, Miller and Genet to demonstrate instances of sexual politics. Paragraph after paragraph of filth is utilized to point out the contempt of these writers for women, which is more like contempt for the whole human race.

The analysis of these writers makes interesting reading and is for the most part written in a very witty and humorous manner, exposing their ludicrous character. Yet one gets the feeling too much importance and time are given by the author to exposing them.

Characterizing Genet differently from the others, Millet says: "Having studied human relationships in the world of pimp and faggot, Genet has come to understand how sexual caste supersedes all other forms of inegalitarianism: racial, political, or economic. He appears to be the only living male writer to have transcended the sexual myths of our era." (P. 20.)

Since, according to Millett, the basic relationship of exploitation and oppression is between male and female, it follows that any substitutes for them are also oppressed and exploited. There is much confusion on this question in today's movements. Little dif-

ferentiation is made between homosexuals who are a product of a decaying capitalism which confuses and corrupts the minds of people, and women, an exploited section of the population used as a reserve labor force by capital.

There is no doubt that homosexuals are discriminated against and considered outcasts in our society. But capitalism's discriminatory policies toward women are utilized to divide the workers and to extort enormous profits from the labor of women. If one sees only the psychological aspect of the oppression of women, as does Millett, it is easy to lump together the problems of homosexuals with the struggle for women's rights.

Unfortunately, Millett does not deal with current struggles or trends. In a postscript she summarizes her views by saying: "For to actually change the quality of life is to transform personality, and this cannot be done without freeing humanity from the tyranny of sexual-social category and conformity to sexual stereotype—as well as abolishing racial caste and economic class." (P. 363.)

It is important to combat the erroneous and misleading concepts in Kate Millett's *Sexual Politics*, since these provide the basis for much of the ideology—whether realized or not—of the current "women's liberation movement."

Just Published!

DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL CHANGE: A Reader in Marxist Social Science. Howard Selsam, David Goldway & Harry Martel, Eds. From the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin on history, social systems, political economy and revolutionary change, with full explanatory introductions. Cloth \$10.00; paperback \$3.95

WE CHARGE GENOCIDE: The Crime of Government Against the Negro People. William L. Patterson, Ed. A reprint of the historic Petition to the UN, with a new Introduction by the Editor and a Foreword by Ossie Davis. Cloth \$5.95; paperback \$1.95

MODERN KOREA: The Socialist North, Revolutionary Perspectives in the South and Unification by Kim Byong Sik. The first full presentation in the U.S. of the views of the North Korean Communists, by a Korean scholar resident in Japan. Cloth \$8.95; paperback \$2.85

WHO HAS THE RIGHT TO MAKE WAR: The Constitutional Crisis by John J. Abt. A succinct, meaty guide to the peace movement on the usurpation of power by the President and the national debate over the withdrawal of troops from Indochina. Paperback, 95¢

CLASS STRUGGLE IN AFRICA by Kwame Nkrumah. His new book analyzing class structures in African society and showing how the modern class struggle relates to national liberation. Cloth \$3.50; paperback \$1.25

DICTIONARY OF AFRO-AMERICAN SLANG by Clarence Major. Words and phrases commonly used in the black community reflecting "a whole sense of violent unhappiness in operation." Cloth \$5.95; paperback \$1.95

AND WHY NOT EVERY MAN? by Herbert Aptheker. Documentary history of Abolitionist struggle. Paperback \$1.50

JAME FENIMORE COOPER: 11 Stories Extracted from His Novels, by Sidney Finkelstein. Paperback \$1.50

KING LEOPOLD'S SOLILOQUY, by Mark Twain. Paperback \$1.25

From your bookshop or

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

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

ANNIVERSARY TOURS

Consult us before planning your trip abroad.

INDEPENDENT TRAVEL — special arrangements

GROUP TRAVEL — to Europe

\$650 to \$855 — for 21 days, 15 people

Guided and accompanied tours

Explore in depth; round table discussions, meet people,
compare, discover, sightseeing galore!

Visit Socialist countries—also Italy, France, England, Scandinavia

We have contacts everywhere!

ANNIVERSARY TOURS

250 W. 57 St. New York, N. Y. 10019

212-245-7117

T H E

African Communist

Published quarterly

in the interests of African

solidarity, and as a forum for

Marxist-Leninist thought throughout

Africa by the South African Communist

Party — 50 cents a copy; \$2 for one year

subscription; \$3 via airmail.

IN THE U.S.A.:

Imported Publications, 1730 W. Arcade Place,

Chicago, Illinois 60612