

AUGUST 1971

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE CRISIS OF THE BLACK PANTHER PARTY

Henry Winston

CAPITALISM IN CRISIS: THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

Gus Hall

THE REACTIONARY ROLE OF ZIONISM

Hyman Lumer

THE FAMILY: IS IT OBSOLETE?

Fern Winston

THE PRESS: "VOLUNTARY ARM OF
ESTABLISHED POWER"

Joseph North

• SPECIAL ENLARGED ISSUE •

60¢

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Editorial Comment</i>	
The Pentagon Papers	1
<i>Henry Winston</i>	
The Crisis of the Black Panther Party	6
<i>Gus Hall</i>	
Capitalism in Crisis and the Fight for Peace	26
<i>Hyman Lumer</i>	
The Reactionary Role of Zionism	39
<i>Fern Winston</i>	
The Family—Is It Obsolete?	56
<i>Joseph North</i>	
The Press—"Voluntary Arm of Established Power"	70
<i>C. Unni Raja</i>	
Realignment of Political Forces in India	80
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	
Cold-War Liars and New Historians	89
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>Alva Buxenbaum</i>	
A Reply to Linda Popper	94

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

The Pentagon Papers

The publication of sections of the Defense Department's analysis of the Vietnam war, "The History," by the *New York Times* and other newspapers is of vast importance with respect to the war and far beyond it. For tens of millions of Americans the message of the document is that the war cannot be won, that the nation has been lied to about its causes and nature by four Administrations, Democrat and Republican, over a period of 25 years. The implication is inescapable that the Nixon Administration, too, lies about the nature of the war, that its explanations of the Cambodia and Laos invasions were lies, that its avowed intention of ending the war is a lie, that the peace talks in Paris are a fraud; and so, too, is its professed concern about the U.S. prisoners of war.

The U.S. opposition to Indochina peace negotiations goes back at least to the Geneva pacts in 1954 which concluded the French colonialist war.

The Defense Department documents reveal to wide masses that the current obstructive U.S. tactics in Paris are but the latest deceit in a long, sordid record of antagonism to peace negotiations.

For millions of Americans belief in the honesty and decency of political leaders of parties has been shaken. They have been lied to by all but a few; their faith has been repaid with the deaths of some 50,000 young men and for what? For Mylais? The nation's political leaders have become non-credible to millions about the greatest issue of this generation—the war in Southeast Asia.

The Defense Department papers show that the Vietnam war was part of a wider foreign policy, an imperialist policy to quell the world-wide national liberation upsurge by drowning the Vietnamese people's struggle for freedom in their own blood. The suggestion of using nuclear weapons has been raised repeatedly; it has been rejected only because of tactical considerations.

In this enterprise the political and military leaders of our nation have recruited successive gangs of cutthroats to do their bidding.

The origins of the present critical situation do not lie in the publication of "The History." Prior to its exposure a large majority of the people, as disclosed in public opinion polls, had abandoned the war course of the Administration, saw the war as lost, and looked to the withdrawal of American troops.

Even more profound re-orientation has been underway. Two-thirds

of the people queried by the Roper Organization in January and February said that "things have pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track." Almost half of those interviewed for Potomac Associates in January and April saw a "real breakdown in this country" on the not-distant horizon. These data are manifestations of a wide-ranging re-orientation, the deepest in more than a century.

The working class has been encompassed in the sharp growth of public revulsion to the Vietnam war and in the more profound shifts in convictions about the future of the nation. This puts into even sharper focus the abominable role played by the Meany hierarchy of the AFL-CIO, in supporting the slaughter in Vietnam, in perpetuating exclusionary racist practices in the trade union movement, and in its failure to arouse the labor movement in opposition to the barracks-regime steps taken by the Nixon-Agnew-Mitchell band.

The revelation last year that the United States Army, under the Johnson Administration, had prepared secret dossiers on tens of thousands of persons, including political figures, showed millions that the democratic guarantees they took for granted were being replaced by police-state measures.

The pursuance of the Vietnam war, in the face of worldwide revulsion, the police-state repression and racist oppression in the United States, the conviction that the underpinnings of our economy are deeply corroded, the reactionary course of the Nixon Administration in foreign and domestic policy have isolated the U.S. further from world public opinion. Even the friends of U.S. capitalism distance themselves from the ship of fools.

With the prolongation of the war two opposing views have emerged within the ranks of the ruling class. One, reacting to the mounting setbacks and the deepening state of crisis, counsels a policy of retreat in Indochina; the other, clinging doggedly to a hope of stemming the tide, calls for continuing the present aggressive policies. The cause of these differences is that the majority of the population has become disaffected; the ruling class is faced not only with the loss of the war but with popular patience wearing thin, with the aggravation of social conflict to a degree not witnessed, in the view of some bourgeois spokesman, since the Civil War.

The differences in the ranks of the ruling class have been in the making for several years. They have become sharply aggravated by the exposure of the Defense Department "History" and by the attempt of the Nixon Administration to suppress the documents.

The publication of the Defense Department papers by the *New York Times* reflected the division in the ranks of the ruling class. The *Times* action represented the views of that sector of the ruling

class which views the war as at a dead-end, and increasingly dangerous, leading to increasing domestic strife and isolation abroad.

The significance of the *Times* action is accentuated, not discredited, by the fact that the *New York Times* was a collaborator in the enterprise, the single most important conduit for Administration war "leaks" to the public.

The attempt of the Nixon Administration to suppress publication of the Defense Department papers sharpened the divisions in the ruling class on the issue of Constitutional government to an unprecedented degree.

The conflict between the Nixon Administration and the *Times* has taken the form of a clash about freedom of the press. The immediate issue was freedom of the capitalist press, for the mass communications media are predominantly in the hands of monopoly capital.

The Nixon-*Times* struggle around freedom of the press was thus immediately part of the struggle within the ruling class, within the bounds of monopoly capital itself, about ending the war. The Constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press, a fixture of the bourgeois-democratic institutions of the nation, is a bourgeois-democratic guarantee, also, for the working-class press, for the Black and other minority press, for all progressive and liberal communications media.

It is a "guarantee" within the limitations prescribed by capitalist property relations, that is, the multi million-dollar press enjoys greater assurances of press freedom than does the working-class press. The "guarantee" to the working-class, Black and other progressive or liberal press is a sometime thing, with the reality of press freedom varying with the ebb and flow of the class struggle. In the present situation the strong opposition to the *Times* action reflected the government's fear that a precedent would be set which the left and peoples' press would seize upon.

The assault of the Nixon Administration on the *New York Times* and other media was part of its program of suppression of all democratic Constitutional rights. This program has been expressed in bitter assaults on the press by Nixon and Vice President Agnew, in the attempt of the President to subvert the Supreme Court by the nominations of Haynsworth and Carswell, and in widespread repressive forays on the legislative and judicial fronts.

The Vietnam war, from its beginning, has eroded the bourgeois-democratic foundations and institutions of the nation. It was essential to the effective prosecution of this imperialist aggression, to lie about its purpose, to portray the Democratic Republic of Vietnam as the enemy threatening the national security of the United States. Without

such a train of falsehoods it would not have been possible to drive two and a half million Americans into combat and pour hundreds of billions of dollars into the invasion.

The public was lied to without restraint or letup. So, too, the Congress, which was relegated, with the approval of the Democratic and Republic leaders, to the function of echoing Administration propaganda, and—most important—providing the war appropriations. The Congress was subverted, its right to decide on the issue of war or peace, was spurned by every Administration.

The Pentagon documents and the acute conflict over their publication have raised crucial questions for millions about the nature of our society and its institutions, questions which never existed for them before.

An increasing number of bourgeois spokesmen see these developments, whose full consequences are not yet discernible, as increasingly perilous to the existing social structure. The questions which millions are now asking relate to the nature of our social structure and the nature of our state, of bourgeois democracy. The ebbing of confidence in things as they are has been most pronounced among the youth, especially the student and Black youth.

The critical attitude of large masses to the nature of our political structure has emerged because the major parties have been co-conspirators in the Vietnam imperialist crusade for a quarter century and, further, because almost all of the liberal spokesmen of the major parties, especially of the Democratic Party, were a party to the crusade.

The bitter truth about bipartisan and liberal complicity and guilt in the Vietnam aggression was presented most sharply, under provocation it is true, by Senator Mike Mansfield, majority leader, on June 21, eight days after the first *Times* disclosures. Mansfield defended the Democrats against what he felt were indecent attempts by the Republicans to cash in on the Pentagon revelations, as though they implicated only the Johnson Administration.

While his argument was immediately a defense of the Democratic party, it was fundamentally, whether he or the Republicans understood it or not, a defense of the two-party system. It was a warning that the two-party system was in jeopardy. His defense was: We were all guilty!

Since his defense deserves to become a classic, it is worth being quoted at length.

Who was so clairvoyant as to oppose the involvement in Vietnam at the outset? What member of this Senate? Who was prepared to

speak out against it 15 years ago? Ten years ago? Five?

What member of this Senate, on either side of the aisle?

Which member of the House in all those years?

What President of the United States? The current Chief Executive? The former President? Any former President?

The Secretary of State? The Secretary of Defense?, Former Secretaries of State, of Defense?

Republicans? Democrats?

Who . . . who? (*Congressional Record*, June 21, 1971 p. S 9521.)

The Defense Department papers exclude two areas. Not once, in the 7,000 pages, Dr. Daniel Ellsberg has said, is there any reference to the monstrous death toll and the barbarous devastation inflicted by the U.S. war machine.

There is no reference, either, with a single exception, to the imperialist economic interests that underlay the Indochina aggression.

Millions who never questioned before, are asking today: Why did it happen? The bourgeois defense is that it was a "mistake," a "blunder," which must never be repeated.

These "explanations" would conceal the single most important fact about the origin and nature of the Vietnam war, its class character, the fact that it was an enterprise of U.S. imperialism, as the previous stage was an enterprise of French imperialism; that its purpose was to establish an economic base for U.S. big business in Southeast Asia and a military base from which to threaten the national liberation movements throughout Eastern Asia, and the Soviet Union and China.

Few developments have aroused so powerful a reaction among the American people as has this exposure of the Defense Department documents by the *New York Times*. Its devastating impact signals the possibility of creating a movement capable of bringing about the ending of the Indochina war *this year*. It is to this task that the peace forces are now called upon to address themselves. Its accomplishment, needless to say, will have far-reaching effects.

It is just such a movement which the ruling class, including its anti-war sections, fear. The latter would like to restrict the conflict to a controversy between the *New York Times* and the Justice Department. The ruling class is fearful that the masses will draw anti-capitalist, anti-bipartisan, anti-imperialist conclusions. That fear pervades all its writing and speaking on the subject. And it is not unfounded.

The Crisis of the Black Panther Party*

What are the causes of the crisis of the Black Panther Party? How could an organization which portrayed itself as the revolutionary vanguard become so quickly isolated from the people? Why were the hopes of so many militant and courageous Black youths who were attracted to the party turned into frustration and even tragedy?

No answer to these questions can be given without taking into account the attacks and frameups launched by the enemy against the party. Yet even these brutal and murderous attacks, conducted both from within and outside the organization, cannot alone explain the crisis of the Black Panther Party.

Huey P. Newton, writing in the *Black Panther* of April 17, attempts to provide an explanation for this crisis, which led to the party's split into factions, one headed by himself, the other by Eldridge Cleaver. (The *Black Panther* is now published by the Newton faction, while a paper called *Right On* is being issued by the Cleaver group.)

In his April 17 article, Newton states: "Under the influence of Eldridge Cleaver the party gave the community no alternative for dealing with us, except by picking up the gun. . . . Therefore, the Black Panther Party defected from the community long before Eldridge Cleaver defected from the party."

In saying this, Newton appears at first glance to have taken a step toward understanding and correcting past mistakes—to have begun the process of disentangling the Black Panther Party from Cleaver's catastrophic influence. However, in this article as a whole, Newton, instead of providing answers, creates still more questions and doubts as to the past, present and future course of the Black Panther Party.

That the uneasiness created by this article is well founded is confirmed by Newton's subsequent writings and speeches, and particularly by his May 29 article in the *Black Panther*. Here he announces that the party is ready to open, in San Francisco, a shoe factory and one to make clothing and golf bags—the first of many factories to be operated by the Black Panthers in ghettos across the nation.

That these are enterprises of "Black capitalism," Newton does not

* The following is a chapter from a forthcoming book.

deny. In fact, he states: "I am doing an article now called 'To Reanalyze Black Capitalism'. . . . I think this is the kind of thing we're involved in and we'll judge how successful we are by whether we can take the community with us."

It will undoubtedly appear to some that there is a head-on contradiction between Newton's "new" direction and his previous "revolutionary" period. The opposite is true. There is no contradiction between his previous ultra-Leftist role and his present position. In essence, both positions represent accommodation to the status quo—even though the earlier one was more effectively camouflaged with the rhetoric of revolution. The link between both positions is the fact that neither "Black capitalism" nor ultra-revolutionary rhetoric offers the people the path of struggle. That is why the new form of opportunism (like the old form, still pursued by Eldridge Cleaver) presents no perspective for the Black liberation movement.

Hard Reality

According to Newton, the Black Panther Party had its origin as a response to what he interprets as the people's rejection of non-violent action. When the Black Panthers first picked up the gun, he states in the April 17 article, "we were acting (in 1966) at a time when the people had given up on the philosophy of non-violent direct action and were beginning to deal with sterner stuff. We wanted them to see the virtues of disciplined and organized armed self-defense, rather than spontaneous and disorganized outbreaks and riots."

In this estimate of what was needed as the next step in the Black liberation struggle can be found the source of the Panthers' subsequent difficulties. By offering the alternative of armed self-defense, the Panthers presented the upsurging Black urban youth with a false choice diverting them from mass unity and struggle.

As Congressman Ronald Dellums recently stated, "The average Black person, if you go back to that experience in the ghetto, doesn't wake up in the morning oriented to the bullet or the bomb. He's oriented to hope, and that's when you can move him. . . . It is time now to translate Black is Beautiful into hard political reality."

In 1966 that "hard political reality" called—as it does today—for more militant forms of organized and disciplined mass struggle. The people, including the youth, in their fight to create a movement to end poverty and racism, will respond to such an alternative to the blind alley of spontaneity or the equally hopeless concept of "picking up the gun."

It is clear that the people want to challenge the oppressor on the

grounds *they* choose, not on those chosen by their enemy. They want to engage the enemy where he is most vulnerable—and this ruling class, the most massively armed oppressor in history, is the most vulnerable of all oppressors when the oppressed and exploited move in solidarity into the area of mass struggle. The guns of the racist monopolists will be of no avail when the Blacks and all the oppressed and exploited exercise their strength through self-organization and unity. That is why the people do not relate to the idea that the power to change things comes out of the barrel of a gun.

Strategy—Defensive or Offensive?

When Newton advocated guns and a defensive strategy as the solution for Black people, he was wrong on both counts: not only did the people refuse to relate to the gun, they also rejected the concept of a defensive strategy. Black people—who have been warding off attacks for 400 years—want and need an offensive strategy to build a great popular movement to end racist oppression.

In his concept of self-defense, Newton endeavored to respond to the oppression of his people. However, this concept excluded the people from their own liberation struggle. It involved the idea of an elite few acting for the masses—in fact, supplanting them.

Thus, even before Cleaver joined the Black Panther Party, Newton had substituted elitism for mass struggle. Cleaver's influence brought the elitist concept to new levels of anarchist, adventurist confusion and provocation—but his ideology was nevertheless inherent in the original concepts on which the Black Panther Party was founded.

At one point, however, it appeared to some that the Black Panthers might be turning away from these original concepts, that they might supplant the Little Red Book and Cleaver's anarchism with Marx and Lenin. This was in the summer of 1969 when the Black Panther Party called for studying the historic report on the united front by Georgi Dimitrov, the Bulgarian Communist leader who transformed himself from the accused into the accuser in a Nazi court. But instead of linking theory with practice, the actions taken by the Black Panther Party turned the concept of the united front into a sectarian caricature of the Marxist-Leninist principles on which it is based. The party's policies and actions continued to be inconsistent with the interests of the class struggle and the Black liberation movement. It became increasingly clear that the Black Panther Party had adopted some of the phraseology of Marxism-Leninism, but not the ideology.

Against this background, internal strife in the Black Panther Party deteriorated into factionalism, and—with neither faction guided by

scientific theory—into an inevitable split. Newton expelled Cleaver and a group of his supporters. Although there are now two separate groups, both unfortunately hold similar anti-Marxist views on the most basic principles of class and national liberation.

"There Go My People"

It is worth recalling that in the same period when the Black Panthers came on the scene, others were also seeking new directions, notably Martin Luther King.

During the Montgomery bus strike in 1955, King had said, "There go my people. I must catch up with them." More than a decade later and at a new turning point, King was still motivated by these sentiments. Therefore, unlike the Panthers, he did not misread the mood of the people in this new phase, often called the "post-civil rights period."

It had become apparent to King that an offensive strategy of new dimensions had to be built. The new situation required the continued and even expanded participation of church and middle-strata forces, including students and professionals, that had predominated in 1954-66. But King saw that the basis for regaining the offensive was *working class* strength moving in coalition with the middle-class forces. He now directed all his efforts toward involving the working class in a higher level of struggle with the Black liberation movement—and with all the poor and oppressed.

The Communist Party welcomed this historic revolution in Dr. King's leadership, and wholeheartedly supported his efforts to bring about a new strategy and a new alignment of forces. The Communist Party saw this as a profoundly important development, even though Dr. King had not yet demonstrated a *full* understanding that an offensive strategy to end class exploitation, racist oppression and war demands not only the *strength* of the working class, but also the *leadership* of the working class—Black, Brown, Yellow, Red and white—guided by the science of socialism. However, before he was assassinated, King had moved toward an anti-imperialist position.

King was also keenly aware of the dangers that faced the movement. For instance, in his historic address—just two months before his death—at the *Freedomways* memorial meeting for Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois, King warned that racism and imperialism could not be fought with anti-Communism. In addition, his words about Du Bois carried an all-important message for today's radical youth:

Above all he did not content himself with hurling invectives for emotional relief and then to retire into smug passive satisfaction.

History had taught him it is not enough for people to be angry. The supreme task is to organize and unite people so that their anger becomes a transforming force. (*Freedomways*, Spring 1968.)

The ruling class did everything in its power to divert and defeat the new direction taken by King. The capitalist mass media went all out to promote the activity and the ideology of those Black and white radicals for whom King was "too non-violent" and the Communist Party "too conservative."

While Newton, Cleaver and Hilliard waved the Little Red Book and talked of picking up the gun, they were joined in these activities by middle-class white radicals who also came forward with "new" interpretations of Marxism. All of this created diversions and confusion on the campus, in the ghettos and in the peace movement.

The Image-Makers and "Revolution"

As part of the ruling-class efforts to divert the radicalization process, the mass media have popularized the caricature of Marxism-Leninism appearing in the writings of Mao, Trotsky, Marcuse, Debray, Cleaver, Newton, Tom Hayden, Stokely Carmichael, Rennie Davis and others. At the same time, they have promoted a "revolutionary" image for many of the new radicals.

These Black and white radicals, including Cleaver and Newton, dismissed what they called "orthodox" Marxism. Taking a different direction from King, they disdained the working class and glorified the super-"revolutionary" tactics of confrontation by an anarchistic elite. In this way, these ultra-"revolutionaries" helped create an atmosphere in which the racist monopolists could falsely portray violence as coming from the Left—and cover up the fact that they themselves are the source of it.

The pseudo-militancy of Newton, Cleaver and Hilliard made their own party and its supporters particularly vulnerable to nation-wide genocidal assaults and frameups. And beyond this, their super-revolutionism made the movements for Black liberation and against war and poverty more vulnerable to mounting repressive attacks.

It is apparent that neither Newton or Cleaver have ever based their tactics on the working class and its revolutionary science, Marxism-Leninism. At the present moment, while Cleaver's opportunism continues along an ultra-Leftist course and Newton's has taken a Right opportunist form (although he attempts to maintain a Leftist image), both base their policies on the lumpenproletariat.

In order to give some semblance of credibility to the "revolutionary" role they assign the lumpen elements, Newton and Cleaver would

have us believe that the Black unemployed, those on welfare, and high school dropouts are all part of the lumpenproletariat. This is an insult to Black men, women and youth. People are not lumpen simply because they are denied jobs, and when Newton and Cleaver make such claims they sound like Black Moynihans.

Today, in the center of imperialism in the era of its decline, there is a massive increase in the army of the unemployed. Alongside this, the number of lumpen elements also increases. However, these groups *do not merge*: each has its distinct characteristics. As Marx wrote in *The Class Struggles in France*, the lumpenproletariat "forms a mass sharply differentiated from the industrial proletariat."

Specifically the lumpen elements are those so demoralized by the system that they are not only jobless, but that to them a job is unthinkable. It is their declassed parasitical status and outlook that sharply distinguish them from the great mass of the unemployed, who are searching for and demanding jobs and the opportunity for a decent life. That is why—in addition to making the distinction that Marx emphasized—it is now even more necessary than in Marx's time to clearly distinguish between the lumpenproletariat and the great mass of unemployed, which includes so many youth (particularly Black and Brown) who have never been regularly employed. And the following statistics from the sixties foreshadow the vastly greater number of youth who will be forced into this position in the seventies:

It is reported that there are now 50 per cent fewer unskilled and semi-skilled jobs than there are high school dropouts. Almost one-third of the 26 million young people entering the labor market in the sixties will be dropouts. But the percentage of the Negro dropouts nationally is 57 per cent, and in New York City, among Negroes 25 years of age or over it is 68 per cent. They are without a future. (Louis A. Ferman, Joyce L. Kornbluh, and Alan Haber, eds., *Poverty in America*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1968, p. 622.)

However it is quite evident that the ruling class is not counting on the prediction that the unemployed will passively accept the idea that "they are without a future." Today, the monopolists fear the fact that the struggle of the unemployed, together with the rank-and-file struggles within the unions, will lay the basis for a new upsurge of the working class and the Black liberation movement. The monopolists are aware that these struggles will eclipse those of the thirties.

One of the ways in which the ruling class is trying to short-

circuit the struggle for jobs and against war and racism is through its barbaric promotion of drugs—in the armed forces (particularly in Vietnam), in the ghettos, among the workers, and among the youth on and off the campuses.

The lumpenproletariat, as Engels noted, includes “elements of all classes.” This is particularly evident today as large numbers of students, demoralized by drugs, turn away from struggle and become part of the lumpen sector for the first time in history.

Together with its mass promotion of drugs, the ruling class is promoting anti-working class ideology on a mass scale in new ways. This is why the media have popularized the writings of such individuals as Regis Debray and Herbert Marcuse, whose views have greatly influenced Cleaver, Newton, Hayden, Hoffman, Rubin and other radicals who foster the idea that workers have “a stake in the system.” From this starting point Cleaver and Newton have developed the concept that the lumpen sectors, who will resort to anything but work, and not the working class, comprise the vanguard of revolution.

Objective Laws of Development

Those who point to the lumpenproletariat as the revolutionary vanguard disregard the objective laws of historical development. In pre-capitalist societies, poverty and oppression were even greater than under capitalism. But oppression in itself, no matter how great, does not create the basis for the struggle to abolish oppression.

Because of the specific nature of exploitation under capitalism, the working class, which collectively operates the mass production process of the privately owned monopolies, is transformed into the gravedigger of the system. That is why Marx and Engels wrote in *The Communist Manifesto*: “Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class.”

No fundamental change—or even a challenge to the monopolists—can occur without the working class. And today the proportion of Black workers in basic industries such as steel, coal, auto, transport and others is transforming the prospects for the class struggle and Black liberation.

These Black workers, who share the oppression of all Black Americans, also share the exploitation experienced by their fellow white workers. But as compared to these white workers, they suffer from racist superexploitation: they have the worst jobs and are still the last hired, the first fired.

The degree of exploitation of Black workers is clearly much greater than that of white workers. Nevertheless, the collective form of exploitation in the decisive mass production industries is suffered by *all* workers. This creates the objective basis for their unity and leadership in the struggle against the monopolist ruling class.

At the same time, history has assigned a doubly significant role to Black workers—as the leaders and backbone of the Black liberation movement, and as a decisive component of the working-class leadership of the anti-imperialist struggle as a whole.

It is the monopolists' fear of Black, white, Brown, Yellow, Red and working-class unity, which forms the basis for still broader people's unity, that is behind racism and anti-Communism—the main ideological weapons of the ruling class.

Leninism, the Marxism of the imperialist epoch, is *the* ideological weapon of the working class. It is the scientific guide that enables the working class to combine its struggle with national liberation movements against imperialism. No other theory has served to free a single working class, a single people, from imperialism anywhere in the world. Beginning with the October revolution, only those guided by Marxism-Leninism have been able to free themselves from class and national oppression and take the road of socialist construction.

“On the Side of the Oppressor”

Cleaver and Newton have tried to use the writings of Frantz Fanon, whose vantage point was the Algerian and other African liberation movements, to justify their anti-Leninist theory of the role of the lumpen proletariat. They have attempted to apply Fanon's ideas to the U.S., although these ideas lack Marxist clarity in some respects even within the African context for which they were intended. On top of this, Cleaver and Newton have inflated Fanon's positive views on the lumpenproletariat, while completely ignoring his serious reservations about this group.

“Colonialism will also find in the lumpenproletariat a considerable space for maneuvering,” Fanon wrote in *The Wretched of the Earth*. There is a danger he warned, that “the lumpenproletariat will throw itself into battle and will take part in the conflict—but this time on the side of the oppressor.” He then stated:

In Algeria it is the lumpenproletariat which furnished the harkis and the messalists; in Angola it supplied the road openers who now precede the Portuguese armed columns; in the Congo, we find once more the lumpenproletariat in regional manifestations in Katai

and Katanga, while at Leopoldville, the Congo enemies made use of it to organize "spontaneous" mass meetings against Lumumba. (Evergreen, New York, 1966, p. 109.)

For ways in which the ruling class can manipulate the lumpen elements, we need only refer to the Panthers' own experience with George Sams, who was used to frame Bobby Seale, Ericka Huggins and others. And we should remember that a white lumpen individual was used to assassinate Martin Luther King, while black ones were recruited to murder Malcolm X. And we should also recall the German monopolists' manipulation of Van der Lubbe to frame Georgi Dimitrov, as part of their drive to launch a genocidal war for world domination.

The Cleaver-Newton theory of the lumpen proletariat as vanguard would mean objective surrender to the ruling class—because only the working class can lead the fight against poverty and exploitation. And not only does this theory fail to offer an offensive strategy for liberation; without working-class leadership of the struggle, the lumpen victims themselves will not be provided with even their own barest needs.

It is ironic that, while some Panthers glorify the lumpen-proletariat, at least one Panther leader takes pride in his working-class background and skills. In his book, *Seize the Time*, Bobby Seale states that his father was a master carpenter, and that he himself is a carpenter, a draftsman and "a top-flight sheet-metal mechanic."

We fervently hope that Bobby Seale will vindicate his well-founded pride by using his outstanding ability to help chart a working-class path of struggle for millions of Black youth, in contrast to the course Newton and Cleaver adopted while Seale was in prison.

Incredible Thrust Backward

Between mid-April and the end of May, 1971, Huey P. Newton became increasingly frank in describing his new course. What he only hinted at in the April 17 *Black Panther*, he made astoundingly clear in the May 29 issue, when he described what he calls a "survival program," i.e., survival through "Black capitalism."

Announcing that the Panthers will now operate factories in ghettos, he went on to say: "We will have no overhead because our collective—we'll exploit our collective by making them work free. We'll do this not just to justify ourselves—like philanthropists, to save someone from going without shoes, even though this is part of the cause of our problems. People make the revolution; we will give the process a forward thrust. If we suffer from genocide, we won't be around to

change things. So in this way our survival program is very practical."

Far from being either "practical" or a "forward thrust," this is an incredibly reactionary thrust *backward*. By comparison with Newton's "survival program," Booker T. Washington's philosophy sounds positively revolutionary!

Newton, however, tries to justify his retreat into the past with the following explanation: "We can jump too far ahead and say that the system absolutely cannot give us anything, which is not true, the system can correct itself to a certain extent. What we are interested in is for it to correct itself as much as it can do and after that if it doesn't do everything that the people think is necessary then we'll think about reorganizing things."

Well, this is a pretty late date to advise the oppressed and exploited to call off their struggles and wait to see if "the system can correct itself"! Why should the people surrender to still more racism and oppression in order to learn what they already know—that the system "can correct itself" only through wars, increased racism, poverty and exploitation.

While in the past Newton did indeed jump ahead of the people's needs, he has now leaped far behind them. He misread the mood of the people and mistook their real needs when he talked of "picking up the gun" from 1966 through early 1971. Now he is again misreading their mood and ignoring their real needs, when in effect he tells them to surrender to racist oppression and accept a "survival" concept based on his anti-working class theories and glorification of the lumpenproletariat.

Newton offers the people mini-enclaves of Black capitalism in the form of ghetto sweatshops across the country. But what Black people want is an *end* to the ghettos. During slavery, the underground railroad established way stations to meet the basic survival needs of Blacks escaping from the South. In today's context, a defensive "survival" strategy cannot possibly serve the people, for whom way stations cannot provide an escape. The vast scope of Black Americans' needs today can be met only by an offensive strategy.

Black Americans have a first and equal claim on the *total* economy of the country—which they helped build with 400 years of slave and near-slave labor—for billions for jobs, housing, medical care, education, etc. They want the *total* economy turned around to meet the people's needs, instead of operating for the wars and the profits of a handful of corporate monopolists.

When in 1968 Martin Luther King warned radicals that super-militancy often ends in accommodation, he seems to have prophesied

Huey P. Newton's latest move. After "hurling" super-revolutionary rhetoric for six years, it appears that Newton will now "retire into small passive satisfaction" while Black people are given the prospect of working in the ghetto under racist sweatshop conditions.

In *Seize the Time*, Bobby Seale attacked Ron Karenga for operating "little jive businesses" in the Black community. "Ron Karenga," wrote Seale, "had no intention before and has no intention now of working in opposition to the power structure to change the system for the needs of Black America." (Random House, New York, 1970, p. 273.)

We truly hope that Seale will recall these words because they aptly describe Newton's "survival program." No matter how Newton may later attempt to portray his new enterprises—as collectives, cooperatives, etc.—he cannot disguise the fact that they offer Black people no hope.

Accommodation—or Struggle

Neither Newton's nor Cleaver's concept of a "survival program" is in the interests of the people. While Cleaver expresses the ultra-Leftist face of opportunism—"urban guerilla warfare now"—Newton's opportunism takes a different form.

Describing his "survival program," Newton says: "We serve [the people's] needs so they can survive oppression. Then, when they are ready to pick up the gun, serious things will happen." (*Black Panther*, April, 1971). In other words, Newton would have us believe that accommodation today will lead to revolution tomorrow!

Both the "survival program" Newton-style ("wait until the masses are ready to pick up the gun") and the "survival program" Cleaver-style ("pick up the gun now!") objectively amount to the same thing: desertion of the people's struggles.

The cause of liberation cannot be served by a negative idea—"survival" pending a future day when "serious things will happen." What is needed is a *struggle* program for the immediate interests of the people and for their ultimate liberation from capitalist, racist oppression.

Marx and Engels taught that the salvation of the exploited requires an ever-expanding unity in struggle even so much as to retard the downward spiral of exploitation and oppression. This concept is even more acutely relevant today. By contrast the idea of a "survival program" evokes passivity and demoralizes the people. To justify his "survival" concept, which would divert the Black liberation movement from an offensive anti-monopoly strategy, Huey P. Newton has devel-

oped a classless approach to capitalist democracy. It is amazing to read his description of democracy in the May 29 issue of the *Black Panther*. This is the way he puts it: "Democracy in America (bourgeois democracy) means nothing more than the domination of the majority over the minority."

It is indeed strange to find one who regards himself as a dialectical materialist speaking of bourgeois democracy as "the domination of the majority over the minority." In the sphere of social science, dialectical materialism relates not to struggle in general but to the struggle of classes.

Because he does not relate dialectics to the class struggle, Newton fails to explain that his is a society in which state monopoly capitalism rules; that there is a class of exploiters exercising state power to defend its class interests; that there is national oppression maintained by this class.

In the same article, Newton also states that the majority has "decreed" that the minority "fight and die in wars." He dares make this claim at a time when even the polls show that considerably more than 70 per cent of the people want immediate withdrawal of troops from Vietnam.

It is certainly not the majority but the ruling-class minority that has "decreed" the imperialist aggression in Indochina and in the Middle East, and which threatens thermonuclear war against peaceful states and peoples—and first of all against the socialist camp, which supports anti-imperialist liberation struggles throughout the world. In the 1930's the threat of war came from Nazi Germany; today it comes from the U.S. monopolists—and Newton would have us believe that the majority has "decreed" it!

But not only do the polls show that there is an anti-war majority. They also show that within this anti-war majority there is another majority—one with the potential to bring an end to the war in Indochina and, moreover, to imperialism itself.

This majority within the majority is made up of the overwhelming percentage of white workers and the still greater percentage of Black Americans who oppose the war. For the first time in U.S. history, the people, though not effectively organized, are in motion against the genocidal aggression of U.S. imperialism.

How then can Huey Newton, who considers himself a revolutionary, speak of democracy in the U.S. as the rule of a majority (white masses) over the minority (Black masses)? How can he deny and cover up the rule of a tiny minority of monopolists who worsen the condition of the people, who fan racial strife between Black and

white, Black and Chicano, Black and Puerto Rican, Black and Indian, and of course between whites and all who are Black, Brown, Red or Yellow?

So-called revolutionary rhetoric cannot hide this monstrous error which omits the class nature of society—which denies capitalism as the source of racism, and the monopolists' use of racism, along with anti-Communism, to exploit and oppress the masses. Such rhetoric is a disservice to all of those, irrespective of color, who are fighting for peace, democracy and the well-being of the people.

Huey P. Newton engages in demogogy when he claims that there is a struggle between a majority of whites and a minority of Blacks. He lumps the white monopolists (a minority) with the white working class majority (and sections of the middle strata).

He fails to identify the monopolists (a white minority), and he does this in a way unbecoming to a revolutionary: by lumping the exploited majority of white workers with the oppressing minority of white monopolists. Revolutionaries must understand that this is the traditional method of accommodating to the imperialist enemy of change.

"The Building of the Machine"

In the June 5 *Black Panther*, Huey P. Newton reveals the full nature of his projected Black capitalist course. "In the past," writes Newton, "the Black Panther Party took a counter-revolutionary position with our blanket condemnation of Black capitalism." Now, however, Newton sees a revolutionary role for Black capitalism.

He outlines a program in which Black Panther clothing and shoe factories and medical programs will be assisted by "contributions" from Black capitalists. In exchange, the Panthers will call upon the community to patronize the businesses of these Black capitalists.

"Black capitalists," states Newton, will have "the potential to contribute to the building of the *machine* which will serve the true interests of the people and end all oppression." (Emphasis added.) One can get an idea of the kind of "machine" Newton intends to build from the following admission: In the past, he writes, "we received money for our survival programs from the big white capitalists."

Perhaps this admission also casts light on some of the reasons why Newton complained, in his April 17 article, that "our hook-up with white radicals did not give us access to the white community because they did not guide the white community." It now becomes clear that he prefers instead to have "access" to white capitalists—whom

he identifies not as the exploiters of Black and white workers, but as the "guides" of the "white community."

Newton cannot, however, camouflage the fact that his "access" to white corporate capital means that he is continuing to serve the monopolists at the expense of Black Americans and all working people. We venture to predict that his new form of accommodation to the white capitalist "guides" will be exposed far more rapidly than his previous super-revolutionary services to the same forces.

Black people are in a unique position. On top of more than 200 years of chattel slavery, operated by the slave-owner partners of emergent capitalism, they have had over 100 years of capitalist exploitation, racism, war and poverty.

And now Newton echoes the monopolists responsible for the oppression and exploitation of Black people who are saying that the problems of the system will be solved if only a few more Black people become capitalists. The capitalists who say this are, of course, the same ones who have set up every type of barrier against those Blacks who have tried to establish small businesses over the years.

And it is particularly ironic that the "invitation" to Black people to become capitalists should come from the very same corporate monopolists who have already destroyed most of the nation's small businesses. Those that remain, whether white- or Black-owned, can operate only under the impossible conditions of monopoly domination.

Not only have the mass production industries come under the control of corporate monopoly. Through their control of the banks, chains, franchising operations, insurance and real estate companies, etc., these same monopolists dominate *all* sectors of the economy, including that in the Black community.

Now, in an effort to recruit a sector of Blacks to support the ruling class against their own people, the monopolists have offered a tiny minority the illusion of Black capitalism. This is another variation of the tokenism rejected by the Black masses.

Yet we must keep in mind that the Black bourgeoisie is oppressed by the same monopolists who exploit and oppress the Black people as a whole. It is within this context that Communists—who are opposed to capitalist exploitation, whether by white- or Black-owned business—support the anti-monopolist demands of Black capitalists.

Access to the handful of giant corporations and banks which control the nation's economy promotes the myth of "Black capitalism" as a crude attempt to convince Black people that anyone can still "make it" in the U.S. The monopolists do this in order to divert the Black liberation movement from its real course. At a time when one-

third of the workers in the great mass production industries are Black, the future of the liberation movement lies in united struggle with all the oppressed and exploited against the common enemy, the monopolists.

In outlining the Panthers' Black capitalist course, Newton states that the party's new programs "satisfy the deep needs of the community but they are not solutions to our problems. That is why we call them survival programs, meaning survival pending revolution." He then goes on to develop his concept of the revolutionary role of Black capitalists:

We now see the Black capitalist as having a similar relationship to the Black community as the national bourgeoisie have to the people in national wars of decolonization. In wars of decolonization the national bourgeoisie supports the freedom struggles of the people because they recognize that it is in their own selfish interest. Then when the foreign exploiter has been kicked out, the national bourgeoisie takes his place and continues the exploitation. However, the national bourgeoisie is a weaker group, even though they are exploiters. Therefore, the people are in a better position to wipe the national bourgeoisie away after they have assisted the people in wiping out the foreign exploiters. (*Black Panther*, June 5, 1971.)

With this brazen misappropriation and misuse of Marxist terminology, Newton tries to put a revolutionary stamp on his scheme to build a machine that will serve the "foreign" U.S. monopolists at the expense of the marginal Black capitalists and all Black people—including the most victimized of capitalism's victims, the lumpen-proletariat.

In accordance with Newton's theory of the revolutionary role of the lumpen elements, the lumpen victims will be rewarded with free handouts from the party. In return, they will form a machine that, to understate the matter, can serve no good purpose in the Black liberation movement.

At the same time, Newton proposes that all strata of Black Americans remain within the ghetto enclaves "pending" revolution. He is asking that they give up the only struggle that can benefit all Black Americans, including the middle classes: a united struggle with all exploited and oppressed people to win the only "territory" upon which Black people can gain their liberation in the United States—that is, the entire country and its economy.

In the former colonies of Africa and other countries, it was the foreign settler who lived in enclaves within the oppressed peoples'

lands. In the U.S., the white corporate oppressors have forced Black people into the enclaves where Newton suggests they remain—until the revolution in which the Black minority frees itself by fighting the white majority. This is the bind alley into which Newton urges Black people. But Black Americans can be liberated only through a joint struggle with all the oppressed and exploited against the white corporate minority.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America, the anti-imperialist phase of the revolutionary process opens the way to the transition to socialism. In the United States, the revolutionary process demands the building of a great anti-monopoly movement—led by contingents of Black, white, Brown, Red and Yellow workers—to break monopolist control of the government. It is the only path offering a perspective for the Black liberation movement—but some "revolutionaries" refuse to recognize this.

Some look for short cuts ("instant" revolution), while others devise "survival" programs pending the day when revolution comes magically into being. In actuality, both concepts are anti-revolutionary diversions from the *centrality* of the anti-monopoly strategy in this stage of the revolutionary process.

The Future Determines Its Own Tactics

To help preserve his "revolutionary" image while introducing his "survival program," Newton makes use of the "when they are ready to pick up the gun" concept. But, shorn of its rhetoric, this is the equivalent of saying, "Since the masses are not yet ready to pick up the gun, we will table the question of picking up the gun until the masses are ready to put it on the agenda." This is simply another way of creating passivity and compounding frustration.

The "when they are ready to pick up the gun" idea has also been expressed by others on the Left. Even some advanced Marxists have reflected views that represent an accommodation to rather than a struggle against this concept. But such views are in contradiction to the program of the Communist Party, to the Marxist-Leninist principles on which the Party is based.

In his April 17 article, Newton stated that Cleaver's concept of "instant" revolution was a "fantasy." But the idea of "picking up the gun when the masses are ready" is no less a fantasy: tomorrow's tactics cannot be determined today. Future struggles, which will be influenced by the outcome of today's, will determine the tactics that go on tomorrow's agenda.

Focusing on the gun in the future leads to frustration in the pres-

ent. It carries the implication that any method short of the gun is inadequate, or futile, amounting to no more than a holding operation until the real thing happens—merely a question of firing blanks until at long last reaching the point of “picking up the gun.”

This same idea is also expressed in a slightly different form by other individuals on the Left. According to one such view, “the possibilities of peaceful struggle have not yet been exhausted.” This formulation implies that while armed struggle is not “yet” on the agenda, a revolutionary strategy must be based on the assumption that it will inevitably be placed there.

This view operates on the fatalistic notion that no matter what changes occur in the relationship of forces on a national and world scale, the working class and its allies will inevitably exhaust their capacity to prevent the ruling class from imposing armed struggle on the revolutionary process. This view, like its variants, differs from Cleaver’s concepts of armed struggle only in emphasis and timing, since it too presupposes the inevitability of armed struggle as the only form of revolution, of transition to liberation and socialism.

“Marxism demands an attentive attitude to the *mass* struggle in progress, which, as the movement develops, as the class consciousness of the masses grows, as economic and political crises become more acute, continually gives rise to new and more varied forms of defense and attack. . . .

In the second place, Marxism demands an absolutely *historical* examination of the question of the forms of struggle. To treat this question apart from the concrete historical situation betrays a failure to understand the rudiments of dialectical materialism. At different stages of economic evolution, depending on differences in political, national, cultural, living and other conditions, different forms of struggle, come to the fore and become the principal forms of struggle; and in connection with this, the secondary, auxiliary forms of struggle undergo change in turn. (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XI, pp. 213-214.)

Marx, Engels and Lenin fought against ideas that foreclosed the possibility of varying forms of revolutionary struggle in the transition to socialism. They rejected both the Right opportunist illusion that the transition would inevitably be peaceful, and the “Left” opportunism that proclaimed armed struggle as the only path to socialism for every country.

Today’s Right opportunists also predict that armed struggle will not be necessary, while the “Left” opportunists predict that it will be inevitable. Marxism-Leninism opposes both the *will* and the *won’t*

of these two faces of opportunism, both of which tend to disarm the mass struggle.

While opposing “Left” concepts of the inevitability of armed struggle, Communist strategy simultaneously opposes Right opportunist illusions that transition to socialism is possible without the sharpest class struggles combined with the struggles of all the oppressed to curb and defeat the power of racist monopoly.

As Lenin wrote, “To attempt to answer yes or no to the question whether any particular means of struggle should be used, without making a detailed examination of the concrete situation of the given movement at the given stage of its development, means completely to abandon the Marxist position.” (*Collected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 214.)

The “Most Extraordinary Privilege”

“Super-revolutionaries” are quick to shout “revisionist” at those who are guided by Lenin’s views regarding different paths to socialism.

By contrast, Le Duan, Ho Chi Minh’s close comrade and successor, who has been at the center of more than 30 years of armed struggle against imperialism, emphasizes that “Lenin, like Marx, was much concerned about the possibility of peacefully seizing power by the working class.”

Even before the October revolution, states Le Duan, Lenin believed that “Communists should do everything to strive for [peaceful transition] as long as a real possibility existed, even through the chances are one in a hundred.” ^{though}

Specifically, after state power had been transferred to the bourgeoisie by the February, 1917 revolution, Lenin saw the possibility of a peaceful transfer of power to the working class. “Lenin,” says Le Duan, “proposed the tactics of the peaceful development of the revolution. . . . When conditions changed, after July, and there was no longer the peaceful possibility, Lenin changed tactics and prepared for armed revolution.”

Now that the October Revolution has led to a world system of socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union, forming the primary contradiction to imperialism, the possibilities for differing forms of revolutionary transition to socialism are increasing. This also means that forms of revolutionary transition that were rare in Lenin’s time may become more frequent in the present epoch.

At the heart of the ultra-Leftists’ errors is a lack of understanding of how the socialist countries have altered the prospects for class and national liberation within the prison of imperialism. They maintain,

for example, that the Cuban experience represents the only valid type of transition to socialism. As Fidel Castro points out, these ultra-Leftists are a part of a "whole series of negators of Lenin [who] have emerged since the October Revolution." Amplifying this view, Castro states:

Today there are, as we know, theoretical super-revolutionaries, super-Leftists, veritable "supermen" if you will, who can destroy imperialism in a jiffy with their tongues. There are many super-revolutionaries lacking all notions of reality about the problems and difficulties of a revolution. They are prompted by sentiments carefully fostered by imperialism and are full of fierce hatred. It is as if they refused to forgive the Soviet Union its existence, and this from "Left"-wing positions. They would like a Soviet Union shaped according to their strange model, according to their ridiculous ideals. Yet a country is primarily a reality, one made up of numerous other realities.

The exponents of these trends forget the incredible initial difficulties of the revolutionary process in the Soviet Union, the incredible problems arising from the blockade, isolation and fascist aggression. They pretend not to know anything about all this and regard the existence of the Soviet Union as almost a crime, and this from "Left"-wing positions, which is an act of absolute dishonesty.

They forget the problems of Cuba, of Vietnam, of the Arab world. They forget that wherever imperialism is striking its blows it comes up against a country which sends the people the arms they need to defend themselves.

We recall Playa Giron these days. We well remember the anti-aircraft artillery, the tanks and guns and mortars and other weapons that enabled us to smash the mercenaries.

This means that the existence of the Soviet state is objectively one of the most extraordinary privileges of the revolutionary movement. (*Granma*, May 3, 1970.)

Shortly after the October revolution, Lincoln Steffens, the U.S. journalist, visited the Soviet Union and said, "I have seen the future and it works." And now, as Castro has shown, this revolution not only "works" for the Soviet people, it works for all oppressed humanity. It is the single most important force in the world working in support of liberation everywhere—a "most extraordinary privilege" constantly creating "extraordinary" changes in the revolutionary process on a world scale. It creates new opportunities for class and national liberation struggles that cannot be contained within the preconceived molds of pseudo-theorists, or by the desperate acts of neo-colonialist imperialism.

While the pseudo-theorists cling to the single idea of "picking up the gun," the Chilean Popular Unity coalition, with a solid working-class base led by the Communist Party, pursues an opposite tactic—aimed *not* at "picking up the gun," but at *preventing* the internal oligarchy and its imperialist patrons from doing so. This tactic combines maximum internal strength with anti-imperialist unity on a world scale.

If, however, the oligarchy together with U.S. imperialism should at some point manage to "pick up the gun," the advantage would nevertheless remain with those who have adapted Leninist tactics to each stage of the struggle.

The imperialists have always been the first to pick up the gun—including in Vietnam. If they repeat this pattern in Chile, victory—as in Vietnam—will nevertheless belong to those who recognize that power comes not out of the barrel of a gun but out of the unity of the masses in struggle against imperialism which picks up the gun.

(continued from page 94.)

In their essay, Professors Adler and Patterson did no more than to show that leading figures in the American historical establishment had for some twenty-five years presented Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union as more or less twin tyrannies in a kind of high-level justification for Truman's comment after Hitler's attack upon the USSR to the effect that he hoped both sides killed each other off. Adler and Patterson do not fail to show the significance of this view for the onset of the Cold War and for some of the worst excesses of that Cold War within the United States; they also do not fail to affirm that the view which identified the two systems was a travesty upon the truth and that, of course, profound distinctions and contrasts marked the two States and the ideologies of fascism and of communism.

This undercuts basic assumptions and postulates of the ideology justifying the Cold War and the anti-Communist hysteria in the United States; no wonder that for a solid year more or less agonizing discussion of the article has been appearing in the leading periodical of the historical profession in the United States.

Social crisis induces a re-examination of the bases of a society. The ideological foundations and adornments of that society were and are lies; as the structure itself sways and threatens to totter and as its inhabitants become increasingly discontented, those foundations and adornments are increasingly challenged. Nowhere is this more true than in the crucial area of history and especially recent history.
June 29, 1970

Capitalism in Crisis and the Fight for Peace*

The Crisis of U.S. Capitalism

Within the system of world capitalism U.S. monopoly capital is the strongest, but it is also the most vulnerable. It is vulnerable because of the crisis of its inner contradictions. For the moment it is also the most unstable and is furthest out on a limb that leads nowhere. It is the victim of its own policies based on its own miscalculations. And if one does not retreat from a limb that leads nowhere, one courts disaster.

For U.S. imperialism this is a moment when the headwinds are threatening to take over. This is a period when the opposing forces have become an effective counterbalance to U.S. imperialist policies. Increasingly they are canceling out U.S. influence.

Areas of difficulties in the past are now turning into setbacks.

In world affairs U.S. imperialism is forced to seek new options. The options that are open are either detours or retreats. Increasingly the detours turn into fiascos. The most dramatic examples of this are the acts of aggression against Laos and Cambodia. These were options that turned into defeats.

Acts of aggression bog down in a maze of contradictions. The clearest example of this is the U.S.-Israel aggression in the Middle East. It is another limb that leads nowhere.

The new element that more and more forces itself into all U.S. imperialist operations is the element of forced retreat. This element is present in many of the past proposals and contingency plans that were not accepted, as now revealed in the Pentagon papers. But more and more of the present-day contingency plans are compelled to leave open the option of a forced retreat.

What we are seeing is the collapse of a plan to dominate the world. We are coming to an end of an era. The plan was based on the judgment of U.S. imperialism that because the rest of the world was weak and had to rebuild after the war, because the United States had a monopoly on the atomic bomb, because the United States had become the pivotal center for the capitalist world, there-

* The following is a part of a report presented to a national conference of the Communist Party USA on July 9, 1971.

fore this was going to be the American Century. Everything that has followed has been in line with that master plan—Hiroshima, the cold war, the Marshall Plan, the McCarthy hysteria, the attack on North Korea, the Indochina aggression, the CIA actions in Iran and Guatemala, the murder of Lumumba, the U.S.-dominated system of alliances, NATO, SEATO, and so on. The anti-Soviet campaign, the counter-insurgency plans, the plans for ideological and political penetration—these, too were features of the plan for U.S. domination of the world.

Five administrations have adopted the master plan of aggression as the framework for their policies. Winston Churchill espoused it in Missouri. In 1951, during the aggression against Korea and when the first steps in the aggression against Vietnam were being taken, Jackson, Eisenhower's speech writer and editor of *Fortune*, called it "U.S.A.'s Permanent Revolution." He was, of course, talking about a permanent counterrevolution. It is worth recalling now, because that era is coming to an end. After openly saying war with the Soviet Union is almost inevitable, he said:

But today, though we again have allies, though we have the U.N., though we have access to resources all over the world, it is *we* who must shape the struggle: *we* must make the mold. . . . The shape of things to come depends on us: our moral decision, our wisdom, our vision, and our will. . . .

It seems as likely that we shall be required to fight a series of partial wars . . . over remote terrains and over a long period, to maintain the principles of freedom, law and balance. That may be the hardest test of all: to fight without national hatred or national fear. . . .

Yet the U.S. has it in its power to put something better in sight: to demolish these autocracies, undermine all their dead-end dreams of state socialism, and set their extraordinary citizens on a new and more promising economic path. (*Fortune*, February 1951.)

That was the design—the master plan. U.S. monopoly capital was united behind this plan of aggression—a plan based on a historic miscalculation.

Forced Retreat

It is this policy that has now bogged down. It is from that master plan that the forced retreat is now taking place.

The withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam is planned as a maneuver, but it also has the elements of a retreat. For U.S. imperialism to give up a military victory is a retreat. The counter-forces are the armed people of Vietnam, the anti-war movement of the people

of the United States, the arms and the know-how of most of the socialist states but mainly of the Soviet Union, and world public opinion. The withdrawal of U.S. ground troops from Cambodia was a retreat. The law forbidding the use of U.S. ground troops in Laos has the elements of a forced retreat.

For Nixon and the Pentagon the troop withdrawal is still an election maneuver. It is a maneuver to get the Vietnamese to fight each other.

But it is daily becoming more difficult for Nixon to hold on to this course. The puppet troops are not a stable force. The demand to set a date for total withdrawal continues to grow. The revelations in the secret Pentagon papers make it more difficult for Nixon to carry out his maneuver. The public is now learning about secret contingency plans to be sprung after the elections.

We are at a historic moment. This war can be brought to an end this year. Total forced withdrawal is an absolute possibility. On this we cannot wait until our Convention. For us it is not a contingency plan. At this meeting we must readjust our priorities to measure up to this moment.

In the Middle East the aggression has bogged down. There U.S. imperialism is trying to maneuver to postpone defeat as long as possible. With each day this is becoming more difficult. U.S. imperialism is forced to consider military cutbacks in Japan, Korea, Okinawa and Western Europe.

The proposals of the Soviet Union of troop reductions, arms reductions and controls are now falling on more fertile soil. U.S. imperialism has been forced to accept the anti-imperialist and socialist direction of developments in Chile, the Sudan, Libya, the Congo and other countries. This is also an element of retreat.

The Nixon Administration is maneuvering in its relations with the People's Republic of China. It is a maneuver but it is a retreat from its policy of trying to isolate and blockade People's China.

A basic pillar of U.S. policy has been the capitalist world's economic blockade against the socialist countries. This is now a shambles.

The Mack Truck deal is an example of the new breakthrough. If Mack Truck does not take the deal, corporations in other capitalist countries are more than willing. This deal would create jobs for 160,000 U.S. workers. These new developments give rise to a number of obvious questions.

Does this mean that U.S. imperialism is going to give up its policies of aggression? To believe this would be a wrong and dangerous illusion. U.S. imperialism will retreat only where it is forced to. It will continue aggression in every possible way, wherever it is possible

to do so. What this does mean is that U.S. imperialism is forced to pursue its policy under changing circumstances.

Besides the resistance in the world arena which forces U.S. imperialism to retreat and maneuver, what has emerged as an equally important proposition is the counterforces on the home front.

There is a new relationship between U.S. foreign policies and domestic developments. There is a new relationship between the struggles conducted by the peoples of the world and the movements and struggles of the people of the United States.

Sharpened Contradictions

What is important and new is the causes that give rise to and feed these counterforces. Among these is the impact the war policies are now having on the home front. Among them is also the cumulative impact of a military-oriented economy of military-dominated values and priorities.

There are newly-sharpened contradictions. There are insoluble contradictions between a military-oriented economy and the possibilities of economic growth, between military production and unemployment, between high military budgets and workers' living standards, between military orientation and decent social services and welfare. There is the relationship between military spending and the critical urban crisis and the crises in housing and education. There are the relationships between the policies of military aggression and racism, between the military orientation and the struggle for democratic rights.

These military-oriented policies pushed by the top circles of monopoly capital are more and more in contradiction with the self-interests of the people, and with sections of their own class. The sharpening of all these contradictions is at the bottom of the political crises. This has given rise to a powerful counterforce here at home.

At the 19th National Convention we spoke about the new level of political and ideological consciousness in the world arena. This consciousness has continued to grow.

U.S. policies have failed because they have come up against two new factors. The first is a new level of political consciousness expressed in a militant anti-imperialism. The second is the availability of an unlimited supply of arms to the forces of anti-imperialism the world over.

Thus U.S. imperialism faces a powerful anti-imperialist force on the world front and an unstable and rebellious home front. These are the reasons why it is forced to maneuver and to accept defeats and setbacks.

What is the direction of the maneuvers? It is toward a greater reliance on neo-colonialist methods. U.S. imperialism is putting greater emphasis on political and ideological penetration.

The new relationship of world forces has given rise to a new intra-imperialist contradiction. The question the imperialists face is how to react to the rising power of the socialist states. The issue is sharpest between the United States and its main capitalist rivals. Most of the capitalist countries have moved toward a policy of peaceful co-existence; hence the U.S.-dominated trade embargo has collapsed. This contradiction has forced U.S. imperialism to retreat from some of its rigid positions of the past. It has exposed the bankruptcy of U.S. cold war policy.

But this also presents a new problem for the countries of the socialist world, and for the newly liberated countries. The question is how to extract the maximum mileage from this situation. The key to maximum benefits from this new contradiction for the socialist countries, of course, is a united policy. The obstacles to such a policy are the influences of opportunism, especially as it is expressed in policies of shortsighted, narrow nationalism. Unity among the socialist countries could now force the U.S. to withdraw completely from its restrictive and discriminatory policies in relation to the socialist world.

It is clear that there are new factors operating on the world scene. U.S. imperialism, the main obstacle in the path of the world revolutionary process, is in a deep crisis. The moment when it can be forced on a number of fronts is *now*.

From all this we must conclude that it is necessary:

1. To put into sharper focus the growth and heightened power of the counterforces to U.S. policies of imperialist aggression.
2. To give greater weight to the element of detour and forced retreat, and to the potential that is inherent in this moment.
3. To assess correctly the impact and significance of the bankruptcy of the dominant policy U.S. imperialism has followed since the end of the Second World War.
4. To see fully the significance of the new relationships between foreign policy and its impact on domestic affairs. To assess fully the new correlation and the reciprocal impact each has on the other.
5. To see the turning-point nature of the moment—that emergence from the cumulative effects of U.S. policies based on the miscalculation policies of a class incapable of doing otherwise.

In the final analysis what it all boils down to is that we must have a correct assessment of these new developments because it is on that basis that we can understand the *full potential* for mass struggle, for mass movements. This is a moment when mass struggles can

achieve their objectives. It is a moment when mass actions can change the course of history. But the moment will not last forever.

Economic Problems

The insoluble problems of present-day U.S. capitalism are most sharply focused on its economic base. Because of this, economic problems have emerged as the most critical aspect of the present moment.

In general, what is unfolding is the economics of state monopoly capitalism. The economic processes are increasingly being affected by the dominating influence of the monopoly sector, by the growing role of the state in economic matters, by the increasingly multinational nature of U.S. corporations. These features are escalated and sharpened by the crises in the war policies of U.S. imperialism. They are further sharpened because of the fact that U.S. imperialism is at an end of a postwar era. It is a shift from the economics of an expanding power, out to enslave and to dominate the world, to the economics of a bogged-down policy of receding influence. It is the economics of a class still preoccupied with the myth of past miscalculations.

Within all this there are important new developments and shifts taking place. For example, monopoly domination is too general a term. It seems to me we need to give greater attention to such questions as the new role of finance capital—the role of the banks in the domination over the productive process and life in general.

The liberal-Left illusions about the declining role of the banks have gone up in smoke. Finance capital has increasingly acquired a special status in the state monopoly capitalist setup. It is the key factor in the process of monopolization, in the development of conglomerates. From these dominating heights it is the most powerful force influencing state policies, foreign and domestic. Monopoly capital continues as a financial-industrial complex. We must consider the meaning of the new role of finance capital within this framework.

This has dramatically come to light in some recent cases of monopolies in trouble. It is not the management of Boeing, of Penn Central or of Lockheed that has manipulated the strings in their relations with the government. The decisions are being made between the banks and the military. And the banks are the decisive element.

That financial capital has increasingly emerged into a special status is not accidental. Every process facilitates this development. Doing business with borrowed money is now an accepted and predominant way of life for U.S. capitalism. The banks are the loaners and the interest collectors.

The permanent policy of deficit government spending gives the

banks a further position of power and enslavement. They collect the huge volume of interest on outstanding debt, public and private. This interest alone comes to something like \$160 billion each year. Most of this is tax-exempt. The government policy of influencing the economic cycles by manipulating the money supply and basic interest rates through the Federal Reserve system with its inter-relationships with the banking chains has given finance capital an unusual position of power both in the state apparatus and the economy.

The growth of the conglomerates has tightened the banks' noose around industry. U.S. finance capital is not only the biggest factor in U.S. foreign operations it is the dominant factor in the capitalist world.

U.S. banks are now world banks. Most have more foreign branches than domestic. They provide U.S. neo-colonial operations with a special kind of cover and control.

Most of the newly liberated countries are not only deeply in debt—mostly to U.S. banks—but they must now make loans to pay interest on the old loans. The revisionist policies of some socialist countries have led them to seek loans from capitalist banks. Some are now in difficulties as a result.

There are tax loopholes for all of big business, but nonpayment of taxes is a way of life for the banks.

The interest rates on all new loans now have an escalation clause, based on the prime rate. Through this they are locked into a permanent position of gouging.

What is the significance of this development?

Financial capital, on the basis of its position of special status, is a big factor in such areas as foreign policy, military budgets, tax policies, policies affecting inflation and methods of financing government debt. This is a further development of the parasitic nature of monopoly capitalism. It has added to the contradictions and the anarchistic nature of U.S. capitalism. They are a new breed of money lenders, with unprecedented economic and political power.

Crisis and Unemployment

The recovery from the crisis of last year is at best a sick recovery. The problems of the recovery are related to the overall problems of U.S. capitalism. Policies which above all else protect big business interests limit the options to either high unemployment or a high rate of inflation. At the present moment we have both. There are now 6 to 7 million unemployed and 3 million part-time workers. The number of those permanently unemployed keeps increasing, both during a crisis and afterward. There are millions who are not counted

as unemployed because they have given up trying. There are almost a million permanently unemployed who have never had a job. They are mainly youth, but especially Black youth. There is no economic recovery for the unemployed, the part-time workers, the millions with fixed minimum incomes. The labor force keeps growing. Automation keeps displacing workers.

And now there is a new factor. For 25 years there has been a steady build-up of the military forces. There has been a steady growth in the federal, state, county and municipal government bureaucracies. Employment in the scientific and academic fields has constantly expanded, student enrollment has escalated year after year. All these outlets have acted as a sponge absorbing tens of millions of people.

This process has now reversed itself, reflecting the overall crisis of U.S. imperialism. These are now areas of high unemployment. This has somewhat changed the composition of the unemployed. There are now special lines at the unemployment compensation offices for scientific workers, returned veterans and government workers.

The crisis and the sickly recovery have again dramatically exposed the roots and the nature of racism. The effects of the economic crisis in the ghettos were devastating. They were immediate and they are still present after the recovery. There is some rise in production but it has had no effect in the Black community.

In the ghettos the deterioration in jobs, in housing, in education, in medical care, in social services continues. The Black youth face a total economic impasse. All this constitutes a form of genocide.

Nixon's economic moves have been presented in the name of fighting inflation. But 1970 was the most inflationary year since the Korean war. The six-month period ending March 1971 breaks all six-month records for the past 18 years. Rising taxes and prices are still cutting into the real wages of the working class.

Nixon illegally gave the corporations a special tax writeoff gift of some \$3½ billion each year for 10 years, while with a wave of his hand he ruled out all tax reductions for the people. What clearer example of a class tax policy does anyone need?

Besides the overall class policies, a special, most coldblooded and inhuman policy against the poorest sections of the poor is being unfolded. In the first place, it is directed at the Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican ghettos, but it strikes at the poor generally. It is a war against the people who are forced to get government assistance. The attack is led by Nixon, Rockefeller and Reagan. The plan is to destroy the whole system of public assistance. For the second time, Nixon has vetoed a bill that would have provided jobs on federal construc-

tion projects.

What they want is to increase the army of unemployed, to keep them on starvation levels of existence so that they will be a source of cheap labor for industry. That is the main aim of Nixon's welfare reform bill.

This attack on the poorest of the poor is giving rise to a new area of struggle, in which new organizations have taken root. We need to give much more attention to the movements and struggles in this field.

The Peace Movement: A New Stage

Since our last convention the mass upsurge of struggle has continued to grow. The mass actions continue to unfold in a pattern of waves that surge and recede. But they take place in a framework of a rising militancy, political consciousness, radicalization and readiness to struggle.

During the past year, the most active and dynamic sector of the mass movements and struggles has been the unprecedented wave of actions demanding an end to the U.S. aggression in Vietnam. The two-week spring peace offensive, in scope and political depth, was without precedent. It represented a new level of anti-imperialist consciousness. The peace movement was able to overcome the period of disorientation and confusion that had affected its activists a year before.

It is our opinion that we have now reached the most crucial point in the struggle. It is crucial because it is now possible to put an end to the U.S. aggression in Indochina this year.

The revelations in the secret papers of the Pentagon have greatly added to the pressures and the possibilities. They not only make it more difficult for Nixon further to follow the path which has now been exposed, but their publication demonstrates how sharp and wide is the split in the ranks of the ruling class.

The aggression is now a policy without any base of support. The credibility gap has now turned into an unbridgable gulf.

The dramatic shift in public sentiment is clearly shown in the 73 per cent who want the aggression stopped now. They want it stopped regardless of what the political settlement is in Vietnam. This is indeed a significant shift.

This shift is also clear in the 51 per cent who, in one public opinion poll, now consider the war unjust and immoral. It is clear in the 33 per cent, in another poll, who think the United States leaders responsible for the war are guilty under the war crimes precedent set in Nuremburg.

This sentiment, expressed by the 51 per cent and even more dramatically by the 33 per cent, is an extremely high-level expression of conscious anti-imperialism. This is the most significant shift in mass consciousness in our history.

This has resulted in the fact that hundreds of thousands are openly resisting the draft. It has resulted in the fact that the armed forces have become rebellious and are now an unreliable military force. The full extent of this rebellion is carefully covered up.

The high level of addiction to drugs in the armed forces is only an expression of the dissatisfaction and sense of frustration in the ranks of the troops. The drug problem has now emerged as a serious problem because it has backfired. In the past the army brass has either facilitated or closed its eyes to the distribution of cheap drugs, because it helped them to control the reluctant and rebellious troops. Now it has become a serious disabling factor.

The Administration has taken steps only because the story of the involvement of puppet governments and military leaders leaked out and because the youth who have returned to civilian life, while addicted to drugs, have become a political time-bomb.

There is no question that the main source for the cheap drugs has been the puppet Saigon government, with the connivance of the U.S. military brass.

A Qualitative Shift

To be able to draw the necessary conclusions we must more fully understand the tremendous significance, the historic meaning, of the fact that we can realistically pose the task of forcing U.S. imperialism to withdraw from Indochina. This withdrawal will signal a qualitative shift in the world balance of forces. It will put an end to an era.

Since the Second World War, the U.S. policy of aggression, the U.S. armed forces and U.S. money have formed the main link in the world counter-revolutionary chain that has held back and slowed down the world revolutionary process.

A forced retreat in Indochina would seriously weaken and even break the main link in this chain. It would have a most positive effect within all of the newly liberated countries. It would greatly stimulate anti-imperialist movements in all of the oppressed colonial countries.

This qualitative shift would make the socialist sector the dominant political, economic and ideological factor in the world. It would force an agonizing reappraisal, a basic, searching review within the United States. The basic direction of U.S. policy would come under heavy pressure and criticism. It would most likely force a fundamental realignment of political forces, a rearrangement of priorities.

In short, it would create a new political ball game at home. It would stimulate a new political consciousness. It would create a popular national majority base for concepts of anti-imperialism. It would become an everlasting obstacle to U.S. policies of imperialist aggression.

There is no question that it would greatly stimulate all democratic forces; it would create a healthier atmosphere for conducting the struggle against racism. The new realignment would move in the direction of realization of the anti-monopoly concepts. Such a victory is now realistically possible.

But, again, it is not automatic. It means shifting some of our own priorities. It means organization and mobilization. It means changing assignments, redirecting resources.

From all this, it is obvious that the October 13th moratorium date set by the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice is a key date.

To end the war means that the people will have to change the present course of the Nixon Administration. The Administration is under great pressures. It faces a serious dilemma. One demagogic rug after another is pulled away from under its spokesmen.

It was Nixon, Laird and Agnew who created the prisoner-of-war issue. They demagogically utilized the families of the prisoners of war. This has now turned against them. The families are now also pressing for a date to end the war.

And only last week the Vietnam delegation in Paris burst that bubble. The prisoner-of-war issue is now an issue that is directed against the war. These actions have again placed aggression as the main and only issue, plain for all to see.

As long as the present policies continue, Nixon cannot set a date for U.S. withdrawal because, in fact, there is no date and there never will be a date when, without U.S. armed forces, the Vietnam puppet forces can politically or militarily hold South Vietnam. With each U.S. withdrawal, the point of a political and military crisis in Vietnam moves closer. In short, Nixon cannot set a date for total withdrawal because that also will be the date that the Thieu government collapses.

But the demand to set a date has become the hottest issue. The possibility of Congress setting the date is growing.

Only the people of the U.S. can really set a date of withdrawal. It is now the most dramatic issue of the political crisis. And what is important is that that date can be this year.

One of the most critical factors in winning this battle is to get the working class to move more dramatically. There is no question that participation of a larger section of the trade union movement

was an important new factor in the spring offensive. The opposition to the war in the ranks of workers is on a new level.

New Labor Initiatives

On the West Coast, there is new initiative, based on the excellent resolution of the West Coast Longshore Union convention, a resolution that takes a forthright stand against the war—that brands it an unjust, wrong war. The initiative by the leaders of the West Coast Longshore Union has now been followed by three Northern California central labor bodies. The resolution is now being discussed and passed by local unions.

As a result of the recent Bronx Labor Conference Against the War, a similar resolution is being endorsed by local unions in New York.

What is important is that these are movements officially within organized labor and that the resolution is based not on the economic effects of the war but on its unjust, immoral character.

In this respect, it seems to me, the decision of the West Coast Longshore Union leadership to exempt military cargoes from the strike now in progress is not in keeping with the Convention resolution.

In this period, increasingly, central labor bodies have passed such resolutions, including the very good resolution passed by the central labor body of Cleveland, Ohio. The sharp split in the ranks of the ruling class has a special meaning when it comes to moving labor. The present split has created new possibilities. Trade union leadership tends to move when sections of the ruling class move.

Comrades, we have now reached the level where some form of stoppage by workers, even if only symbolic, is a realistic tactic in a number of areas. This has not been possible in the past. We must not underestimate the new possibilities that have emerged in this regard.

We must canvass, we must work for, we must probe for every possibility, for the very maximum participation of workers and unions in the October actions. Our priorities must be directed here. This must become our number one task.

It is possible to move the working class in many ways, on many forms of action.

For a United People's Movement

The organized sector of the anti-war movement is now focused around the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice, and around a movement largely controlled by the Trotskyite groups called NPAC and a subgroup calling itself the May Day Movement.

The Coalition for Peace and Justice is a coalition of the major

peace forces in the country. But it is much more. There is a working relationship between it and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, between it and the Welfare Rights Movement, between it and the Chicano movements. This gives the Coalition a broad organized base. The Coalition also has in its leadership councils a number of trade union leaders.

NPAC is a Trotskyite-controlled split off, which plays around with the idea of unity but only to hold on to the non-Trotskyite honest element. But in life its Trotskyite leaders have sabotaged every united action. They follow the typical Trotskyite line of double dealing and division.

Their policy is an opportunistic mixture of left phrases and Right-wing practices. They hide their racism behind the single issue line. They are against forcing the Nixon Administration to set a date because they are afraid that once the Vietnamese have a right to determine their own affairs they may put Communists into leadership. They give lip service to unity but sabotage any action except the one they control.

We are for a policy of unity but we should have no illusion about the Trotskyites. They have become the focal point of mobilization for all of the worst red baiters, anti-Sovieteers and disrupters. We have the problem of convincing all honest elements in both movements of the need for unity without subordinating this to unity with the Trotskyites.

In the end this struggle will be won in the organization and mobilization for mass actions. Our policy of seeking the path that unites the struggle against the war, against racism and poverty, is a correct policy. There are problems but in the end it is the only policy that will build a united people's movement that will have lasting value.

The Reactionary Role of Zionism*

Organized Zionism in the U.S.

In the pursuit of their reactionary, pro-imperialist policies the Israeli rulers rely on the support of the organized Zionist movement throughout the capitalist world, and especially in the United States.

On a world scale the official spokesman for Zionism is the World Zionist Organization. In Israel this body has quasi-governmental status, as the Israeli Status Law of 1952 makes clear. It says:

... The State of Israel recognizes the World Zionist Organization as the authorized agency which will continue to operate in the State of Israel for the development and settlement of the country, the absorption of immigrants from the Diaspora and the coordination of the activities in Israel of Jewish institutions and organizations active in these fields.

The Israeli government also looks upon the World Zionist Organization as an instrument for winning support abroad for Israeli foreign policy.

Here in the United States, bourgeois influences among the Jewish people have grown enormously during the past few decades. Jewish nationalism has greatly increased and the influence of Zionism has become widespread, especially since the 1967 war.

In the early part of this century, however, political Zionism met with little acceptance among U.S. Jews. It was opposed by Orthodox religious leaders as contrary to the precepts of Judaism, by Reform religious leaders and others as bringing the loyalty of Jews to the United States into question, and by class-conscious Jewish workers as contrary to their class interests and destructive of the fight for socialism.

Its first spurt of growth came immediately after World War I, stimulated by the Balfour Declaration and by a wave of anti-Semitism in the United States. Later, with the rise of Hitlerism and especially with its mass slaughter of Jews, the Zionist movement grew very rapidly. Indeed, it was only with this genocidal persecution of Jews that Zionism became a mass movement; it was their common per-

*This is the second part of a two-part article. The first part appeared in the July issue.

secution which became the chief bond among Jews in different lands. After World War II the establishment of the State of Israel gave further impetus to Zionist influence.

There are more than 200 active Jewish organizations in the U.S. today, and a number of them have memberships running into the hundreds of thousands. Avowedly Zionist organizations claim a combined membership of some 750,000. The largest of them is the Women's Zionist Organization of America (Hadassah) with 300,000 members. Second largest is the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) with 100,000.

Of those organizations which refer to themselves as "non-Zionist," the largest is Bnai Brith, a men's fraternal and religious organization with some 500,000 members. Other influential organizations include the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee. The leaders of these and other such organizations are generally Zionist in outlook, and the organizations themselves are for the most part no less active in support of Israel than the explicitly Zionist organizations. The American Jewish Congress is affiliated with the World Jewish Congress, which plays the same "non-Zionist" role on a world scale.

Other pillars of Zionist support are the synagogues and temples, whose total membership is very considerable. And not least, Zionism boasts the support of Jewish Right-wing social-democracy as embodied, for example, in the Jewish Labor Committee and the *Jewish Daily Forward*, both of them rabidly anti-Communist and anti-Soviet.

Since 1948, aid to Israel has become the chief focus of activity among U.S. Jews. Scores of millions of dollars are raised every year, sums large enough to be a highly important factor in the Israel economy. The United Jewish Appeal, which raises funds for all purposes, reports that up to the end of 1968 a grand total of \$1.22 billion, some two-thirds of all funds raised since 1948, had been allotted to the United Israel Appeal. In addition, from 1951 to the end of 1968 more than a billion dollars worth of long-term Israel bonds were purchased in the United States (almost 85 per cent of total world sales). On this huge inflow Israel has been heavily dependent for its economic survival.

Accompanying these mammoth fund-raising drives is an uninterrupted flood of political activity, aimed at winning support for the Israeli government and its foreign policy. In the major centers of Jewish population, and especially in New York City, the big Jewish organizations wield not a little influence in the political arena.

Because the Jewish population is concentrated in the biggest cities

and in key states from an electoral standpoint, the Jewish organizations are able to make themselves felt in national elections. It would be a rash presidential candidate who would dare openly to oppose Zionism or Israeli policies. There is also a well-organized pro-Israel lobby which a *New York Times* article (April 6, 1970) describes as "one of the most potent in the Washington sub-government." The article goes on to say: "The foundation stones of the pro-Israel lobby are an embassy that is generally considered the best run in Washington and scores of Jewish organizations which have large amounts of manpower, money and zeal."

Because of these pressures and because it accords with U.S. imperialist policy to build Israel up as a champion of "Western civilization" and the "free world," the communications media have joined in presenting to the American people a completely one-sided, chauvinist and essentially false picture of "little Israel" as an oasis of light and progress in a desert of Arab backwardness—an oasis, moreover, which is constantly threatened with physical extinction by the surrounding Arab hordes.

Agents of Israel

We have already noted the quasi-governmental status of the World Zionist Organization in Israel. With this body, and with particular political parties and other groupings in Israel, the various Zionist organizations in this and other countries are affiliated. And thereby they have come to serve as vehicles of Israeli influence abroad.

The ties of these organizations, and of non-Zionist organizations as well, with the Israeli government are maintained through the Jewish Agency for Israel. This body was originally established under the British Mandate as a Jewish governing body in Palestine, under the aegis of the World Zionist Organization. Today it continues to exist as a sort of shadow government made up of representatives of the various Zionist political parties in Israel plus a number of members from abroad, and bearing specific responsibility for promoting immigration and integration of immigrants.

Some two-thirds of the funds raised yearly by the United Jewish Appeal, as noted above, are turned over to the United Israel Appeal, which allocates them on the basis of a budget prepared by the Jewish Agency in Israel. They are distributed through the offices of the Jewish Agency in New York. The three organizations—UJA, UIA and the Jewish Agency—work closely together and, as Lawrence Mosher points out in an article in the *National Observer* (May

18, 1970), their leaderships overlap. Thus, at the time of the article, two officers of the Jewish Agency were registered with the State Department as agents of the Israeli government. One of these was also a vice-chairman of UIA, and the other was a member of its board of directors and a former president of Hadassah. The executive vice-chairman of UIA was also a secretary of UJA.

At the other end, much of the money distributed by the Jewish Agency goes to political parties in Israel and to the institutions controlled by them. Of this, Uri Avneri, editor of *Haolam Hazeh* and a member of the Israeli Knesset, writes:

Several million dollars are parcelled out directly among the Zionist parties, ostensibly as compensation for relinquishing their rights to organize their own fund-raising in the United States. But this represents only a small fraction of the real division; by financing youth organizations, educational activities, propaganda agencies, and other institutions belonging to the Zionist parties, the Jewish Agency goes a long way toward sustaining the huge apparatus that every Zionist party maintains in Israel and abroad. (*Israel Without Zionists*, MacMillan, New York, 1968, p. 175.)

Much larger sums are spent by the Jewish Agency for its own operations. Says Avneri:

. . . By agreement between the State of Israel and the Zionist organization, the State has abdicated to the organization its role in organizing immigration, absorbing the immigrants, setting up new agricultural settlements and supporting the old ones. These immense operations are conducted, even today in Israel, by the Jewish Agency. (*Ibid.*, p. 176)

In addition, considerable sums find their way into the hands of the Israeli government, to be used in pursuit of its own aims. And the bulk of the money raised here provides the government with desperately needed foreign exchange to pay for arms acquired from the United States.

At the same time, substantial amounts of money are funneled back to this country via the Jewish Agency, to be used for propaganda in support of the Israeli government. These operations usually go unpublicized, even though federal law requires that propaganda activities for or on behalf of foreign governments or other foreign principals be publicly disclosed. As an example, Mosher, in the article cited above, points to the Zionist magazine *Midstream*, published in New York by the Herzl Foundation. *Midstream*, he states, "is subsidized by the Jewish Agency in the amount of \$96,000 a year. Emanuel Neuman, chairman of the magazine's editorial board, is

one of the two persons who are registered foreign agents for the Jewish Agency's American office." But no reader of *Midstream* would ever know this from the magazine itself.

In 1963 a Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigation of the American Zionist Council (a coordinating body for a number of Zionist organizations) found that it was acting as a "conduit" for the Jewish Agency, having received over an eight-year period more than \$5 million for the purpose of creating favorable public opinion toward Israel's foreign policy. The investigation put a stop to this particular operation but the propaganda continues through other channels.

Nevertheless, all contributions to the UJA are tax-deductible, and the UJA has to this date retained its tax-exempt status despite such disclosures. And as long as Israel's policies serve the interests of U.S. imperialism, the U.S. government is hardly likely to question the use which the UJA makes of the funds it raises.

The fact remains, however, that the major Jewish organizations, Zionist and non-Zionist alike, play the role of political arms of the Israeli government. To some degree this role is openly acknowledged. Thus, Mosher, in the article cited above, quotes Rabbi Jay Kaufman, executive vice president of *Bnai Brith*, as writing to a fellow staff member: "BB [Bnai Brith] is now playing a greater role in the fate and future of Diaspora Jewry, assuming the tasks which the State of Israel cannot legitimately undertake because it is a sovereign state and cannot intrude in the affairs of other nations."

About a year ago Sol E. Jofte, dismissed after 22 years as a Bnai Brith official, sued the organization for breach of contract and its two top officers—its president, Dr. William A. Wexler, and Rabbi Kaufman—for libel. The suit was based on two letters by Rabbi Kaufman charging him with incompetence and failure properly to perform his duties. The real reason for his dismissal, Jofte asserted, was that he had fought efforts to convert Bnai Brith from a charitable and welfare organization into an unregistered agent of the Israeli government. He cited in evidence the employment of a Mrs. Avis Shulman whose job was to brief Jews about to visit the Soviet Union and to pass information obtained on these visits to the Israeli government.

These are clear indications that Bnai Brith maintains a relationship with the State of Israel which goes much beyond the charitable or religious.

Are They Really Zionists?

Central among the tenets of Zionism is that Israel is the homeland

of all Jews and hence it is incumbent on Jews everywhere—at the very least on Jews who consider themselves Zionists—to migrate to Israel. According to Ben-Gurion, Zionism can have only one meaning—“to Zion.” In his address to the 25th World Zionist Congress in December 1960, he declared that since the founding of Israel “every religious Jew has daily violated the precepts of Judaism . . . by remaining in the Diaspora.” Jews, he maintained, can truly live as Jews only in Israel, and “there cannot be a full and complete Jewish culture in the Diaspora, even in those free countries which grant Jews every right.”

This concept is fundamental in the thinking of Israel’s Zionist ruling circles. As Uri Avneri puts it:

The fundamental tenets of Zionism can be defined as follows: (a) all the Jews in the world are one nation; (b) Israel is a Jewish state, created by the Jews and for the Jews all over the world; (c) the Jewish dispersal is a temporary situation, and sooner or later all Jews will have to come to Israel, driven, if nothing else, by inevitable anti-Semitic persecution; (d) the Ingathering of these Exiles is the *raison d’etre* of Israel, the primary purpose to which all other aims have to be subservient. This line is taught in Israeli schools, propounded in political speeches, written in the daily press. It is the essence of the existing regime. (*Op. cit.*, pp. 157-158.)

Aliya—migration to Israel—is the incessant demand of the Israeli leaders. But this demand has met with almost no response from American Jews; as of mid-1970 there were only some 27,000 Americans of Jewish descent living in Israel—less than half of one per cent of the U.S. Jewish population. To be sure, the Zionist organizations in this country diligently preach aliya, but few among even their most devoted adherents have any intention of going to Israel except as visitors.

The failure of U.S. Jews (and Jews from other Western countries as well) to migrate to Israel in substantial numbers has given rise to a resentment among Israeli Zionist leaders which not even the millions in financial contributions serve fully to erase. Despite their devotion and generous support to Israel, these Jews, they maintain, are not really Zionists, since they do not accept Zionism’s mandate to live in Israel.

This idea is accepted by not a few in Jewish circles here. Thus, the well-known writer on Jewish affairs Judd Teller states:

We speak of a defunct Zionist movement in America. . . . Actually

there has never been a Zionist movement in America. . . . What we had was a movement of pro-Zionists, and that is why we faced a crisis in 1948. Everyone became pro-Zionist then. If it had been an ideological movement, it would have faced no crisis. However, Zionist ideology had not been accepted; some sections of the Zionist program were accepted, but not Zionist ideology. (“The Failure and Prospects of U.S. Zionism,” *Israel Horizons*, April 1970.)

The Jews who came to this country from Europe, says Teller, have chosen their homeland and it is the United States, not Israel. And since the chief function of Zionist organizations is aid to Israel, others contend that there is no point to their continued existence, since non-Zionist organizations perform this function just as well.

Indeed, with the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, membership in Zionist organizations fell off considerably. That of the ZOA dropped from 200,000 to 100,000. The reason given for this decline is that Jews who wished to support Israel found that they could readily do so without assuming the political commitments involved in belonging to Zionist organizations.*

Consequently the idea that U.S. Zionists are not really Zionist but are only “pro-Zionist” has gained considerable currency. However, this is an erroneous view.

To begin with, not all Zionists accept the thesis that Israel must become literally and physically the homeland of all Jews. Thus Ahad Haam, one of the most dedicated of Zionists, looked upon Palestine as the *spiritual* homeland of world Jewry, as a cultural and religious center for Jewish communities everywhere, providing a basis for the preservation of their Jewish identity. And Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress and for a number of years also president of the World Zionist Organization, holds a similar view, expressed in his autobiography in these words:

. . . We shall find some new way of continuing the intimate, fateful relationship between the state and the people, the center and the periphery, and thus acquire the spiritual strength to guarantee the survival of the Jewish communities in the Diaspora. The situation of the Jews will never be normalized through a state alone, but only by creating a center in Palestine while at the same time

*In 1970 an American Zionist Federation was formed, seeking to capitalize on the increased support for Zionism since the 1967 war. It includes in its ranks the 13 adult and 10 youth Zionist organizations now in existence. And it provides for individual memberships, thus permitting individuals to affiliate themselves with the Zionist movement without having to join specific organizations identified with particular political parties or groupings in Israel.

retaining the great Diaspora, linked with the state in an enduring and mutually enriching relationship. (*The Autobiography of Nahum Goldmann*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1969, p. 79.)

This concept has its adherents both in Israel and the United States, some of whom present it as a "new Zionism."

But more important, U.S. Zionists *do* accept the basic precepts of Zionism such as the concepts of a world Jewish nation, of the permanency of anti-Semitism and of a Jewish state which is exclusively Jewish and is the homeland of all Jews everywhere. And they fully support the reactionary, aggressive policies of the Israeli rulers stemming from these concepts.

Indeed, the U.S. Zionist Establishment has been notorious for its slavish adherence to every detail of Israeli policy, so much so that some leading figures in its ranks have been moved to protest. Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, writing in *Dimensions* (Fall, 1970), deplored "the spectacle of a supinely submissive and self-suppressed American Jewry," adding: "Not a peep of protest against a single scintilla of official Israeli foreign policy is permitted by the Jewish Establishment of America."

There are some within the Jewish Left in this country who seek to distinguish between "good" and "bad" Zionists, between "good" and "bad" Zionism. For example, Paul Novick, editor of the *Morning Freiheit* writes in that publication (April 5, 1970): "We oppose political Zionism that cooperates and supports the State Department. But there are other Zionists, such as Rabbi [Arthur J.] Lelyveld, who oppose the State Department, who oppose the war in Vietnam."

But this is sheer sophistry, serving to cover up an opportunist conciliation to Zionism. There are not, as the above statement implies, two kinds of Zionists or Zionism, one pro-imperialist and the other anti-imperialist. To be sure, the opposition of Rabbi Lelyveld (and of the American Jewish Congress which he now heads) to the U.S. aggression in Indochina is to be welcomed and supported. But this in no way lessens the reactionary character of his support to the Israeli government's aggressive, pro-imperialist policies and to the imperialist policies of U.S. ruling circles in the Middle East. Nor does it render his blatant anti-Sovietism any the more acceptable.

To suppress the fight against Zionism in the name of unity in the struggle to end the war in Indochina, is to impair this struggle, too. For Zionist support of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East weakens the struggle against its aggressions elsewhere.

Prop of Reaction

U.S. Zionism is not only an indispensable bulwark of the Zionist regime in Israel and an important adjunct of U.S. imperialism in its machinations in the Middle East. It is equally a base of support for the reactionary, racist policies of monopoly capital at home, as well as for U.S. foreign policy generally. And since the 1967 war there has been a marked trend to the Right in the Jewish Establishment here.

This is expressed, for one thing, in the widespread retreat of Jewish organizations and leaders from the fight against the Indochina war. Some groups, such as the Zionist Organization of America and the Jewish War Veterans, like Golda Meir and Moshe Dayan, have openly supported Nixon's criminal aggression. Others, though not so outspoken, have exerted pressure to suppress Jewish participation in peace activities. Rabbi Balfour R. Brickner, himself an active opponent of the war, last year noted with dismay that "many Jewish 'peaceniks' who only a few months ago were conspicuously vocal in opposition to their government's conduct of the war in Vietnam now seem to have lost their tongues, silenced by a fear . . . that such criticisms might jeopardize American political or military support for Israel." ("Vietnam and the Jewish Community," *Christian Century*, April 29, 1970.)

A second consequence of the heightened influence of Zionist ideology since 1967 is an alarming growth of racism and chauvinism within the Jewish community. Anti-Arab chauvinism of the most virulent kind has reached disturbing proportions. And the rise of white chauvinism has dangerously undermined Jewish-Black relations.

Today the alarm is being sounded in Jewish circles of an alleged upsurge of a new anti-Semitism—an "anti-Semitism of the Left." Lothar Kahn, in the *Congress Bi-Weekly* of March 6, 1970, spells it out in these words:

For the first time in modern history, the Jew is imperiled from both the Left and the Right. . . . For the Left, the anti-Jewish course is hidden under the political label of anti-Zionism. It has been used by much of the Marxist camp, the so-called neutrals, and by Black Power groups and their sympathizers. It has served as a respectable political cover by Arabs inflaming their people to a new frenzy, by Communist states frustrated by their inability to assimilate Jews fully and exterminate every vestige of religious-cultural identity, by African nations eager to prove their solidarity with the anti-imperialist, socialist Soviet-Nasser bloc, by American black extremists merging their pro-Moslem bias with the charge of Jewish capitalism and exploitation.

The device is obvious: to be anti-Zionist (or even to oppose the policies of the Israeli government) is to be anti-Semitic.

This has led, among other things, to a refusal to support the defense of framed-up Black Panther leaders (whom the courts are now acquitting), and especially to a total boycott of the fight to defend Angela Davis.

Thus do Zionism and the fraudulent slogan of "Black anti-Semitism" serve to align the Jewish people with the forces of racism and to divert them from the struggle against the real fomenters of anti-Semitism—the fascist ultra-Right elements supported and abetted by monopolist reaction.

Third, but by no means least, among the expressions of a Rightward trend is the rise of a campaign of vilification and slander of the Soviet Union, based on the Big Lie of official "Soviet anti-Semitism" and persecution of Soviet Jews, which has been built since 1967 to frenetic proportions. All the major Jewish organizations are actively involved. An American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, representing these organizations, was set up some years ago and has become increasingly vocal, accompanied by an Academic Committee on Soviet Jewry. Also deeply involved is the Israeli government and its representatives here. At the center of this unholy crusade is the demand that the Soviet government permit Soviet Jews to migrate to Israel.

The refutation of the falsehoods and distortions being propagated is beyond the scope of this article. Suffice it here to take note of two important points.

First, the sources of this campaign lie in the circles of Right-wing reaction. Thus, one of its most prominent instigators was the late Senator Thomas J. Dodd, a rabid Red-baiter who, like others of his kind, was caught with his fingers in the till. He was censured by the U.S. Senate. The State Department has given this crusade its full support and it has the blessings of the FBI, the CIA and other such organs of repression. It has attracted some of the worst racists and anti-Semites in the country, whose hearts now bleed for Jews—in the Soviet Union. Of this unsavory campaign, against the interests of the Jewish people, the Jewish organizations and leaders, it is sad to say, have become the spearhead.

Second, the Israeli government has been carrying on a policy of de facto annexation of the occupied territories and of seeking to populate them with Jews. Among the more explicit of the numerous public expressions of this aim is the complaint of the Jewish Agency, in its report to the 27th Congress of the World Zionist Organization in 1968, of "having to populate with Jews the newly liberated areas" in the face

of the slowing down of immigration to a mere trickle. It is very largely this aim which underlies the officially sponsored campaign of anti-Soviet slander in Israel with its slogan "let my people go." And it is to this Zionist-inspired expansionist aim that the anti-Soviet campaign in this country contributes.

The natural spawn of this disturbing rise of racism and anti-Sovietism within the Jewish community is the so-called "Jewish Defense League." This gang of fascist hoodlums simply carries to their ultimate extreme the reactionary views prevalent today among the "respectable" Jewish organizations and their spokesmen. To be sure, the JDL has been denounced by virtually every such organization of any consequence. But the denunciations are based merely on tactical differences. What is condemned is the JDL's methods; its violence and hoodlumism, it is contended, "won't bring one Jew out of the Soviet Union." However, on the *desirability* of bringing Jews out of the Soviet Union there is full agreement. Hence no real struggle is waged to put an end to the JDL's criminal activities, and this toleration contributes to its continued existence.

The Role of Monopoly Capital

Spearheading the Zionist movement in the United States today is a major section of Jewish big capital. This group has provided the lion's share of the contributions which have helped Israel to finance its enormous military expenditures. It is the main purchaser of Israel bonds. It has made large investments in Israel and has been a key factor in the three "millionaires' conferences" held in Israel since 1967 for the purpose of securing increased foreign investment. And it has exercised preponderant ideological influence.

It is important to note, however, that the main sections of Jewish big business were initially strongly anti-Zionist and assimilationist. Part of them, including such families of Jewish finance capital as the Lehmans, Morgenthau, Rosenwalds and Warburgs, became involved in Palestine from philanthropic and business standpoints. And later, after the establishment of the State of Israel, many of them became markedly pro-Zionist. Another grouping, however, associated with the American Council for Judaism, has remained completely anti-Zionist and assimilationist in outlook.

A major vehicle for investment of Jewish capital in Palestine and subsequently in Israel has been the Palestine Economic Corporation, now designating itself as PEC Israel Economic Corporation. It was founded in 1926 under the sponsorship of the top Jewish financial groups, Kuhn-Loeb and Lehman Brothers. Felix Warburg, then senior

partner in Kuhn-Loeb, became its largest stockholder. PEC was an offshoot of the American Jewish Committee, founded in 1906 by a group of Jewish bankers and industrialists, chiefly of German origin, and representing some of the most reactionary, most assimilationist sections of Jewish big capital. But at the same time they were evidently not adverse to profitable investments in Palestine.

Lehman Brothers and Kuhn-Loeb have continued to maintain an interest in PEC Israel Economic Corporation. As late as 1961 Herbert H. Lehman was honorary chairman and Edward M. Warburg was a vice president. In 1970 its board of directors included a member of the Szold family, associated with Lehman Brothers. At the close of 1967 the corporation held \$25 million in investments in Israel, embracing 45 enterprises. In 1970 the IDB Bankholding Corporation Ltd., a conglomerate-type company, was formed, listing as its two subsidiaries the Israel Discount Bank and PEC Israel Economic Corporation, and as affiliates four other Israeli banks. With declared assets of about a billion dollars and a total capital of \$40 million it is said to be Israel's largest private firm.

A role is played also by other groups such as AMPAL American Israel Corporation, Israel Investors Corporation and Israel Development Corporation. And to facilitate these ties, branches of a number of Israeli banks have been established in New York.

But financial aid to Israel is not limited to Jewish capitalists and other Jewish contributors. Since its birth, Israel has received well over \$1 billion in grants and credits from the U.S. government, in contrast to a mere \$57 million received by a country like Syria. Nor are investments in Israel restricted to Jewish capital. Of the more than \$1 billion invested in Israel by U.S. capitalists, the major part is in the hands of non-Jewish capital. Of the top 500 industrial corporations, 30 are operating in Israel. Among U.S. investors are such familiar names as Ford, Chrysler, Monsanto Chemicals, Motorola, International Business Systems, Holiday Inns, American Can and others.

U.S. monopoly capital is a dominant factor in the Israeli economy today. More than half of all foreign capital invested in Israel is American. A great part of Israel's financial, industrial and commercial institutions are in American hands. Of Israel's immense foreign debt, 80 per cent is owed to the U.S. government and to U.S. organizations and institutions. Of its large annual trade deficit, some 40 per cent is incurred in unequal trade with the United States. This includes large purchases of arms, of which the United States is now by far Israel's chief supplier.

Instead of seeking economic independence, Israel's ruling class has

from the beginning tied the country's economy to foreign capital, chiefly U.S. and British. Now, with the burden of military outlays threatening Israel with economic bankruptcy, and with an increasingly desperate need for foreign currencies a way out is being sought through increased foreign investment. Hence the three "millionaires' conferences" held between 1967 and 1969 and attended by representatives of foreign capital. These gave birth to a \$200 million dollar investment corporation. In the end, however, only a fraction of this sum materialized, and this was mainly devoted not to establishing new enterprises but to buying into already existing government-owned firms such as the ZIM steamship line, Israel Oil Refineries, Timna Copper Mines and Palestine Potash.

To secure these investments the Israeli government has willingly disposed of its holdings to a point where it has little left to sell. It has also offered numerous concessions, among them grants and long-term credits up to twice the amount invested, generous tax concessions, exemption from duties on required imports, export premiums, payment of half of research and development outlays, full rights of repatriation of principal and interest, and others. It should be noted that thanks to the lavish grants and loans the actual value of foreign holdings may be as much as three times the amount invested.

The largest new venture is the Eilat-Ashkelon oil pipeline, built at a cost of \$120 million. Such a pipeline is not required by the Israeli economy; its purpose is rather to provide the foreign oil monopolies with an alternative route to the Suez Canal. And though it was built mainly with government funds it is operated as a concession by a subsidiary of Canadian A.P.C. Holdings, Ltd.

Thus does the Israeli ruling class barter away the country's economy to foreign monopolies and subject Israel to increasing imperialist domination. For U.S. monopoly capital, including Jewish capital, Israel exists primarily as another arena of exploitation, of the extraction of super-profits at the expense of the Israeli working people, to be milked for all it is worth. As a source of comparatively low-priced skilled and technical labor, it provides a profitable base of production for export to African and Asian countries. Through these channels much of the money raised by the United Jewish Appeal among the Jewish people in this country finds its way into the pockets of U.S. monopoly capital, Jewish and non-Jewish. This is the reality cloaked by high-sounding hypocritical declarations of undying support to Israel's welfare.

Zionism and Anti-Semitism

The Communist Party of Israel defines the Jewish question in these

terms:

When we talk of the Jewish question, we mean the question of the discrimination, persecution and even annihilation . . . of Jews for being Jews. The problem of the solution of the Jewish question is, therefore, the problem of liberation of the Jewish masses from the virus of anti-Semitism, which appears in various forms in the society of class exploitation. The problem is . . . how to ensure the Jewish popular masses freedom and equality of rights. ("The Jewish Question and Zionism in Our Days," *Information Bulletin*, Nos. 3-4, 1969.)

In the Soviet Union and other socialist countries this problem has been solved with the elimination of the monopolist roots of racism and chauvinism. But in the United States anti-Semitism is a problem of considerable proportions, both in its "respectable" forms and in the highly virulent forms propagated by the fascist ultra-Right. However, the Jewish Establishment, Zionist and "non-Zionist," habitually downgrades the struggle against this real anti-Semitism. One finds no mass campaigns against its manifestations such as are organized for the "deliverance" of Soviet Jews. On the contrary, such actions are frowned upon, on the false argument that they would only stir up the anti-Semites and thus worsen the position of the Jews.

Actually, Zionism encourages anti-Semitism since it accepts the premise of the anti-Semites that Jews cannot become fully citizens of the lands in which they live. More, it relies on anti-Semitism as the cement which will hold Jews together as a distinct entity and bring them eventually to Israel. Any lessening of anti-Semitism is looked upon as opening the doors to assimilation and weakening of Jewish identity.

Indeed, the process of assimilation is considered to be the chief threat to the Jewish people today. Speaking at the 26th Congress of the World Zionist Organization in 1964, Nahum Goldmann, then its president, stated:

. . . We are now living in a period when a very large part of our people, especially the younger generation, is threatened by an anonymous process of erosion, of disintegration . . . by lack of challenges which would arouse Jewish consciousness and make it evident why they should remain Jewish. . . .

This process, if not halted and if not reversed, threatens Jewish survival more than persecution, inquisition, pogroms, and mass murder of Jews had done in the past.

And, of course, nowhere does this terrible fate threaten Jews more than in the Soviet Union. Such a view, to put it mildly, is obviously not conducive to fighting anti-Semitism. For Zionists the rise in anti-

Semitic propaganda in the United States is not half so serious as the rise in intermarriage.

Suppression of struggle against anti-Semitism has characterized Zionism throughout its existence. It became especially glaring during the thirties when leading Jewish organizations and spokesmen opposed any forthright expressions or demonstrative actions against the mounting horror of Hitlerite anti-Semitism in Germany on the grounds that to speak out would only arouse the Hitlerite elements in the United States. Instead, millions of dollars were sent to Hitler for the relief of German Jews.

This attitude continued even when Hitler's plans for the extermination of Jews became known. Weizmann encountered it on a visit to the United States in 1940, projected in the name of maintaining "neutrality" and avoiding "war propaganda." He writes:

. . . Now for the first time rumors began to reach us of plans so hideous as to be quite incredible—plans for the literal mass extermination of the Jews. . . . It was like a nightmare which was all the more oppressive because one had to maintain silence: to speak of such things in public was "propaganda"! (*Trial and Error*, p. 420.)

But it went much further than this. As Knesset Member Haim Landau, speaking at a symposium in 1966, charged: "It is a fact that in 1942 the Jewish Agency knew about the extermination . . . and the truth is that they not only kept silent about it but silenced those who knew." (*Maariv*, April 24, 1966.) Even more, as the Kastner trial held in Jerusalem in 1952 revealed, there was actual collaboration with the Nazis. Rudolf Kastner and others, knowing that Hungarian Jews were being sent to the gas chambers, kept this silent in exchange for the promise of the Nazi hangman Eichmann that some hundreds of Jews, mainly Zionist leaders and wealthy pro-Zionists, would be permitted to migrate to Palestine.

Today the Zionists' soft-peddling of the fight against anti-Semitism continues, as does their association with spokesmen of Right-wing reaction. A particularly disgraceful case in point is the extension of invitations to Senators Henry M. Jackson and James L. Buckley to address a Carnegie Hall meeting held on April 28 of this year to celebrate the 23rd anniversary of the State of Israel. The former is notorious as a militarist hawk and the latter is even more notorious as an exponent of the fascist ultra-Right, whose election campaign was among the most racist and anti-Semitic ever conducted by a major candidate in New York. Yet it is precisely these two who were chosen to speak!

The Fight Against Zionism

In sum, Zionism is a deadly enemy of the best interests of the Jewish people and of working people generally. It is an enemy of peace, freedom and progress everywhere. It must be thoroughly exposed and its poisonous influence on the Jewish masses destroyed. And an end must be put to the pro-Zionist mythology which has been so diligently cultivated by the ruling class among the American people as a whole.

But one must not make the mistake of equating Zionism with the Jewish people. The masses of Jewish people, mainly working people, who join the various Jewish organizations and take part in their fundraising and other activities, are not consciously Zionist in their thinking. Rather, they are motivated by such feelings as a sense of national pride and an emotional attachment to Israel, as well as apprehension for the future of the Jewish people growing out of the frightful experiences of the Hitler period. In themselves, these are by no means unhealthy sentiments; however, they have been perverted by the Zionist Establishment and harnessed to the support of reactionary policies both in Israel and in this country, policies which are falsely identified with the interests of Israel and the Jewish people.

At the time of the 1967 war the emotional reaction of large numbers of Jewish people to what they saw as a threat of literal annihilation of Israel was built up to a pitch bordering on hysteria.

But the Jewish masses, precisely because of their genuine concern for the future of Israel, can be won away from Zionist influence. As the annexationist policies of Israel's rulers and the disaster they hold in store for Israel are increasingly exposed, opposition to them will mount. Indeed, there are already significant beginnings in this direction.

In Israel there is a growing questioning of government policy and a rising tide of opposition is emerging. In its vanguard is the heroic Communist Party of Israel, and today opposition is spreading rapidly within other circles. Significantly, when one speaks of "the peace movement" in Israel, it is this opposition which is referred to.

In this country organized opposition is still very limited, thanks largely to the insistence of the Zionist Establishment on blind, un-deviating adherence to the policies of the Meir regime. Nevertheless an opposition is developing even within the Establishment.

Opposition is developing especially among sections of Jewish youth. Involved in the struggles for peace and Black liberation, these young people are subjected to the process of radicalization taking place today, and are finding that their radicalism comes more and more into conflict with their Zionism. And these developments are not without

effect on sections of the adult Jewish community.

Among non-Jews support for the Israeli position is declining. The unreasoning support of this position by the Zionists, coupled with their labelling of all opposition as "anti-Semitic," has contributed to the alienation of important sections among gentiles. Particularly noteworthy is the challenge offered by Christian religious groups.

This and other opposition has developed within the framework of acceptance of the premises of Zionism. But if it is to grow and to acquire effective organized expression, it is essential to lay bare the reactionary bourgeois-nationalist character of Zionism and its role as an instrument of big Jewish capital in league with U.S. monopoly capital as a whole.

In this country, the heartland of U.S. imperialism and the home of the largest Jewish community in the world, the fight against Zionism takes on exceptional importance. It is here, above all, that the battle must be waged against the machinations of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East and for the liberation of the Arab peoples. It is here that powerful pressures can and must be generated, together with the movement of the Israeli people, to compel a basic change in Israeli policy. It is here especially that the slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries must be combatted. And it is here that a militant campaign against all manifestations of anti-Semitism must be launched.

In all this the initiative of the Communist Party is vital. The fight against Zionism is an important part of the fight against U.S. imperialism. And in this fight the Communist Party must at all times be in the forefront.

A CORRECTION

In the July issue of *Political Affairs*, the following two lines were inadvertently omitted from Linda Popper's communication, "The Centrality of Male Supremacy":

Universal child care and maternity leaves are not enough. There must also be paternity leaves and men should staff the child-care centers as well as women.

Editor's note: Linda Popper's communication was a response to the special March issue of Political Affairs on the fight for women's equality. For further material on this question see Alva Buxenbaum's "A Reply to Linda Popper," in this issue.

The Family - Is It Obsolete?*

Is the family obsolete? Many in the feminist movement feel that it is, and a good deal of the activity of some groups is centered around finding ways of living outside the family structure, pending their ultimate goal of its abolition. For example, Cheryl Fleming Libbey, in advocating communes as a way of life while preparing for the "revolution," says: "We have, of course, moved entirely away from the concept of 'marriage.' We believe that no one has rights of possession over another person's body at any time, which is what marriage essentially denotes." (*Women, A Journal of Liberation*, Winter, 1971.) At another point in the article she refers to the nuclear family as "the most repressive institution known to humanity."

Susan Brownmiller, a member of the New York Radical Feminists says: "If few in the women's movement are willing to go as far as the Feminists and say that marriage is slavery, it is hard to find a women's liberationist who is not in some way disaffected by the sound of wedding bells." ("Sisterhood Is Powerful," *New York Times Magazine*, March 15, 1970.)

Another view, which reflects much probing and searching for a better way of living is expressed in an editorial written collectively by the staff of the magazine *Up From Under* (January-February 1971). It says: "The one feeling that came out of our discussions that we all share, despite whatever conflicts exist and regardless of whether our own experiences in families have been good or bad, is a sense that in this society the family is shot through with contradictions; that it (the family) is perhaps as essential as it is damaging, as much a fulfillment of our needs as it fails them. . . . We see a society someday in which some people will choose to live in families and others not. Where there is an equality among women and men and where work means more than a deadening job for which someone else gets the profits, then perhaps the family can begin to live up to its potential as a unit of cooperation."

Such movements as there are away from the family are expressed by sections of the radical feminist groups, and take the form of various types of communes, ranging from what they call "extended families" (that is, a number of traditional families living together in a communal setting) to communes of families and non-families

*The following is the text of a lecture delivered at the Center for Marxist Education, New York City.

and to all-women's communes. There are also so called "Hippie communes." These, although they include single men and women, are made up mostly of married couples and children, some of the marriages "legal," some "non-legal."

Many but not all of the people living in these communes are white middle-class "revolutionaries." The ideological outlook of many of them is that the petty-bourgeois radical anarchist, although some are searching simply for a way of life they consider more humane. Within the working class, the Black community, the Puerto Rican, Chicano or Indian communities, which will be discussed later, there is no such movement away from the family.

In discussing this question I am going to take the position that the family is not obsolete. If you look around New York, the United States, all over the world, you will find that there are too many viable families of long standing, and too many families just beginning, to say that the family is obsolete. Is the family evolving? I would say yes. As society has passed from one stage to another, the family structure and its relationship to society has changed undergoing a long process of evolution but never disappearing. The family as a unit of society has not yet had a chance to develop to its full potential. It has not yet had the chance to live and develop without the threat of war, and lives in a situation in the capitalist world where racism and poverty are rampant.

On the evolution of the family Lewis H. Morgan writes:

When the fact is accepted that the family has passed through four successive forms, and is now in the fifth, the question arises whether this form can be permanent in the future. The only answer that can be given is that it must advance as society advances, and change as society changes, even as it has done in the past. It is the creature of the social system, and will reflect its culture. As the monogamian family has improved greatly since the commencement of civilization, and very sensibly in modern times, it is at least supposable that it is capable still further improvement until the equality of the sexes is attained. (*Ancient Society*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1964, p. 420.)

The Family—An Oppressive Tool?

I shall not go further into the works of Morgan or of Marx and Engels on the historical roots of the family or the development of the monogamous family. Rather, I propose to open a discussion on the role and function of the family in today's world, and possible changes in the family structure and role as the family develops under capitalism, socialism and communism.

Some in the feminist movement, maintain that the family is a direct

instrument of capitalist oppression of women and the working masses generally. For example, Evelyn Reed, a leading Trotskyite ideologist, says:

In the beginning the institution served a single purpose, that connected with the ownership and inheritance of private property. But today the family serves a double purpose; it has become a supplementary instrument in the hands of the exploiting class to rob the working masses. Universally state-imposed marriage became advantageous to the profiteers with the rise of the industrial wage-slave system. (*Problems of Women's Liberation*, Pathfinder Press, New York, 1971, p. 54.)

I would ask Evelyn Reed: what family is she talking about? What working-class family has ever "robbed" the working masses? Of course the Rockefellers, the Du Ponts, and other families of monopoly capitalism *do* rob the working masses. They reap super-profits from payment of unequal wages to women, from discrimination against Black workers, especially Black women, from discrimination against Puerto Rican, Chicano and Indian workers. But is this due to the family as a unit of society, or to the nature of capitalism, which oppresses all working people, men and women, and the family as a unit?

Engels frequently stressed the fact that the emancipation of women is tied to their relation to the means of production.

... to emancipate woman and make her the equal of man is and remains an impossibility so long as the woman is shut out from social productive labor and restricted to private domestic labor. The emancipation of woman will only be possible when women can take part in production on a large, social scale, and domestic work no longer claims anything but an insignificant amount of her time. And only now has that become possible through modern large-scale industry, which does not merely permit of the employment of female labor over a wide range, but positively demands it, while it also tends toward ending private domestic labor by changing it more and more into a public industry. (*The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, International Publishers, New York, 1942, p. 148.)

Engels was right when he said that capitalism draws women into social production, in fact forces them into social production. However he did not and possibly could not foresee that capitalism, as it developed into what is today state monopoly capitalism, would not take any measures to lessen the double work of women, lessen household work or provide for the care of the children. This, capitalism

has never done and does not do today. Capitalism reaps benefits from the labor of women and men, gets surplus value from both, and at the same time exploits both as a family unit. In today's situation of monopoly capitalism there is the added burden of the war in Indochina, racism, inflation, higher taxes and all the things we're so familiar with.

Capitalism—The Real Culprit

Of course the ideology of male supremacy, fostered by monopoly, serves the interests of monopoly, and is an obstacle to the fight for the complete equality of women. This, however, does not make the family an instrument used by capitalism to oppress women. Rather, it seems to me, capitalism—today monopoly capitalism—is antagonistic to the interests of the family as a unit of society.

Let us suppose that somehow or other we could magically abolish the institution of marriage and the family as a unit of society. Would this change the relationship of women to the means of production? Would this in any way affect the unequal pay given to women? Would this have any effect on the establishment of child care centers for children of working women? Would this really lessen the housework of women? Would this eliminate the ideology of male supremacy? I don't think so, because even if a woman is not married there would still be relationship with people, with men. There would still be children to be cared for. There would still be cooking, shopping, dishwashing, cleaning and all the other chores. Clearly the abolition of the family would not change the situation in any of these respects.

Those who say that marriage and the family should be abolished also talk about the many problems faced by the family—the collapse of many families, the high divorce rate, alienation of children from parents, the sense of hopelessness and despair. They tend to place the blame for this on the family as an institution.

Certainly capitalism throughout its development has been brutal and has brutalized people; it has plundered, murdered, robbed. It has used racism. It has exploited child labor. It has exploited women in all kinds of conditions of labor such as sweatshops in the home. Today, in the stage of imperialism, the stage of dying capitalism, the awfulness of the quality of life is manifested all around us in the problems of drug addiction, crime, racism, growing repression, alienation, the search for ways of life outside the system. These conditions are a reflection of the inability of capitalism to meet, to any degree, the needs of people. Capitalism, with all its evils, assaults the very sensibilities of people. But people are fighting back. Families are fighting back.

Much of the discussion about the collapse of the family, the moral breakdown, the despair and other features if capitalism today reminds me of an article published by Lenin in *Pravda* in 1913, just prior to the First World War. At that time there was much discussion in Russia, especially in intellectual circles about the hopelessness of life. There was much despair and alienation. There were anarchist movements, and many movements towards communes. A Doctors' Congress was called in St. Petersburg to discuss the legalization of abortions and the use of contraceptives for birth control. In the course of the Congress a Mr. Astrakhan, speaking amidst thunderous applause, said: "We have to convince mothers to bear children so that they can be maimed in educational establishments, so that lots can be drawn for them, so that they can be driven to suicide." Lenin reacted to these remarks in this way:

If the report is true that this exclamation of Mr. Astrakhan's was greeted with thunderous applause, it is a fact that does not surprise me. The audience was made up of bourgeois, middle and petty bourgeois, who have the psychology of the philistine. What can you expect from them but the most banal liberalism?

From the point of view of the working class however, it would hardly be possible to find a more apposite expression of the completely reactionary nature, and the ugliness of "social neomalthusianism" than Mr. Astrakhan's phrase cited above.

... "Bear children so that they could be maimed." ... For that alone? Why not that they should fight better, more unitedly, consciously and resolutely than we are fighting against the present-day conditions of life that are maiming and ruining our generation?

This is the radical difference that distinguishes the psychology of the peasant, handicraftsman, intellectual, the petty bourgeois in general, from that of the proletarian. The petty bourgeois sees and feels that he is heading for ruin, that life is becoming more difficult, that the struggle for existence is ever more ruthless, and that his position and that of his family are becoming more and more hopeless. It is an indisputable fact, and the petty bourgeois protests against it.

But *how* does he protest?

He protests as the representative of a class that is hopelessly perishing, that despairs of its future, that is depressed and cowardly. There is nothing to be done . . . if only there were fewer children to suffer our torments and hard toil, our poverty and humiliation—such is the cry of the petty bourgeois.

The class-conscious worker is far from holding this point of view. He will not allow his consciousness to be dulled by such cries no matter how sincere and heartfelt they may be. Yes, we

workers and the mass of small proprietors lead a life filled with unbearable oppression and suffering. Things are harder for our generation than they were for our fathers. But in one respect we are luckier than our fathers. *We have begun to learn and are rapidly learning to fight*—and to fight not as individuals, as the best of our fathers fought, not for the slogans of bourgeois speechifiers that are alien to us in spirit, but for our slogans, the slogans of our class. We are fighting better than our fathers did. Our children will fight better than we do, and they will be *victorious*. (*The Emancipation of Women*, International Publishers, New York, 1966, pp. 28-30.)

Lenin then points out that it goes without saying that we are for the right of abortion and dissemination of birth control information, and he emphasizes that laws restricting such rights are only expressions of the hypocrisy of the bourgeois.

It would seem to me that if the family is an instrument of capitalism to oppress the working masses, the question of getting rid of the family would be one of the big demands of the working masses. But when you look at the ferment today, is this so?

Family Can Aid the Struggle

Let us look at some concrete situation. Let us go back to 1955, to the days of the Montgomery bus boycott, a historic episode in the life of our country. This struggle began when a Black woman, Mrs. Rosa Parks, got on the bus one day after work. She was tired, and said to herself that on that day she would not sit in the back of the bus, she would not give her seat to any white person. She was arrested, and this sparked a struggle that went on for many months. The struggle involved women, their husbands, children, uncles, aunts, nephews and nieces—entire families, with the support of the entire community, until their struggle was won.

In Charleston, South Carolina in 1969, hundreds of hospital workers, almost all of them Black women, struck the County Hospital against inhuman wages, working conditions and racist situations in the administration of the hospital. In the course of the struggle the entire community rallied around the strikers. Community kitchens were set up, children worked, teenagers, husbands, grandmothers. Whole families picketed together, marched together and went to jail together. These women won their strike, and in the struggle rallied a wide section of the labor movement, including the longshoremen of Charleston. They challenged the racist, opportunist policies of the leadership of the AFL-CIO and their failure to organize the South,

and put this question squarely on the agenda of the labor movement. Would this have been possible without the support of families working together?

Remember the children of Little Rock High School. Were not these children, who went through the gauntlets of the racist insults, backed and supported by families and did this not add to their courage and stamina?

There are many other examples of people fighting back against the attacks of monopoly on the family, such as the march of welfare mothers on Mother's Day in Washington in 1969 with signs reading: "Save Our Families." There is the daily fight of mothers on welfare all over the country against racist harassment and insults. There is the magnificent struggle of the Chicano grape strikers, who certainly had to have the cooperation of families to win their strike. There is the protest of Indian families when children were taken from home by government agencies and placed in schools where they became ill because of the abrupt separation from their culture, their families. Think of the thousands of Puerto Rican families whose daily lives are made up of fights against ghetto conditions and to keep their families together. There are the thousands of families who took part in the recent demonstrations against the Indochina war and who demonstrated as families. And what about the family of Angela Davis? Certainly it must be a source of strength to her that her entire family, even though they don't all agree with her political views, have rallied to her defense. Or think of George Jackson, of the Soledad Brothers. In his book there are many letters in which he carried on endless arguments with his mother and father about his way of thinking, and even disowned them a number of times. But in the end what permeated everything was his deep love for his family, and his feeling of reliance on it.

These examples show that families are very much alive—that the family is not obsolete but plays a decisive role in today's struggles, and that objectively it can be a revolutionary force in society. This does not take away from the fact that women suffer from attitudes of male supremacy, and that this ideology of monopoly capitalism is an obstacle in their fight for complete equality. But understanding this, they are fighting on every front for the things that are most immediate. If you urged upon them the idea that women and the working masses are being oppressed by the family as a unit of society, what would their reaction be? Would they see the family as an instrument of their oppression, or would they not be more likely to see as the causes of their oppression the "system," racism, the landlord of their rat-infested apartment, the rotten educational system, the war

in Vietnam, high rents, high prices, etc.? And would they not be more ready to fight against these things than for the abolition or restructuring of the family? This poses the question of whether or not this way of placing the matter is not really a diversion from the most pressing problems of women and the family.

The feminist movement, comprising various sections of the Women's Liberation Movement, has made important contributions to the fight for abortion reform, the right of women to birth control information and child care, and has generally raised dramatically the issue of women's equality. Their fight is weakened, however, by their failure to develop sufficiently an approach to working women as central to the winning of complete equality for women. In equating racism with what they call "sexism" ("the white male power structure"), they let white women off the hook in the fight against racism, and lump together such women as Happy Rockefeller, Jackie Onnasis and Martha Mitchell with the great mass of working women.

The fight for abortion reform and birth control, the fight against the insults to women by the advertising industry and the mass media, fights sparked by the feminist movement, must go on, as well as the fight for universal free child care centers. It is also important that women have the right to marry or not marry as they choose, with no stigma being attached if they choose not to marry.

The Family Under Socialism.

More and more people in all sections of the movement for women's equality are taking the position that the full emancipation of women is bound up with the restructuring of society. Let's take a look at the development of the family where society has been restructured—in the socialist countries. But first, a brief look at a country in between—a country in transition, the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, which has had a revolutionary democratic government since October 1969. There the women of the Women's Union saw the fight in the period before the revolution as being directed against backward tradition and for better family laws. During the celebration of the first anniversary of the revolution in October 1970, at the same time that nationalization of the banks was announced, there were also announced reforms in the divorce laws which resulted in strengthening the monogamous family. In addition, he announced granting of equal pay to women in the professions. This in a country where only a few years ago women wore the veil, and where a woman member of parliament was not allowed to attend sessions unless accompanied by a male member of her family. In a short

space of time when the economic relationships in the Sudan, are just beginning to change, already a great deal of progress has been made in the status of women. In discussing their future struggles the women of the Women's Union do not include the abolition of the family. Rather, they see the strengthening of the family as an important goal.

In Cuba, the youngest socialist country, one of the first results of the revolution was the decreeing of the absolute legal equality of women and the recognition that the first steps toward complete freedom for women was to bring them into the social process of production. Immediately schools were set up to teach women trades so that they could earn money and gain a certain measure of economic independence. Today in Cuba, women are engaged in all kinds of work, but the Women's Federation feels that its most important job is further education and training of women in skills, and bringing more women into the productive process, so that they can gain complete economic independence and take a more active part in public life. The socialist government has set up a wide system of child care centers, with children admitted from the age of 45 days. The mansions of Havana's Fifth Avenue, where formerly only the very rich lived, are now boarding schools whose students are brought in from the countryside for education and training in a trade or profession, going home on weekends and holidays. A large percentage of these children are Black girls. Many varied methods are being used to train children and women. There is also a widespread educational campaign against the ideas of male supremacy. In Cuba the perspective is not one of abolition of the family, but rather one of strengthening the family, making it possible for the family to function under better conditions.

This same outlook exists in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which in 17 years has been transformed by socialism from a country completely devastated by U.S. imperialism into an industrial country. Women now take part in all types of industrial work. They are government ministers, directors of cooperative farms, textile mills and department stores. They are professors, scientists, etc. Nevertheless, the Korean Workers Party and the Women's Union consider that the most important task before them is to draw women further into all aspects of the productive process. At the 5th Congress of the Korean Workers Party, held in October 1970, one of the three main points discussed was measures to increase facilities to lessen housework for women, to increase child care facilities and to improve conditions, on top of the great achievements already accomplished in these fields. No thought whatever is given to the abolition of marriage

and the family. The theme of many of their films is the reunification of families separated by the aggression of U.S. imperialism.

If, in these countries, everything they want to do has not been achieved, and women are not yet completely free from housework and the effects of male supremacy, this is not due to socialism or the family as a unit of society. It is due to the fact that the people of Cuba and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had to wipe out the effects of imperialist domination and oppression, and are still threatened by U.S. imperialism. There are the embargo and the constant intrigues against Cuba, and there are the continued division of Korea and the occupation of South Korea by U.S. troops.

In the first socialist country, the Soviet Union, there has been a great deal of thinking and discussion about the family and its past, present, and future role.

The Family in the Soviet Union

When we think of the Soviet Union today, a powerful, modern industrial country, we sometimes forget its origins. We forget that at the time of the October Revolution it was largely a peasant country with a backward, patriarchal, feudal type of family structure. The head of the family was a man who was lord and master of his wife and daughters and of his daughters-in-law and granddaughters.

In a paper prepared for a Far Western Slavic Conference at the University of Southern California in May 1970, William M. Mandel writes:

When a son sought to break away from his father's or grandfather's household, the son's wife often supported or even prompted this move. This was because, in the extended family, she was under the direct and permanent management of her mother-in-law in every detail of housework and fieldwork, in which the Russian woman traditionally participated. She was also subject to the sexual exploitation by her father-in-law, which occurred on a scale widespread enough for a word to have existed to describe it. . . .

This was much worse in the colonies of the Tsar, as in Turkestan where women lived under the worst feudal conditions of child marriage and polygamy, where they wore the heavy veil and were confined to one part of the house.

One of the first acts of the Soviet government was the enactment of laws guaranteeing the legal equality of women and wiping out all the patriarchal laws regarding marriage.

Soviet power was not established in all areas at the same time, and had to be established in a situation in which the economy had all

but collapsed. Railroads were broken down, there was a lack of fuel, there was hunger and famine. There was pillage, chaos, anarchism, civil war and foreign intervention. In the efforts to establish Soviet power many Communists were murdered. In Turkestan, many women were killed when they took off the veil and began to take the first steps toward taking part in public life.

The breakup of the old feudal patriarchal family structure took place parallel with the upsurge of movements for "free love."

The "free love" movement in Russia was organized by petty-bourgeois radicals and anarchist groups which carried on campaigns against "all structures" and "all leaders," and which advocated ultra-Leftist ideas and actions and organized communes. These groups, reminiscent of similar groups in the United States and other capitalist countries today, had been active for many years prior to 1917. After the revolution, they contributed greatly to the turmoil which existed in that period.

Laws on marriage and the family in the early days of the young socialist state were revised several times, the direction always depending on the situation, and always with the main aim of protecting the rights of women and children, particularly of unwed mothers.

Lenin wrote and spoke frequently of winning women to support of Soviet power, and of what had to be done to accomplish this. Women were without skills and had to be trained. They were in their majority illiterate. They had to be won away from religious superstitions. Lenin advocated, and the Soviet government established, many types of schools so that illiteracy could be wiped out and women could learn skills. Child care facilities were set up. Women began to be brought into the productive process and into government and party bodies at various levels. In this stage, lasting up to about 1928, only the initial steps were taken toward making it possible for women to realize real equality. This was a period of wiping away the debris, a period of the destruction of the old feudal, patriarchal family structure and establishment of a new, socialist family structure. With the first five year plan, and establishment of the basis for a socialist industry and agriculture, the economic independence of women became a reality, and women have made rapid advances since.

Today in the Soviet Union no job is barred to women except those judged by the Ministry of Health to be injurious to their health. No profession is closed to women. In the Central Asian Republics the advances of women are especially striking. There is a sense of vibrance and vitality among women there even greater than in other regions, because they have advanced such a great distance from the past.

Through the Women's Commission of the Trade Unions, women

have a great deal to say in determining actual legislation which concerns them. They make the investigations and present recommendations to ministries and legislative bodies pertaining to conditions of work, catering services, child care facilities and similar matters, and ministries are held accountable to them in the carrying out of projected plans. They see in the coming period of the 9th five year plan the most rapid advances in all aspects of life as regards facilities to lessen the burden of housework and child care facilities. Equal pay for equal work is an absolute fact. In collective bargaining agreements with enterprises, since women constitute more than 50 per cent of the population, the enrollment in schools connected with factories training for various skills must be 50 per cent women, and 50 per cent of the jobs in the enterprises must be filled with women. As the character of jobs involving heavy lifting is changed due to automation, women must be hired on these jobs on an equal basis.

Not all the vestiges of hardship for women have been completely eliminated. This is due in large part to problems caused by imperialism, by the Second World War, by the tremendous aid given by the Soviet Union to other socialist countries, as well as the aid given to developing countries and to national liberation movements.

Attitudes of male supremacy are still widely prevalent, but under pressures from party and government and from the women themselves, such attitudes are becoming less and less. When asked about this, a member of the Soviet Women's Committee told me that "my husband didn't help me with the housework, but my daughter's husband helps her." It is very common to see men shopping, wheeling the baby carriage, taking the child to the day care center.

The latest fundamental laws on marriage and the family in the Soviet Union were adopted in 1968. Their direction can be summed up in this paragraph from the preamble:

Soviet legislation on marriage and the family is designed eventually to rid family relations of purely materialistic factors, eliminate survivals of women's inequality with respect to everyday life and create conditions for family life founded on principles of Communist morality, which will make possible the full satisfaction of personal feelings.

Writing on the functions of the family, A. G. Kharchev says:

The functions of the family are to an appreciable extent a problem of the relationship between family and society . . . family life is both different from social life and identical with it, and its functions, no matter how specific, embody many functions of a general social nature. Hence constant contradictions between the family and society exist only when the social structure itself is

contradictory and antagonistic. But in this case the family is no exception, since relations between non-kindred groups and society as a whole as well as among any of these groupings are just as contradictory if not more so.

When the social structure ceases to be antagonistic, which is to say, when capitalism is replaced by socialism, the relationship between the family and society loses its competitive character . . . as a result the family loses only the functions it wants to lose. (*Communism and the Family*, Crosscurrents Press, New York, 1964, p. 60.)

The Soviet people, living in conditions of building the material and technical base of communism, no longer look upon communism as something in the far, distant future, but as something now on the threshold. There is much looking ahead to the role and function of the family under communism. It is their feeling as Kharchev states that:—"Not only such mainstays of the old style of family as private property, the enslavement of women, and private inheritance of property, but many of the features of the socialist family will also disappear under communism." (*Ibid.*, p. 64.)

One might ask, then, will the family as a social institution remain under communism?

When Marx and Engels spoke of the "vanishing" family in the *Communist Manifesto* and in later writings, they pointed out that they do not mean the family as such but merely its bourgeois, property-minded form. Neither Marx nor Engels ever took it upon themselves to predict exactly how relations between men and women or between parents and children would develop under communism. They said:

What we can conjecture at present about the regulation of sex relationships after the impending effacement of capitalist production is, in the main of a negative character, limited mostly to what will vanish. . . . But what will be added? What will be settled after a new generation has grown up: a generation of men who never in all their lives have had occasion to purchase a woman's surrender either with money or with any other means of social power, and of women who have never been obliged to surrender to any man out of any consideration other than that of real love, or to refrain from giving themselves to their beloved for fear of economic consequences. (Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1962, Vol. II, p. 241.)

Implementation of this prophecy by Marx and Engels, as experience in the Soviet Union and other countries has shown, results, according to Kharchev,

. . . not in abolition of the family but in its transformation and consolidation. From an economic and legal institution the family is coming more and more to be a moral institution whose stability is ensured primarily by moral conviction that it is necessary, and also by public opinion. . . . From this we can safely draw the conclusion that with the withering away of the state, of law, and of legal regulations of the relations between men and women or parents and children, the family will cease to exist as a "juridical category" but will continue to exist and develop as a moral unit of society.

Monogamy itself, although it was legalized in a class society, began to develop before the class society. It was the result not only of private property relations but also of the moral progress mankind was making. It follows that while communism rejects monogamy as it related to and was engendered and consolidated by private property, it accepts, perpetuates and develops it as the highest form of relationship between the sexes. . . .

The Communist family will be formed and will exist as a family of working people closely linked to the life of society. Distribution according to need and the elimination of survivals of the desire for property ownership will preclude the possibility of marriage of convenience or for any reason other than personal inclination. (*Op. cit.*, pp. 65, 68.)

The program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, adopted at the 22nd Party Congress in October, 1961 states:

The remnants of the unequal position of women in domestic life must be totally eliminated. . . .

It is essential to provide conditions to reduce and lighten the domestic work of women, and later to make possible the replacement of domestic work by public forms of satisfying the daily needs of the family. . . .

A happy childhood for every child is one of the most important and noble aspects of communist construction. The development of a ramified network of children's institutions will make it possible for more and more families to keep children and adolescents free of charge at children's establishments if they so desire. . . . The number of comfortable homes for old people and invalids providing free accommodation for all applicants will be greatly increased in town and country. . . .

The Soviet state will thus demonstrate to the world a truly full satisfaction of the people's growing material and cultural requirements. (*Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, International Publishers, New York, 1963, pp. 101-103.)

The Press: "Voluntary Arm of Established Power"

This book by James Aronson, one of this country's leading journalists, will help fortify a generation on the search for truth and a philosophy. It will serve, too, to remind the older generation that the American press has been the target of justified criticism since the days of Benjamin Franklin. I say justified because this basically social operation has always been overwhelmingly in the hands of private entrepreneurs.

Despite that, the press in this country has had its share of honest journalists, some of whom were men of truly heroic stature. They give substance to the saying of Cuba's immortal Jose Marti, himself a journalist, that "an honest newspaperman is more powerful than an emperor." To mention some illustrious journalists whose names have come down to us, we could begin with Frederick Douglass, the editor of the North Star, an extraordinary man who began life as a slave and whose writings in his paper *The North Star* inspired generations. There was his contemporary Horace Greeley, editor of the *New York Tribune*, who first published Dr. Karl Marx here, his European correspondent. There was John Swinton, who could be regarded as one of Aronson's spiritual ancestors, for Swinton too was a *New York Times* man, and he too left it to found a working-class newspaper of merit in the latter years of the last century. A few generations later we come to men who founded and edited working-class newspapers—the socialist press, the IWW papers—despite every conceivable adversity. And then there were the founders of the Communist press, like the immortal John Reed and his contemporaries, such as Robert Minor and C. E. Ruthenberg.

A Newspaperman of Integrity

Yes, there were—and are—many newspapermen of integrity whose names should never be allowed to die, men like Heywood Broun who was a principal founder of the American Newspaper Guild and whose advocacy of the First Amendment is enshrined in "the Broun

* James Aronson, *The Cold War and the Press*, Bobbs-Merrill, New York, \$8.00.

clause" of the Guild's Constitution. That clause says no man may be ousted from the union because of his political principles.

Your reviewer has been in the game since he was twenty, has spent some four decades in it and has found the breed of newspapermen sufficiently courageous, in the main, courting physical danger often to get their story. But most I have known were politically frustrated, adapting themselves to the fact that they were unable to get most of the truth that they saw into print. Most, like the men that Thoreau describes, "live lives of quiet desperation"—but there are those who rebel, like the author of the book under review.

Early, as you will see in his account, he realized that the *New York Times* was not the palladium of civic virtue. He saw beyond its reputation. Aronson left it to become a founder of the radical journal *The National Guardian* in 1948. This book, damning indictment, throws a relentless spotlight on the course of the American press throughout the Cold War—a time that damaged the welfare of every citizen of this country and every human being of the world. Nobody can fault Aronson his meticulous presentation of fact although no few have tried to do so, especially, of course, the *New York Times*.

Irving Dilliard, professor of journalism at Princeton University who formerly presided over the prestigious editorial page of Pulitzer's *St. Louis Post Dispatch* says Aronson's book on "newspaper performance in the United States is most urgently needed." He writes that Aronson "looks at the press with the kind of concerned critical eye that is seldom turned on the press from within. The case is that our newspapers have largely become 'a voluntary arm of established power.'" Aronson, Dilliard says, "finds the Cold War neither accidental nor avoidable, but intentional, with the press making it possible and abetting it."

The book opens with the significant personal history of a young man who is motivated by ambition to rise in his field, journalism. A Harvard degree and a diploma from the Columbia School of Journalism inaugurated his career on the *Boston Transcript*, in 1937. The paper was "a good workshop in the technique of journalism, but little more," he said. Yet he did learn much about "politics and Spain and labor" while there. He had become an active member in the newly founded American Newspaper Guild (which we of the Communist Left had a significant share therein). "The Guild was still so new that the *Transcript* unit meetings [of the Newspaper Guild] were often held in private homes." And when the agenda was finished "many of us stayed to discuss Spain and politics and the newspaper." His skepticism of "Western diplomacy" grew as he

began to see "the betrayal of Republic Spain" and "the concomitant rise of fascism in Europe."

This began his "disenchantment with political liberalism." However, he pursued a newspaper career in commercial journalism until he reached the *New York Times*. But his experience here confirmed the earlier disenchantment and he resigned. He joined Cedric Belfrage and John T. McManus in founding the *National Guardian*.

Newspapers: A Profitable Business

Reading this book you feel that newspapers in the United States are a kind of fever chart of the body politic. The disease in question, one might say, is hereditary, given the material and political factors involved, the environment of capitalism. Newspapers, Aronson emphasizes, "were almost always individually owned, and the personal mark of the editor-publisher was almost ever-present, often with responsibility the casualty of a brilliant but erratic and violently partisan mind." Overwhelmingly, of course, partisanship favored the class in power.

Aronson has many telling quotations and illustrations to nail down his point. Back in 1904, Arthur Brisbane, chief commentator of the Hearst press, wrote: "Journalistic success brings money. The editor has become a money-man. Where your treasure is, there you will also be." Later Lord Thomson said it even more pithily: "It is the business of newspapers to make money."

The author puts it in graphic statistics. "Conservative conformity had become the byword as the press had been shrunk . . . From a peak of 2,200 daily newspapers in 1900, there were 1,753 in 1961. But in only 45 of 1,500 cities were there competing daily newspapers under separate ownership." The mortality of newspapers in the nations largest cities is a grim index. Where once 14 dailies in New York hit the streets morning, afternoon and evening, now there are three. The eight in Boston have shrunk to three also. In 1,455 cities today there is only one newspaper publisher.

Despite the "consolidation" of newspapers, absolute circulation has risen (although not in proportion to the increase in population). At the end of 1968 daily newspapers were selling at the rate of 62,535,494 a day—an increase of almost a million over 1967 and of ten million over 1948 when there were 30 more newspapers.

The merger of newspapers has paid off in dollars. Television did not reduce newspaper profits—"there's plenty for everybody in the communication field." Newspaper advertising brought \$5.4 billion in profits in 1968, or 22 per cent more than the total of television and radio together.

The total advertising volume for all the media in 1968 was 18.5 billion, an increase of 5.6 per cent over 1967. There is little that ails this industry economically.

Aronson quotes Gardner Cowles: "If you own a newspaper in a one-newspaper market, and if you give it competent management, little misfortune can befall you. You can sleep well."

The key is the monopoly market, but if the publisher can sleep well, heaven help the public's slumber. Its sleep is troubled with nightmares. This is the burden of Aronson's book.

The bulk of this work is a course through the maze of politics and journalism after World War II. Aronson describes the hysteria that swept the country during the Henry Wallace presidential campaign on the ticket of the Progressive Party which challenged the two traditional parties. We get the frenzy when a *Time* editor named Whittaker Chambers produced the "fateful papers" that he claimed he had hidden in a pumpkin his field—the notorious Pumpkin Papers that helped manufacture the spy scare. A new generation will find it hard to believe that madness and its significance but learn it must in order to be forewarned against the persistent Administration efforts to return to an escalated repression today.

All this happened simultaneously with the pirate war against Korea, about which one must read to appreciate fully the Vietnam war today.

Then Aronson analyzes the phantasmagoria of the Bay of Pigs episode (more about that later).

The Times—Defender of Imperialism

I want to isolate his most graphic and telling argument. I refer to those portions of the book dealing with the *New York Times*, for to understand the *Times* is to understand the journalistic scene in the USA. The *Times* is the most prestigious of all newspapers in the USA, setting the editorial pace for most journals in the country. It is the canniest organ of US capitalism in this stage of imperialism, and it has amply demonstrated that it knows best how to present most palatably issues that are inimical to the interests of the people. Its ties are with the most powerful of corporations and men in the country and it has long enjoyed the accommodation of key people in Washington throughout various administrations. It has learned through generations of practice how to present issues in such a manner that the credibility of capitalism has, as yet, not been rejected among most readers.

Aronson's recital of the way the *Times* covered the Russian Revolution in October 1917 and the immediate years afterward is the most

instructive of all chapters, I feel. Then when he deals with the way the *Times* handled the invasion of Cuba at the Bay of Pigs in 1961 you discern the basic guideline of that newspaper. It is the defense of imperialism: subtly when possible, crassly if need be. As we say in Pennsylvania, when push comes to shove, the newspaper takes off its velvet glove and uses brass knuckles.

Most people, Aronson says, believe the Cold War began with the Fulton speech in 1946 by Winston Churchill, which President Harry Truman sponsored. But, says the author: "An excellent case can be made for fixing the date as March 3, 1918, the signing of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty," when the Soviets effected a peace with Germany and refused to continue in a war—World War I—which the people of Russia had rejected." Aronson contends that the 1918 date "marked the origin of the journalistic Cold War against Communism." He cites the work of two journalists, later to become among the best-known of all newspapermen—Charles Merz and Walter Lippmann, one to become managing editor of the *New York Times* and the other, Lippmann, the famous political commentator. Because of their effective work then, they were later "co-opted" by the very forces they exposed.

A 42-page supplement to the *New Republic* of August 4, 1920, was called "A Test of the News." In it Merz and Lippmann put the *Times* news coverage and editorial treatment of the Russian Revolution under sharp scrutiny.

In the first two years of the USSR, the two journalists found, the *Times* had reported "the [Soviet] Government collapsing 61 times; Petrograd toppled six times; on the verge of capture three times more; burned to the ground twice; in a state of absolute panic twice; in revolt against the Bolsheviki six times; and in a state of starvation constantly."

The victories of the White Armies were enormous and the casualty figures and captured weapons totals were many times larger than the armies and material in all of Russia. The authors simply added up the *Times* figures to reach that conclusion.

Lippmann and Merz demonstrated "how Americans were misinformed on every important question involving Russia." (Emphasis added.)

How apt that last sentence then, and how true today. It is a truth often overlooked by many who should know better, who are in reality brainwashed by the smooth operation of the gentlemen of Times Square.

Lippmann and Merz summarized their findings: "From the point

of view of professional journalism the reporting of the Russian Revolution is nothing short of a disaster. On the essential question the net effect was almost always misleading, and misleading news is worse than none at all. . . . The Russian policy of the editors of the *Times* profoundly and crassly influenced their news columns. For subjective reasons [the *Times* staff] accepted and believed most of what they were told by the State Department, the so-called Russian Embassy in Washington, Russian Information Bureau in New York, the Russian Committee in Paris, and the agents and adherents of the old regime all over Europe. . . ."

"The office handling of the news, both as to emphasis and captions, was unmistakably controlled by other than professional standards" Merz and Lippmann continue. "So obvious is this fact, so blatant is the intrusion of an editorial bias, that it will require serious reform before the code which has been violated can be restored."

Restored? This is the misconception of the liberal mind that reckons without the overriding fact of all—that social judgment is rarely made without class bias, without a slant that derives from the political and economic syndrome of the individual who is making a judgment.

The Bay of Pigs

To prove that we need but examine what happened on the *Times* over half a century later—the episode of the Bay of Pigs. What you will see there has been happening in all the intervening years to one degree or another. It has been true in every issue of the paper, for nobody is ever more consistent than the *New York Times* in its tenure of bias. It is the most class-conscious newspaper in America on the side of capitalism. It has a massive experience and a pocket-book to achieve its purpose: to color the news in such a way that most of the public fails to recognize the coloration. I have noticed that its coverage through the years has won the admiration of the topflight circles of the nation's capitalists, experts in the arts of hoodwinking the public. I have often written how persistently it has omitted, as a policy, any viewpoint ever expressed by leaders of the Communist Party. Its *index expurgatorius* begins with Henry Winston, national chairman of the Communist Party and Gus Hall, its general secretary.

Let us consider what Aronson says about the Bay of Pigs episode, a turning point in the history of the U.S. relations with Latin America. For this was the first time U.S. imperialism received an astounding blow to its prestige and to its image of the all-conquering force: the giant has clay foot,

Cuba was centrally involved in this episode, but the repercussions had world-wide impact of the gravest nature, affecting relations with that foremost socialist country, the USSR, with all of Latin America, straining the whole complex of U.S. policy, foreign and domestic. No wonder that President John F. Kennedy said he wished the CIA had been smashed in a thousand pieces before he had ever heard of it—for it was the CIA that engineered this affair. Shattered forever was the effort to create the image of Good Neighbor that previous Administrations had sought to build up.

The involvement of the *Times* was unique: it stood exposed as an institution chained to the government of the exploiting class.

It so happens I was the only U.S. newspaperman on the scene at the Bay of Pigs. Forgive me for writing in the first person singular, but for months I had been sending stories back to my paper, the *Worker*, warning that invasion was being organized and that it was imminent. As a matter of fact just 24 hours before the CIA mercenaries landed the *Worker's* main headline on Page 1 was "Invasion Imminent"; we called for the urgent organization of the widest public pressure possible.

Aronson's weekly *Guardian*, too, was summoning its readers to exert themselves to their utmost to rouse the American people to the danger. Here and there, nationally, other periodicals indicated their knowledge that invasion was pending. The weekly magazine *The Nation* knew it and said so. The *York Gazette and Daily* courageously printed the facts.

But, as Aronson quotes White House correspondent David Wise of the *New York Herald Tribune*, "Actually, only a handful of stories appeared, in widely scattered publications. The invasion, and the United States involvement came as a surprise to the vast majority the American public."

It was clear that it came as no surprise to much of the working press and their editors. The story was available if one wanted to dig for it. Aronson says acidly the reporters "had shown remarkable restraint in not pressing for publication of the facts on the preparations—facts easily available in New York, Washington, Miami and any number of Central American and Caribbean capitals."

The role of the *New York Times* was important. "It was the most influential newspaper in the country. It supposedly set standards for journalistic responsibility and ethics." But as Clifton Daniel, editor of the *Times* confessed *after* the experience, the *Times* did have the story, did know it was about to happen, and did keep the news from the nation.

James Reston advised the *Times* not to print it—Reston is now head of the *Times'* far-flung Washington bureau and a vice president of the *New York Times* corporation.

To make a long story short, the *Times* did not print the story because it regarded itself as an agency of the government, "a voluntary arm of established power," and President Kennedy, before the invasion, evidently felt the same way, for he had urged the *Times* to play down the preparations for the invasion. Later, after the fiasco, he was reported to have said regretfully, according to Clifton Daniel, "I wish you had run everything on Cuba. . . . I am just sorry you didn't tell it at that time."

In his own view, Daniel said later, "the Bay of Pigs operation might well have been canceled and the country would have been saved an enormous embarrassment if the *New York Times* and other newspapers had been more diligent in the performance of their duty—their duty to keep the public informed on matters vitally affecting our national honor and prestige, not to mention our national security."

Reston, however, sentinel of truth, said, "If I had to do it over, I would do exactly what we did at the time."

One may well believe this, for he, vice president of the newspaper, a corporation executive, is closer to the heart of *Times* policy than the other newspapermen. This is a billion-dollar investment and its primary purpose is to safeguard the corporate earnings. The main guideline has not changed since Lord Thomson said, "A newspaper exists to make money." That is the nub of the matter. Not what Daniel says, which only serves to confuse the public, that the "duty" of a newspaper is to "keep the public informed on matters vitally affecting our national honor and prestige, not to mention our national security."

Needed: An Alternative Press

History has abundantly shown how capitalism operates: if it feels a given policy will jeopardize its material interest it will scuttle that policy whether it safeguards the public's welfare or not.

It is not simplistic to emphasize that the newspaper operation in America is a commercial enterprise, essentially. Its attitude toward life is essentially that of all capitalists. The publisher regards his material interest prior to any other consideration. Hence his newspaper is an expression of the capitalist class, of its state power, much like the courts, the prisons, the Army, the police department, the FBI, the CIA, all the agencies of government. As Marx and Engels said in the *Communist Manifesto*, "The executive of the modern state

is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie."

In saying this I do not imply that the *New York Times* is the equivalent of the *Voelkischer Beobachter* of Germany's capitalist class during Hitler's time. It is not, and our press is not, for at this point in history, the ruling class does not feel it requires Hitler-type fascism to govern the country. It is doing well enough, thank you, with its brand of bourgeois democracy. Limited as that is—and efforts are constantly made to limit it even further by reducing the organized power of the working-class, of the twenty-five million Black Americans and all minorities—it is still different from fascism.

An instance in recent history is the peace demonstrations in Washington. Hitler's regime would have mowed down the demonstrators before they ever arrived at the Capital Mall. The *Beobachter* would not have printed a single line about the demands of the masses.

Although the *Times* assessed the crowd at 200,000 when most of the participants and most of the press knows there were more than three times that number there, the *Times* did print much of the story and the facts, slanting them, of course, as imperceptibly as it could toward its own bias.

Of course, Aronson, who worked in post-war Germany to try to effect the creation of an anti-fascist press, knows that the *Times* is no *Beobachter*. And that certain aspects of truth—if there is enough popular pressure—can still find their way into the pages of the capitalist press today.*

* Since this essay was written, news broke about the secret 47-volume Pentagon report which the *New York Times* made public. Whatever the motivations, the publication can be registered as a historically progressive act. The *Times* printed what the *New York Daily News*, for example, would never be found publishing. The publication of these documents does not contradict the *Times* role as a willing arm of established power. When it concealed the news of the Bay of Pigs the proprietors of the *Times* felt they were helping the established power. In printing these documents it believes their publication will help that power to continue. For the national reality is that the country is in far greater crisis today than it was even at the time of the Bay of Pigs. Many capitalists fear that the Vietnam war is driving the economy and their class interests over the abyss, that their national interest will be irretrievably harmed. That fear corresponds to the genuine people's interest—to end the disastrous war immediately. The *Times*, remembering the disaster of its course at the Bay of Pigs, chose a different way this historic moment. Its right to publish these documents must be defended with all vigor possible. And the public must protect the working newspapermen involved in the publication—for it is their hides the Administration's bloodhounds seek. The effort of the Nixon-Agnew Administration to prevent publication is a perilous fascist-type act, and will have profound repercussions on the rights of all newspapers in the country. If the Administration gets away with it, the First Amendment will suffer another terrible blow.

I concur with Aronson in remaining a realistic optimist about journalism. But I do not believe major improvement will come from within the industry. It is true that there is in the United States "a company of honest journalists of all ages, conscious of the potential power of an informed people, who will never give up the effort to establish an honorable communication network." But basically the reality is, as he says in his final paragraph, "The press helped to lead the nation into accepting a quarter century of the Cold War, with the awfulness that ensued." He advocates an alternative press that "can help dismantle the Cold War and lead the nation into accepting its place in the family of men."

That alternative press will develop as the trade unions and the 25,000,000-strong Black people build their own media of expression. It will develop as they, the peace movement, and all progressive groupings coalesce to form an anti-monopoly coalition and embark on independent political action as well as affect the destinies within the various existing political formations.

And an important factor in all this is the part the Communist press will play, has already played. It is a miracle well worth considering in a work as serious and truthful as Aronson's book.* The Communists have placed upon the American scene a daily organ when the organized labor movement, more than seventeen million strong, has not done so. The reasons for that should be examined and recognized. The steadfast loyalty of journalists to their conviction and the support they receive from their Party have made this miracle possible. It is a tribute to the power and the integrity of the American working class; it belongs in the tradition of the Abolitionists, of Garrison's *Liberator* and his immortal outcry: "I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch; and I will be heard."

* I regret that Aronson found it necessary to mention the *Daily Worker* only twice in this valuable book. It is not self-serving, I submit, to contend that there is much for American journalists to learn from the remarkable reality of the *Daily Worker* (and its successor, the *Daily World*). To omit these facts can only gladden the heart of the Cold War advocates whose principal stock-in-trade is anti-Communism. Their major effort is to black out all truth about the Communists here and world-wide. One need not be a Communist to recognize these truths.

Realignment of Political Forces In India*

Significant developments have taken place in the shifting sands of Indian politics during the year that is just closing. It was in July 1969 that Prime Minister Indira Gandhi dismissed the notorious Right-winger Morarji Desai, Deputy Premier and Finance Minister from the government and nationalized the 14 big Indian banks. Then followed the victory of V. V. Giri, the veteran freedom fighter and trade union leader, in the Presidential elections. He defeated the official Right-wing candidate of the ruling Congress Party. He was supported by the Communists and other Left parties as well as the progressive sections inside the Congress Party including the Prime Minister.

A New Political Alignment

Then the ruling Congress Party, popularly known as the "Syn-reactionary wing of the Congress Party, popularly known as the "Syndicate" in India, split away and formed a separate party, claiming that theirs is the real Congress Party. This split in the leading political party of the Indian bourgeoisie marked a new, significant stage in the political differentiation in the country which had been growing in the recent period under the impact of the deepening crisis of the discredited capitalist path of development on the one hand and the massive advance of the democratic movement on the other. It was essentially a culmination of the process of social contradictions manifested in the broadening mass struggles and mass movements against the negative consequences of the capitalist path, especially against the plunder and exploitation by the monopolists. This led to progressive isolation of the extreme reaction in the life of the nation and inside the Congress Party itself, which had lost heavily in the 1967 general elections and in the 1969 midterm elections in the four major states in Northern India.

The "Syndicate" Congress Party openly allied itself with the other parties of Right reaction, namely the "Swatantra" Party (party of "Free enterprise") and the Jan Sangh (party of Hindu religious revivalism) and hoped to overthrow the government of Indira Gandhi and take power. These three parties with their slogans of aggressive defense of monopoly interests, opposition to all progressive measures,

* C. Unni Raja is a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of India.

a shift in foreign policy in a pro-imperialist direction, of rabid anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, represent the most aggressive sections of monopoly capital and pro-imperialist reaction.

The alliance of these three Right reactionary parties is the main political enemy against which all the Left and democratic forces have to concentrate their attack in order to avert a Rightist takeover in the country.

With the split in the Congress Party and with the "Syndicate" crossing over to the opposition, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi lost her single-party majority in the Parliament. She can maintain herself in power only with the support of Left and democratic parties and progressive groups who are in the opposition. Though there are many vacillating and even reactionary elements in the Congress Party of Indira Gandhi, progressive and democratic elements, who are for fighting the Right section and broadly stand for radical changes in the policies of the Government, are a powerful force in it.

Thus the political life of our country entered a new period. The confrontation between the forces of progress and those of reaction attained a new dimension; a new alignment of political forces, both at the national level and in the states, became necessary and possible. Unprecedented possibilities opened before the democratic movement in India to broaden its base and for the masses to forge ahead in their struggle for democracy and democratic structural changes. Concretely, most favorable conditions have arisen for unleashing popular struggles against monopoly capital, pro-imperialist and pro-feudal reaction, on a much broader and wider basis, by mobilizing those progressive sections inside the Congress Party of Indira Gandhi together with Left and democratic forces outside.

Realistically assessing the new polarization of class and political forces that was taking shape and the new possibilities that had arisen for developing the mass movement, the Communist Party of India came to the following conclusions:

First, in the fight against the Right reactionary alliance of "Syndicate" Congress, Jan Sangh and Swatantra Party and for a decisive shift to the Left in Governmental policies, the main weapon is united mass political campaigns and united mass struggles, organized around a minimum program of urgently needed measures in an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-monopoly, democratic direction.

Second, all Left and democratic forces inside and outside the Parliament must exercise the utmost vigilance to thwart the evil designs of the Syndicate-Swatantra-Jan Sangh axis to topple the Indira Gandhi Government and take power. This is not a question of supporting the anti-people and anti-democratic measures of the Government. The Indira Gandhi Government must be pressed forward to carry out

certain minimum measures to improve the conditions of the masses, to strengthen their positions, to further isolate Right reaction and pave the way for democratic advance.

Third, the present Government of Indira Gandhi whose very survival depends on the democratic opposition and which is vulnerable to reactionary pressures, is only a temporary, passing stage in a fast-moving political situation. Its place is bound to be taken either by a Government of Left and democratic unity or by a Rightist coalition. To prevent a Rightist take over, and to establish a popular stable government at the center, a wide Left and democratic unity, including progressive and democratic sections within the present ruling Congress, should be forged and a nationwide militant political movement for a decisive shift to the Left launched.

Fourth, in order to build the unity of all Left and democratic forces and fully utilize the new possibilities that have arisen, all narrow sectarian outlooks and prejudices should be eschewed and vigorously combatted. The parallel Communist Party (Marxist) and the dominant leadership of the Samyukth (United) Socialist Party are following such a sectarian line which disrupts Left and democratic unity and lands them in the camp of Right reaction.

It is against this background that two major events of great national political significance took place during the past six months. One was the nation-wide struggle of the peasants and agricultural workers for land and land reforms in July-August, 1970; and the other was the mid-term elections in the state of Kerala in September 1970. Both these events are having a far-reaching impact on the democratic movement as a whole.

The Struggle for Land Reforms

The land struggle was the greatest and the broadest agrarian movement on a national scale since Independence in India. It was organized and led by the All-India Peasants' Association, the Indian Agricultural Workers' Union and the Communist Party of India. This struggle roused and moved into action hundreds of thousands of poor peasants and agricultural workers. More than 140 thousand people participated in the struggle; nearly 61,500 volunteers were arrested and put in jail; 26 people were killed as a result of attacks by the police or armed gangs of landlords; 385,000 acres of land belonging to either the Government or big landlords, were occupied and 213,000 acres were actually cultivated.

Apart from these immediate gains, including certain radical amendments to existing land reform laws being introduced by some State Governments, the land struggle has once more brought the

issue of basic agrarian reforms to the center of national policies.

The agrarian movement shook up every political party and helped the process of polarization of political forces on a national scale. Reactionary parties like Syndicate Congress, Swatantra and Jan Sangh shamelessly and openly attacked the struggle as "land-grab movement" and came out as defenders of the big landlords, former princes and monopolists who are their patrons. The pro-landlord sections in the ruling Congress Party and some of the middle-of-the road parties in the states also opposed the land struggle. But the progressive sections in the parties in varying degrees supported the toiling peasants and demanded the speedy implementation of radical land reforms.

The reactionary character of the sectarian and disruptive political line of the Samyukth Socialist Party and the parallel Communist Party (Marxist) was also revealed in the struggle. Both these parties kept away from this militant mass movement of the Indian peasantry and denounced and ridiculed it as a "political stunt" of the Communist Party of India.

United Front in Kerala

In the mid-term elections held in the state of Kerala in September 1970, the alliance formed by the United Front consisting of the Communist Party of India, the Revolutionary Socialist Party, the Praja (People's) Socialist Party and the Muslim League, with the Congress Party led by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in the state, won an absolute majority of the seats in the State Legislative Assembly and the United Front has formed a new popular government, headed by a Communist Chief Minister.

Kerala State, situated along the southwest coast of India with a population of nearly 20 million people, had made history and attracted world-wide attention in 1957 when it voted the first Communist-led, non-Congress Left, Government to power. It was then hailed by wide sections of democratic opinion in India and abroad as the most significant political development in our country after Independence.

Again in 1967, in the Fourth General Elections, it was in Kerala that the ruling Congress Party, dominated by the Right-wing and its anti-people policies, suffered the biggest defeat. Though the Communist Party had split in 1965, and the parallel Communist Party (Marxist) was following a policy of "blind" opposition to the Communist Party of India, a broad united front of seven Left and democratic parties was formed in Kerala. It was forged in the course of big united mass struggles. It adopted a program of radical democratic measures, including land reforms. The support of the people for the United Front was so overwhelming that it won 117 out of

133 seats in the State Legislative Assembly. As the single largest Party in the United Front, the leader of the parallel Communist Party (Marxist) headed the new United Front Government.

A popular ministry with such an overwhelming majority inside the Legislative Assembly, and with such a massive popular support outside, was expected to be stable and to go ahead with determination and urgency to implement the major provisions of the United Front election platform. But that was not to be. The high hopes of 1967 were shattered over the following two years and a half, because of the wrong, sectarian and hegemonic understanding and practice of the Communist Party (Marxist) with regard to United Front and its government.

"Left"-Sectarian Disruption

The leadership of the Communist Party (Marxist) did not consider the United Front or its Government as consisting of equal and independent partners. They wanted everybody else to toe their line. If other parties disagreed or expressed independent opinions, they were slandered as "saboteurs of the United Front." The Communist Party (Marxist) wanted to establish its one-party domination.

They paid scant respect to the United Front program. In the name of the Constitution or Central Government or Courts, they refused to take steps for implementing the program. It took two years and a big mass campaign to force the Communist Party (Marxist) leaders to bring a land reform bill into the Legislative Assembly. They refused to carry out a unanimous decision of the United Front to take wholesale trade in food grains from private merchants.

The Communist Party (Marxist) leaders openly and unashamedly used the Government machinery to "strengthen" their Party, which naturally led to large-scale corruption on the part of their members at all levels. The Labor Department was used to split the trade unions. They used the police in a partisan manner. Struggles of workers and peasants, if not under their leadership, were subjected to attempts to suppress them. Corruption charges were leveled against members of the Cabinet belonging to other parties and enquiry was ordered. But no action was taken when similar charges were brought against Ministers belonging to their Party.

Naturally the people began to get disillusioned. The very idea and image of the United Front got tarnished and discredited. Conflicts and contradictions developed inside the United Front itself. The Communist Party had to carry on a consistent ideological and political struggle against this wrong, sectarian and disruptive attitude and activities of the parallel Communist Party (Marxist), who refused

to change their policies but instead intensified their slander campaign against the Communist Party and other parties.

That result was that the Communist Party (Marxist) was isolated in the United Front and to escape isolation, they decided to scuttle the United Front Government and destroy the United Front itself, by asking their Chief Minister to resign. That was in the latter half of October 1969.

But the Communist Party of India took the initiative and succeeded in regrouping the United Front on a broader basis and in forming a United Front Government, with the veteran Communist leader, Achutha Menon as the Chief Minister. Thus the crisis created by the sectarian and disruptive policies of the parallel Communist Party (Marxist) was solved for the time being in the interests of the people. By that time, the Congress Party had split. The new emerging alignment of political forces was reflected in the extension of support by the legislative group of Congress members, allied to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, to the new United Front Ministry and its efforts to implement popular democratic measures.

Realization of Land Reforms

The new United Front Government in Kerala, following the traditions of the first Communist-led Ministry of 1957, initiated a number of progressive measures. A law was enacted for the payment of gratuity by employers to all workers who retire, resign or are dismissed. Another measure was passed to ensure statutorily enhanced rates of wages for agricultural workers. Wholesale distribution of food grains in the state was taken away from private merchants and handed over to the state-owned Food Cooperation of India. Preliminary steps were taken to nationalize the big tea, rubber and coffee estates, owned by British monopoly companies.

But most important of all, the Kerala Land Reforms (Amendment) Act, passed by the State Legislative Assembly in October 1969, was put into effect in toto from January 1970. This is the most radical land reform enacted or implemented anywhere in India. As a result of it, landlordism has been completely abolished in the State. From January 1, 1970, no tenant has been obliged to pay rent or any other dues to the landlords and nobody can lease out land on rent. An effective ceiling has been imposed on landholdings and there will be no family holding more than 20 acres of land. The surplus land over the ceiling will be taken over by the Government and distributed to the landless poor. Rural and urban poor who live in huts, built on land belonging to landlords, will get ownership of their house-sites; all poor peasants and agricultural workers who have "illegally" occu-

pied Government forest and waste lands will get permanent ownership rights; and the cultivable wasteland in the possession of the state will be distributed on a priority basis to the landless poor.

Already by the end of July 1970, more than 125,000 cultivators were given permanent ownership rights over the Government waste or forest land they had "illegally" occupied. An equal number of rural and urban poor received ownership of their house-sites.

It was this great achievement of the United Front Government in Kerala that inspired the nation-wide struggle for land and land reforms.

Naturally, the foreign monopolists who owned big estates, the landlords opposed to radical land reforms, the erstwhile wholesale food grains traders, the bosses of big industrial concerns, anti-Communist sections of the Catholic Church and all other reactionary elements were perturbed. They wanted somehow to get rid of the new United Front Government as soon as possible. Attempts were made to overthrow the Ministry. And, true to their sectarian, blindly partisan outlook, the parallel Communist Party (Marxist) and the Samyukth Socialist Party joined hands with the Right reactionaries with the slogan that they were prepared to "ally with any devil" to oppose and overthrow the new United Front Government which they termed as a "Ministry of betrayal." Following the footsteps of the reactionary forces which unleashed a "liberation struggle" against the first Communist Government in 1959, they provoked the masses under their influence, in the name of mass struggles, to indulge in terroristic activities.

United Front Victory

In such a situation, the United Front decided to recommend to the Governor of the State that he dissolve the Legislative Assembly and order fresh elections so that it can get a new mandate from the people for its policies of democratic reforms and improving the living conditions of the working people. Hence the midterm elections in September 1970.

As explained above, this took place against the background of political polarization and nation-wide confrontation between the forces of progress and those of Right reaction. The decision of the Government of India to terminate the privy purses and other privileges of the former princes had enraged the parties of Right reaction. The Syndicate Congress, Swatantra Party and Jan Sangh were working to form a "grand alliance" as the spearhead of the interests of the most reactionary, aggressive, pro-imperialist and anti-Communist sections of the bourgeoisie and the feudal elements in the country for a

Rightist takeover. The interests of the democratic and revolutionary movement urgently demanded the coming together of all Left and democratic forces including progressive sections within the Congress Party led by Indira Gandhi to fight and defeat this grave menace.

In Kerala State, because of the strength of the Left and democratic movement and also because of the character of the Congress Party (dominated by radical youth), it would have been possible to forge a United Front even broader than what was formed in 1969.

But, unfortunately, the Communist Party (Marxist) and Samyukth Socialist Party followed a dangerous course of disrupting Left and democratic unity and directly or indirectly aligning themselves with the forces of Right reaction. Blind "anti-Congressism" and narrow "Left"-sectarianism had led them to the disruptive and dangerous path of collusion with the most vicious reactionary forces. For these "Left" parties as well as for the parties of the vested interests, the United Front, led by the Communist Party of India and the progressive sections inside the Congress Party of Indira Gandhi were the main enemies.

The Communist Party (Marxist) and the Samyukth Party, together with two small local political groups, formed as a "People's Democratic Front" which came to an electoral understanding with the parties of Right reaction. To facilitate this understanding, the "People's Democratic Front" did not issue any election program and the Syndicate Congress agreed to put up some of its leading candidates as "Independents."

All the candidates officially sponsored by Syndicate, Swatantra Party and Jan Sangh were miserably defeated; but four Syndicate Congress candidates, parading as "Independents" won with the support of the "revolutionary" Communist Party (Marxist).

On the other hand, the alliance forged between the United Front and the Congress Party of Indira Gandhi was a principled one, based on radical democratic policies. The United Front approached the elections with its minimum program. The Congress Party issued a similar election manifesto. Both were based on the same radical principles such as rapid implementation of the land reforms Act, a vigorous program of industrialization, steps to solve the acute unemployment, especially among the educated youth, effective and urgent solution to the burning issues of the working people, etc.

The United Front-Congress Party alliance won 68 seats in the State Legislative Assembly of 133 members and polled 48.3 per cent of the total votes. The seats of the Communist Party (Marxist) were reduced from 52 to 32.

The new Council of Ministers headed by the Communist Party

leader Achutha Menon took office on October 4, 1970. The other members of the cabinet consisted of three from the Communist Party, two each from the Revolutionary Socialists and the Muslim League and one from the Praja Socialist Party. The Government has the support of the 32 Indira Gandhi Congress members. A high level committee consisting of four representatives each from the United Front and Indira Gandhi Congress Party, presided over by the Chief Minister, has been formed to decide questions of policy.

The Kerala election results register a significant victory for the political perspectives and tactical line put forward by the Communist Party of India in the situation following the split in the Congress Party. They were a big defeat not only for the parties of Right reaction, but also for the disruptive, "Left"-sectarian and thoroughly opportunistic political line of the parallel Communist Party (Marxist).

The National Council of the Communist Party of India at its meeting held in the first week of October, 1970, said:

The results of the Kerala election are bound to have significant nationwide political impact, from the point of view of strengthening and furthering the cause of unity of all Left and democratic forces, including the progressive sections of the Congress (R)*, in the common fight against Right reaction and for taking our country's political life towards the Left. They will speed up the process of political polarization and differentiation on a nationwide scale and open up new democratic perspectives for our country.

Editor's Note: General elections were held in March 1971. The outcome was a smashing victory for Indira Gandhi and the New Congress Party which won 350 out of 518 seats in the Lok Sabha (House of the People)—a two-thirds majority. The chief factors in the victory were the break with the Right and the espousal of democratic reforms. Especially important were the decision to nationalize the banks and the pledge to continue implementation of the land reforms, expand the state sector of the economy, check the concentration of wealth in the hands of big business and pursue a policy of neutrality in foreign affairs.

Despite all-out efforts, including the formation for the first time of a Right-wing coalition in league with the feudal elements and the monopolist oligarchy, the parties of Right reaction suffered disaster. The Syndicate dropped from 65 to 16 seats, Swatantra from 44 to 8 and Jan Sangh from 33 to 22. The Communist Party retained the 23 seats it had previously held. The Samyukth Socialist Party declined from 23 to 3 seats; however, the parallel Communist Party (Marxist) was able to increase from 18 to 25 seats.

* That is, the sections led by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

Cold-War Liars and New Historians

Oscar Handlin, Charles Warren Professor of American History at Harvard University, delivered a paper, "History: A Discipline in Crisis?" before the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association in December, 1970; it appears in the current issue (Summer, 1971) of *The American Scholar*.

Mr. Handlin states that for some ten years prior to the delivery of the above paper he had ceased attending the Meetings of the Association; having attended that of 1970, "partly out of nostalgia and partly in response to an invitation suggesting the retrospection appropriate to advancing age," he has come to the conclusion that he "need not soon return."

The meetings of the 1930's, 1940's and 1950's were splendid, Mr. Handlin reports. They conveyed a sense of "the continuity and integrity of the historical enterprise" and they represented a community of dedicated scholars "inching the world toward truth." Now he sees the historical profession afflicted with "decay from within"; one of its central difficulties, he writes, is that historians "stagger beneath a burden . . . of making ourselves useful in the solution of society's ever-changing problems."

It is likely that Dr. Handlin and I are of the same or very nearly the same age; he writes that the first A.H.A. Meeting he attended was that of 1936 and this happens to have been my first Meeting, too. True, I was not invited to offer an address before the Association—even in 1970 with all its decay "appropriate to advancing age;" but, then, perhaps Mr. Handlin thoroughly understands this oversight.

Of course, what one sees depends upon one's angle of vision and memories are highly personal. Still, as an historian, Mr. Handlin might be interested in another viewpoint and different memories.

The dominant historical profession of the 1930's through the 1950's—as represented in the American Historical Association and what is now called the Organization of American Historians—was a closed, intensely conservative, lily-white, anti-Semitic bulwark and reflection of the same kind of ruling class. When in the 1930's a handful of

mavericks called attention to the fact that only white people (and almost always only white men) delivered papers or held offices or conducted key journals or held professorships, we were treated as pariahs. At the most recent meeting of the Organization of American Historians, held in New Orleans, Professor Harrington—lately a President at the University of Wisconsin—mentioned in quite an offhanded way that thirty or twenty years ago there was a general policy in the profession to bar Jews from professorships and, in any case and in any position, to keep their numbers to a minimum. This was notorious at the time and denounced—by a handful—at the time.

In the late 1930's when some daring soul who was a member of the Program Committee of the American Historical Association actually suggested that perhaps Carter G. Woodson or Charles H. Wesley (both holders of doctorates in history from Harvard and authors of distinguished books) might be asked to deliver papers, that hero was removed from the Program Committee! The most distinguished and creative historian then living in the United States, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, had last been asked to participate in a meeting of the major historical organizations only at the turn of the century; his masterful work, *Black Reconstruction*, published by Harcourt, Brace in the Spring of 1935, was not reviewed in the *American Historical Review*—and to this day has never been reviewed! When the Doctor died in the Summer of 1963, the *Review* was able to spare one line simply giving the date and place of his passing.

When in the 1930's and 1940's there were shameful witchhunts and people were never hired and/or were summarily fired from positions in various history faculties—people like the late Herbert M. Morais and Jack and Philip Foner, and others—there was never a mumbling whisper of protest from the community of scholars (including Mr. Handlin) that Oscar Handlin so lovingly describes. When the witchhunts of the McCarthy era again shamed this nation, all the American Historical Association did was to give that despicable demagogue and his Committee the names of "radicals" and to affirm to him and it that the Association deeply regretted their membership. When the dean of real American scholarship—Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, then in his eighties—was arrested and mugged and fingerprinted and tried—for being "an unregistered foreign agent"—neither Mr. Handlin nor his precious and scholarly associates said a word; they did not even hold their noses in the midst of this stench that poured over the Republic. No, they went on with their polite Meetings and their damned careers and Mr. Handlin wrote no papers for *The American Scholar* on a profession in crisis.

* * *

Of course, the times are changing and it is more than just a profession which today is in crisis. It is the social order of imperialism which is deeply in crisis and that means the crisis shows itself nowhere more sharply than in that system's home base—the United States.

Societies in crisis mean societies in which significant sections of the intelligentsia are disaffected and vast layers of the youth, in particular, are in turmoil. In the United States, the crisis has produced deep splits in ruling-class circles themselves; nowhere is this more evident than in Washington's policy in Southeast Asia. This surely helps explain the exposures undertaken by the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post* and other papers with some pretensions towards reliability; perhaps also the gentlemen at the *Times* have gotten wind of future plans of the Nixon Administration—looking towards 1972—and have decided that those plans must be undone.

At any rate, today it is not only damned Reds and militant Blacks and enraged women and radical professors (and our beautiful Comrade Angela Davis has the honor of being all these together!) who are hounded and framed, but white Roman Catholic priests and nuns and distinguished M. I. T. professors.

No area of intellectual pursuit is more sensitive than that of history; lies about the past feed failures of the present and fuel disasters for the future. Today many of the faculty members who are in their late twenties or early thirties are the products of the post-McCarthy era; they are part of the sit-in and Free Speech and teach-in and Little Rock and Birmingham generation.

They loathed Batista and hailed Castro; they despised Eastland and admired King; they were appalled by the Bay of Pigs and stand enthralled by the selfless heroism of the Vietnamese. They may not know what dialectical materialism is; they remain deeply infected by remnants of anti-Communism; Scottsboro, Stalingrad, Lidice mean nothing to them, but they know—in the largest majority they know—as between J. Edgar Hoover and Angela Y. Davis who is right and who is wrong, who is monstrous and who is glorious and they know which of the two is the chief of police and which of the two is one of "America's Most Wanted Criminals!" They loath the chief cop and they love the one who fights despite her solitary confinement and her steel-encased and windowless cell.

Now some of these are the graduate students and the young professors and the pap in the old texts that came from the Schlesingers and Handlins and Cravens and Phillipses do not satisfy them. More, they have made heroes for themselves of Communists—of Castro, of Ho, of Du Bois, of Angela; they ask not about labels but rather about

deeds, about whose side are you on and who are your enemies? They want guts and frankness and sincerity and they want an end to a social order that pays Eastland \$13,000 a month for not raising cotton on his Mississippi plantations and gives \$9 a month to a Black child who is hungry in that same State.

They insist on making themselves "useful in the solution of society's ever-changing problems;" indeed, they know that that is what scholarship—what science itself—is all about. It is these youngsters, who now number millions, who insist that anti-Semitism is filthy and white chauvinism is barbarism; even in the inner sanctums of the history profession they are forcing democratic and even radical changes. This helps explain why, two years ago, a session of the American Historical Association was devoted to the life and work of Du Bois (with a Communist among those presenting papers!); and why, at the very December 1970 session of the A.H.A. of which Handlin writes, the incoming President, Professor Robert R. Palmer of Princeton, apologized for the knuckling under by the Association to the McCarthyites and added of so notorious a person as the present writer that "I hope that activists who can produce such history . . . will always be among us." (*American Historical Review*, February, 1971, p. 7.) Perhaps this helps explain Handlin's statement that the 1970 Meeting persuaded him that he had been right in staying away from such Meetings for the past ten years!

* * *

I believe that the "crisis" that troubles such distinguished traditional U.S. historians as Mr. Handlin is the growing challenge in the leading professional journals of attitudes, concepts and "truths" hitherto characterizing the work of such historians. Some examples, confining ourselves to the past year, are in order.*

A fundamental shift is the quite conscious rejection of the elitist assumptions of classical historiography and an insistence that the so-called "inarticulate"—the mass, the workers and producers, the exploited and oppressed—hitherto neglected by that historiography, are exactly the people with whom historians should be most concerned. Professor Jesse Lemisch, of Roosevelt University in Chicago, has been especially productive along these lines; noteworthy was his long, detailed and absolutely devastating critique of Hiller B. Zobel's *Boston Massacre* (Norton, New York, 1970)—a book which, for all the world, seemed to be prepared for Attorney-General Mitchell. The contents

* The present writer has, from time to time, called attention in this magazine to the appearance of anti-traditional history books coming from professional U.S. historians: see the issues for August and September, 1968; May, June and October, 1970; and February, 1971.

of this bombshell were themselves overwhelming but to my point is the fact that it was published in the *Harvard Law Review* (December 1970).

Articles significantly questioning even anti-Communist stereotypes are beginning to appear in the journals. Thus, Professor L. Wittner offered a serious and rather well-informed account of the National Negro Congress in the *American Quarterly* (Winter, 1970); the general absence of Red-baiting was especially striking for in the area of Marxism and the Afro-American liberation struggle, anti-Communism has been pronounced and has, indeed, served as a major vehicle for eminent "careers"—as in the case of Harold Cruse. Professor L. Dyson in a study of "The Milk Strike of 1939 and the Destruction of the Dairy Farmers Union" (*New York History*, October 1970), does not fail to show the courageous and basic contributions made by Communists and the dastardly role played by employer-financed Red-baiting. Professor J. Diggin's critique of Daniel Boorstin—a central figure in the neo-Conservatism that marked the McCarthy era—is telling and deep, and appears in *The American Historical Review* for February 1971.

Of exceptional significance is the appearance in the *Journal of American History* (June 1971) of Professor Garin Burbank's trail-blazing study of "Agrarian Radicals and Their Opponents: Political Conflict in Southern Oklahoma, 1910-1924." As part of the anti-democratic and anti-working class outlook of Cold-War history there developed the view—which became dominant—that the radical agrarian movements of the late 19th and early 20th centuries were really racist, anti-democratic and—indeed—pre-fascist. Usually this travesty was associated with the work of "liberal" historians, like Irwin Unger and the late Richard Hofstadter; it was part of a snobbishness that naturally caricatured working people and deeply influenced the anti-working class stance of much of what passed for a "New Left."

By the early 1960's some professional historians—and notably Norman Pollack—resisted this travesty but Mr. Pollack's temerity earned him little more than rather ill-tempered assaults from his colleagues. Professor Burbank's essay demonstrates that in an area and a time where and when the validity of the Unger-Hofstadter thesis might be expected to be confirmed it is in fact utterly refuted by the actual evidence. Professor Burbank's essay must be read in its entirety; here, however, is its concluding paragraph:

When engaged in political action, farmers identified with non-agricultural workers, rendered them aid at the local level, and supported reform measures. With their attention fastened upon these issues of economic and political reform, impoverished farmers

were indifferent, indeed actively hostile, to the politics of ethnic and moral bigotry so prevalent among their political opponents. The victims of political oppression and social scorn, they had a tolerance and sympathy for maligned and oppressed groups elsewhere which was all the more remarkable in a state where religious, racial, and social intolerance was 'respectable' and rampant. Their values, methods, and programs stamped the Socialist and Farmer-Labor constituents as the most genuinely democratic group in the state. It is by their political actions and goals that southern Oklahoma's agrarian radicals should be known and judged. Another basic component of the "crisis" that distresses the tradi-

tionalists is the frontal and mounting attack upon the racism that characterized their work. Increasingly this is coming from young men and women who are the sons and daughters of the insulted people themselves and who have been expertly trained and are fiercely motivated in tune with the heights reached in the liberation efforts of their peoples. This includes people like the American Indian, Professor Roger Buffalohead of the University of Minnesota, the group of scholars coming mostly out of southern California and publishing twice a year *The Journal of Mexican American History* (Volume I, No. 1 dated Fall, 1970), and younger Black scholars proudly standing on the shoulders of Du Bois, Woodson, A. A. Taylor, Charles H. Wesley and pushing vigorously ahead—like Robert Chrisman, Vincent Harding, Mike Thelwell, John H. Brace, Jr., Sterling Stuckey, Clarence G. Contee, Adelaide C. Hill, Janette Harris, Joyce Ladner and others.

* * *

Fundamental, too, so far as the "Crisis" is concerned, is the accumulating historical literature challenging central myths concerning the diplomatic history itself of the Cold War era. The so-called revisionist books in this area are so numerous by now that any evaluation would require—and I hope to produce at some future opportunity—an essay probably longer than this one. For the present, confining ourselves to very recent essays in leading professional journals, attention must be called to the long study with the long title, "Red Fascism: The Merger of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia in the American Image of Totalitarianism, 1930's-1950's," by L. K. Adler of Sonoma State College in California and T. G. Patterson of the University of Connecticut, published in *The American Historical Review*, April 1970. Every quarter since the Spring of 1970, the "Communications" section of the *Review* has devoted page after page to letters pro and con with replies by Adler and Patterson; the discussion continues in the latest issue of the *Review* (June 1971, pp. 856-858). (continued on page 25.)

COMMUNICATIONS

ALVA BUXENBAUM

A Reply to Linda Popper

The letter sent to *Political Affairs* by Linda Popper is very much welcomed by the National Women's Commission of the Communist Party. It is this kind of very positive and constructive expression of opinion and criticism which aids us in updating and formulating analyses and policies around very vital issues. The questions raised are very basic to the current ideological debate taking place among the various sections of women. They revolve around two main themes:

1) the source and features of male supremacist thinking and practice.

2) the roots of women's oppression—whether in the exploitation of the working class as a whole or as a separate feature of a separate home economy.

This last approach centers attention on the division of labor in the family under capitalism where men in general are viewed as the major beneficiaries of male supremacy and therefore as exploiters of women.

Linda Popper and I agree on several things. Her criticism that we in the Communist party are not emphasizing the problem of male supremacy enough is valid. One conclusion of a very good critical discussion and evaluation of

the March issue of *Political Affairs*, held at the May meeting of our Commission, was that there should have been an article dealing specifically with male supremacy as it effects society and as it influences people in the Party. Such an article is being worked on now. However, and this may be a problem of semantics, when Linda refers to the "centrality" of the question of male supremacy we get into the same problem again of what is the central or main tool of capitalism in dividing the working class. That central tool is racism. As important as male supremacist ideology is to capitalism it is still not on a par with racism. However, I assume, knowing Linda's understanding of the struggle against racism, that she meant centrality of male supremacy in relationship to the struggle for women's equality. This is certainly correct and a valid criticism of the way we've dealt with the question in the past. We haven't placed it clearly in our arguments.

Further, there is much agreement between us as to how society views and fosters the "women's role" in the family. Women are prevented from achieving a status of full and equal partnership with men based upon restrictions pro-

jected as her "role and function," defined not only by society but also by males who accept this concept (consciously or unconsciously) in their daily lives.

What I take issue with, however, is a tendency to view the status of women in the family and the existing male/female roles, as the whole story. This is only part of the question. Although a woman's status under capitalism is as a service and maintenance worker for no pay it is not her basic function or relationship to capitalist production. We are speaking in Marxist terminology and according to Marxist concepts where sections of the population must be viewed according to their relationship to the means of production. The basic means of production in our society operate to produce public, saleable commodities, not private, household services. One aspect of capitalism's greater ability to exploit workers is its maintenance of workers in reserve to be used at will by capitalists to threaten other workers with wage competition. Women make up a major part of this "reserve army" of unemployed labor and in addition to this they serve the function of providing necessary domestic labor to maintain the worker's domestic needs and as bearers of children (future workers). Women, too, are added to the work force as cheap labor thus having a direct relationship to production when employed. The degree of oppression suffered by an individual woman flows directly from her relationship to social production—when she works and has a direct relationship as well as when she

doesn't work and has an indirect relationship through the maintenance of the worker's family. Since the majority of women have and have always had either a direct relationship to production as workers or an indirect relationship as members of working class families the extent of a woman's oppression is directly related to which class and to which section of the class she belongs and not primarily to whether or not she is a housewife. Her role, therefore, as a service and maintenance worker is a secondary feature and a side effect of her basic oppression as a part of the exploited working class. *It is this emphasis on the oppression of women rooted in the exploitation of all workers as a class, rather than the emphasis on oppression as rooted in the roles fostered by the continuance of the division of labor in the family, that separates Communist analysis from other sections of the women's movement.* This is not to say that this age old division of labor in the family is not the primary means of maintaining male supremacist ideology and thus preventing women from being fully and equally integrated in social production. But once class oppression is ended male supremacy then becomes an obstacle to a socialist society where no one exploits others and where the maximum participation of every individual in social life is necessary for the advancement of all.

The material basis for ending male supremacy is present today (i.e. the advanced level of technology and scientific innovation which makes full and equal em-

ployment and a secure economic life possible for all sections of society). But control of this vast scientific and technological knowledge in the hands of monopoly serves to intensify exploitation. At the same time the contradiction between what is under capitalism and what could be is more apparent to more sections of society, therefore the intensity of the struggle against monopoly control also increases and with it the struggle against ideologies which disunite workers. Women are a critical part of the working class and without their participation it will not be possible to unite the class. This is the reason that it is especially crucial today to raise the level of the conscious fight against male supremacy and with it to raise the level of consciousness of the class as a whole.

Monopoly goes to great lengths to conceal the fact that working-class housewives are in the main unemployed workers. They have even included the category of "housewife" on application forms where one can check "employed," "unemployed," and "housewife." Further, by forcing the family to depend primarily upon the wages of the father, monopoly perpetuates the myth that woman's place is in the home, while making it difficult for women to find and keep employment. This encourages the division of labor within the family. Built upon this are other forms of supremacy including the view of women as sexual objects.

The fight for women's equality must be to fully integrate women into the productive economy. Therefore the demands must be to relieve women of the primary

responsibility for the home and care of children. Child care must be available to all. Private domestic labor must and can become a social responsibility with men and women equally sharing whatever cannot be done by society. Women must be enabled to hold equal job status with men without paying penalties for bearing children. Equality without recognition of the biological differences and functions of male and female is not equality but can be another form of oppressing women unless protective measures are guaranteed. These issues must become the issues of the working class as a whole and not just "women's issues." It is this recognition of what the goal must be—full and equal integration of women into social production—that is the basis of correct strategy and tactics for full equality for women. In the course of these struggles male supremacy must be recognized and exposed for what it is—the ideology of the exploiting class and not of the exploited.

Socialism is showing us the tremendous potential for realizing the goals that must be set forth for women, in spite of any problems socialist countries are having rooting out male supremacist thinking and practice.

Finally, I wholeheartedly agree with the final paragraphs of Linda Popper's letter with regard to the need to break down the competition between families, to find new and cooperative ways of living and that "socialism will provide the means for the abolition of the oppression of all people, but it will not happen automatically."

SPECIAL

NEW SUBSCRIBERS OFFER!

**Subscribe now during our circulation drive at
the special rate of \$4.50 for one year**

Or: Subscribe now at special book premium rates and receive one of the following books with your *new* subscription:

<i>Book</i>	<i>Premium rate</i>
1) Benjamin J. Davis, <i>Communist Councilman from Harlem</i>	\$6.00
2) John Williamson, <i>Dangerous Scot</i>	\$6.00
3) William L. Patterson, ed, <i>We Charge Genocide</i>	\$6.00
4) William L. Patterson, <i>The Man Who Cried Genocide</i>	\$6.30
5) William Z. Foster, <i>History of the World Trade Union Movement</i>	(cloth) \$6.50
6) V. I. Lenin, <i>National Liberation, Socialism and Imperialism</i>	\$6.00
7) V. I. Lenin, <i>The Emancipation of Women</i>	\$5.50

check appropriate box(es)

—Enclosed please find \$4.50 for a one year sub at special
new subscribers' rate

—Enclosed please find \$—— for a one year new subscrip-
tion and send me number —— as my book premium.

clip and mail to: Political Affairs Publishers, Inc.

23 West 26th Street

New York, N.Y. 10010