JUNE, 1966

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Dennis Ogden
GHANA

Victor Perlo
SOVIET ECONOMY

Joseph Reynolds
Howard Selsam
ETHICS AND MORALITY

PROGRAM AND PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION

50c

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

Vol. XLV, No. 6 JUNE, 1966

HYMAN LUMER, Editor BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor

CONTENTS

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: $5.00 a year; $2.50 for six months; for foreign and Canada: $6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

DENNIS OGDEN

The Reactionary Coup in Ghana

A General Motors man once observed that "what is good for Generals Motors is good for America." Major-General Sir Edward L. Spears, chairman of Ashanti Goldfields Corporation, takes the similar view that what is good for Ashanti Goldfields is good for Ghana.

The Corporation, a British company which works a gold concession in the Ashanti region of Ghana, was founded in 1897 with a capital of £250,000. Today it has a capital of £3 million; until 1961-62 it was able to pay shareholders dividends of 50 per cent and over.

Despite his tycoon's tale of hard times under President Nkrumah, Sir Edward was able to report an increase of over £30,000 in after-tax profits when he addressed his shareholders' annual general meeting in London at the end of March.

But what most gladdened his hearers' hearts were his hints of even bigger bonanzas to come, now that Dr. Nkrumah, the man who was leading Ghana along the road of non-capitalist development, had been overthrown and replaced by the militarist-police regime led by General Ankrah and Police Commissioner Harley.

Sir Edward was in Ghana during the February 24th coup. He described how he sought an early appointment with the two coup leaders. "There can be no doubt that both these very intelligent and well-informed men were fully aware of the importance of Ashanti Goldfields Corporation to Ghana," he confidently declared.

Even before his talk with them "there were already indications that we would find the new regime much more satisfactory to deal with than the old," he said, describing how within a week of ruling power it had released nearly £100,000 in sterling for the company and issued import licenses without restriction. Sir Edward was "not unhopeful" that the leaders of the new regime "will be responsive to an approach from us to reduce taxation" to what he termed a "reasonable" level.

Sir Edward unambiguously set his seal of approval on the Ankrah-Harlley regime; there can be no clearer testimony to the true nature of the February 24th coup—testimony backed by the jubilation with which the event was greeted in London, Washington and Bonn.

The Imperialist Counter-Offensive

The Accra coup is the latest and most ominous development in

imperialism's counter-offensive against Africa—a counter-offensive which began with the Belgian-U.S.-British operation against Stanleyville. Coming on the heels of the reactionary military take-over in Burundi, the Congo, the Central African Republic and Dahomey, the overthrow of Kwame Nkrumah, the man who had become the standard-bearer of the freedom and unity of Africa, marks the biggest success to date of this counter-offensive.

Sensitive to African opinion, the new regime was quick to claim that it will continue to pursue the Nkrumah policy of the total liberation of Africa and support for the Organization of African Unity.

But one of its first moves was ostentatiously to shut down camps where, in accordance with O.A.U. decisions, freedom fighters from Rhodesia, South Africa and the Spanish and Portuguese colonies had been trained.

In place of Dr. Nkrumah's policy of positive neutrality, General Ankrah proclaimed what he termed "genuine" neutrality. It means a vicious campaign of anti-Soviet, anti-Chinese and anti-socialist smears, with the expulsion—in some cases manhandling—of socialist technicians and diplomats.

The grossly inflated U.S. Embassy staff, bigger than those of the Soviet and Chinese embassies combined, remain, together with the Peace Corps and the numerous other Americans—among them "research workers" said to have assisted in the compilation of a Pentagon "Special Warfare" handbook on Ghana.

And one of the first moves of the new regime was to restore diplomatic relations with Britain, severed in protest against the ineffectiveness of British action against the racist Smith regime.

For us, the coup had begun at 3 a.m. on February 24th when we were awakened by the crash of mortar shells, intensive automatic weapons fire and the roar of trucks and armored cars hard driven on the road at the back of our bungalow on the northeastern fringe of Accra.

Normally quiet as an English country lane, that road had in those dawn hours become an artery of counter-revolution; it was the shortest route between Burma Camp, headquarters of the Ghana Army, and Flagstaff House, Ghana's "White House."

Along it went the young soldiers, told by their British-trained officers that their President had abandoned them, flying off to Peking and Hanoi with all the country's money.

The officer-plotters had murdered Major-General Charles Barwah, the Chief of Defense Staff, who had refused to violate his oath. They seized the unguarded cable office, post office and other key

points; the small guard on Ghana Radio was subdued; an all-out attack was launched against Flagstaff House, defended by the heavily outnumbered and outgunned Presidential Security Detail, which kept up a stubborn resistance till the evening of February 24th.

After a morning of light music interspersed by terse announcements regarding the closure of Accra International Airport and demands for the surrender of the Presidential Security Detail and of all Members of Parliament, Ministers and local officials of the Convention People's Party, which had earlier been declared illegal, the new regime broadcast its first policy statement at 1 p.m.: "The economic situation of the country is in such a chaotic condition that, unless something is done about it now, the whole economic system will collapse . . . the country is on the verge of bankruptcy."

Echoing an argument long part of the stock-in-trade of Ghana's imperialist enemies, it painted a glib picture of a Ghana which had inherited a rich patrimony from its former British colonial rulers, only to have it frittered away by "gross economic mismanagement" and "prestige spending."

The "rich patrimony" was in fact an economy geared to the production of a single crop—cocoa—upon which the country had to depend for two-thirds of her foreign currency earnings. It is from this fact that the economic difficulties which the new regime has been able to exploit in the main flow.

The Vision of Nkrumah

With the achievement of political independence in 1957, the next task was that of winning economic independence through the eradication of the colonial legacy and the creation of a balanced, diversified economy.

Dr. Nkrumah saw the non-capitalist road as the only way forward. Socialism, he declared, "is our only alternative." He saw that for a developing country to take the capitalist path would mean that its national economy would remain in the hands of foreign capital. Colonialism would be replaced by neo-colonialism—the brand of "imperialism without the flag" which the United States had for decades practiced with great profit in Latin America.

While he envisaged that Ghana would remain a mixed economy for a long time, his aim was clear: "We are determined that the economic independence of Ghana shall be achieved and maintained so as to avoid the social antagonisms resulting from the unequal distribution of economic power. We are equally determined to ensure

that the operation of a mixed economy leads to the socialist transformation we envisage, and not to the defeat of our socialist aims."

In line with these aims, the Seven-Year Development Plan introduced in March, 1964 provided for the greatest possible encouragement of the publicly-owned and co-operative sectors, with investment regulated to ensure its most effective use. Foreign investment was welcomed—provided it conformed to the national economic objectives.

Ghana's progress was symbolized by the three-phase Volta Project, one of the most ambitious development schemes in Africa—or indeed, in the whole world.

Phase One was the completion of a new port at Tema, some 15 miles east of Accra. There, at a cost of some £35 million drawn entirely from its own resources, the Nkrumah administration built one of the finest man-made harbors in Africa. There too were built many of the country's new industrial undertakings, from a steel mill to a chocolate factory; Ghana, the world's largest cocoa producer, had until last year to import every bar of chocolate she needed.

Phase Two was the building of the Akosombo Dam on the Volta River some 60 miles north of Tema. Completed a year ahead of schedule and—rare thing in these days—at a cost substantially below the original estimate, it is already supplying power. Indeed, the accounts which Sir Edward Spears presented to his shareholders show that its commissioning is saving Ashanti Goldfields £240,000 a year in power bills.

Ghana herself paid half the cost of the dam. The other half was split three ways between the International Bank, the United States and Britain, who made loans at normal commercial rates of interest. Not a single cent was given.

Phase Three is the building of a £50 million aluminum smelter at Tema by VALCO, a Ghana-registered consortium of two U.S. companies, the Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation and the Reynolds Metals Company. With an eventual capacity of 120,000 tons a year, the smelter will be one of the main customers for Akosombo's power. It will at first use imported bauxite, but the agreement creating VALCO as a company subject to Ghanaian law provides incentives for the use of Ghanaian deposits within ten years. Provision was also made for the allocation of part of the VALCO profits to a special fund to finance educational and social projects in Ghana.

As envisaged by Dr. Nkrumah, the Volta project was to change the face of Ghana, providing abundant power for the new industries and for the domestic consumer as well as creating new opportunities for north-south water transport, fishing and irrigation through the

formation of the largest man-made lake in the world. It is the embodiment of the new Ghana that he and the best elements in the C.P.P. were striving to build. It is the answer to those who claim that Ghana's patrimony has been wasted.

So, too, is the impressive progress made in the modernization and diversification of agriculture through the development of state and cooperative farms and varied forms of encouragement to individual farmers. Great efforts were made to introduce new crops, such as rice and rubber, to end excessive dependence on cocoa and help cut foreign spending.

Yet another answer is the immense and purposeful social progress made since independence: great strides were made towards free and compulsory elementary and secondary education; new universities and higher educational establishments like those at Cape Coast and Kumasi were built; university education became free; progress was made towards a free health service and the first steps taken towards the introduction of a social insurance scheme, with unemployment benefits and pensions—Sir Edward has complained bitterly about the contribution equivalent to 15 per cent of their wages bill, which employers have to make.

The Economic Squeeze by the Monopolists

The new regime is trying to obscure these achievements with its talk of "gross economic mismanagement" and "prestige spending" as a prelude to whittling away the benefits won thanks to the C.P.P. administration.

This immense development program—unparalleled anywhere else in Africa—entailed great overseas spending. Ghana, thanks to the legacy of colonialism, had to rely on cocoa sales to earn the money. The Seven-Year Plan was drafted on the assumption that an increased output (production more than doubled between 1956 and 1964) would be sold for at least £190-£200 a ton, ensuring an average annual foreign currency income from this source of £86 million.

The cocoa monopolies who control the world market had, with the tacit agreement of western governments, repeatedly urged Ghana to produce more and repeatedly pledged that no matter how much output was increased they would guarantee a fair and stable price of £200-£250 a ton.

But when Ghana, at considerable cost to herself, did increase output, all talk of a fair and stable price was forgotten. Thanks to market manipulation by the monopolies, the price fell to an all-time low of £85 a ton last summer (compared with £467 a ton in the early '50s)

and Ghana's earnings slumped to below pre-independence levels, although she had produced and sold more cocoa than ever before. Meanwhile, the prices of the industrial goods she had to buy abroad soared.

Ghana's losses as a result of this market manipulation and as a result of the imperialist policy of buying cheap and selling dear have been estimated at more than £500 million. It was this which led to the drain on her reserves and constituted the prime cause of her economic difficulties. She had to resort to credits to a much greater extent than would otherwise have been the case—and it needs to be emphasized that, in the words of *West Africa* (March 17, 1966), a London publication which had no particular sympathy for the Ghana of Dr. Nkrumah, "the bulk of the suppliers' credits which are a millstone around the country's neck come from the West." Service charges swallowed up a quarter of Ghana's already diminished foreign currency earnings last year.

Ghana had been trying to renegotiate the terms of these credits to win a breathing space to enable her new industries to reach their full potential. She took steps to check wasteful spending in the state corporations and Foreign Service. But her capitalist creditors were out to take advantage of her temporary difficulties to make her renounce her policy of non-capitalist development by making assistance conditional on better terms and broader opportunities for foreign investors and cut-backs in the state sector—demands which Dr. Nkrumah rejected, but which the new regime has already started to concede.

The socialist countries, with whom Ghana had in recent years been extending her technical and economic cooperation, agreed to a moratorium on interest and credit repayments, and increased their purchases of cocoa under long-term agreements at prices above the level in the capitalist world market.

This wide-ranging and fruitful cooperation with the socialist countries aroused great concern in the West, notably in Britain and the United States, and also among Right-wing elements in the leadership of the C.P.P., who in the months before the coup had been preparing an offensive against it.

The new regime has claimed that it considers itself bound by the agreements entered into by the Nkrumah administration, specifically mentioning the cocoa agreements with the socialist countries. But there have already been hints that it will seek a revision, with allegations that the socialist countries are reselling the cocoa they buy as the pretext.

The shortage of foreign currency made controls necessary. But controls are difficult to enforce when foreign trade is mainly in the hands of foreign companies, and when they have to be administered by officials who are at best inexperienced and at worst corrupt. As a result of hold-ups and shortages of spares, many of the new factories were obliged to work below capacity or even to shut down altogether, while at time the whole of Accra's public transport fleet was off the road.

There were gaps too in the deliveries of imported basic foodstuffs. The situation was exacerbated by speculation and blackmarketeering by traders—including prominent members of the government and C.P.P. and their wives—who cornered supplies in order to jack up prices. There was profiteering too in the marketing of locally-grown foodstuffs, particularly in the main population centers.

But investigation and measures to check price increases were blocked at every turn. Last year's much-publicized Abraham Commission set up to enquire into trade malpractices exposed only small fry, and a Right-wing Trade Minister took advantage of its findings to deprive the state-run National Trading Corporation of the few exclusive rights it had, handing them back to the big foreign firms. Likewise leading officials in the Ghana National Association of Women who should have been leading the fight against profiteering were themselves reaping huge profits as market "Queens."

Kwame Nkrumah repeatedly tried to initiate action against speculation and profiteering, and against the bribery, corruption and ostentatious living by "big men" which sowed the seeds of disillusionment and eroded popular support for the C.P.P. He failed. The new regime will not even try, for it draws its support from those who are profiting the most from these abuses.

The new regime is now trying to smear Dr. Nkrumah by claiming that he himself amassed a large private fortune. It produced Ayah-Kumi (himself one of Ghana's richest men and a former economic advisor to the President) for "protective custody" to provide the "evidence."

The technique is to assert that accounts held by members of the former government now in custody were the property of the President, or to claim that corporations which were publicly-owned or the property of the C.P.P. were the personal property of Dr. Nkrumah. By the same token it could be claimed that the chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, for example, "owned" all the atomic research facilities of the United States.

Signs of Resistance

The fight for political independence had united almost all sections of the Ghanaian people. For the ordinary Ghanaian, political independence was the first step on the road towards a richer, fuller life for all, free from exploitation and oppression; the Ghanaian national bourgeoisie hoped that political independence would open the way to enrichment and supreme power in the new state.

Some of the Ghanaian bourgeoisie had supported the C.P.P. in the fight for political independence from the outset; others went through the motions of transferring their support to it when the parties which had openly voiced their aspirations passed into oblivion, failing to retain popular support. But few had any genuine sympathy for the aim, once independence had been won, of building a socialist Ghana and transforming the C.P.P. into a vanguard party based on scientific socialism.

Ghana, unlike most other newly-independent African countries, had a relatively well-developed middle class of merchants, lawyers, civil servants—and Army and police officers—all trained in the British tradition. It was through these that Kwame Nkrumah had to work. Many served the new Ghana loyally; others resorted to obstructionism and, ultimately, betrayal.

By contrast, the working class was still small, and the C.P.P. had been unable to build a genuine democratic political life at grass roots level. Too often the fight for socialist ideas was replaced by personal adulation of Nkrumah. In consequence, the ideas of capitalism and neo-colonialism, continually encouraged from without, remained a potent force, while those of socialism fought a battle against odds.

The first days after the coup saw a wave of Nazi-style book-burnings and mass arrests in which every minister, every M.P. and every leading C.P.P. official and activist was taken into "protective custody." Leading socialists like Kofi Batsa, editor of the socialist weekly *The Spark* and Kodwo Addison, director of the Ideological Institute were singled out as quarry in the manhunt.

The new regime has tried to focus attention on its release of detainees, including those sentenced for complicity in earlier assassination attempts directed against Dr. Nkrumah. But the number of detainees which it now holds in "protective custody" (a conception, incidentally, which does not in fact exist in Ghanaian law) is far greater, totalling according to some estimates as many as 2,000.

But despite this wave of repression, the seeds of socialism sown during the struggle to transform the C.P.P. and build a socialist Ghana are bearing fruit: less than one month after the coup, an illegal leaflet signed by a newly-created Committee for the Defense of the Revolution was circulating in Accra, calling upon sincere socialists and "lowly but staunch" activists to resist the counter-revolution.

The leaflet warned that the consequences of the new regime's sell-out to foreign big business "will be increased unemployment; increased dependence of Ghana's economy on Britain and America; a falling standard of living for the majority of the people side by side with a more than comfortable living standard for a small class of businessmen, top civil servants, top army and police officers and privileged intellectuals."

The first overt sign of organized resistance to the new regime, is conclusive testimony to the fact that although the new regime has cunningly exploited the difficulties confronting Ghana, it cannot solve them, for they are the legacy of Ghana's colonial past and the consequences of imperialist policy. They can be solved only by resolute action to overcome this legacy and to defeat this policy.

> Africa today is the main stamping ground of the neo-colonialist forces that seek the domination of the world for the imperialism they serve. Spreading from South Africa, the Congo, the Rhodesias, Angola, Mozambique, they form a maze-like connection with the mightiest international financial monopolies in the world. These monopolies are extending their banking and industrial organizations throughout the African continent. Their spokesmen push their interests in the parliaments and governments of the world and sit on the international bodies that are supposed to exist for the promotion of world peace and the welfare of the less-developed countries. Against such a formidable phalanx of forces, how can we move? Certainly not singly, but in a combination that will give strength to our bargaining power and eliminate so many duplications that give geater force and greater advantage to the imperialists and their strategy of neo-colonialism.
>
> Kwame Nkrumah, *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, pp. 30-31

VICTOR PERLO

Economic Theory and Practice in the Soviet Union

The last major work of Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, consisted of a report delivered in 1962 and his replies to three letters from correspondents who had expressed disagreements with his report. Stalin "tore into" one of the correspondents, Yaroshenko, whose points were obviously foolish, but he dealt respectfully with the others, whose points were fundamental. The first reply was to Alexander Ilyich Notkin; the second to A. V. Sanina and V. G. Venzher. Presumably these correspondents exhibited civic courage by arguing with Stalin at that time. While we do not have the texts of their letters, we can see from Stalin's replies that they raised issues that are at the very heart of the current economic reforms in the USSR.

Stalin thought that only consumers goods and collective farm products should be regarded as commodities. Notkin thought that producers goods should also be regarded as commodities and hence, by implication, subject to strict bookkeeping and rational pricing. Stalin considered the profitability of individual plants of secondary importance to the profitability of the entire economy, which could be established over a period of years through subsidizing unprofitable capital goods industries. Notkin considered it just as important for capital goods industries to operate profitably.

Now Soviet economists and political leaders agree that failure to treat producers goods as commodities, and to insure profitable operation of factories making them, has caused large losses to the Soviet economy as a whole. Major elements in the current economic reforms are the pricing of capital goods at their values and the charging of enterprises for their use. These measures aim to stimulate producers to gear output to users' needs, and users to employ their equipment more intensively. Realistic wholesale prices will enable capital goods factories to operate profitably, eliminating budgetary subsidies.

Sanina and Venzher urged the machine and tractor stations to sell the machinery to the collective farms, thereby increasing the farmers' self-management of their enterprises and investments. Stalin argued against this as a step away from Communism and, he added, the

farmers couldn't afford to buy the machines. Years ago the Sanina-Venzher recommendation was carried out, and in the current reforms a broadening of self-management by collective farms and an improvement of their real incomes are central features.

Thus the discussion which culminated in the present reforms began at least fifteen years ago. It was developed much further, made more specific, in studies of Soviet economists since then, especially during the past five years. Notkin and Venzher are two of five authors of a book published in Moscow in 1965: "Production, Accumulation and Consumption."*

These professors rank with Liberman, Gatovsky, Trapeznikov, Kantorovich, and the late Nemchinov, among those who fundamentally clarified the economic laws of a modern, industrialized, socialist society and proposed corresponding practical reforms. They, and colleagues in other socialist countries, led a prolonged fight for these principles and practices, combatting both dogmatists who wished to continue obsolete rigid bureaucratic control and libertarians who wished, under cover of economic reform, to abolish centralized planning and take serious steps towards restoration of private ownership of productive enterprises.

These people deserve recognition and honor, just as the physical scientists, cosmonauts, foremost workers, and other outstanding contributors to the progress of socialism.

Why didn't this happen earlier in the USSR? Partly because of particular conditions faced in the earlier stages of building a socialist society. Remaining aspects of the class struggle and extreme external military pressures forced the use of administrative measures and non-economic priorities. The technical backwardness of the country extended to economic science. A few outstanding men projected sound economic planning schemes, but they were not numerous enough to implement the plans in detail, and the necessary technical equipment was lacking. Also important were the arbitrary, bureaucratic methods of control which developed during the Stalin period, and which have been reduced only gradually since. This subjective factor delayed the new reforms for a number of years, but once in effect, the reforms will hasten the breakup of excessive, inflexible bureaucracy. These reforms open big opportunities for the broader process of the democratization of life in the Soviet Union that is underway.

---

*V. G. Venzher, Ya. B. Kvasha. S. P. Pervushkin, I. A. Heinman, *Proizvodstvo, Nakopleniye, Protrebleniye*, Moscow, "Ekonomika" Publishing House, 1965, 304 pp., 91 kopecks.

The volume has some of the weaknesses characteristic of essay collections. There are some repetitions, unevenness, and inconsistencies. But generally the authors divided up their tasks well. The volume holds together in an amazingly comprehensive treatment of most of the main economic problems of Soviet society. While the authors are now preparing a revised edition, this original edition is an economic work of exceptional theoretical and practical importance. Much of its content is now being transferred from the printed page into the life of factories, farms, and households.

What Growth Rate of Socialist Countries?

S. P. Pervushin, in the first essay, discusses the desirable and possible economic growth rate of an industrialized socialist country. Some people argue that the earlier, fast rates of growth occurred in the specific conditions of the shift from an agrarian to an industrial economy and are not possible now. Pervushin claims that this concept is based on a metaphysical positing of unchanging conditions of production. The increasing role of scientific-technical advance makes it possible to maintain or even slightly increase the early growth rate. The slowdown in socialist countries in recent years is abnormal, as evidenced by declining output per unit of capacity.

A sustained high growth rate is needed for continuous growth in living standards and in order to win in the decisive economic competition with capitalist countries, which have possibilities for speeding their growth rate. The socialist countries cannot rest on their laurels on the assumption that the advantages of socialism will automatically insure victory. During the last decade, leading capitalist countries have come closer to the Soviet growth rate, and Japan has surpassed it.

True, the capitalist countries had particular advantages and the USSR particular disadvantages during this period, but it is necessary to cope with these circumstances. The recent average industrial production growth rate of 6-8 per cent in the socialist countries is too low. Pervushin considers 10-12 per cent an optimum, possible with full use of reserves over a long period. He claims that this would be achieved if the USSR applied its investments as efficiently as some capitalist countries. To accomplish this, he makes recommendations which are spelled out by other contributors to the volume.

There are substantial differences among Soviet economists as to the desirable and possible growth rate. Those with whom I discussed it are more or less evenly divided between Pervushin's view and the view that an 8-9 per cent rate is all that is practical and desirable.

The Soviet leadership appears to agree with the latter view. The new Five-Year Plan calls for an annual rise of 8-8.5 per cent, close to the planned and actual increase of the recently concluded Seven-Year Plan. But in a concession to the other viewpoint, the Draft Plan directives express the conviction that the Soviet people "will bring to light additional potentialities for overfulfilling the plan."

In this reviewer's opinion, the answer to this issue will be determined for the coming decade by agriculture more than by industry. If the current Five-Year Plan for agriculture, unlike its predecessors, is achieved in full, there will be excellent gains in living standards, and material and moral conditions will evolve favoring speedier industrial growth.

What Share for Consumption?

Pervushin says that at the present stage of development of Soviet industry, no "economies" at the expense of consumers' welfare will speed up accumulation or the growth of industry generally. A rapid rise in consumption should accompany that in basic industry. He contrasts this with the early industrialization period when the slogan "More coal, metal, machines," had to have absolute priority to insure the future of communist society.

I think that the sacrifice of consumer needs, relatively—and sometimes absolutely—was a specific result of the exceptionally hostile and isolated environment in which the USSR built socialism. It is not an intrinsic necessity for rapid socialist industrialization. On the contrary, a simultaneous rapid rise in living standards from the very start of industrialization is not only possible, but also helps release the social forces which can make the whole program a success.

Notkin devotes a major portion of his essay to examining how a radical rise in peoples' welfare can best be combined with rapid economic growth. The theoretical solution lies in a proper proportion of productive accumulation (investment) and consumption. With this in mind he calculates various dynamic models to determine the best distribution of the national product. The higher the share of accumulation, the lower the short-term gain in consumption, but the more the long-term gain. Where should one strike the balance between the short-term and the long-term future? Mathematically, the higher the percentage of accumulation, the better the long-term results. But also, more perfection is required in the use of reserves—there is more tenseness and danger of breakdowns in the situation should any element go wrong. Each country must work out the safety point from its own experience and conditions.

Notkin then translates this into a schematic development of output

of producers goods and consumers goods (Departments I and II), in the fashion of Karl Marx. Notkin uses parameters which attempt to simulate actual Soviet conditions. He finds that the most appropriate relationship involves a slightly higher rate of growth in producers goods. In one variant, producers goods output increases 8.36 per cent yearly, consumers goods 7.74 per cent. Thus the weight of fixed capital increases with technical progress, but not as rapidly as in past Soviet practice.

The Draft Five-Year Plan for 1966-70 calls for an increase of 8.52 per cent per year in producers goods and 7.79 per cent per year in consumers goods, virtually coinciding with Notkin's model. In 1965, for the first time, the percentage rise in consumers goods output came quite close to that for producers goods. Notkin uses traditional global categories of production and simple algebraic methods of calculation. Soviet mathematical economists will surely make big contributions in this area, developing models with more categories, more complex relationships and refined parameters, utilizing electronic computers to test planning variants, and selecting optimal variants in a more objective fashion than has been possible until now.

Notkin's proposals for speeding output of consumers goods include standard remedies: to intensify farm output and increase the material interest of farmers; to cut capital costs; to make more use of chemistry and chemicals; to increase the supply of equipment for agriculture and consumers goods industries; to develop consumers goods output in heavy as well as light industries. Of particular interest, he urges that the country get started on the mass production of cheap light automobiles. These recommendations reflect the actual current emphases in Soviet planning and practice. In particular, mass production of autos is starting in this Five-Year Plan.

The Two-Shift, Five-Day Week

Notkin makes an important specific proposal for using capacity more effectively. He thinks the USSR should change from the present 41-hour, 6-day week to a 40-hour, 5-day week; but with staggered work schedules so that each factory works 6 days and 2 shifts per day. Since most factories now work only 1½ shifts daily, this would bring the activity of the average factory up from 62 hours to 96 hours per week. Careful preparation would be required and money would have to be spent on equipment to eliminate the bottlenecks preventing 96-hour operation. I suspect that the main bottleneck hampering 2-shift operation is the shortage of materials and fuel. Some Soviet and American bourgeois economists have claimed for

a long time that the USSR is losing much production by inadequate use of multiple shifts. Among the contributors to this volume, Heinman and Pervushin agree with Notkin; Kvasha does not. Whatever the merits of the argument, factory managers in the USSR are now devoting much effort to increasing the number of shifts their machines work in order to increase the profits of their enterprises and, correspondingly, to raise the incomes of their personnel under the new planning system.

The 5-day week proposal is being tried experimentally in East Germany, apparently with favorable results. General Secretary L. I. Brezhnev announced at the 23rd CPSU Congress in March, that this has been adopted in principle and will be introduced during the current five-year plan period. Already Soviet workers enjoy an actual average working week that is shorter than in any major country in the world, including the United States. But they have had to work six days per week instead of the five enjoyed by American workers. Now they will have this advantage too.

Capital-Output Ratios

Professor Kvasha deals with the capital cost of production: the amount of employed capital needed for a given volume of output, and the amount of additional capital needed to get a given additional volume of output. Expressed in terms more commonly used by Western economists, he deals with average and marginal capital-output ratios. The higher these ratios, the less efficient is production, and vice versa.

Kvasha finds that since 1960 both the average and the marginal ratios have increased. During 1952-56 it required 1.4 rubles of added fixed capital to get an additional ruble of national income, but during 1959-62 it required 2.4 rubles. In the earlier period the marginal capital-output ratio in the USSR was only one-third that in the USA, but in the later period it was one-half as large.

This comparison shows that with all the specific shortcomings of Soviet economic management and planning, the existence of all around coordinated countrywide socialist planning makes the system much more efficient than capitalism in the use of its capital resources.

Some economists, arguing from Marx's law of the increasing organic composition of capital, consider it inevitable that the ratio of capital to current output will increase. Others argue that the technical-scientific revolution has so cheapened key lines of equipment as to make that law no longer valid. Kvasha examines carefully the work of the National Bureau of Economic Research on this subject with

regard to the United States, and other data. He considers that the available evidence doesn't permit a firm conclusion as to whether technical advance brings higher or lower average capital-output ratios. But it does permit the conclusion that increases are not inevitable, that the ratio is subject to conscious influence by people striving to reduce it in the interest of economic progress. Certainly, he says, the law of the rising tendency of the organic composition of capital must no longer be used to cover up bad practices, such as selection of high capital-cost projects over low capital-cost projects by enterprises.

His main theme is the need to strive to reduce capital costs per unit of output by all possible means. Obviously, success in this direction has great leverage for accelerating economic growth. Much of Kvasha's essay discusses factors tending to raise capital-output ratios and proposals to counter them.

He has a very interesting comment about the introduction of new techniques. Often these are introduced prematurely, without an adequate accounting basis, so that the most advanced technique produces less than the highest economic return. Often there is insufficient experimental and test output, so that additional capital expenditures and time are needed to set matters right. The new system of planning and management, making it worth while for enterprises to economize on equipment, should reduce indiscriminate ordering of super-modern capital goods.

Excessive concentration on ultra-large establishments also inflates capital costs. U.S. experience reveals an important role for small establishments, using not the latest, but intermediate techniques, for production of components, spare parts, etc. Such establishments have maximum flexibility and maneuverability, and require the least state planning control under socialism. They require little capital and administrative overhead. In the U.S. they are particularly active as suppliers for auto companies and subcontractors for armament concerns.

Kvasha thinks that in the Soviet Union such production could be carried out to advantage by cooperative establishments in which the members have broad rights and responsibilities, share in profits and losses, and receive favorable tax treatment.

The most important negative factor has been the lag in agriculture. Relative stagnation in farm output in the last seven years has been accompanied by rapidly rising farm investments, and hence a rising capital-output ratio. The supply of agricultural raw materials has not kept pace with rising capacities to consume these materials in industry. This causes much idleness in consumers goods factories, and hence rising capital-output ratios there as well. Obviously, a real breakthrough in farm output will have very powerful stimulating effects on the entire Soviet economy.

Industrial Structure

Professor Heinman is one of the world's outstanding specialists in the concrete comparative study of American and Soviet industrial organization, structure, and operations. In his essay he mercilessly shows how much the Soviet economy lags behind the American—the most advanced in the world—in many of these respects, and he suggests ways to overcome the lag.

The most characteristic portions of his essay deal with the details of industrial structure, its "microstructure," shortcomings in special products rather than broad industries. Another, and connected theme is the need to economize in the use of machinery and materials. There is an enormous overuse of fuel owing to lack of modern equipment. Heinman recommends a big rise in the output of boiler-utilizers, economizers, heat recyclers, etc., in order to improve this factor.

Electric energy is a bottleneck. Electrification of Soviet industry is somewhat behind the U.S. standard, and is growing inadequately. Because the main modern growth industries—chemicals, non-ferrous metals, etc.—use enormous quantities of electricity, electricity production must grow considerably faster than industry as a whole. In the U.S. electricity consumption grows 7 per cent for every 4 per cent rise in industrial production. But in the USSR the ratio has been only 5 per cent for every 4 per cent rise in industrial production, hampering the qualitative structural improvement of industry as well as its overall growth. An even faster rise in electricity is needed for agricultural and household use.

The new Five-Year Plan calls for a growth of electricity one-third faster than that of industry as a whole. This is some improvement, but not enough. In a recent interview, Academician Strumilin, dean of Soviet economists, recommended increasing the Draft Five-Year Plan goals for electric power. Whether the necessary equipment, structures and transmission lines can be built quickly enough to do this is another question.

Heinman shows the glaring insufficiency of output of sheet steel, heat-treated steel, prepared shapes of steel, in the USSR. He indicates the big economies in metal and the increased output of autos and other consumers goods that would become possible with an appropriate structural improvement of the steel industry. The new plan devotes much energy to this. Output of cold rolled sheets is to double, of oxygen converter steel to multiply 5-6 times. There is to be much

more heat treatment, stainless steel, high precision patterned profiles, etc.

Heinman gives the shocking estimate that consumption of finished steel per unit of output in the machinery industry in the USSR is 40-50 per cent more than in the United States. The new Five-Year Plan aims at a 20-25 per cent reduction in metal consumption per unit in the machinery and metalworking industries, which would still leave Soviet metal consumption per unit somewhat higher than the present U.S. standard, if Heinman's estimate is correct. The recently concluded Seven-Year Plan also called for a major reduction in steel consumption per unit, and general statistical evidence suggests that considerable progress was made, although probably less than planned.

Recently the Soviet Union has been modernizing its chemical industry, but not rapidly enough. The process will now be speeded. By 1970, under the new plan, output of plastics, synthetic resins and synthetic fibers will exceed the 1963 output of all countries except the United States. Synthetic detergent output is scheduled to multiply six times. The USSR is making large investments not only domestically, but also in foreign exchange, to buy equipment embodying up-to-date world techniques in the chemical growth industries.

Concerning machinery, Heinman stresses the need for specialized establishments to produce various details and spare parts, and centralized control to standardize these items throughout the machinery industry—or large segments of it. He also calls for specialized repair shops. Achievement of U.S. standards of specialization, he estimates, would permit a reduction in the number of auxiliary workers in the basic factories great enough to permit an increase of 30 per cent in labor productivity in the machinery industries as a whole. The Five-Year Plan embodies his basic recommendations. The recent organization of a powerful new State Committee on Material and Equipment Supply signifies a major effort in this whole area.

The Scale of Material Icentives

Heinman lays much stress on the importance of adopting a new system of industrial management and incentives, along the lines recommended by Liberman and others, and adopted at the September, 1965 Plenum. His specific proposal envisions real flexibility for the enterprises and sufficient funds for incentive purposes to make a difference. He says that the central authorities should *not* determine the average wage. This should be within the province of the enterprise, so long as it achieves the planned profit and output.

A major test of the new system will be whether it is applied with

the correct combination of boldness and scope for local initiative and bargaining, on the one hand, and planning controls to preserve the balance between money in circulation and goods produced, on the other hand. Too little of the former would dampen the enthusiasm which many Soviet people have for the new system; too little of the latter would cause a harmful rise in living costs and upset the planned growth of the economy.

Earlier premium systems were trivial in amount and rigidly confined by centralized rules. There is strong evidence that the USSR is avoiding such faults this time. A methodological decree has been published describing how each enterprise shall work out its own regulations governing the payment of premiums to its workers, administrators, and technical personnel. It defines the funds that may be used, and provides certain boundaries, general conditions, and suggestions. But the main responsibility for deciding on the premiums—how they are to be calculated and how distributed—is left to the enterprises themselves.

There is no central limit to the average wage, including premiums. The financial restrictions are on the total funds out of which wages and premiums may be paid, which consist of preset wage funds plus a share of profits or sales. In this way the danger of inflation is avoided, since the total income of the people is kept within the bounds of their addition to production (with appropriate deductions for increasing investments), while maximum flexibility is provided for increasing the income of individual workers and whole groups of workers corresponding to their increases in productivity.

How much will the workers themselves participate in developing and controlling the premium system? The engineers, economists and administrators have been and are participating with much enthusiasm. The previous role of shop workers, apparently, was rather limited. Now this may change.

The decree on premiums is signed jointly by A. Volkov, Chairman of the State Committee on Questions of Labor and Wages, and V. Grishin, Chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions.

Further, and perhaps more important, the decree provides that every key decision within the enterprises must be made by the administrator *in agreement with* the local trade union. To avoid self-serving such as takes place in U.S. corporations, the premiums payable to the top administrators are directly limited by the higher bodies supervising the factories.

A proper framework has been set up for a *democratic* system of

material incentives. Wherever the workers have the right kind of leaders in their local unions, wherever they have the initiative to exercise their rights, the objectives of the framework will be realized. When the workers themselves participate in formulating details and understand what is being done, the stimulating value of the incentives will be multiplied. Then the system will fulfill its political and economic functions.

The Theory of the Collective Farm

According to Venzher, the weaknesses of the Soviet collective farms do not result *mainly* from the specific mistakes in crop structure, methods of cultivation, etc., but in the connections between the collective farms and the rest of the economy. He specifies two basic features of a correct relationship, which flow out of the voluntary cooperative character of the collective farm:

1. There must be no transfer of surpluses from or to the collectives. That is, there must be real equivalence of exchange between the farms and industry. This is in marked contrast to the original theory and practice, whereby agriculture was a prime source for the accumulation of industrial capital. Initially there was no other source, and the use of surpluses produced in agriculture to provide investment funds for heavy industry was combined with bettering of conditions for the peasants, who had gotten land from the socialist revolution and could now begin to get the use of tractors and other farm equipment. Moreover, the amount of surplus transferred was much less than when the peasants were exploited by the landlords.

But this practice continued too long. Now industry produces much more surplus than agriculture, which itself needs especially heavy capital investments. Moreover, collective farmers became dissatisfied with a relationship under which their conditions lagged decisively behind those of city workers.

In part, the relatively poor work on the collective farms represented a sort of unorganized slowdown against the terms of trade with the cities. In the past decade, and especially starting in 1965, the Soviet regime has moved to alter these terms radically in favor of the collective farms and their members. By now there is probably a net flow of surplus from the cities to the farms, as a major push is underway to eliminate the lag in agriculture.

2. The collective farms must have full independence. Only the cooperatives can decide what to produce, what to sell, and how to distribute their resources of land, equipment, and labor. Centralized

planning of the farm economy by administrative methods alienates the farmers from society, contributes to a lower intensity of labor and to a lower supply of marketable goods.

Planning must be by use of economic levers of credit, prices, taxes. This may appear to be the more difficult way to plan, but it is the only way that will work. Venzher mentions the fear that self-planning by cooperatives will lead to their not supplying needed things to the cities. He regards this fear as ill-founded, because: a) the historical ties of the country to the city have institutionalized the flow; b) the proposals will not change the socialist essence of the collective farm system. If informed what is wanted, and if the right prices are set, the farmers will supply the goods; and c) the *kolkhozes* need the state as purchaser of most of their produce. They can't sell but a fraction of it on local markets, hence must produce what the state wants.

The March, 1965 Plenum moved substantially toward restoring self-planning by collective farms. But a caution is in order. Nominally, the collectives always had considerable leeway for self-planning, over and above the compulsory deliveries. The decisive use of administrative pressures was revealed only later in self-criticism of the old system. It remains to be seen whether outside administrative methods of planning *kolkhoz* economies have been eliminated in practice as well as on paper. Recent reports of good results on the farms are a favorable sign.

The move in the Soviet Union to substantial regular monthly payments to collective farmers, and pre-crop state credits to support those payments in the first half of the year, sets up a financial mechanism quite different from that of the traditional cooperative but more favorable from the members' viewpoint.

Venzher also advocates a system of production contracts for one year or longer periods, under which the collective farms will sell to and buy from the state and its enterprises. He strongly advocates inter-*kolkhoz* cooperative production enterprises to manufacture foodstuffs, preserve fruits, refine sugar, etc. He sees this, along with the other forms of self-management, as elements of self-administration which will assist government administration and create conditions for the future communist organization of administration without the state.

Venzher says the collectives have a big task before them in a comparatively short historical term to increase the volume of their output 2-3 times, and the productivity of their labor 5-6 times. He is optimistic about the possibility and about the collective farm

form. He is certain that if the proper measures and approaches are taken, within 2-3 years the collectives will eliminate their main insufficiencies and start to fully satisfy the social requirement of supporting a quick rise in mass consumption.

* * *

The Soviet leadership has officially adopted the general approach of the economists holding views such as those represented in this book. This new, scientifically sound, approach has the potential for stimulating much more rapid improvement in Soviet economic life than that achieved during the first half of this decade. But this potentiality will not necessarily be realized. In the past, many shortcomings were known, but decisions made to overcome them were sometimes not carried out or carried out too slowly and incompletely.

Will there be more success in achieving the planned economy in steel now than in the previous plan? Chances are there will. *Under the new system of planning and management it will be in the material interest of the producers to achieve the 25 per cent economy in steel.* It will increase their incomes and living standards. And this consideration applies across the board. Formerly the calls to overcome shortcomings and tap production reserves were based mainly on *moral* appeals, and sometimes even went contrary to the immediate material interests of those directly involved. Now there is an attempt everywhere to combine the moral appeal to serve the interest of society as a whole with the material incentive to better one's own condition.

Obviously much depends on the consistency and promptness with which the new system is introduced and applied. There are two main potential obstacles:

1) There are conservative and bureaucratic elements in positions of power who tend to hold back the full and consistent application of economic levers. This, in turn, could considerably reduce the favorable material and psychological results of the new system. Material in the current Soviet press suggests that such tendencies have been decisively rebuffed. Detailed reports give the impression of a people hastening to put this new system into effect as rapidly, universally, and thoroughly as possible, with the Party and Government leadership giving wholehearted support and sensible guidance to the process.

2) International tensions are rising. U.S. comment on the new Five-Year Plan rightly emphasized its assumption of a period of peace. But the text of the draft plan pointed out:

> The last few years of the Seven-Year Plan period coincided in time with a rise in international tension, touched off by U.S. imperialism, which launched aggressions in various regions of the world. This necessitated allocations of additional funds to strengthen the country's defenses.

Continuation of Johnson's escalation policy will force more military diversions on the Soviet Union and slow down the application of economic incentives by curtailing the supplies available for civilian use. But the Soviet economy is now strong enough to carry a substantial added military burden and simultaneously support the new system, if more slowly and incompletely than would otherwise be possible. Moreover, nobody should overlook the continued and increased importance of moral incentives to the labor of the Soviet people. They, like the masses of all countries, are deeply indignant over U.S. aggression in Vietnam. If required, they will work even harder and better to provide the requirements of the Vietnamese than for any material reward.

Even now less than in the past can the military-economic strategists of the Pentagon and some leading circles of high finance succeed through the pressure of the arms race in stopping the advance of socialism and its economic gains on capitalism. Such a strategy, of course, risks the vital interests of the American people, and under present conditions will bring much more difficulty to the U.S. economy than in past periods of peak application.

The writer believes that, with the application of the new system of planning and management, the USSR will gain more on the United States economically in the next five years than it did in the past five years.

> In the last analysis, productivity of labor is the most important, the principal thing for the victory of the new social system. Capitalism created a productivity of labor unknown under serfdom. Capitalism can be utterly vanquished, by the fact that Socialism creates a new and much higher productivity of labor. . . .
>
> Lenin, *A Great Beginning*, Selected Works, Vol. IX, p. 438

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

Reflections on Fifty*

Frazer, in *The Golden Bough,* says that in ancient times it was believed "a man who has been on a journey may have contracted some magic evil from the strangers with whom he has associated. Hence, on returning home before he is readmitted to the society of his tribe and friends, he has to undergo certain purificatory ceremonies."

Presumably, this was the main purpose of these elaborate activities!

* * *

One of the leading figures in U.S. history-writing and rewriting is Mr. Forrest McDonald. Mr. McDonald's heroes are 18th century mercantile aristocrats; he writes accordingly and Houghton Mifflin recently published Mr. McDonald's latest work, *E Pluribus Unum: The Formation of the American Republic, 1776-1790.* Mr. McDonald finds the essential genius of our Constitution to lie in its allegedly conservative, anti-popular nature. In the course of exposing this view, there occurs this wonderful paragraph:

> Once the vulgar [meaning the populace] overstepped the bonds of propriety [during the American Revolution] and got away with it —there was no logical stopping place. *Common Sense* led unerringly to Valmy and Valmy to Napoleon, and Napoleon to the Revolution of 1830, and that to the Revolutions of 1848, and those to the Paris Commune of 1871, and that to the Bolshevik Revolution, and that to the African and Asian Revolutions in Expectation, and those to eternity . . . all the planet's peoples in their turn, would become so unrestrained as to lose contact with sanity. The Americans might have suffered a similar history, had they followed the lead of those who, in 1787 and 1788, spoke in the name of the

*Upon the occasion of his having reached his fiftieth year, and the appearance of his twentieth book—*Mission To Hanoi*—and the completion of the second year of The American Institute for Marxist Studies (AIMS), a testimonial dinner for Dr. Aptheker was held April 28 at the New York Hilton Hotel. It was attended by over 700 friends; the original sponsors were: Prof. Robert S. Cohen, Mr. Ossie Davis, and Prof. Staughton Lynd. Upon that occasion, after expressing appreciation to friends and comrades and particularly to his wife and their daughter, Bettina, Dr. Aptheker made the following remarks.—The Editors.

> people and of popular "rights." But there were giants in the earth in those days, and they spoke in the name of the nation, and the people followed them. As a result, the Americans were despite themselves doomed forever to be free.

This, then, explains the uniqueness of the United States: alone free and sane in a global populace unfree and insane; and determined we are to remake all others, despite themselves, into our image!

What is the image of the 18th century aristocrat? What would they have? Du Bois—the former Vice President will forgive me if I use the correct pronunciation—sixty years ago said they would turn the country into "a dusty desert of dollars and smartness."

Eleven decades ago, Whittier described them and their world:

> . . . Men creep,
> Not walk; with blood too pale and tame
> To pay the debt they owe to shame;
> Buy cheap, sell dear; eat, drink, and sleep
> Down-pillowed, deaf to moaning want;
> Pay tithes for soul-insurance; keep
> Six days to Mammon, one to Cant.

* * *

Power they have had and havoc they have wrought but secure they have not been. And they are of the past—less and less of the present, and not at all of the future.

Whittier entitled the poem from which I have quoted, "For Righteousness' Sake"; he dedicated it "to friends under arrest for treason against the slave power," having in mind the Negroes and whites who, in Pennsylvania in 1854, had forcibly resisted fugitive-slavehunting U.S. marshals.

"Give thanks to God," said Whittier, "that somewhat of the holy rage/With which the prophets in their age/On all its decent seemings trod"—give thanks, said the poet then, that the holy rage survived.

We celebrate its survival here; more than its survival, its certain triumph. Epitomizing that prophet's rage is Staughton, and I was struck by a comment he made in a recent review in the *William & Mary Quarterly,* quoting that British rebel, John Wilkes: "Thank God our Ancestors were Heroes and Patriots, not *prudent* men. . . . They risked all for liberty."

Certainly, there is the original meaning of "patriot"—one enlisted in the cause of liberty. It remains the word's correct meaning. Let me improve on Wilkes by thanking God that not only some

among our ancestors but also many among our contemporaries are not *prudent* men and women, but rather risk all for liberty.

One among the ancestors of our country leaps to mind. Nat Turner, the slave rebel, finally caught, in chains within a Virginia prison, faced by the Court Clerk who taunts him that his comrades have been hanged and soon he will go and demands of him "Do you not now admit you were in the wrong?"—and Turner's immortal reply —recorded by that same Clerk: "Was not Christ crucified?" The Clerk is long since dead—and might just as well never have lived; the hanged one will live so long as Man lives.

"Risked all for liberty," said Wilkes. But what does one really *risk*? Nothing; in fighting for liberty one risks nothing and guarantees a life that is lived. Not a life of dull despair, not a life of anxious fear, not a life of pale placidness; no, a life of eager venture, a life of vigorous action, a life of throbbing creation—in short, a Life.

George Bernard Shaw wrote: "You see things and you say, 'Why?' But I dream things that never were, and I say 'Why not?' "

Said one of his great contemporaries:

> Dreamer of dreams, born out of my due time,
> Why should I strive to set the crooked straight?

Why, indeed. William Morris knew why, and did set some of the crooked, straight. What else is there? "Principle alone is defense and refuge from chaos and utter defeat," wrote Frank Lloyd Wright. And in all this, what excitement, what joy, what challenge—and what people!

Jack London, explaining fifty years ago, "What Life Means to Me," stated that he became a socialist because among socialists he found the salt of the earth—"warm faith in the human, glowing idealism, the sweetness of unselfishness . . . all the splendid, stinging things of the spirit." Especially, by the way, did London mention among these splendid people, those professors who were attacked and dismissed and denounced—or never hired—by the University trustees, "because they were quick with knowledge which they strive to apply to the affairs of mankind."

* * *

Needed is an abiding conviction in the reasonableness of nature and all life, in the value of life, and in service to that reasonableness and that value as the point of living.

Brecht has Galileo say: "My intention is not to prove that hitherto I have been right; but to discover whether I am right." Easily said,

perhaps, but the hardest thing in the world to do and do consistently; to make of one's life that supreme dedication to truth and beauty and service that is the life of Science.

One requires: health; an active mind; work fit for such body and mind; to love and be loved; and a splendid world fit for healthy people with active minds who do love and are loved.

As always, Du Bois said everything in the briefest possible way; what is needed, he said, is "to make Humanity divine."

We insist, with Bernard Shaw, why not? Can the dream that was and is the United States of America end in "besieging Heaven by trampling men to death"—in napalming villages and pouring gases upon women and children? We shall not *permit* it so to end.

No, we are as William Morris sang, "The Pilgrims of Hope" and he will forgive me if I revise the song slightly:

> now the streets seem gay, the high stars
> glittering bright;
> for me, I sing amongst them, for my heart is full
> and light.
> I see the deeds to be done and the day to come
> on the earth
> riches vanished away and sorrow turned to mirth;
> I see the city squalor and the country stupor gone
> And we a part of it all—we three not alone
> In the days to come of the pleasure, in the days that
> are of the fight—
> I was born once long ago: I am born again tonight.

* * *

Let us away, then, to the fight again.

COMMUNICATIONS

JOSEPH REYNOLDS

Problems of Ethics and Morality

Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, calls for the abandonment of moral principles in the conduct of American foreign policy (*New York Times*, December 10, 1964). However, the people of the world denounce the use of poison gas by the United States in South Vietnam as immoral. How does morality relate to social and political movements today? By what ethical standards shall we judge the actions of governments, parties, and individuals?

A book dealng with such questions, by a noted Marxist, is certainly most welcome. *Ethics and Progress* by Dr. Howard Selsam (International Publishers, New York, 1965) tackles these ethical problems and offers solutions. Its subtitle—*New Values in a Revolutionary World*—promises the breaking of new ethical ground.

Much of this promise is realized. Dr. Selsam makes a valuable contribution by linking ethical questions to the struggles of the peoples of the world. If this were a review of Dr. Selsam's book, most of the discussion would center on the positive contributions it makes to ethical thought. However, we wish to explore several ethical points dealt with in this book which, we feel, require either fuller treatment or different treatment. It is hoped that such exploration will stimulate further discussion of the problems of ethics and morality.

The Sources of Ethics

Morals, as Dr. Selsam points out, are commonly accepted rules of conduct, while ethics consists of explanations of these rules (pp. 7-8). Dr. Selsam states that ethics derives from "the contradictions between the reality man faces and his aspirations. These aspirations . . . are . . . the peculair stuff of which ethics is made" (p. 16).

We agree with Dr. Selsam that this is one important source of ethics. But there is another source of ethics (as an explanation of commonly accepted rules of conduct) that is equally important.

This source is the need to justify the status quo, to have people accept "the reality that man faces." In the history of ethics, many theories arose precisely to show that the present reality *is* the way it ought to be; that what is *should* be. Dr. Selsam himself shows this to be

true of the dominant ethical theories of slave, feudal and capitalist societies (pp. 25-26, 42-43). These ruling class-inspired theories sought to show either that this is the best life or, with all its difficulty and suffering, no better life is possible.

Such theories derive, not from a contradiction, but from the need to show that there is *no* contradiction between the way people do live and the way "one can, should, and *ought* to live." Therefore, a correct formulation of the origin of ethics must point to two sources: 1) the contradiction between how one lives and how one ought to live (Dr. Selsam's point), and 2) the need to show that people do live the way they ought to live (our point). Such a formulation will correctly emphasize both the class nature of ethics in a class society and the role of ethics in the struggle for a better society.

We might add here that socialist ethics today derives from both sources. Certain features of socialist life today are what they should be, e.g., absence of exploitation. Socialist humanist ethics stresses that such absence of exploitation is a necessary and desirable feature of socialist life, that what is ought to be. On the other hand, certain features of socialist life today are not what they should be, e.g. crime. Socialist ethical theory, therefore, shows why crime is evil and harms socialist life, and why it must be eliminated. It shows a contradicton between existing reality and a future better reality.

Reason and Morality

Dr Selsam arrives at a rather peculiar conclusion from his view that "ethics derives from the distinctive human ability to see a contradicton between how one lives and how one can, should, and *ought* to live" (pp. 65-66). He states that people who do not see such a contradicton cannot be reasoned into a correct morality (p. 64).

Such people, he says, "may be vulgarians, just plain 'know-nothings', or highly cultured people . . . [They] can simply say: I am having a good time; I love my power, fortune, ease or security; my art or scientific pursuits, my scholarship, or just my wife (or husband) and children; and don't care a hang about anything or anyone else" (p. 64). He adds: "Someone else may see a contradiction between his mode of life and what the time or situation calls for, but if he doesn't see it, all reasoning is at an end" (p 65).

Of course, every Marxist has met people like this and may even have "given up" on some. But Dr. Selsam says that it is *theoretically* wrong to try to reason with them: "There are those who think they can reason such people into morality, into some kind of social consciousness which is moral consciousness. Such an approach is generally useless in practice, and wrong in theory" (p. 64).

Wherefore such a strange conclusion? Are Marxists to ignore those Americans who may *now*

feel subjectively satisfied with their present life? Such people are not frozen permanently to their present indifference. Marxists must patiently and persistently show them the true nature of capitalism. Indeed, capitalism itself frequently shocks them out of their complacency. Were not many such previously inactive people galvanized into anger and political activity by Governor Wallace and the brutal police of Selma, Alabama? How many previously indifferent young people (and college professors) are now actively fighting to end the criminal war in South Vietnam?

We must not declare that this grouping of Americans should be abandoned. Is not reason one of our best weapons against the ideological irrationality and social illogic of capitalism?

Marxism and Existentialism

The philosophy of existentialism, especially Jean-Paul Sartre's version, has had a powerful impact on contemporary ideology. Since existentialism centers on problems of the individual and his activity, i.e., on moral problems, it requires discussion in a book on ethics by a Marxist. Several pages of Dr. Selsam's book are devoted to Sartre's ethical views.

Dr. Selsam states that the French existentialists have revealed "a deep sense of moral responsibility" and have given us "a heightened understanding of this much-ignored question" (p. 60). He writes:

Albert Camus, Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, through their writings and their participation in the resistance movement, in opposition to the Algerian war, and in the cause of world peace, have focused a new and sharp light on the problem of individual responsibility in relation to any and everly social collective (pp. 60-61).

Further, Dr. Selsam says that "existentialism reinforces Marxist theory with its powerful and eloquent appeal to the individual conscience" (p. 61). He adds that Sartre sees that "in a real sense, there is no human freedom and no possibility of moral responsibility and personal integrity" without the individual person's freedom to project "what he wants to be and the kind of life he wants to lead" (p. 61).

"Satre's ideas," he writes, "serve nevertheless to provide a possible basis for the moral judgment of individuals" (p. 62).

Dr. Selsam qualifies this praise of Sartre's views with some critical comments. He correctly calls existentialism "a basically non-materialist and anti-historical philosophy" (p. 60). He says that Sartre's "stress on the individual person's freedom to make such a projection (of his future life — J. R.) may be exaggerated . . ." (p. 61). He adds: "From a materialist standpoint this (Sartre's belief in full freedom of choice — J. R.) is too easy a solution of the age-old problem of personal freedom and social-historical determination" (p. 61).

Dr. Selsam contrasts Sartre's

view that "man's ability to choose one kind of life and character or another is man's tragedy" to the Marxist view that "it is man's hope and opportunity" (p.62).

In further criticism, he writes:

> What Sartre and existentialism generally have not yet done is to provide an ethic that gives us an objective standard by which we can judge the rightness or wrongness of the individual's choice. He has for years been struggling with this problem but his approach has remained too much that of the isolated individual person for whom all other persons are essentially alien (p. 62).

We agree with Dr. Selsam's criticisms of Sartre's existentialism but we believe they do not go far enough. At the same time, we cannot accept his praise of Sartre's views. Indeed, we wonder how Dr. Selsam can find "personal integrity and deep moral responsibility" in what he himself calls "a non-materialist and anti-historical philosophy" which does not have "an objective standard by which we can judge the rightness or wrongness of the individual's choice." What "personal integrity and deep moral responsibility" motivates "the isolated individual person for whom all other persons are essentially alien?"

But let us offer Sartre's own writings on these problems. In his *Existentialism,* Sartre writes:

> To say that we invent values means nothing else but this: life has no meaning *a priori.* Before you come alive, life is nothing; it's up to you to give it a meaning, and value is nothing else but the meaning that you choose (p. 138).*

Elsewhere in the same work, Sartre states:

> In other words, there is no determinism, man is free, man is freedom. . . . So, in the bright realm of values, we have no excuse behind us, nor justification before us. We are alone, with no excuses . . . (p. 137).

This view—that the individual is completely free to choose, that he makes his own life in full freedom, that he alone decides what is good or bad, right or wrong—is endlessly repeated by Sartre in all his writings. In his novel *Age of Reason,* Sartre voices this outlook most clearly. His central character states: "Whatever happens, it is *by my agency* that everything must happen." Sartre adds:

> . . . he was free, free in every way, free to behave like a fool or a machine, free to accept, free to refuse, free to equivocate; to marry, to give up the game, to drag this dead weight about with him for years to come. He could do what he liked, no one had the right to advise him, there would be for him no Good nor Evil unless he brought them into being. . . . He was alone, enveloped in this mostrous silence, free and alone, without assistance and without excuse, condemned to decide without support from any quarter, condemned forever to be free (p. 139).

---

*Page references are to *The Worlds of Existentialism,* edited by Maurice Friedman, Random House, New York, 1964.

So here is each individual with absolute freedom to choose anything and to decide anything. But Sartre sees that each individual's freedom conflicts with every other individual's freedom. So Sartre's "social" world consists of isolated individuals alien to each other and in conflict with each other. Sartre writes of this dreadful world of hostile individuals: "Hell is—other people!" (p. 188).

Further, this Sartrean world is futile and frustrating, full of anguish, nausea, and despair. Man's absolute freedom results only in defeat and disillusionment. But man's freedom includes the choice of—death! With freedom as a product of the mind, and death as an alternate choice, Sartre arrives at the astounding conclusion: "We were never more free than during the German occupation" (Walter Odajnyk, *Marxism and Existentialism*, Doubleday, New York, 1965, p. 105).

So here we have the ethics of "personal integrity and deep moral responsibility"—an ethics which permits the choice of anything, which has no standard of right and wrong, which has a world of alienated, hostile individuals, which offers us a hopeless, senseless, nauseating world, which gives us freedom to choose death, and which finds freedom under Nazi occupation!

We recognize that Sartre tries to qualify individual freedom with concepts like "the human condition" and "the situation" of the individual. But this merely confuses and contradicts the above-states principles of Sartre's ethics. Indeed, confusion and contradiction are rampant in Sartre's views. But it is urgent that the basic nature of existentialism be correctly evaluated.

Many Marxist writers have consistently refuted and rejected existentialism generally, and Sartre's version specifically. On the other hand, Sartre himself has written in detail and at length to refute Marxist philosophy and ethics, and has offered his views as a substitute. Odajnyk's book is completely devoted to showing how Sartre's philosophy and ethics is opposed point by point to Marxism.

It is true that Sartre has been moving closer to Marxism in recent years, a movement which we hope will continue. His recent philosophical work *Critique of Dialectical Reason* (1961) shows a greater acceptance of Marxist philosophical views. If Dr. Selsam had this work in mind, he should have said so clearly. In such case, he would have been obliged to distinguish Sartre's later views from his earlier views. In any case, Sartre's latest work does not accept Marxist ethical theory and presents only a confused and diluted version of his earlier theory.

Dr. Selsam is correct in praising Sartre's progressive political views and we join in applauding them. However, people of the most diverse philosophical views are participating actively in the struggles for world peace, for civil rights, for national liberation.

Obviously, their correct political views and activities do not make their philosophical views valid.

One final point should be made. Both Dr. Selsam and the Polish Marxist Adam Schaff (in his book *Philosophy for Man*) give credit to the existentialists, particularly to Sartre, for raising important philosophical and ethical problems. We are reluctant to grant such credit. Should we praise those who raise important problems but offer false, subjectivist solutions? Do we not add luster to their views in doing so? Certainly, Marxists must deal seriously with these problems, must scientifically analyze the solutions offered by the existentialists, must show in detail why such solutions are incorrect, and must offer comprehensive Marxist solutions.

Our conclusion is that Sartre and his existentialism have nothing to offer to Marxist ethics. Existentialism is a philosophy which can only disorient people today.

Ethics and Socialism Today

Dr. Selsam raises a number of points regarding ethics and socialism which require examination.

After stating that "socialism is no panacea," Dr. Selsam writes: "Its long-range goal is the abolition of all exploitation of man by man" (p. 31). First, we say that socialism's *immediate* (not "long-range") goal is the abolition of all exploitation of man by man. Second, this is no longer a goal since the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have long since abolished such exploitation. Further, we are tempted to add that socialism *is* a "panacea"—for war, exploitation, jim crow, poverty, etc.

Elsewhere, Dr. Selsam states: "One cannot *prove* that the world will get better. . . . Future progress cannot be proven and can scarcely be called inevitable" (pp. 32-33). Marxist social science and political economy has developed specifically to *prove* that "the world will get better." Did not Marx and Engels uncover the economic and social laws which operate so that socialism *inevitably* replaces capitalism? Unlike Dr. Selsam, we say that future progress can be proven and is inevitable. Further, living socialism in one-third of the world affirms this inevitability and proves future progress.

Dr. Selsam writes further:

> One certain way to achieve progress is to think and speak of such ethical values as right, freedom, equality or justice as conditions that exist rather than as demands to be struggled for. . . . Such ethical terms have nothing only as demands, aims or goals, not as descriptions of an existing state of things (p. 33).

Of course, we can readily agree that "such ethical values as right, freedom, equality or justice" are never fully achieved and must always be raised to higher levels. But does this mean that we will never have a society which has right, freedom, equality and justice as "existing values"? More pertinently, do socialist countries *today* represent societies with

such *existing* values? Is equality in the Soviet Union today only something to be struggled for and not also an existing value?

Marx and Engels spoke of the movement from capitalism to socialism as a leap from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom (i.e., existing freedom). Socialism today both embodies the existing values of right, freedom, equality and justice and will continue to develop and expand these values in the future.

Dr. Selsam envisions "access for everyone to all the facilities the earth can provide for the creative use of leisure." But he places this in some dim future: "Such a transformation of society and of all moral values is a stupendous task, requiring the activity of many generations" (p. 120). Such a view is both pessimistic and unrealistic, we believe. Existing socialism, in this time of automation, will make giant strides economically in a short period. It has already taken several giant strides in moral areas: national equality, social responsibility, sex morality, equality for women. A moral and economic revolution has occurred and is continuing in socialist countries and need not await "many generations" for its basic completion.

Our impression is that Dr. Selsam is overly-tentative and dubious in his approach to the present-day socialist countries. This is confirmed by the last chapter of his book. Here he makes one comment that "the Soviet Union and other socialist and partly socialist countries now see the necessity of utilizing the most advanced techniques" for effective economic planning (pp. 122-123). But there is no other reference to present-day socialist countries as embodying progress. There are statements praising socialism in general (as there are throughout the book). But Dr. Selsam still places progress in some dim, to-be-realized future:

> The statement of Marx and Engels that with the socialist transformation of society mankind moves from the prehistoric to the historic era of man provides one more insight into their idea of progress. Society has moved forward, there has been progress, but through blind forces and dimly conceived ideas (p. 121).

A Marxist may well have written this in 1900 or 1910 but not in 1965 when one-third of the world is socialist. Are there only "blind forces and dimly conceived ideas" in the Soviet Union today after almost half a century of socialism?

Dr. Selsam immediately follows the above quotation with:

> Progress will truly begin when men and nations and ultimately a world commonwealth will, through every democratic means possible, plan this future for the fulfillment of mankind's ever-growing ideals of what human life can and should be on this earth (p. 121).

What! Has progress not "truly begun" in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries? Are not present-day socialist countries planning their future "for the fulfillment of mankind's ever-growing ideals of what human life can and should be on this earth?" We believe they are and that progress "truly began" in 1917. Such uncertainty about and lack of confidence in present-day socialist countries runs throughout the book. This seriously dilutes its message on *Ethics and Progress.*

* * *

Although we have set forth differing views on several aspects of Dr. Selsam's book, we wish to repeat our affirmation that it contributes to ethical theory. It should provide a basis for continued discussion and debate towards the end of achieving a clearer and more comprehensive Marxist ethics.

HOWARD SELSAM

Comments by the Author

Joseph Reynolds' communication on my *Ethics and Progress* is most welcome. I do not so much want to take issue with it as to comment on four principle questions it raises.

The first criticism is that there are two sources of ethics rather than the one I presented, namely that "ethics derives from the distinctive human ability to see a contradiction between how one lives and how one can, should, or ought to live." My critic asserts that "there is another source of ethics that is equally important . . . the need to justify the status quo . . . to show that the present reality *is* the way it ought to be; that what is *should* be."

I cannot see this as a *separate* source of ethics. No ruling class ethics would ever have developed —for it would never have been needed—had it not been for the challenge being made to the status quo by members of suppressed classes. The very contradictions that created their ethical demands as *oughts* required that these demands be denied by denying the existence of the contradictions. Heraclitus implied as much when he said early in the 5th century B.C.: "Men would not have known the name of justice if there were no injustice."

There are not two sources of ethics but two or more opposed classes in society to whom ethical values appear in different and even opposite perspectives. My point is only that these ethical values would not *appear* at all were there not conceived contradictions that created demands, activities, challenges. Those on one side of the fence see the contradictions and

make the demands. Those on the other side deny them. That seems to me as close as we can get to the unity and interpenetration of opposites. Rather than a question of two "sources" of ethics it is one of two forms or expressions of ethical theory, those of dominant and oppressed classes. I tried, throughout this little book as well as in the earlier and longer work, *Socialism and Ethics*, to emphasize correctly what Joseph Reynolds refers to as "both the class nature of ethics in a class society and the role of ethics in the struggle for a better society." And I must add that I fail to find two "sources" of socialist ethics today, either in socialist or non-socialist countries.

The second comment concerns my statement that people cannot be argued into an ethical view of life. Perhaps I overstated my case when I wrote that people who are perfectly satisfied with their life as it *is*, cannot be reasoned into "social consciousness which is moral consciousness." My critic is most disturbed by my saying that it is theoretically wrong to try to do so, and calls it "a strange conclusion." He interprets me to mean that Marxists should ignore Americans who are now satisfied with their lives. Personally I have never ignored anybody with whom conversation was possible, but I have found degrees of usefulness ranging all the way from 0 to 100 in such conversations.

It seems to me to deny some central Marxist theories to assert what Reynolds does. Is there a super-structure? Is there a bourgeois ideology and are there bourgeois people who have developed a very thick skin? How meaningful is it to think we can "convert" the "perfectly satisfied" to change their way of life by mere argument? This suggests idealism, not materialism. Reynolds understands the issue himself when he says such things as "capitalism itself frequently shocks them out of their complacency," and asks how many previously inactive people were galvanized into activity by the events in Selma, Alabama, or our "dirty war" in South Vietnam. The reader will note at once that it is not "arguments" that are here referred to but objective events that challenge peoples' lives and values. Of course I agree with him that "reason [is] one of our best weapons against the ideological irrationality and social illogic of capitalism." All I was trying to say is that it is only "one" of such weapons and not always effective. And whether it is a Governor Wallace in Alabama, a Johnson, Rusk and McNamara in Washington, or longshoremen in New York who picket ships of lines that have called at North Vietnam, we must remember what Marx and Engels wrote in *The German Ideology*: that the ideas of the ruling class are always the ruling ideas.

The third feature of *Ethics and Progress* that is challenged is my two and a half pages on "Sartre and Existentialist Ethics." I can think of a number of ideas in the book that better deserve criticism than these passing remarks on existentialism. My critic seems to think that I accept existentialism as a philosophy because Sartre and others "are participating actively in the struggles for world peace, for civil rights, and national liberation." I deny that I have done this with existentialism anymore than I have with, say, Bertrand Russell and the logical positivists. But it is something else again to deny that one might legitimately find "personal integrity and deep moral responsibility" in "a non-materialist and anti-historical philosophy." This is not Marxism but metaphysical dogmatism. Used historically it would dany all value to pre-Marxist institutions, philosophies, and ethical ideas. His concluding statement on the subject, "Existentialism is a philosophy which can only disorient people today," requires the rejoinder, "what people?" This is a new and curious method of philosophical refutation. Whether a philosophy orients or disorients people may depend as much on the people as on the philosophy.

Finally, Reynolds questions a number of statements in my book on "socialism" and on "progress." He finds that "uncertainty about and lack of confidence in present-day socialist countries runs throughout the book." If this were true I would certainly regret it, but I fear that my critic fails to see the dynamics of the process of building socialism, the time it takes to achieve its goals, the difficulties of the legacy left over from capitalism and feudalism, etc. Socialism is not the solution of all the problems that beset present-day mankind. But I believe it is the only way through which these problems can be resolved and mankind can make progress, as it has been doing in all the countries of socialism. This is precisely what I meant when I wrote: "Socialism is no panacea." It does not of itself fulfill man's highest values but it provides the best if not the only possible basis in our century for the continued movement toward these values.

And what does Reynolds mean when he says that "Marxist social science and political economy has developed specifically to *prove* that the world will get better?" I always thought it was developed to help the world get better. Central here is the question of "inevitability." The only meaning I can give this term is that "if such and such conditions are fufilled such-and-such a result will follow." To deny this is to deny causality as a basic relationship in the world. But to go beyond it without careful specification of the conditions (and these can never be completely delimited) is to fall into a mechanistic materialism such that everything that has happened or will happen in the whole universe was predetermined by some "original" agglomeration of atoms. To believe progress is inevitable is to play fast and loose with both terms. To have

hope and confidence in the future is not to "know" that it will be what we wish for. I remember hearing the argument some years ago that we could not call socialism inevitable because for all we know a comet might collide with the earth. But today there are enough nuclear weapons to blow us all into "Kingdom Come." And we are faced with the fact that this possible catastrophe would itself be a product of the whole of man's historical development.

But all of these are questions that cannot be resolved in any article or any book. They are fundamental and perennial and require continual examination and re-examination. This is so true that no one should think he has the final answers—or even that there *are* final answers. One can only hope, to paraphrase Lenin, to be *moving* towards more truth rather than away from it.

It is the thesis of this work that present-day standards and modes of conduct in much of the world bear little relationship to overall theory of what a good life is. They have little relation to what man's life can and should be, and offer nothing toward ideas of the nature of human progress or betterment. Without defining these questions we can have no ethics worthy of the name. We can have only parochial and traditional standards and ideas, which may be good or bad in long-range terms, but which cannot help mankind to solve its most pressing problems and move forward. Men's ideas of right and wrong, better and worse, are in the long run determined by the conditions of their lives. The circumstances of human life on a world scale are impelling men to form an ideal of a more abundant life and to strive to achieve it.

Throughout the world men are today turning away from old established standards and creating richer, fuller human ethics by envisioning and seeking a life free of poverty and ignorance and offering the fullest possible development of man's limitless potentialities. Men make their moral codes and their ethical theories, and in the world today masses of people are making them consciously or unconsciously, with blood and sweat, and with a deeper, securer sense of what human life on this earth should be than in any previous period of the world's history.

Howard Selsam, *Ethics and Progress,* pp. 9-10.

DISCUSSION

BERTHA C. REYNOLDS

How We Appear to Others

The program is refreshingly well-written, with the exception noted below. I was impressed with the coherence and logical movement of the thought. If my remarks are overweighted on the *how* of the writing rather than on content, that is due to my limitations and area of competence, not to order of importance.

The matter of length raises important questions. I do not think the program should be any longer than it is, for people in this period of headline-reading and TV have not the power to concentrate for long. Yet most of the criticisms I have heard want added emphases on this or that, for instance on peace, the poverty program, or Latin American affairs. Taken singly, each merits more space, yet one of the values I find in the draft is its good balance and good treatment of the interrelations of a multitude of factors. I would like to leave to the writer the responsibility of maintaining that balance, even though some emphases should be strengthened. To return to *length,* a writer may have to sacrifice some of the full treatment a subject deserves or risk loss of the reader's attention just when it is needed to realize the relationships of parts to the whole.

Then there are some subjects which are important but cannot be adequately treated briefly. Such might be the Sino-Soviet conflict or the Vietnam war. (To digress for these two: perhaps the basis of the Sino-Soviet differences might be a difference of appraisal of the way nuclear warfare has affected strategy for war prevention, not neglecting to support wars of liberation which are really defense against annihilation. The war in Vietnam could be discussed as an example of the genocide to which imperialism leads, even though the war picture which changes from day to day cannot find a place in a program which should not be dated.) Such subjects as these may have to be left out rather than being given misleading short treatment, but they may be used as illustrations of other subjects which are discussed fully.

If this draft should have to be shortened, and I think this might even be desirable. I can find no major part to omit, but think there might be a combing of the sentences which still show some tendencies to wordiness and repeti-

tion. The space saved might not be more than a few pages, but might give room for a few emphases that would strengthen the whole.

I found three examples of single criticisms that may be typical of others:

1. Page 5, last paragraph: "to those who want to throw mankind back to a caveman existence." Not a truthful figure. What they want is their privileged status quo, as stated in the rest of the sentence. The *result* of what they do is not what they want.

2. Page 7, last paragraph: "the democratic will." This does not mean anything. One could say, "the will of the people democratically expressed."

3. Page 117, second paragraph: "Full freedom of conscience and worship will be guaranteed in a socialist United States." This sentence answers no questions and raises doubts. How do we know what will be guaranteed? Is it to be by edict? Whose? I would leave it out and include the thought of freedom of conscience and worship under what Communists believe, as stated in the preceding paragraph.

Where I hope for rewriting: The only section where I had trouble *staying with* the text was the section entitled *Communists and the Left* (pp. 110-116). It seems to me that once writers or speakers get into the realm of "Left" and "Right," "broad movements," "activists," etc., their words become cliches and lose vitality. I wish the whole section could be rewritten, with a reaching out to the man in the street and the housewife, and what is on *their* minds. Maybe we can't get rid of "Left" and "Right," having no other terms, but can't we stop talking to ourselves? Can't we answer simply such questions as: What urgent needs make people today begin to question our kind of economic system? Why do reforms so often fail? Can people work together who disagree on some things? If we don't work together won't we be picked off one by one by the enemies of the true interests of everybody?

These are just simple but very important questions, and there are many more. What bothers me is that our minds, being human, tend to center on ourselves and the impression we are making, not on the people whose questions are not answered and who need our help. There are serious problems raised by atomic energy, by nuclear warfare and what it means for the class struggle, by automation and cybernation and what they do to our ideas about work, subsistence and even education. Some of these ideas are better treated elsewhere in the program. The purpose of this section, it seems to me, is to focus, briefly but fundamentally, on where the Communist Party stands among the forces which are shaping up to meet these challenges.

We do have to deal with the fact that the CP is discredited among its potential friends within the progressive forces. The diatribes of its enemies have taken

effect in the whole population, and even among ourselves. We lack confidence, after twenty years of intense persecution, and have to reassure ourselves. Yet we do not want this program to sound apologetic or defensive. We shall have to admit that McCarthyism *has* hurt us, and these years of semi-illegality have caused what we said to be distrusted and made our presence in active movements feared. Our members have worked with dedication, but could not do so as Communists. These movements need us. We want to be recognized and play our part. We want people to know what we stand for and why.

Another reason for more clarity in this section is that while America is becoming conscious of forces for radical change, there is the greatest confusion about how to distinguish, for instance, Communist forces from pro-fascist. The mass media of communication regularly lump both together as "radicals" or "extremists of the Left and Right." The Goldwater Republicans and segregationist orators constantly use words like freedom and democracy to camouflage their opposites. Add to this that Communists are daily lied about as undemocratic and devoted to violence, and one cannot avoid explanations, even at the risk of seeming defensive. I think we can tell the truth about ourselves without too much organizational jargon, but putting the emphasis on the issues we espouse rather than on how we stand among other organizations, for whose existence we are duly glad.

Knowing that the strongest impact in any piece of writing, after its opening to gain the reader's attention, is its closing statements, I would like to see some change of order. This is in line with my feeling that the Party itself is not the most important thing, but what it stands for. The program has done well to create a sense of balance in the whole and of steady progression from one aspect to another. I would therefore like the section on *The Socialist Goal* to be the last. Preceding this, and following *The Path Ahead,* could come a strong section on the CP and its relations with other forces whose genesis would have become evident in discussion of the gathering movements for progress. This would make clear how the Party has the guidelines to help the confused nations to get from the mess they are in to something else which is possible and radically better. I think there is every advantage, since socialism is the answer, the need of which these pages have so beautifully demonstrated, to have the program close with its vision and practical hope.

Congratulations on a wonderful job!

Communism and Religion

I too felt a weakness in the draft program's section on *Communism and Religion.* The attention to this subject seems extremely inadequate.

Nowhere can one point to a greater change in an institution of our society than that in the church. What can equal the unexpectedly dramatic role played by nuns and priests on the picket lines in the civil rights struggle; the militancy of seminaries in protesting, to the extent of picketing their rectors, the restraint on academic freedom and association with progressive movements outside the confines of the church; the leadership of churchmen of all faiths in the anti-war and civil rights movements; the voice of the Council of French Bishops in attacking capitalism; and perhaps of greatest importance the liberalizing role of Pope John XXIII which has opened the windows of the Catholic cloister and given heart to liberal churchmen of all faiths.

Such changes affecting the thinking of a large majority of the American people demand greater attention and more serious evaluation.

The comments of Richard Greenleaf in *Political Affairs* of April seem to me, however, to be grotesque. To say that "the mystical and supernatural elements in the principal present-day religious are contaminations which have been introduced by vested interests in order to water down the essentially revolutionary character of those religions as they were founded" is to ignore history and the actual definition of religion. And a Marxist will never accept religion in any form as a part of his philosophy. However, it does not follow that the Marxist and the mystic have nothing in common.

The great present-day religions have a common goal with Marxism—the well-being and happiness of all mankind. Without a scientific knowledge and understanding of the moving forces in society and the world around him man has turned to the mystical to find the answers to the problems of his life. Mankind shares common problems but moves in different ways to solve them.

Today more and more religious leaders and followers are turning to seek some solutions by the means that have always been espoused by the Marxist—a mass confrontation with the exploiting powers. Surely they are mystics, though, Mr. Greenleaf notwithstanding, not so mystical as was Jesus and his disciples, but from the nun on the picket line to Pope John's *Pacem in Terris* we have found new allies who cannot be dismissed with a half page in the Draft Program.

The Mexican People in the Southwest

The program is an extremely exciting and on the whole creative analysis of American reality and the directions and perspectives ahead—a basically correct and comprehensive one, despite specific defects.

One such defect is that there is no adequate handling of the realities, the oppression, the conditions of the 6,000,000 or so people who make up the Mexican national minority in this country (and we know of no other proper way of looking at this question than as a national question). Neither is there any grasp of the special realities of the Southwest, the first major territories swallowed up by an emergent imperialist U.S. There is not so much as a line of reference to the half-million or more American Indians in the United States.

Likewise, there is no statement of a Communist position towards the question of independence for Puerto Rico, and other areas held by the U.S. as outright colonies.

The Southwest Bill of Particulars

The program spends two paragraphs on the question of the second-largest ethnic minority in the U.S., the six millon Mexican-American people, overwhelmingly working-class in composition, ruthlessly oppressed and exploited, bearing *all* the characteristics which historically Marxist-Leninists have seen as constituting a distinct oppressed *national minority people,* holding in relation to monopoly capitalism in the Southwest a position of specially aggravated exploitation comparable to that of the Negro people in the South and in the northern ghettos. To sum up their condition in two paragraphs while spending pages on the dubious role of, say, small businessmen in the struggle against monopoly and eventually for socialism, is at best a rude slight to the people concerned.

The same comment applies with equal force to the total ignoring of the American Indians and their very peculiar situations. When even the U.S. government represents the Indian tribes as autonomous national entities, how is it that we, with our special understanding of the problems of nationalities and minority peoples, have not a word to say of these inhabitants of our land (once theirs), their problems, their social organization (usually collective and communal), their oppression, the theft of their lands and resources, the solemn pledges made them and violated, but more to the point than all the foregoing, our interest in solving their particular problems today. Surely we can discuss these matters with Indian leaders like Buffey Ste. Marie, or with scholars like John

Collier, or with radicals specially conversant with these conditions like Stan Steiner.

Again on the question of the Mexican people in the Southwest, particularly in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and California. The resolution on the Mexican People and the Southwest offered to the Party Convention in 1959, granting the need to bring it up to date, provides a better basis and certainly a more comprehensive grasp of realities than the program as it now stands. Specific materials relating to monopoly domination of this region, and the plight of the Mexican people here, are being sent by one of our members, and we need not go into this information here. But we want to point for a moment to our area and its people in their historical perspective.

Many whole towns were founded by Europeans before the founding of Jamestown and have been continually inhabited down to the present. Farms are still tilled by the descendants of families which settled in valleys like San Cristobal in New Mexico 350 or more years ago. A varied and rich-cultured life was established in this area when the Eastern seaboard was just being penetrated by white men. The people here had a long social heritage and their own indigenous institutions, adapted from Spain, adjusted to and borrowing from their Indian neighbors, when 120 years ago they became the first victims of U.S. imperialism, which conquered them and occupied their land in an ugly and brutal war for territory. One-third the national domain of Mexico was then wrested from that country. Then, in direct violation of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, began the systematic disenfranchisement and despoliation of the newly conquered people, with a special attempt to destroy their cultural heritage and their economic and politcal influence.

But this was not done without resistance. In California, Joaquin Murietta led the struggles of his people for their national liberation. In New Mexico, the priest Padre Martinez inspired the freedom fighters of the Taos uprising of 1847, and throughout the century there were repeated attempts to drive the invader from New Mexico's soil (which at one time included southern Colorado as well). This required the U.S. to continue governing New Mexico as a territory down to 1912. All this time, land grants supposedly secured to the people by the Guadalupe-Hidalgo pact were torn from their owners by outright seizure, through crooked banks, railroad expansion, violence and terror, and a host of other illegal methods. Meanwhile, the schools waged a deliberate and conscious process of cultural genocide, belittling the local culture, ignoring much in the heritage of the people, distorting history, and trying to root out of the schools the Spanish language.

Simultaneous with this was the removal of Mexican people—except a few Tios Tomases—from all areas of real political and economic power (e.g., not in 40-some

years of incorporation, down to the present year, has there been a Spanish surname on the city commission of New Mexico's largest city, Albuquerque). Unequal employment practices, police harassment, discrimination before the courts, all were used, as graphically shown in the movie about our Mexican working people in the southern part of the state, "Salt of the Earth." (In fact, that film says more about the national question, the condition of the minority people, and their power when united and struggling, than any learned article.)

Today the battles go on—the strikes in the vineyards of California, PASSO and the bid for political power at Crystal City in Texas (and the recurrent violence directed against these people), and the organization of 14,000 citizens of New Mexico and Colorado in the Alianza Federal de Mercedes, to recover their lands and begin to reassert themselves as masters of their own fate. These pose questions and indicate potentials that the program must deal with, and totally ignores.

How do Communists relate to the fight for the land grants—a feudalistic concept, nonetheless based on communal control of the land? Do we offer as a concommitant perspective the reorganization of these grants on the basis of voluntary cooperatives (the only rational solution where farms if divided among all the descendants today would be as small as 10 acres), and as part of a program for breaking up the million-acre ranches one finds in Texas and New Mexico? These are areas, and only a few which do not even scratch the surface, which we must develop and spread out from, if the program is to have an adequate section on the Southwest, on the six million Mexican-Americans, on our relations to their conditions and struggles. If we do not begin to treat this area as it requires, then we do not have a national program, and we seriously endanger our perspective of an American road to socialism.

We Live in a Federal Republic

If we are to talk of an American road to socialism, it would be well to bear in mind that we live in a nation whose constitutional framework is that of a federation of states. There is nothing in the program dealing with the federal structure, its relation to planning, to socialist construction, to a genuine democratic participation in the decision-making processes, and we feel that this is an area that the program should deal with in detail. Comrade Dorothy Healey in her pamphlet, *A Communist Talks to Students*, said:

> It is possible that many of the present governmental forms would be utilized in the transition (to socialism). The separation of power in the 50 states and the Federal structure, once they are made completely responsive to the popular will, may be very well suited to the needs of majority rule, direct democracy, and the encouragement of

popular initiative side by side with Federal planning. The checks and balances provided by our constitutional form and Federal-state relationship, thoroughly democratized by socialism, may provide an effective means of preventing bureaucratic abuses and over-centralizaton of power.

We think the program should develop in some detail the areas indicated by Comrade Healey's comments. The relations between federal, state, and local and regional planning, as well as the program's comments on such forms of public ownership and other forms of social ownership (which were excellent) should receive emphasis. Another area directly related to this and not sufficiently explored in the program, was raised in the previously quoted article from *Studies on the Left.* Its authors wrote:

> Socialist ideals of community, equality, democracy and free individual development require not only social ownership and control of the nation's industrial plant, not only planning, but also units of government and of economic organization small enough to encourage and permit anyone to participate in the decisions that establish the framework of his life.

In our search for a human and socialist America, and before that for structural reforms and a democratized political apparatus, ought we not to look more carefully at the critiques of overemphasis on centralization, and at the counterbalancing community power and radical constituency approaches of the New Left? And ought we not also to look again at old progressive demands for recall and referenda, and for initiative at every level of government, and the extension of the electoral process to issues of foreign policy and major congressional and executive decisions—again to be duplicated at all the lower levels of authority? Perhaps we need to take a close look at some fundamental questions raised as to local groups and communities participatng directly in the decision-making process, on workers' control and on social self-government by Dr. Erich Fromm in his social democratic program presented in his book *Let Man Prevail.*

Also, there ought to be a clearer discussion of the class nature of the state and the use of old state forms, filled with a new class content, as the basis on which to build a new state apparatus—a working people's state.

JIM WEST

For the Independence of the Trade Unions

We respect the independence and autonomy of all popular oranizations, for these are essential to their democratic integrity. In asserting this principle, we acknowledge that on occasions, we, too, made mistakes in violating it. We emphasize genuine democracy, which means the decisive participation of the ranks in making and executing policy, and which constitutes the best safeguard against attempts by the corporate establishment or government bureaucracy to manipulate popular organizations for their own ends. The struggle for real democracy as against bureaucratic control is the key to the viability and effectiveness of each popular organization as an instrument of its grass roots constituency.

The above outlines our attitude toward all popular organizations and is applicable most especially to the mass movements, and in the first instance to the labor and civil rights movements (Draft Program CPUSA, p. 110).

The struggle for the independence, autonomy and democratic integrity of the mass movements is, indeed, an excellent starting point for a discussion of the attitude and relations of Marxists to the trade union movement. For, as noted above, we (and not only we, but also our predecessors and many contemporary non-Communist Marxists) have violated this principle on past occasions.

Important as it is to acknowledge mistakes, it is no less important to seek out their sources and causes. For it is in this that we can develop assurance of learning from mistakes and improving our work. This is, after all, the sign of a serious political party, as has been noted before.

This is also necessary because there are some who have drawn the wrong lessons from past errors. These include individuals in both the "old Left" and the "new Left." Some of the "old Left," mainly among those who left the Communist Party, have concluded that there is no need for a party because, they say, the trade unions have begun to play a political role, have matured and are capable of leading the working class to socialism. We propose to show that, far from learning from the past, these people are perpetuating a chief error which has plagued Marxists for almost a century in our country—syndicalism.

In the ranks of the "new Left" today, there are certain middle-class radicals who voice great impatience and scathing criticism of the labor movement. Lacking the theory of scientific socialism and as yet incapable of the patient, tireless work required to enable great masses to move forward, their tendency toward "instant solutions" leads them to

new and inverse variations of old syndicalism. The lessons of the past are needed no less by the youth; for the past cannot be ignored or simply wiped off the slate. The past is there to build upon and, despite mistakes, constitutes a good basis from which to work for the future.

We propose to examine not tactical errors, but rather certain concepts which have been distorted by dogmatism and syndicalist tendencies into something quite the opposite from their original intent.

Labor and the Marxist Vanguard

Marx advanced the thought that the trade unions, which arose as organizing centers gathering the forces of the working class together, could be the guarantee that this class would develop into an independent power. Marx and Engels often wrote of the trade unions as schools of solidarity, schools of socialism, that is, organizations of struggle in which the working class can learn unity, solidarity and class and socialist consciousness.

They never held that it was the *task* of the trade unions to teach and develop class and socialist consciousness. Marxists have always held that class consciousness comes to the workers from the outside, that it is brought to them by scientific socialism, by the revolutionary party of the working class.

The idea that trade unions are schools of socialism is intended to describe the tasks of Marxists in the trade unions. Yet, there have been Communists and Socialists who have poorly understood and distorted this to mean that it was the job of the unions to teach socialism and to lead the way to socialism. Thus, the clear line of demarcation between the special, unique function of trade unions and the unique and special function of the working-class political party of socialism was obliterated. At one time, around the turn of the century, there existed the "Labor and Socialist International"; at another time some American Socialists sought affiliation of unions to the Socialist Party.

This is not simply a matter of keeping a neat dividing line between the unions and the party. From this distortion-turned-to-dogma flowed an extremely harmful practice which tended to negate the basically correct Marxist approach to the relationship with the labor movement. This was the practice of judging the activities and policies of the trade unions by the measure of what the party of socialism must do. Since no trade union can fulfill a vanguard role, the result of such invalid, unreal criticism was the cultivation of a generally negative attitude to unions in general and to trade union leaders in particular. And this, tending to negate the distinct role of each, contributed to widening the gap between the party of socialism and the labor movement.

It represented an expression in Marxist ranks of the syndicalist idea that "the trade unions are

sufficient unto themselves" to lead the working class out of wage slavery to socialism and communism. Much of the negative attitude to unions and their leaders is, in the last analysis, rooted in the idea that the unions—not the Party—must fulfill the vanguard role. Little wonder, then, that some union leaders have reacted to such negative attitudes with the charge that Communists seek to replace them with themselves, to "take over and dominate the unions."

Marx's long struggle against syndicalism and anarchism should have made it quite clear that he never intended that the concept that "trade unions are schools of socialism" was to be converted into a means of once again smuggling syndicalist ideas into Marxist ranks. But it happened, with costly consequences.

Incidentally, in the mass sense, this characterization of the unions is fully applicable to every socialist country, since it corresponds to objective reality as well as the level of understanding of the workers. And in many of the developing countries, where the party of socialism arose before unions and often was the prime initator, organizer and leader of the unions, the concept "trade unions are schools of socialism" is, undoubtedly, also meaningful in the mass sense. But for the advanced capitalist countries, at least for the United States, it would correspond more to objective reality and more closely approximate the level of workers' understanding to regard the trade unions as schools of class struggle.

The problem, however, goes deeper than the matter of understanding what kind of "schools" trade unions are in different conditions. A syndicalist understanding of this question gives rise to syndicalist attitudes and criticisms all down the line and often obscures the reality of the labor movement. It is therefore in order to examine certain other Marxist critiques which have been transformed into dogma and often bandied about in unthinking fashion in Communist, Socialist and radical literature.

Labor and Political Action

The draft program (p. 53) cites "pure and simple unionism" as an obstacle to labor's political independence. Originally, this criticism was directed at the idea that the economic struggle alone was sufficient to abolish capitalism. It was meant to show that the working class must also enter the arena of political struggle to fulfill its historic mission.

Can it really be said that the American labor movement today does not take part in political struggles? Obviously, this is not so. In this respect, it is interesting to read what the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions wrote on the "new role" of trade unions in 1955:

> With the progress of trade unionism, a new understanding of the role of trade unionism in society has developed. This is the idea that trade unions shall represent the workers on questions of broad social interests.

In our complex modern society, political, social and economic problems interweave among all elements of society. The old days in which clear-cut interests existed are now long past.

Today, the existence of problems such as tariffs, let us say, may seem to have little direct connection to the problems of the workers. Yet tariffs affect the lives of the workers, as they affect the whole population of the country.

Similarly, atom bombs and the problem of peace may not seem to be of direct concern to the workers, yet such problems must be considered by the workers because they may be destroyed by wars along with the rest of the population.

A new concept has therefore developed that the workers should express themselves on broad social questions which may not have direct relationship to the workers . . . (Trade Union Study Notes, No. 1, ICFTU, 1955).

One may argue that such questions are of direct concern to the workers, but it is clear that this "new concept" excludes "pure and simple unionism."

One can disagree with the course and direction of organized labor's political action and other positions on broad social questions—that it is not yet sufficiently based on working class interests, is not yet independent, etc. But there is no denying that it is involved, even deeply involved, in political action. "Pure and simple unionism" simply doesn't describe the reality of today's American labor movement which has left that state far behind and faces other, newer problems and obstacles.

Developing Political Independence

Let us pursue the matter of labor's political independence and examine the meaning of the criticism of its traditional slogan: "Reward Your Friends and Punish Your Enemies."

Classic Marxist criticism has held, correctly, that this reflects the fact that labor does not yet understand that it must have an independent position, that it still tails behind the capitalist-led parties and limits itself to the position of choosing the better of the limited choice offered it by the ruling class.

However, it is one thing to understand the meaning of this slogan and to undertake all the necessary activity and education among the workers so that they learn, in good time and from experience, why this slogan is a very far from adequate expression of the political needs of the working class. It is another thing to transform this slogan into another reproach and negative criticism of the labor movement, as though to demand that it scrap this slogan forthwith and replace it here and now with the slogan, say, "For a Labor Party" or "For a People's Party."

The task of Marxists is not to wage a battle of slogans with the labor movement. Yet, it must be acknowledged, this has too often been the case. Far better to recognize the level of understanding of the working class; that it is, by and large, still such as makes this slogan about reward and punishment have a sound and just

ring in its ears. Would it not be better to respond to this slogan (and more than the slogan, since this is also the *policy* of the American labor movement) by agreeing: "Good! But how do we judge who is a friend and who an enemy?"

Shouldn't Marxists be raising such questions as: What is labor's independent yardstick for measuring friends and enemies? What is labor's own program for the country, foreign and domestic, which would enable it to make such judgment? Isn't it time for organized labor to begin advancing its own candidates for public office based on commitment to labor's own independent program?

For programmatic independence, independence on issues, precedes organizational independence. It is by going through a whole period of experiences and testing the validity of the policy of rewarding friends and punishing enemies that the working class will come to learn the need for moving beyond this policy to one of political and organizational independence in alliance with other anti-monopoly forces. But for this, the idea of programmatic independence, of organized labor having its own yardstick of political measurement, must first take root and gain deep support among the workers. And this includes education and agitation by Marxists on the need for political realignment, for an ant-monopoly coalition, for a new people's party.

Viewed this way, the "reward-punish" slogan becomes a starting point for progressive development and forward motion to a new and more advanced level. But if we get bogged down by initial, snobbish rejection and repudiation of such a policy, of making it a bone of contention further emphasizing differences with organized labor, we will influence no one and there will be no real, meaningful forward motion.

Overcome Syndicalist Approaches

Now let us take the slogan "A Fair Day's Pay for a Fair Day's Work." Classic Marxist criticism of this slogan was, correctly, directed at the fact that it kept the class struggle confined to the limits of capitalism, didn't challenge the system itself, bred the illusion that it was possible to solve the class struggle under capitalism.

But classic Marxist criticism of this slogan, like that of the "reward-punish" slogan, was also directed at proving the need for a Marxist political party of the working class, and to indicate the nature, the tasks and responsibilities of Marxists in working among trade unionists so that workers come to the point where they understand that the fundamental answer is to "Abolish the Wages System."

But syndicalism and syndicalist tendencies take the complex process which is here involved, that of advancing the level of understanding of workers to class and socialist consciousness, and reduce it to a duel of slogans: "Abolish the Wages System" versus "A Fair Day's Pay for a Fair Day's Work."

Essentially, the question is one of understanding the dialectical unity of the struggle for reforms with the struggle for a revolutionary transformation of society. Syndicalism counterposes the two, demanding the trade unions cast aside the "fair pay" slogan and hoist the "abolish" slogan here and now. Marxism sees the transformation of one into the other as the result of a long and persistent process and struggle; it stresses the unity, rather than the conflict, between both.

Such an understanding takes as its point of departure an approach such as: "O.K., what, then, is a fair day's pay; what is a fair day's work? How do we get it? What assurance is there that what we win on the picket line will not be taken away by inflation and taxation? Isn't something more required?"

This is no moot question, for the "fair pay—fair work" policy remains the fundamental policy of the American labor movement. And the remnants of syndicalist and dogmatic approaches to this policy still plague us. What is more, the reactions within the labor movement to this type of criticism still linger and hamper the solution of the all-important question of a correct relationship between the labor movement and Marxism.

It is instructive to read what William A. Lee, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor-Industrial Union Council, wrote about this in his 1965 Labor Day Review of labor's progress:

When we recall the men and women who petitioned for the Chicago Federation of Labor charter in 1896, we are amazed that they were able to accomplish so much in the face of strongly organized opposition from many angles. Advocates of various economic philosophies opposed to free enterprise had attempted to capture the labor movement. Their objective: to use the organized labor movement as a transmission belt for their own brand of a new social order. There were followers of strange and now obscure theories.

Typically, these groups spent far more time disputing points of economic and social theory than they did in combatting the so-called "capitalist class." In only one aspect of their activity was there any agreement: their profound dislike of the practical trade union philosophy of men like Samuel Gompers whose goals for labor were immediate and tangible (*Federation News*, Labor Day, 1965).

By way of underscoring Lee's point, the same issue of *Federation News* carried the following, prominently set off in a box:

UNION PHILOSOPHY

Labor's philosophy was spelled out by AFL President Samuel Gompers in 1916 in an exchange with Morris Hillquit, the noted labor and Socialist attorney, before the U.S. Industrial Commission:

"Mr. Gompers: Just a moment, I have not stipulated $4.00 a day or $8.00 a day or any number of dollars a day or 8 hours a day or 7 hours a day or any number of hours a day. The aim is to secure the best conditions possible for the workers.

"Mr. Hillquit: Yes, and when these conditions are obtained . . .

"Mr. Gompers: (Interrupting) Why then we want better . . .

"Mr. Hillquit: (Continuing) You will still strive for better?

"Mr. Gompers: Yes.

"Mr. Hillquit: Now, my question is, will this effort on the part of organized labor ever stop before the workers receive the full reward for their labor?

"Mr. Gompers: I won't stop at all at any particular point, whether it be that towards which you have just stated, or anything else. The working people will never stop in their efforts to obtain a better life for themselves and for their wives and for their children and for humanity."

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

Defend Trade Union Independence

Whatever criticism may be due this or that labor leader, no Communist can afford to ignore such past mistakes which must be overcome; no Communist can afford to ignore the framework in which criticism is registered. And it is certainly impermissible for anyone calling himself a Communist to descend to the point where resort to negative criticism of labor leaders becomes a practice whereby our own shortcomings and weaknesses, or lack of answers for problems in the labor movement, are covered up.

The acceptance of Marxist ideas by trade union masses can only be a free and voluntary act on their part; it cannot be forced or shouted upon them. It can come as a result of respecting the unique, special role of the trade union movement, respecting and defending its independence and democratic integrity, taking its own characterizations of itself at face value as the starting point for any constructive work.

In view of some negative aspects of an otherwise great heritage in which Communists have played a foremost role in helping to build the labor movement (a role acknowledged by such figures as John L. Lewis and Phil Murray among others) it is all the more important, at this time especially, that Communists be foremost champions of the struggle for the independence, autonomy and democratic integrity of organized labor.

This must be fundamental to any Communist approach to the trade unions. Only in this way can conditions be created in which the sharp edge of that fight for independence and integrity becomes turned against the class enemy and its political parties, and helps open the road to real political independence for labor.

In this way, too, can conditions be facilitated for organized labor to re-establish its traditional right to dissent (a right for which it fought long and hard in capitalist society as a whole) in which all working class viewpoints

find full and free expression in its ranks. It is in this spirit and in this direction that Communists can also make ther contribution towards once again earning their citizenship rights and become accepted as equals in the labor movement.

J. S. BRIGHTON PRESS CLUB

The Richness of Language

In his speech introducing the draft program to the public, Gus Hall stated: "It must, in final form, be redrafted in more down-to-earth and common language."

In my opinion this is an arbitrary statement and a disservice, both to the authors of this invaluable document and to its readers. I am at a loss to understand what Gus means by "down-to-earth" language. Does he mean using a simpler vocabulary to express the same ideas? If so, I would remind him that there are no two words in the English language that have the exact same meaning, and when a writer uses a certain word to express an idea, that meaning would not be so well expressed *by any other word.* The word "understand," for instance, is a synonym for "comprehend," and though they mean the same thing, they do not mean *precisely* the same thing. "To *understand* is simply to receive into the intellect; to *comprehend* is to embrace, as a subject, in all relations and dependencies." (Webster's Unabridged Dictionary.)

An enlarged vocabulary provides greater and more varied shades of meaning to ideas than a more limited vocabulary. You can express yourself with a basic vocabulary, but you can express yourself better with a richer vocabulary. To rewrite the draft program in more "down-to-earth" language would means to substitute new words in place of the existing ones; would mean to detract from its precision and clarity. It would be making concessions to those readers whose knowledge of English is more limited than that of the authors. Certainly anyone who knows English can read the draft without an interpreter, and if there are words here and there that one must look up in the dictionary, his vocabulary is thereby enriched.

I belong to a club composed mainly of needle-trades workers, most of them foreign-born. We are reading the program at every meeting, paragraph by paragraph, and I have yet to hear a single comrade say it should be rewritten in more "down-to-earth" language. Now and then they will wonder about the meaning of a word such as "sacrosanct," and then quickly answer the question themselves by saying, "Oh, it means something like 'sacred.'" "Yes," I add. "You've got the idea."

In all my years in the movement, no one has ever called me an intellectual snob (not to my face, anyway) and I have always found that workers have the deepest respect for education and generally express regret at their lack of formal schooling. For them, it is one more valid reason for their unquenchable desire for socialism.

Criticism of the content and omissions in the draft program? By all means! (For example, it lacks a section on women!). Tamper with its impeccable style and flawless language? By no means!

WEST SIDE COMMUNITY CLUB

The Meaning of "Working Class"

In "The Path Ahead," the section on the working class might expand on the elements traditionally considered to differentiate the American from the Western European working class: their lack of political class solidarity. This is based in part on the myth, capitalist-fostered, that we're all middle class, and partly upon the quite genuine upward social and economic mobility afforded a portion of each succeeding generation within the lower levels of the working class. Working-class parents expect their children through education and hard work to do better than they did and so do the children. Was this true in Europe in the past and is it still?

There appears also to be ambiguity in the use of the term "working class." All wage or salary workers are included at the bottom of page 47, but then on page 49 "other classes and social strata feel the oppressive weight of monopoly." We are not told what these other classes and social strata are. The average white collar worker—and there are now more of them than "blue collar"—thinks of himself—or more frequently herself—as middle class, and in New York at least, was quite resentful when the transport workers went out on strike at the beginning of this year.

On page 48: "Economic classes are aggregates of human beings who stand in a specific and distinctive relation to the productive process" is a statement not readily interpreted by the average per-

son for whom the program is written. The number of production workers in the manufacturing industries in the United States is little, if at all larger than it was a decade ago, while the number employed in the service trades now exceeds the number in production. How do the millions employed in offices, schools, laboratories, hotels, restaurants, service stations, the mass communications industries amusements, etc., relate to the productive process? Unless this is explained, there will be confusion on the part of many readers.

The term "social strata" connotes a different frame of reference from that of "class" and also requires explanation to be useful in the discussions of the antagonist of monopoly. Presumably it relates to the upper economic levels of officials and managers, the professionals, intellectuals, artists, etc.; if so, this should be stated; if not, to whom does it relate?

Also, who compose the "middle class" and what are their relations to the productive process? With the rise of the chain store, the small shopkeeper, formerly the typical middle class representative, is being replaced by the hired manager, employed by a distant corporation. Even competing stores, like Bonwit Teller, Henri Bendel, Frank Brothers, Roger Kent, Whitehouse and Hard, and others in New York are all controlled by Genesco and their presidents can be fired if they flaunt the wishes of the holding company.

E. S. LOS ANGELES

Section on Working Class and Labor

I feel that this section is weak and superficial in its analysis, and fails completely to face up to the existing situation today. It is fundamental, of course, that working class leadership is required for any social movement to be solidly based. Without the substantial participation of the working class, and without a strong working class ideology, social movements tend to go up blind alleys and expend themselves in frustration.

The first thing that has to be faced today is that the major social movements of our day (the civil rights movement and the peace movement) do *not* have the substantial participation of the working class, and in particular organized labor is very much removed from these movements. This is reflected sharply in the hostile attitude toward labor of many forces in both the civil rights movement and the peace

movement. But this attitude is the *result* of the non-participation of organized labor; it cannot be combatted by agitating the civil rights and peace movements about the importance of labor's participation.

It seems to me that our program should start with a basic analysis of the working class in the United States today. Some of the elements of such an analysis, I believe, are:

1. The changing composition of the working class as the result of highly advanced mechanization and automation, with the shift in numbers to white collar, service and governmental fields, and the growing importance of highly skilled persons, including scientifically trained people, in the production fields.

2. The division in the working class today between the relatively smaller groups (predominantly white) who are employed, with relative security of employment, and the growing group of workers (including large numbers of Negro, Mexican-American and Puerto Rican people) who have little prospect of employment. In this latter category there is a group relatively new on the American scene—the discarded worker, still ablebodied and capable of productive work, often with a union history and background who has been driven out of his industry by mechanization or automation. The railway firemen and the bituminous coal miners are but two examples.

3. The relation of the organized labor movement to the working class as a whole—what sections of the working class are organized, in what industries, the extent to which the minority groups are in organized labor. Such an analysis will show, I believe, that organized labor in the main represents the relatively "affluent" section of the working class, and that in the main the unemployed, the discarded, the poorly-paid employed, the Negro, Mexican-American and Puerto Rican workers are outside of the organized labor movement.

4. The influence of war and war economy on the thinking of the working class. In particular, this analysis should be made of such influence on the trade union membership—both because of the importance of the trade unions, and because the major war production industries are organized. For example, Harry Bridges is quoted in an article in the *Los Angeles Times*, in response to a question as to whether he would call a strike against loading war materials for Vietnam, as saying that he would like to do so but the members of his union would not go for it because their jobs are involved. Whether or not Bridges was correctly quoted by the *Times*, the fact remains that on the very day that Bridges was vigorously supporting the right of the Berkeley anti-Vietnam demonstrators to march through Oakland, the ILWU union hall was being besieged by men registering for jobs loading war material for Vietnam. I believe that the war economy has exercised a profoundly corrupting influence upon the thinking of the working class,

despite the general uneasiness which the American people feel about the war in Vietnam. This is a corruption which is distinct from that of certain union leaders who are part and parcel of the administration machinery.

5. The extent to which anti-Negro, anti-Mexican and anti-Puerto Rican prejudice has penetrated the working class, and the extent to which this has been stimulated by the development of mechanization and automation and the consequent shrinking of employment in many industries. In California, Proposition 14, the constitutional amendment which outlawed fair housing legislation, carried many working class precincts. In Detroit, the stronghold of the UAW, a similar municipal ordinance was overwhelmingly passed. In Los Angeles, after the Watts upheaval, the Building Trades Council rejected a proposal to give preference in employment to residents of Watts in the rebuilding of Watts, stating that the unions would strictly observe union membership in dispatching men to these jobs. The AFL-CIO here opposes reforms in the apprentice system designed to involve more Negro and Mexican-American youths in apprentice training, on the grounds that the standards for apprentices must not be lowered.

Only upon the basis of such an analysis (and this does not pretend to be a complete statement of all the elements that should be covered in an analysis) can we then project a policy that will be an effective response to an actual situation. It seems to me that such an analysis will reveal that the motive force capable of bringing about a new resurgence of the working class is that section of the working class that is largely outside of the organized labor movement. This is not something new in American history. In the 1920's, the organized labor movement, consisting primarily of craft unions, had shrunk to some two million members, and was incapable of answering the problems of American workers. The great upsurge of the labor movement in the 1930's was the result of the unorganized in the mass production industries, a movement in which our Party played an historic role. While this movement started outside the then organized trade unions, and apparently in some industries at least in conflict with them, it resulted in changing the whole character of organized labor. The situation today is of course very different than that of the 1920's and 1930's. But the organization of the poor, the discarded, the unorganized today can have a similar effect upon the existing labor movement. An article which represents the beginning of a creative approach to this problem appeared in *The Nation* of May 2, 1966: "A Strategy to End Poverty," by Richard A. Cloward and Frances Fox Piven.

This does not mean the neglect of work in the existing trade unions. On the contrary, such work is even more important. In fact, such work will have better chances of success if there is outside the organized labor movement a climate of organization and struggle among the poor and presently unorganized.

The conclusion drawn here with reference to the working class applies to the perspectives for building a new party, as developed later on in the draft program.

Of course such a new party must have a strong labor base, and a strong working class ideology. But we cannot wait for the day when the present organized labor movement will free itself from the corrupting cold-war ideology and break its ties with the old political machines. As part of the process that will impel such a development in the present organized labor movement, political forms must be developed in which the poor and unorganized find their expression. The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is an example of such a form; it should be carefully studied and analyzed so that we may learn both from its strengths and its weaknesses. The various congresses of the poor and their struggles with the bureaucracy in charge of the federal and local anti-poverty programs are also such forms.

James and Grace Boggs, in an article in the current *Monthly Review*, call for the black people to seize municipal power in many of the large cities. They dismiss altogether the question of allies for the black people—for example, they say that organized labor is part of the white power structure. This is a blind alley for the Negro people; to go up it will only increase their frustration and despair. One of the lessons of the recent elections in Alabama, it seems to me (and this is an immediate reaction which may change with a deeper study of those elections) is that the Negro people alone cannot achieve their necessary political goals, they must have allies. But we must recognize that tendencies do exist among the Negro people to reject the whole concept of allies, and that these tendencies have their foundation in the failures of the allies, and most important the failures of the organized labor movement, to respond to the needs and demands of the Negro people. These tendencies cannot be overcome by agitating the Negro people about the need for Negro-labor unity; they can only be overcome to the extent that the objective basis for them disappears and the organized labor movement begins to play its proper part.

A profound change must take place in the organized labor movement; my thesis is that to make this change possible, there must be a great upsurge of organization among the poor and unorganized. It is this upon which our party must base its program.

GIL GREEN

Some Pre-Convention Thoughts

American history is replete with examples of persecutions and frameups of working class organizations and leaders. Never before, however, has a movement been so steadily persecuted and for so long a period of time as has ours—for nearly two decades. Communist Party leaders have spent years in prison. Party members have lost jobs and professional positions. Communists have been denied the right to be elected to posts of responsibility in the labor movement and in many trade unions denied even the right to membership. And the basic beliefs of our party have been maligned and contorted into their opposite by a ruling class bent on making anti-Communism its ideological rationale for the cold war and for intervention and aggression in all parts of the world.

My first thought, therefore, is of deep pride in our party, and in the way the leadership and membership have stood up under the grueling test of the past period. There have been many defections and losses. There have been many mistakes. But what history will record is that the party never bent its knee, never gave up the fight and is here to tell the tale.

At this convention, our first in seven years, we shall do more than lick our wounds and point to battle scars. We shall register more than mere survival, for the period of retreat and decline is past. We have consolidated and unified our ranks, increased our membership — particularly among young people, and begun the steady climb upward.

But the pride we all feel and share must not leave us arrogant toward others nor complacent with ourselves. We should not conceal weaknesses, for that would be the sign of greatest weakness. We should encourage criticism, especilaly from the ranks, for only by uncovering weaknesses and errors can we surmount them. We must remember that the ascent ahead will not be smooth, straight, nor easy to negotiate.

We face a new generation. Like every new generation it sees things somewhat differently. Furthermore, because McCarthyism produced a "silent generation" in the '50s, and because of our losses in the same period, one long distance runner in the relay race of the generations is missing. Thus the gap between generations has been widened still further, and the new generation does not have the same direct link with the historic experience of previous deccades. The period of persecution has also left a mark on the older generation in the party, which frequently finds it difficult to think in new terms and is constantly haunted by the experiences of the past. This tendency to look back-

ward, over its shoulder so to speak, contrasts with the tendency of young people to look ahead. This further complicates the problem.

Role of Consciousness

There is a tendency to underestimate the decisive importance of the conscious element in the struggle of the masses. This is not expressed in so many words, but is frequently expressed in the way we work. There seems to be a view that changing objective conditions and the spontaneous struggles generated by them will do the job of changing people's consciousness. If such a view were carried to its logical conclusion it would deny the need for a Marxist party. The spontaneous struggle exists with or without a party, and it does generate a certain level of consciousness. But only a Marxist party which introduces advanced consciousness into the struggle can teach masses on the basis of their own experience and thereby lead the struggle forward. This means that no matter what may be the *specific* immediate task, or how important it may be, the *overall* task of the party is to bring growing class understanding and socialist consciousness.

There are comrades who see the party's prime role as a mobilizing agency in support of given struggles. I do not want to disparage the importance of such mobilizing efforts. They are extremely important, often decisive. But there is another side to the party's role —a qualitative side. It must aim to raise the level of understanding of people and deepen their thinking. It must be concerned with what issues and demands to project, what new slogans to introduce, what new struggles to initiate. And this should be done everywhere, outside of existing organizations and movements as well as inside of them. Wherever a communist belongs he should impart a special quality to the struggle and consciously work to create deeper understanding and radical thinking. And this is above all necessary in the labor movement.

The Labor Movement

This leads me to the question of the labor movement. In my opinion the party has been right in its refusal to downgrade the labor movement and the historic role it must play in the struggle ahead. To give up the working class and its organized expression, the labor movement, is to give up the struggle for basic change in the United States.

In our desire to counter the negative anti-working class ideology of some in the New Left, we have at times over-simplified the problem of the labor movement.

The situation in the labor movement today is certainly not a good one and every class conscious worker is aware of this. The labor officialdom is supporting the dirty war. Labor's political arm, COPE, is so "independent" that one could think it belonged to the body of the Democratic Party. At least this is so in the overwhelming majority of cases.

While there is a degree of cooperation between the AFL-CIO and

the Negro liberation movement, and while some unions have done considerably more than others in the struggle against discrimination on the job, to speak of a "Labor-Negro alliance" as if this already existed today is certainly far-fetched. In most unions the rule is still tokenism when it comes to Negro rights on the job and Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American participation in top leadership bodies.

Also, the tendency on our part to accentuate the positive often leads to an exaggerated estimate of progress made, and a failure to analyze it critically. Hence we do not warn against possible backsliding, nor indicate what is needed for more significant advances. This is true of our estimate, for example, of such organizations as the Negro American Labor Council, which has great potential, but has not achieved what it could, due to tied-in restrictions emanating from a fear of antagonizing top trade union leadership. Were the Negro and Puerto Rican workers organized to fight for their full trade union rights as an independent force with the active support of other trade union progressives, the situation in the labor movement, especially on this score, would rapidly change.

Some comrades seem to think that the change in the labor movement will come from a division in the leadership hierarchy. Fissures and differences do exist on top. But even those in responsible leadership positions who would like to see a change of direction will not find the courage of their convictions until they are stirred by a rumbling in the ranks. The change will come from the bottom up and not from the top down.

It seems to me that our party has the responsibility of more boldly challenging the main course of the officialdom and educating and organizing the workers for an opposite line of policy. This will be difficult and great tact is required. But tact must never become the pretext for not doing things; it is only a reason for doing them the right way. It is our responsibility to fight for class struggle policies. It is our duty to fight for *real* trade union democracy, for the right to dissent, for the right of trade unionists to discuss every question concerning them and the nation. We must fight for labor unity, all of labor, especially when facing the employing class in a given industry. We must argue persuasively for labor's political independence, for nominating workingmen and women as candidates in city, state and congressional elections. We must advance a program to meet technological change which is based on defending the job rights and security of those presently employed, as well as the job rights of the young and the unemployed. This, therefore, projects the struggle for a thirty-hour week as one of major importance for the working class as a whole.

The Emerging Nations

In the area of world contradictions, the main contradiction that

rends the world is that between capitalism and socialism. In the concrete context of present-day world reality, in which U.S. imperialism is not anxious for a military showdown with the Soviet Union—not now anyway—the sharpest expression of this contradiction is between U.S. imperialism and the emerging nations. Unable to destroy the socialist world, U.S. imperialism has set for itself one paramount objective —not to permit any other country to gain its complete independence from imperialist rule and to take the path to socialism. It aims to do this by all means at its command—where necessary by armed intervention; where possible, by lesser means. And it does have lesser means: CIA-manipulated military coups, assassination of militant leaders, wholesale bribery, economic blackmail, etc.

Of course, it cannot succeed and where hard pressed will have to retreat. But this is its objective. The Kennedy-Fulbright differences with the Johnson policy are not over ends but over the best way to achieve them. Kennedy questions the wisdom of the course pursued in Vietnam because he sees no chance of its winning and a great chance that it may weaken U.S. power and prestige and therefore U.S. neo-colonial ambitions in the world. He sees victory in Vietnam as impossible of attainment and therefore favors not withdrawal, but a more limited commitment in the form of military enclaves that would guarantee U.S. bases in Vietnam but without aggressive military action. Furthermore he believes that the $13 billion being spent yearly in this fruitless war could win for U.S. imperialism more durable prizes with less risk.

Thus we must be prepared for a long period of collision between U.S. imperialism and the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. And the recent "easy" victories by military coups in so many countries will not make the character of the struggle ahead easier. Where military dictatorship rules, where the peaceful democratic process is halted by tanks and guns, there is no other way than an ultimate resort to force to remove the obstruction. When and how this takes place, what are the preparatory stages leading up to it, is a matter to be decided by the people of each country and cannot be imposed upon them from the outside. But that armed force will play its part in the struggle for national liberation is so evident that it need not be argued.

The prospect is, therefore, in my opinion, not for less wars of national liberation but for more of them. This is further underlined by the fact that the people of the underdeveloped countries cannot continue to live in the old way. They know it is now possible to end their terrible poverty. They also know that at the present rate they are not catching up with the modern states but falling farther and farther behind, both in respect to rate of economic development and per capita income. In fact, while science has helped lower the death rate in these coun-

tries and thereby increased the rate of population growth, the economic growth has not kept pace with it. Thus in many of these countries there are more mouths to feed each year with less food per mouth. It is this growing contradiction between the poor nations and rich imperial U.S.A. which cannot continue much longer without major explosions.

Educating the people to the true role of American imperialism in the world, building solidarity with the peoples of Latin America, Africa and Asia, are tasks, therefore, of great importance for our Party.

The Approach to Our Theory

Life has validated Marxism-Leninism as the only social theory worthy of being called a science of society. As such it has become a truly great liberating force in the world. Sooner or later, wherever people fight for freedom from exploitation and oppression, they must grasp Marxism-Leninism as their guide.

A few years back, when the Cuban Revolution was still in an unsettled stage, many non-Communists and some anti-Communists looked to Cuba to provide the example of a successful revolution without Communists and, as some hoped, even against Communists. Things turned out differently. Because they were true to the revolution, Fidel Castro and his comrades embraced Marxism as their theory. And the unified party of the Cuban Revolution, composed of new and old Communists is today the newly formed Cuban Communist Party.

Thus the Cuban Revolution has validated the lesson of all other socialist revolutions — that they cannot succeed without revolutionary theory (Marxism-Leninism) as their guide and a party based on this theory.

For the United States, Marxism has a special significance. This is not just another country. It is the heartland of world imperialism. The struggle here is more complicated than anywhere else. This requires a specially creative application of Marxism. Only by deeply rooting Marxism in American soil and developing it further on the basis of American conditions will there be a guarantee for the building of a strong revolutionary movement in this country. And this task is made more necessary and at the same time more difficult by the traditional American disdain for theory and the narrow pragmatic approach to all questions — something which has plagued the movement in this country historically and continues to plague it today.

This requires far greater attention to theoretical - ideological questions. It requires a defense of Marxism from those who challenge it, as well as from those who, in the name of bringing it up to date, disembowel it. For example, to deny the existence of a class struggle, or to think that socialism can come about without the working class or even against it, may appear to some as *avant-garde* Marxism, but it is no Marxism at all.

And yet, while defending basic principles I would caution against dogmatism and against tendencies toward arrogance and pretense. No one has a monopoly on either Marxism or truth. We can only succeed in developing a rich ideological life within the party and between the party and others if we strive to achieve a scientific, that is, a Marxist approach to Marxism itself.

What I mean is simply this: Marxism, like every branch of science, is neither sacrosanct nor fixed. It is not a key, safely tucked away in our pocket, belonging to us and to us alone, and which at will can open the door and shed light on any and every question. First of all, to the extent that one can compare Marxism with a key at all, it is one that is in the public domain and not the private property of anyone. Secondly, to continue this impossible comparison further—the lock to be opened is never the same, nor is the key, for Marxism itself must grow and develop and thereby also change. Lenin said that Marxism, as yet, provided only the cornerstone for the scientific edifice of tomorrow. It is not yet the full structure.

Therefore our approach to our science must take all this into account, even in discussion with adversaries. Antonio Gramsci, the great Italian Marxist philosopher and Communist, wrote on this question:

> We must not conceive of a scientific discussion as if it were a courtroom proceeding in which there are a defendant and a prosecutor who, by duty of his office, must show the defendant guilty. . . . The most advanced thinker is he who understands that his adversary may express a truth which should be incorporated in his own ideas, even if in a minor way. To understand and evaluate realistically the position and reasons of one's adversary (and sometimes the adversary is the entire thought of the past) means to have freed oneself from the prison of ideologies in the sense of blind fanaticism.

Furthermore, it must be recognized that legitimate differences can exist amongst Marxists, without impugning their Marxism. Marxist methodology tells us that phenomena must be studied in all their many-sidedness and in their process of motion and change. But it is very difficult for any individual or even the best of parties to see every aspect of a question. No one can be absolutely sure that he has even seen all *main* aspects of a question in their proper interrelationships. Therefore even among people who agree on the same basic principles, differences in judgment are not only possible, they are inevitable. Therefore, also, more than one answer is possible to some problems and one cannot be absolutely sure that the answer given is the best possible one. Only life and experience can be the final judge.

For this reason, even the way policies are formulated for the party requires that the membership be given the thinking that went into arriving at them and why they, and not other possible conclusions, were agreed upon. In this way comrades will feel free

to raise questions, discuss policies, become concerned with theory and ideology, and make of every party discussion something intellectually stimulating and vital, both for themselves and for non-party workers with whom they associate.

There is room for differences of opinion in the party, as long as we act in unison once a determination is arrived at.

JIM SMITH

The Mexican-Americans

The section of the program dealing with the Latin-American minorities in the United States should be delved into to a greater extent because of their important and ever-growing role in the anti-monopoly movements now and those ahead. In all struggles, in strikes, civil rights and anti-imperialist movements in which they participate they lend great militancy and ardor to these struggles.

Mexican-Americans are an important segment of the population of Southwestern United States and in many areas and communities stretching from the Gulf of Mexico in South Texas to the Pacific in South California they form the majority of the population. This is the area that once made up two-thirds of the territory of Mexico and was annexed by the U.S. after the Mexican War of 1848. With this began the oppression of the Mexican-American inhabitants and their treatment as an "inferior" people. Treaty provisions (Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, 1848) assuring them rights of language, culture, religion as well as property rights within the annexed area were flouted and ignored. Those with land holdings were robbed of them through outright confiscation and fraudulent procedures. Thus, for the mass of Mexican-Americans there was no alternative but to turn to migratory wage labor on the farms, plantations, railroads, and other seasonal enterprises, subjected to the most severe exploitation at the lowest wages and ill-treatment. This squeezing of the Mexican-Americans for extra profit, buttressed by a chauvinist ideology, continues to this day and has prompted Prof. George I. Sanchez of the University of Texas to point out: "The reports of the United States Bureau of the Census will reveal that persons of Spanish-surname in the Southwest are at the bottom of the scale on virtually every criterion measuring health, wealth, education and welfare."

The corporate establishment uses anti-Mexican chauvinism not only to reap extra profits out of Mexican-American labor, but as a means to divide the people as a whole and hold back progress of all movements for democratic advance.

It must be brought out what is generally too little known or recorded, and that is that the Mexican-American masses have a history of struggle against the conditions they suffer. It goes back to tales one hears repeated in Mexican-American communities on this side of the border of the many armed clashes that occurred against the raiders, among these the Texas Rangers who appeared to evict them from their land. It should be recalled the militant role of Mexican-American migratory workers in support of the early labor struggles of the West during the times of the IWW. Mexican-American workers rallied to these struggles in response to the influence of the Flores Magon brothers. The depression years record extensive organized movements of the Mexican-American unemployed in support of work-or-relief demands and against the discriminatory practices in the granting of relief. In Texas the movement of the organized unemployed encouraged the workers in the pecan shelling sweat shops to rebel against intolerable conditions of shelling pecans for as low as 30 cents a day of interminable hours. It gave rise to a union which was able to negotiate an improved wage scale and working conditions and created the political climate for the election of Maury Maverick as a New Deal mayor of San Antonio.

Prior to 1940 Mexican-Americans in the Southwest were predominantly a rural population. In 1950 they were two-thirds urban and by 1960 they were four-fifths urban. Industrial growth in the Southwest area has mainly contributed to the urbanization of the Mexican-American population. So new generations of urbanized have emerged to enter political struggle on paths independent of the old political machines, though as yet largely within the framework of the Democratic Party, but independent of the main forces that dominate that party in the Southwest.

In Texas the 1958 gubernatorial race by the then State Senator Henry G. Gonzalez was the signal for the mass breakaway from local political machines and the mass participation of Mexican-Americans in state elections. Another turning point was the 1963 election victory in Crystal City where a Mexican-American slate won the city elections over a machine that had been entrenched in power for over thirty odd years. The Crystal City victory organized by local members of the Teamsters Union (which had organized the main cannery in the city) with the support of teamsters elsewhere as well as with active aid of PASO, the leading Mexican-American political organization, was an inspiration and an example for Mexican-Americans throughout the Southwest.

The Negro freedom movement has also shown the way and serves as an example and inspiration for Mexican-Americans. The activities of PASO (Political Association of

Spanish Speaking Organizations of Texas), an outgrowth of the Viva Kennedy clubs, has in particular reflected this influence. At first PASO supported the election of Mexican-Americans as such; now most PASO members see the local "power structure" as the enemy and those Mexican-American politicians who play the role of "Tio Tomases" are regarded with as much contempt as most Negroes have for the "Uncle Toms" who play Charlie's game. PASO bases its tactics on the need for unity with the labor movement and the Negro people. This tactical approach has resulted from a continuous struggle by progressive forces in the Mexican-American community and with the establishment doing everything to undermine this approach.

Seeing the local "power structure" as the enemy falls short, however, of seeing and admitting that it is capitalist monopoly power with its war-making policies that is the main source of Mexican-American oppression. This is reflected in the tendency of Mexican American leadership, especially in Texas, to rely on the Federal government and on Johnson for a redress of grievances and as a result of this no Mexican-American leader in Texas has yet dared to take a stand against monopoly's war in Vietnam. But the direction in which Mexican-Americans are moving was indicated by the March 28 walkout by 50 Mexican-American leaders from the Albuquerque conference called by the Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. The walkout united—for the first time—representatives from various Mexican-American organizations identified as PASO, MAPA, the LULACS and the American GI Forum. One month later 300 Mexican-American leaders from across the country met in Los Angeles to honor the 50 who walked out. The Los Angeles meeting heard talk of a march on Washington.

Monopoly has always been aware of the powerful force that Negro - Mexican - American unity would be and is doing everything to disrupt this unity. Anti-Mexican ideas have been spread among Negroes and anti-Negro ideas among Mexican-Americans and go-it-alone ideas among both. But unity in the struggle against oppression has very deep roots. In communities along the border one still hears tales of the role of Mexican-Americans in harboring and protecting Negro fugitive slaves during pre-Civil War days. And this unity will develop still further as Mexican-Americans through their experience in struggle come to see monopoly as the main enemy.

The Mexican - American anti-monopoly movement we briefly describe would be greatly aided to attain the political cohesion necessary for its goals, if it counted with the factor which at present it is all too lacking in. We mean it must find and develop from its current greater and more numerous forces who are armed with "the science of social change," the science of Marxism-Leninism. We are of the opinion that greater cognition by the party program of the importance and the problems of this great segment of the American working class and toiling people would contribute very greatly in overcoming this shortcoming. It would help those among the Mexican-Americans who are groping for clarity to find it in the program and activity of our Marxist-Leninist vanguard, the CPUSA.

PAVLOV CLUB

Four Questions

Our contribution to the discussion involves four major questions: *Imperialism, Historical Analysis, The Contradiction between Appearance and Reality, and International Solidarity.*

Imperialism

It is relevant to recall that emerging capitalism, in its period of primitive accumulaton of captal, meaning outright plunder, had sought the "wealth of the Indies," whether East or West, as a requirement for the exploitation of its own proletariat. In so doing it destroyed entire cultures and peoples in Latin America in the name, of course, of God and Country. We, here in the United States, will never forget the specific expression of that impulse which sent slave ships to Africa to return laden with the black gold of labor-power itself.

Capitalism has gone full circle. Today, our ships go by air as well as by sea, but they carry the same malignancy: the grasping for labor power to feed our arrogance and our own instability. This, of course, is not new. For many years American imperialism has been entrenched in its neighbors, North and South; was it not our Admiral Perry who "opened up" Japan and with it the Far East? But since World War II imperialism has assumed a new character. What has become an imperative for the capitalist economy and the fulcrum of its foreign policies and tactics has by the same token become the greatest threat to the aspirations of the peoples in these exploited countries for self-determination and self-realization. It also represents the greatest war danger, and its evaluation is the touchstone of political judgment.

When Lenin wrote his study of the imperialism of his time, the world was on the eve of events that culminated in the formation of the first socialist state. Had there been a greater degree of understanding and militancy on the part of greater sections of the European working class and its leadership during that intense period of flux, it might have been possible to establish other socialist

states, and the history of Europe and of the world would have been very different. However, the past as such is irrevocable, and if we go blindly into the future, greater disasters can result.

Today, we need another "Imperialism" to cast a great and penetrating light on the realities of world capitalism in its period of total crisis. Although it is not to be expected that the draft program would perform this task, we do expect that it arouse the Party, and therefore also our people, to the significance of the exploitative role of the United States in Latin America, Asia and Africa, to its meaning for our economy, and its implications for our morality. Relevant data and statistics should be made available to harden and highlight the general analysis. And finally, on the basis of that analysis, we must pose the question—what is to be done?

Historical Analysis

It is here that the draft program makes some very troubling formulations and parallels which must be challenged. We quote from page 97: "We believe this democratic transformation [i.e. the transformation from capitalism to socialism] can be effected through the Constitutional process and Constitutionally established institutions. The Constitution contains within its own provisions, especially those for its amendment, the flexibility that allows for a democratic majority to make the most fundamenal alterations in the economic and social order and in the Constitution itself."

Not only is this an astonishing conclusion, but also most irrelevant. Should the time come when this democratic majority were really in a position to modify the Constitution so as to negate the very purpose for which the Constitution was designed, namely, the protection and extension of private property relations, there would be no need for that Constitution. The "flexibility" of the document is besides the point; what matters is the inflexibility of the bourgeoisie, and the *structural* changes in society that must accompany the establishment of socialism. Despite assertions in the draft program regarding our revolutionary role, it is abdicated at this important point, and opened the way to dangerous fantasies.

It is further disconcerting that a parallel is made between the Constitutionally legislated abolition of slavery and the wishfully projected Constitutional abolition of private property. First of all, the abolition of slavery did not in any way threaten the capitalist order, and, in fact, accelerated the rate and extent of the exploitation of the industrial proletariat, Negro and white. Furthermore, what degree of freedom did the Negro people win through this Constitutional change, which, incidentally, took a bloody war to effectuate? It is more than a hundred years since the Emancipation Proclamation and the Civil War, and through all these generations our "free" Negro citizens

constituted a viciously exploited and abused colony within our own borders, suffering superexploitation and yielding superprofits. So much for the substance of democratic changes through Constitutional flexibility.

On page 35 the draft reads: "In the early years of this century, looking at the world as realistically as they could, employing the instruments of Marxist analysis as best they could, the Marxists concluded that with the growth of imperialism and the intensification of imperialist rivalries a world war was inevitable." Such an asserton is in the first place vulgar determinism and in the second place is untrue. World War II became inevitable *following* Munich, when, in effect, the mechanics of the war were set. But, before that the Communist world worked consciously to avert the war because it was possible to do so. It is curious and contradictory that this determinist and fatalist argument is not applied to the present situation, but its opposite corollary is wishfully assumed, namely, that fascism and war will be averted *now* through peaceful application of our bourgeois democratic rights and heritage. We submit that it is neither the given conditions nor the idealistic wish that determine history and progress, but rather the conscious actions that people are able to and actually do take.

Contradiction Between Appearance and Reality

It is one of the functions of theory, that is, of adequate theory, to expose the gap between appearance and reality, and perhaps nowhere is this gap more flagrant than in the United States. The draft program fails to analyze this important contradiction. Statistically, we are a prosperous nation, and this "fact" is proclaimed, for example, through the charts and graphs of "our" Gross National Product or of our *per capita* income. Our industries are busy, our roads cluttered with cars, our stores full of goods; mechanization and automation are reducing heavy labor on farm and in factory, and even Art and Culture are in fashionable demand. And yet, where is the good life?

Even bourgeois students of sociey refer to our Age of Anxiety, speak of alienation and fragmentation, lament the increase in psychological disorders, and submit frightening statistics cataloging the rise in crimes of violence. But in the spirit of bourgeois ideology, the professionals dealing with these problems, with some honorable exceptions, are concerned with describing the disease of a particular organ rather than with analyzing the disorder of the entire organism. They are concerned with deviation from the norm rather than the deviation of the norm itself from social fruitfulness. Clearly, bourgeois life, which is the sick organism, produces a growing misery of the people whose minds and bodies bear the burden of the ever-increasing competitiveness and frustrations of daily life, of the increasing intensification of the destructive

features of our society, of the irrationality of social existence, of trying to be part of a whole that is in constant dissolution. What production of the Theatre of the Absurd can compete in grotesqueness with a Pentagon report wherein estimated nuclear war casualties are "rounded off" in units of five million? Where is the gory product of the blood and violence school of writing that does not pale against a single mission by our Air Force in Vietnam? Or observe the hypocrisy of the campaign for "Making America Beautiful" while the enormous pollution of our soil, our waters and our air continues at dangerous and accelerating rates, and while investigating committees "investigate." Or, what has happened to what we used to call representative government when wars are no longer declared, or even discussed, but simply turned on?

The increasing misery and the loneliness, the fear and frustration of our people do not derive from some mechanism of the psyche but from the mechanism of the capitalist *modus operandi,* from the violence, the dishonesty, the grotesqueness and the inhumanity that characterize it. Our so-called prosperity rests largely upon the exploitation of peoples outside our own borders and this exploitation returns to us in the form of the disintegration of our own society and its values. The failure to recognize this central feature of our national existence is to encourage the corruption of our people, and their own self-deception; it is to disarm them in coping with their needs and problems. Again and again in the past the American people have shown their vitality, their energy and their readiness to struggle for progress. Today, the murky stifling fog of our precious so-called prosperity hinders their vision, and the raucous razzle-dazzle of "success" makes it difficult to hear the voices of their brothers throughout the world. As our bourgeoisie follows in hot pursuit of profit and power, they drag the nation from one impossible position to another even more impossible. But for the bourgeoisie no position is impossible so long as the people wll pay the bill. Perhaps it is time to revise the entire bookkeeping system. One of the primary roles in this task is the exposure and analysis of the above contradictions between appearance and reality. Such analysis should appear in the first section of the program as a part of the theoretical basis for the political program itself.

International Solidarity

During the capitalist era the extent to which man increased his mastery over nature, the extent to which he acted upon nature, grew enormously, and the rate is still accelerating. This attack upon nature was accomplished with the bourgeois hegemony, ethic and ideology, and created new contradictions between man and nature and between man and man, even while presenting new possibilities. The resolution of these contradictions and the realization of these possibilities, which are on an all-embracing level, requires the reintegration of society, requires the mastery of man over his own social organization.

The Communist movement is both a product of history and an agent of history. In this sense it has no existence *per se,* but only in so far as it contributes to the forward motion of history which in the last analysis means the increasing consciousness of man. If the Communist movement is to contribute to that consciousness, if it is to lead in thought and action, it must clarify its own consciousness, its own understanding. The contradiction expressed in the division of the world Communist movement is dangerous, nor will it be healed by pretending it does not exist. The very fact that it does exist is an indication of how deep and pervasive are the contradictions of society today. We feel that our Party should be unequivocally for the resolution of all breaches within the world Communist community, and that it should be our declared purpose to play a constructive role in the reestablishment of international solidarity in these crucial times.

BROOKLYN CLUB

A Proposed Section on Women

Here is our club's idea for a section on women. Such a section might fittingly follow *The Intellectual and Professional Community* (pp. 69-79). It contains most of the content and all of the last sentence of the one paragraph in the program about women (p. 53). That paragraph might be edited to read:

> There is division between men and women, a factor of growing importance because of the economic increase of women in the labor force. This divisive factor is aggravated because a disproportionate number of women workers is employed in the largely non-unionized occupations—office, service, retail trade, sweatshop industry.

Our proposed section is as follows:

Women reached the ballot box nearly 50 years ago; but they have yet to reach equality with men. They confront discrimination by law and custom. Property rights, marriage and divorce laws, employment practices—all attest to women's inferior status.

In recent years the number of women in the labor force has soared. They now constitute 37 per cent. But this increase is more an index of the growth of service

industries—in which so-called "women's work" predominates — than of a basic change in the status of women. Even in this expanded area of our economy men get the top jobs. Where women do manage to get the same jobs as men they usually receive less pay. Nor are matters improved by the custom and practice, reflecting the deep prejudices of our society, that generally exclude women from leadership and positions of influence even in unions where they comprise a majority of the membership.

The responsibilities of home and children still fall mainly to women. This task, difficult and important as it is, nevertheless limits a woman's range of activity and helps to perpetuate incorrect and harmful attitudes to the detriment of man, woman, family and society.

Especially restricted are the women of minority groups, who are discriminated against also as Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Indians, etc. The havoc wreaked by discrimination on minority group families results all to often in the woman bearing a double burden as breadwinner and homemaker. The employment she finds, if she can find any, is the most menial and least rewarding—spiritually and financially.

Such conditions are in marked contrast to the position of women in the socialist countries. In the Soviet Union, for example, 75 per cent of the doctors are women. Most occupations which we in the United States customarily think of as being "for men only" are filled by women as well as men. Women are also prominent in politics and trade union leadership. In China the status of women changed dramatically after the revolution in 1949. Ancient customs which had kept women in virtual slavery were swept away and replaced with laws declaring women's equality.

Even in the emerging nations of Africa and Asia the participation of women in revolutionary struggle and the subsequent drive toward national development smashed many of the centuries-old social restrictions and enabled women to enter political and industrial areas still considered taboo for women in our country.

But the women of the United States have not been passive in their desire to improve their status and conditions. They have a long history of fighting for their rights as women, and for the causes of labor, social welfare, civil rights and peace. Whatever advances on these fronts we enjoy today were won through the united struggle of men and women.

The Communist Party is proud to have been always in the forefront of the struggle for women's rights. One of the early leaders in these struggles was Rosa Luxemburg, a leading Communist. Also in our ranks were such great fighters for the people's welfare as Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Ella Reeve Bloor and Claudia Jones.

Today the women of our country spearhead the fight for peace. Their dedication and ingenuity illustrate that women constitute a powerful force. It is unfortunate that this force is only partly utilized.

The Civil Rights Law of 1964 has made an inroad against discrimination in employment with regard to sex as well as race. It must be enforced and strengthened. Other laws are needed, and some must be repealed. Women must be given an equal opportunity to enter society's decisive arenas. If a woman is employed and is expecting a child she should not have to view the prospect as representing a sharp cut in the family income and a termination of her outside-the-home ambitions. Among reforms to assist women to function as equals with men should be maternity leave with pay and reinstatement, and a system of subsidized day-care centers for her children.

The double standard applied to man and woman hangs like an albatross around both their necks, and serves only the exploiter. Ending it, therefore, is a necessity for the mass of Americans—male and female.

ALBUQUERQUE YOUTH CLUB

The Communist New Left

All of us in our club have come into the Communist Party—in an area where there were no adult Communists and no party organization since the late 50's—and arrived at a Marxist outlook from the New Left, from the young radical intellectual community. Some of us have backgrounds and continuing work in broad left youth groups like SDS and Du-Bois, some have been active in the civil rights movement both in the North and the South, some have been influenced by the "theoretical organ" of the New Left, *Studies on the Left,* others by the socialist humanism of Erich Fromm, by the late C. Wright Mills and by the work and writings of Marxist Herbert Aptheker.

In becoming Communists we did not stop being New Leftists—we are of the New Left; the New Left in its constant growth and changing development is our milieu, our generation, our language and our contribution to the struggle for a country and world in which people come first. In fact we only deepened our commitment and broadened our horizons—and we learned, not without difficulty, a new and vitally necessary approach to the struggle for social change; we learned the meaning of collectivity in work and in responsibility. We saw and learned that democratic centralism in practice and in theory is not what most of the New Left pictures it, nor what some of the editors of

Studies On The Left would have us believe. It is not an authoritarian and bureaucratic apparatus for stifling creativity and silencing inquiring radicals. Rather it is the vital component missing from the New Left and its "participatory democracy." Democratic centralism is participatory democracy in the fullest and best sense for it is genuinely democratic in both the processes of arriving at decisions and in accepting those decisions. And it is this acceptance of democratic decisions that gives to the movement and to the struggle its necessary unity, cohesion and coherence.

Clarify Democratic Centralism

We emphasize this because in our continuing relations with New Left compañeros, particularly in SDS, especially the ones who agree with the party program, we have found their principal barrier is "democratic centralism" and the many myths, some based on past distortions of democratic centralism, surrounding the concept. Gus Hall has said: "Fighters who do not fear jails will not fear joining our party. The same courage they showed in battle, they will show in joining our party." He is right; it is not fear of harassment, nor of attack, that will keep radical youth from our party—but a fear of "the specter of expulsions for differing opinions," of "bureaucracy" and "conservatism," based in part on misunderstanding and in part on past abuses. These reasons will keep many New Leftists from our ranks unless we make a full-scale assault on their fears, myths and misconceptions. We must clarify the whole concept of collectivity, of democratic centralism, of our style of work, and do so in terms that the New Left will understand and accept. One step that would help would be a far more detailed discussion in the program of democratic centralism and party work. Emphasis must be placed equally on both centralism and democracy, while re-examining the forms and content of both, to give them the vitality needed today.

Once the area of confusion over democratic centralism is dispelled, the fears of many young fighters who have already won their credentials in battle and in jail may still not be overcome, because, very specifically some in the Party may be afraid of them. And this is to leave the field and the New Left to the prey of the ultra-Left. Comrade Hall described such fears with great clarity and justified anger in his pamphlet, *Labor—The Key Force,* when he took on "the walls around us"; the too-quick to label "ultra-Left," "trotskyite," "flighty," "he's different," "he's hip or beat," "he's not a Marxist yet"—ideas and attitudes all too prevalent among some older comrades.

When friends in SDS or the peace movement hear of these things or read Gus's description of what was done to the young radical turned away as "not ready," they were shocked and angry. They saw their worst fears confirmed and the only antidote in sight was that such bureaucratic and arrogant handling of people was denounced by the leading Communist spokesmen. It was not too long ago when a "New Left" youth group, the DuBois Clubs, issued their first magazine with an excellent, even brilliant, editorial that caught the spirit and reality of our times just right. The magazine's title—*Insurgent*—led some older Communists to wince, some to say the name and editorial were "ultra-Left." Such attitudes are bankrupt and out of touch with reality.

In the Language of the New Generation

We have a scientifically valid method of analysis—in dialectical materialism—of looking at and grasping the constantly changing realities and forces about us. Surely this, and not tired clichés, forms the substance of Marxism and Marxist approaches. If we are to reach the non-Communist radicals on the New Left, then we must use these scientifically relevant concepts, terms and methods which are at the heart of Marxism—but the scientific content of Marxism-Leninism must be given in a new form, in the language of our generation and style, not in the language and jargon of a generation ago. Nothing could be more undialectical, and nothing can turn off a young audience more than that. A clear example of the use of new and relevant terms can be found in the program and in Gus's recent pamphlets. And the right approach emerges with great force in the party's youth draft "For A Life With a Purpose" and in Bettina's new pamphlet on the universities. But more must be done in terms of style and approach. And this applies with even more force to demonstrating empirically the validity of our positions and the conclusions of our analysis.

Perhaps here some of our own experiences on a very small scale can be used as an indicator. We have held soul-sessions (New Left term) with New Leftists on the role of our party and won an eager hearing. We have built a solid coalition with the radical groups here and in the peace movement, giving a unity which has proven vital to a small but active Left in New Mexico, a state often influenced by the military-far-Right complex. And this we have done in several ways, first and foremost by honest, frank and critical discussions—critical of them and of ourselves—and have helped to allay many fears, suspicions, and stereotypes. Along with other young New Leftists, we have built a peace movement, gone to jail, and been harassed by both extremists and local authorities, demonstrating our commitment to everyone. We have also brought them the spirit of collective work, asked them to read and comment on some local club articles for the university paper before submitting these, and accepted their criticisms in a fraternal fashion. Our discussions of alienation, our concern for the arts and culture, our love of life and hope in man, so distinct from the negativism and despair of a few of the older

radicals in the area who are ultra-Leftist, all this has deepened the coalition with the New Left here. They take pride in association with young Communists, and this has opened even wider the perspective of further recruitment of these fighters in the battle for human freedom.

What Is Needed

Here we feel is a major area of work—our youth must relate in the manner and style of the New Left. The need for a radical journal initiated by young Communists devoted to the "Movement," to its problems and development, to Marxist approaches, to art and music and culture in a *fresh* and *young spirit,* is of supreme importance. Why should the ultra-Left be able to produce something as attractive as *Weapon* in style and form, if not in ideology, and not we? Why should the ultras dominate the Free Universities? These are not counter-communities, they are a battle ground to reach many of the best young intellectuals in the radical upsurge, and they should be utilized by us for an area of active recruitment by participating both as students and faculty members. We should not just participate in courses about economics or history, but in courses about music, films, art, poetry, and the revolutionary process as it applies in contemporary America. We need, too, our own youthful institute for ideology, and broad range of cultural topics open and attractive to all in the movement, combining the best features of the Free University, the older Marxist schools, and something like the Highlander Folk School.

And we need more. We need up-to-date studies, detailed analyses of the ruling class and power structure and their workings. Where are the decisions made? Who actually makes them? What are the actual trends and divisions in the ruling class; its internal conflicts and who speaks for the various divisions? Which element is dominant? Are there "progressive elements" within the ruling class; or elements which because of dissatisfaction one can temporarily form alliances with and use in the struggles facing us? We must have facts and data, empirically tested.

We also need sociologically sound studies of the working class which demonstrate (as we are convinced they will) the validity of our views on the basic and fundamental role of the working class in social change. We need to know how and where the working class is moving, or may move in the near future. We need to know scientifically, and not as an article of faith, that the working class is not to be written off—that *Monthly Review* is wrong, or right, in its "junking" the role of the US working class. There are already ample examples of the increasing restiveness and radicalization going on among workers and in trade unions. These must be given currency and clear explanation pointing particularly at this stage to the more militant sections of the trade union movement and working class. We must indicate, on the basis of clear analysis, that the process once unleashed will affect the whole movement of our class and why the New Left's writing off the working class (less today than a few months ago) can only lead to isolation, defeat and despair. Let us show the need not only for young people to work in the ghettos of the North and rural slums of the South, but also in the fields of the far West, the mines of the Southwest and the steel mills of the Midwest, carrying a new life into the labor movement, winning working class youth to the party of the working class, and learning too the reality of the conditions and class-consciousness of workers today.

Let us in practice and theory utilize and build on the New Left's concept of "seats of radical power," broadening it and deepening it both in practical work and in the expansion and development of our own program. In particular let us relate this concept and the struggles and successes and developments around it to the concept of structural reform, the building of a people's coalition, rooted firmly in the working class, in the fight against monopoly, all as part of the particular road to socialism in America, a democratic and peaceful road. And in this area we must clarify our position of working with people at their current levels to raise them to the next stage of struggle, our peculiar form of revolutionary warfare in the struggle to free America, less spectacular and less romantic in some ways than those of our comrades in many areas of the world, but no less serious, necessary, hazardous, or revolutionary. We must explain and win the New Left to see the need for this kind of struggle and the danger of isolation from the people and mass movements by being too way out, too advanced, "an engine that has become uncoupled from its train."

The New Left Can be Won

We need to reach the New Left, we need to impart to them the historical experience of our party, and learn from them much of what we have forgotten, as well as a whole new style. We must therefore not only open or reopen new and different avenues of approach, struggle with them in common fights, engage in a dialog with them, walk the picket lines and fill the jails, return to creative Marxist scholarship and produce scientifically valid studies, but we must also appeal to them out of a a sense of revolutionary humanism and the commitment which is inherent in that humanism. We must make the New Left aware of the Challenge of Marxism and the demands that such a challenge and revolutionary commitment makes on a person. Our generation is up to such a task, and will not shrink from a party that offers it struggle, commitment, the rationality, breadth and depth of a creative and humanistic Marxism.

Already the New Left is moving away from the suspicions and

hostility of the not too distant past, already many have become Communists or are grappling with that possibility. And the process is not too difficult to understand, for we in our club have all in varying degrees experienced it. The whole logic of our involvement, of our dissatisfaction with our dehumanizing society, our struggle with personal and collective alienation, led us to vague feelings about the need to alter the situation, and then to active participation with others of our generation in seeking to bring about social and radical change. This naturally, almost inexorably, brought us face to face with ideas and alternatives long branded taboo in our society, opening before us the perspective and alternative of socialism. And it was natural too that we then would inquire each in our own fashion into the Party of Socialism, a party concerned with American reality and yet part of the world movement.

And we are convinced that we are not unique, but representative of a growing segment in the New Left. The New Left can be won to Marxism-Leninism and the Communist Party. We have much to contribute to the New Left, and we of the New Left have much to contribute to the party once we have chosen it. The party, our party, has nothing to fear from the New Left and much to gain. We can build a cadre and a generation of New Left Communists and Communist New Leftists. We can do it if we but try—bearing in mind Lenin's ever more valid maxim:

> a bolder and broader, bolder and broader, and still bolder and broader recruitment of youth, *with no fear of them.* This is wartime. The youth will decide the outcome of all struggle, both the student youth and still more, the working class youth (emphasis Lenin's).

So let's get on with the job —we have a movement to build, a nation to humanize and a world to win.

MIKE GREEN

Distinct Features of America

At the heart of the new program is the further development of the distinctly American features of the class struggle in our country—always based on the universal laws of social science—Marxism-Leninism.

The American features, vitally important from a theoretical, strategic-tactical and practical point of view, have been raised to a level unprecedented in the history of American Marxism, and run through the program like a red, life-giving vein.

Nevertheless, a certain discrepany is to be noted between the democratic and socialist features

in the program. Those of the second category are brilliantly summarized, thus giving the reader more clarity. Those of the first category exist everywhere, are summarized nowhere. As a result, certain weaknesses appear in various parts of the program.

On American Features

Obviously, the democratic features should be further elaborated, i.e., summarized. An attempt to contribute something towards such an effort flows:

1. Main Feature: Our country is the land of the strongest monopoly and imperialist reaction, which has entered its period of decline; our country is also the land of the largest, and potentially strongest, working class, which is on the rise.

Note: The main danger today is to underestimate the strength of the American working class. Such tendency plays into the hands of "Left" dogmatism and revisionism, who make a living by distorting the main American feature.

2. Any success of the U.S. peace movement, even a temporary one, has the widest repercussions all over the world, by far greater than the peace movement in any other capitalist country. Hence the second feature: The peace struggle of the American people has become, in our time, one of the fundamental preconditions for the decisive victory of peaceful coexistence and world peace, one of the principal sources of non-inevitability of World War III.

3. Other fundamental American features, as outlined by Marx, Engels and Lenin during their lifetime have, of course, changed in the present third stage of the general crisis of capitalism. Lenin had brilliantly summarized the American features as follows:

> . . . the absence of any big, nationwide, democratic problems, whatever facing the proletariat; the complete subjection of the proletariat to bourgeois politics; the sectarian isolation of groups, handfuls of Socialists from the proletarat; not the slightest success of the Socialist in the elections among the working masses, etc. (Preface to the 1907 Russian translation of *Letters to Americans,* International Publishers, 1953, p. 275.)

As an outgrowth of the past and present U.S. features, another particular feature emerges, on which Engels laid much stress: *The special importance of the American trade unions.*

Many people believe the U.S. features, as outlined by Lenin in 1907, to be in full force even today! Hence the need of presenting an up-to-date summary in a separate section of the program.

Such a need is demonstrated by some weakness in elaborating the character of the modern democratic revolution, of which the Negro Freedom Movement is but the first symptom.

Lenin was correct in pointing out that there are no big nationwide democratic problems whatever in the USA, in the sense of having strong feudal remnants (as was the case with Russia), except some in the South.

In 1907 imperialism was in its early stage. But since 1907, the big bourgeoisie became state-monopoly capitalism and entered the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism. Now the monopoly bourgeoisie tramples underfoot the bourgeois-democratic freedoms. Now it uses them as a window-dressing. Now it tolerates whatever democratic freedoms exist only because of the popular pressure.

Clearly, there exist today big nationwide democratic problems in the USA, but with a new content!

Hence a new type of revolution is being born in our country; the *people's democratic revolution,* which is of a bourgeois-democratic character, but the leading force now is the working class, and not the bourgeoisie. And because the new democratic leader is the working class, the people's democratic revolution inevitably becomes the opening phase of the socialist revolution.

Herein lies the indivisibility of the democratic and the socialist revolutions: In the people's democratic revolution, the *minimum program* of the working class becomes reality. In the socialist revolution, the *maximum program* of the working class becomes reality.

These points must be injected in the new program, which could be divided in two parts: minimum and maximum program.

On Strategy and Tactics

The three-phase sketch is the foundation of the whole program. It is also the greatest achievement of creative American Marxism in the field of strategy (p. 40).

Unfortunately, it is presented in an embryonic and fragmentary form. Elements of strategy and tactics are scattered all over the program (pp. 76-81, 87-89, etc.). None of them is incorporated in three distinct strategies corresponding to the three distinct stages of the revolution. As a result, the over-all strategic clarity is somewhat handicapped.

An attempt to make some contribution to the three-phase sketch follows.*

Strategy in the First Stage

Objective: Prevent World War III and American variety of fascism.

Main Fire: Against the extremist group of monopolies, the ultra-Right (which blindly strives for all-out nuclear war, *while raising private fascist armies on American soil, building mass fascist organizations and infiltrating the government apparatus, armed forces and police*).

Maximum Pressure: To expose and isolate the limited-war, centrist and presently dominant group of monopolies (in order to frustrate any compromise with the ultra-Right).

Main Force: The working class.

Direct Allies: The Negro people and the intermediate classes of town and country.

*Italics indicate what should be further stressed in the program, or what is missing; in brackets are added explanatory notes.

Indirect, temporary and highly unstable ally: The moderate group of monopolies (which, *in contrast to the extremist group more closely associated with armaments and foreign investments, can be economically compensated by a massive trade with the one-billion strong socialist market;* which would temporarily withdraw from the brink of world war; which would hesitantly accommodate itself to world reality; which leans towards a "liberal" method of prolonging monopoly rule at home; *but, which has not yet been forced* by the people's struggle to *give up completely its partnership in the joint monopoly strategy of a surprise nuclear attack* against the socialist countries—this is the only possible way out of the present monopoly dilemma).

Present Tactics

1. Mass struggle within the two-party vise, *spearheaded by the trade unions' political action committees* and the independent, peace, freedom, youth, Left and Communist movements—in the direction of a new people's party.

2. Key link in the chain of all tasks: *Re-alignment of forces within the trade unions* (beginning right now with the advancement of all forms of class unity for the immediate economic and political demands; for mergers and expansion of unions in every single industry and field under the slogan "One Industry, One Union, One National Contract"; which channelizes the present scattered and isolated struggles into unified struggles on a national scale, and thus hastens the massive development of class consciousness and political independence of our workers on the basis of their own experience.

3. Creation of a National Small Businessmen Association (for their immediate problems; inevitably leads to sharper confrontation with the monopolies, helps *transform small businessmen into a new independent force,* and brings them closer to an actual alliance with the working class).

4. A "Socialist Alliance" coalition of the Left, with New York as its starting point (based on a minimum program of mass struggle which a) combines today's popular demands with what is common to all varieties of socialism—*working class and petty bourgeois socialism;* b) retains the right of friendly and constructive mutual criticism).

5. For a mass legal CPUSA with deeper roots in the working class, especially the industrial workers.

The creation of a new people's party marks the beginning of a new stage of the revolution.

Strategy in the Second Stage

Objective: A pepole's democratic government, led by labor and capable of crushing the danger of war and militarism-fascism (by carrying out the most radical structural reforms within the boundaries of capitalism and *by relying on the organized strength of the working class in order to safeguard the democratic-consti-*

tutional path by all means available).

Main Fire: Against the centrist group of monopolies (which strives to continue limited wars, and thus prolongs the danger of world war; which strives for compromise with the ultra-Right, and thus prolongs the danger of fascism).

Maximum Pressure: *To expose, isolate and neutralize the moderate group of monopolies (which strives to grab the leadership of the people's democratic revolution and end it in a compromise with the centrist and the extremist groups*).

Main Force: The working class, fighting through the people's party, a militant united federation of all trade unions, and a mass CPUSA (or a mass united party of scientific socialism).

Direct Allies: Small businessmen, poor and middle farmers, Negro people.

The creation of a people's democratic government, led by labor, marks the beginning of a new stage of the revolution:

Strategy in the Third Stage

Objective: Peaceful transition to socialism (under an elected, *all-powerful Congress* and a labor-led *coalition government, always relying on the organized strength of the workers in order to safeguard the dmeocratic-constitutional path by all means available*).

Main Fire: Against all groups of monopolies (but providing *partial compensation, right of inheritance to their children and technical directorship of "their" socialized enterprise to those who would abide by the Constitution, and no compensation, etc., to those who would not*).

Main Force: The working class (leading through the vanguard party of scientific socialism, the trade unions, the federal, state and local congresses).

Form of U.S. Socialist Democracy: Local, state and national congresses, supreme organs of the people's power, new and highest form of American democracy.

Direct Allies: Small owners of town and country (who retain their small property).

The creation of a socialist government marks the beginning of a new stage of the revolution:

Strategy in the Fourth Stage

Consolidation of socialism; transition to communism.

B. L. M., BOSTON

A Number of Omissions

In 1807, Jefferson drafted a message to congress and submitted the draft to his cabinet for comment. Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, said he could not make any suitable suggestions

for revising the draft because his "objections [were] less to details than to its general spirit."

With respect to the draft program, I find myself in a position opposite to that of Gallatin. I heartily endorse the spirit and, in general, the substance of the draft. But there are some details, I think, that need correction. And there are some serious omissions.

First, however, allow me to indulge in a long, loud and spirited round of applause for the draft, as printed, on several grounds:

Program per se: We are going to have a program. That, in itself, is cause for joy. The publication of the draft obviously indicates the adoption (after discussion and amendment) of a finished program in the near future. Such a program cannot help but give inspiration and specific direction to our party's work. Such a definitive and stated program has been too long wanting.

Language: For the first time in memory, we have produced a political document written in Americanese.

Spirit: Comrade Hall's forward sounds the keynote, stating, as it does, "This does not mean that it is possible to struggle—only by joining the Communist Party," and inviting non-Communists to join in critcial discussion of the draft. This spirit is consistently present throughout the draft, particularly in the chapter on our relations with others.

Substance: Saving the serious need for some important additions and allowing for possible improvement in language here and there, the draft is politically correct, realistic as to goals and extremely well presented.

Now, as to suggestions for improvement.

There are, in my opinion, five important errors of omission; two total omissions and three other items mentioned but not by any means adequately covered.

First, and most amazing, Vietnam. How is it possible for any group of Communists to write such a draft in this era and completely forget (so far as the draft goes) the existence of Vietnam? The very mention of the name of that country is enough to bring to the minds of all Communists (and most other people) the overriding importance of this issue. No plan or program without this orientation will get far off the ground. I don't think that that point needs further elaboration from me. Yet, I would cite one item, Drew Pearson's column, *New York Post* (March 21, 1966):

> . . . Shriver replied that with the Vietnamese war costing more and more, the anti-poverty program also lacked funds and could not alleviate the situation in Watts . . .

Second: There is the question of differences existing between various of our brother Communist Parties with particular reference to Sino-Soviet relations. These differences exist; they cannot be ignored and should be commented upon in any program we issue. We do, after all, have principles and these must be clearly stated. Respect for the opinions of others (so well stated in the draft) and

the necessity for resolving differences between various Communist Parties does not preclude our holding definite opinions on the points at issue and cannot absolve us from responsibility for participation in the discussions of these issues.

Third: There is, I think, general agreement in our ranks as to the fact that we have special responsibilities with respect to relations between our country and the countries of Latin America. Yet, the question of Latin America is hardly mentioned. Wall Street's neo-colonial, super-exploitation of Latin America is practically untouched in the draft.

Fourth: It is probably no coincidence that there are two things wrong with the section on Latin American minorities in the U.S. (p. 67). This question is treated typographically, as well as in tone, as a sub-section of "The Negro People." (Note the difference in type faces between "Latin American Minorities" and "THE FARMERS" on p. 67.) The section under discussion is merely a short (I think too short) statement of the existence of a problem. No suggestion for cure.

The foregoing raises a question in my mind. Are these two (probably related) neglects of two important issues a reflection of inadequate study of the problems? Is this the underlying cause of an inadequate program with respect to these problems? If that be the case, it would clearly indicate the need for a commission to study these issues thoroughly and to publish the results of these studies.

Another inadequacy, as I see it, lies in the discussion of the economy. Not enough is said about the innate illness of a society whose "affluence" is built so largely on an economy of planned obsolescence, conspicuous consumption and a future so heavily mortgaged by today's installment buying. The draft also lacks a discussion of how the economy operates, its various ills, corrective measures and how these measures would affect the welfare of the workers.

I turn now to two instances of poor composition that mar an otherwise exceedingly well-written document.

Refer to page 54 of the draft, the second paragraph under the heading "Class Partnership." I suggest that poor sentence structure, resulting in hazy antecedents, serves to reverse the intended meaning. I suggest correction along the following lines:

> . . . and significant departures from this policy are to be noted (period—new sentence). These departures from the policy of "class partnership" are more pronounced in the lower levels of leadership . . .

Another case of hazy antecedents, leading, possibly, to misunderstanding on an important point, occurs on p. 65, in the first two paragraphs in the section on "Integration and Counter-Currents." The language here is such as to give the impression that the favored position of 5 per cent of the Negro population leads to *three* currents among the Negro people (including the one we think the correct one). I suggest improvement in the text along the following lines:

> There are three identifiable currents among the Negro people. One, the most important and progressive one, flows from the main stream of Negro life and espouses the integration goals of the freedom movement.
>
> But there are two counter-currents whose primary source is in the professional and business groupings . . .

This brings me to a discussion of several minor, possibly picayunish, points:

Page 7, *paragraph* 3: This paragraph overlooks the fact that there has been a rise in the standard of living for most Americans. True, this fact is handled later in the text. However, I think that many people reading our program, basing themselves on first impressions, will note an obvious and glaring "misstatement of fact" and pass up reading further into the program. I think, therefore, that recognition of our comparatively high living standards belongs in this section.

Page 10, *paragraph* 3: The phrase "action from below" is one of the very few bits of Communese to be found in the draft. It is possibly unintelligible to many non-left, non-labor readers and should be replaced by something like "popular action."

Page 30, *paragraph* 2: The text reads, "a foreigner named Adolph Hitler." It may be that I am the only one that thinks so but, to me, the word "foreigner" has taken on a slightly chauvinistic flavor. The use of quotation marks around the word might serve to remove the bad taste.

On page 38, the phrase "corporate establishment" is introduced and, quite properly, an asterisk refers the reader to a footnote which defines the term. However, previously, on p. 32 (and, I think, once or twice still earlier in the draft) the text contains the phrase "U.S. corporate interests." This phrase is not defined and is, therefore, possibly misleading. A definition should be provided.

Finally, let me pose a question. On p. 56 of the draft, the paragraph numbered (2) speaks of Negro workers being a *radicalizing* (my emphasis, B.M.L.) force within the labor movement. The question is, do the Negro workers really constitute a radicalizing force for militancy? I understand that the two terms have different meanings.

Allow me, now, to close in the same tone as used in my opening paragraphs. Unlike the Articles of Confederation which did not "have enough whole cloth to hold the patches," the draft program under discussions is extremely well worth the effort to improve it. My criticisms are intended constructively and are offered in the context of overall, hearty approval of the draft, in general, as to intent, tone and text.

BOOK REVIEWS

HYMAN LUMER

The Problem of Full Employment

Since the appearance in 1936 of *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money,* the ideas of J. M. Keynes have come to dominate the economic scene in capitalist countries, and not least in the United States. In one or another variant, Keynesian doctrines today underlie the views of most American economists and policy makers, liberal and conservative alike. Keynesism is the foundation of economic policy in the trade union movement. Keynes has in the main replaced Marx as the theoretical mentor of social democracy. And most important, his theories are presently the acknowledged basis of the economic policies of the Johnson Administration, policies whose support has extended from the main leadership of the AFL-CIO to some of the most conservative segments of big business.

In the light of these developments, the critical examination of Keynesian theories as well as the policies flowing from them is a task of prime importance for Marxist economists. Starting some two decades ago, a substantial beginning was made toward fulfilling this task; in more recent years, however, it has been very largely neglected. Dr. Joseph Gillman's latest book* represents a welcome break with this neglect, and as such makes an important contribution to Marxist economic literature in this country.

"This book," its preface opens, "deals with the theoretical and practical problems of providing full employment in America on a continuing basis." The standpoint from which Dr. Gillman approaches these problems is "the thesis that capitalist economies experience booms and depressions because they operate within a framework in which more profits, more social surplus, we will say, is produced than can be absorbed in the expansion of their productive assets on a *continuing* basis, and that this condition has worsened under the impact of the new technologies and concentrated business organization" (p. 14).

Our economy is marked, he maintains, by a long-term growth in the disparity between capital accumulation and outlets for productive investment—a trend which increasingly affects the character of cyclical fluctuations and gives rise on a growing scale to the unproductive use of the social surplus, particularly through military expenditures, to keep the economy going and mitigate unemployment. "In these respects," he concludes, "modern capitalist prosperity is often but the manifestation of a continually existing unemployment crisis" (p. 16). This is the meaning of the book's title.

* Joseph Gillman, *Prosperity in Crisis,* Marzani and Munsell, New York, 1965, 256 pp., $5.00.

The Theories of Keynes

Following brief examinations of social surplus and of underconsumptionist theories of economic crisis, Gillman proceeds to a detailed analysis of the economic theories of Keynes as the foundation of present-day ideas of combatting crisis and unemployment through the medium of state intervention in the economy. His presentation of Keynes' basic concepts is a remarkably lucid exposition of a difficult subject, and one which is to be highly recommended especially to the general reader who seeks an understanding of what Keynesism is about. Similarly his critique of Keynes, though it contains nothing fundamentally new, is illuminating and effectively presented. It shows clearly both the extent and the limitations of Keynes' departure from the orthodox economists who preceded him.

The basic element in that departure was his rejection of Say's Law of Markets, a sacred dogma to his predecessors (although Marx had repudiated it many years before). Say argued that: "A product is no sooner created than it, from that instant, affords a market for other products to the full extent of its value." James Mill had earlier expressed the same idea in these words: "The production of commodities creates, and is the one and universal cause which creates a market for the commodities produced. . . . A nation's power of purchasing is exactly measured by its annual produce. The more you increase the annual produce, the more by that very act you extend the national market. . . . The demand of a nation is always equal to the produce of a nation."*

"Under this 'law,'" says Gillman, "indeed, even depressions were, theoretically impossible. Demand is always effective; that is, it is always sufficient to clear the market. General overproduction, or general underconsumption is, therefore, impossible" (p. 29). The Great Depression of the thirties dealt a shattering blow to this absurdity and paved the way for Keynes' rejection of it and the development instead of a theory of effective demand which allows for—indeed leads to—the establishment of equilibrium levels of the economy short of full production and full employment. This deficit in production and employment, generated by the normal working of the economy, must, said Keynes, be made good through the intervention of the state. He offered, in short, a theory purporting to show how

* Both quotations are taken from Maurice Dobb, *Political Economy and Capitalism,* International Publishers, New York, 1945, pp. 41-42.

full employment on a continuing basis can be maintained under capitalism.

Keynes thus emerges as the theoretician of state monopoly capitalism—of the growing dependence of monopoly capital on the economic resources and powers of the state to bolster its profits and dominance during the period of the general crisis of capitalism. To be sure, it was not Keynes' theories which led to the growing economic role of the state; rather, he provided a theoretical rationale for a phenomenon which had already made its appearance. As such, his ideas became widely accepted—and this despite their demonstrable flaws.

These failures of the Keynesian theory Gillman analyzes in detail. The economic categories on which Keynes bases his analysis—propensity to consume, marginal efficiency of capital, liquidity preference—are defined as innate psychological tendencies of individuals for which no material social explanation is offered. It is solely in terms of these purely psychological factors that he develops his thesis of an inherent tendency for savings to outstrip investment and hence for the economy to fall short of full production and employment. He completely ignores the class division of capitalist society and, of course, the central fact of economic exploitation. He also ignores the existence of monopoly capital, and he treats the economy as a static entity which undergoes no historical development.

Further, much of the picture he presents does not correspond to reality. For example, his contention that savers and investors are two different groups of people, on which he bases much of his argument, does not stand up, especially in light of the fact that today the major part of investment funds come directly from retained profits and other cash reserves of the corporations themselves. Similarly, his thesis that as incomes rise a greater share of them tends to be saved can be shown to be at odds with the statistical facts. These and numerous other indictments are brought by Gillman against the Keynesian analysis—in our opinion, tellingly.

The Evolution of Keynesian Theory

The next section of the book is devoted to certain aspects of the evolution of Keynesian thinking. Born in the depths of a depression of undue severity and length, Keynes' *General Theory* emerged, says Gillman, as "an economics of depressions." Keynes saw the problem simply as one of offsetting production and unemployment generated by the economy itself. The effort to explain the severity of the depression of the thirties led from this to a theory of "secular stagnation"—that is, of long-term non-cyclical economic decline arising principally from a falling off of outlets for investment. This theory, first articulated fully by the American economist Alvin H. Hansen, led to a longer-range conception of the regulatory role of the state. Gillman describes it as follows:

> To preserve the security and stability of the existing social order—to save capitalism—the government is asked to proceed along three broad fronts: Monetary, Fiscal and Spending. As [Seymour] Harris sees it: "In a period of deficient demand it is necessary [for the government] to pump money into the system, reduce taxes, and raise public expenditures; and in periods of excess demand, to withdraw money, raise taxes, and reduce public expenditures." These would be the regulative, or control devices. In addition, the country already has certain "built-in stabilizers," such as old-age pensions and unemployment insurance, which Hansen has defined as "social mechanisms so constructed that they automatically operate to offset unbalancing tendencies and exert pulls on the economy tending toward stability" (p. 112).

Here, designed to offset the tendency toward secular stagnation (and the cyclical fluctuations which continue within it), is the well-known Keynesian program, supposedly leading to the building of the "welfare state." Gillman then proceeds to deal with the elements of this program and their limitations. In particular, he shows that the measures actually employed are directed primarily toward absorption of the social surplus through unproductive expenditures, particularly for military purposes — expenditures which do not add to economic growth in any real sense but only conceal the underlying crisis conditions.

In the final section, the book deals with the question: "What outlets are available to such an economy [i.e., a capitalist economy], outlets of a more socially useful and socially productive nature than the military outlet, for absorbing the excess savings of the comunity?" (p. 165). Under this heading, Gillman discusses such factors as foreign investment, increased social and personal consumption, and tax policies. He shows that such measures as genuine aid to underdeveloped countries, greater outlays for social welfare, higher wages, or a truly progressive income tax may have genuinely positive effects. But at the same time, he points to the overwhelming obstacles to their achievement in a monopoly-dominated capitalist society in which all such steps eat into profits. He concludes with a plea for an end to the cold war and a shift from military to peacetime production: "Stagnation of the American economy would be halted and economic growth stimulated if the billions now wasted in the pursuit of the cold war were diverted to the building of a healthy civilian economy" (p. 236).

On the whole, Gillman has produced a valuable book which deserves a wide readership, particularly among those who want to understand what Keynesism is and what, from the Marxist point of view, is wrong with it. Its presentation is basically sound and well-argued.

Certain Inadequacies

At the same time there are, we feel, certain inadequacies in the presentation, particularly with

regard to the evolution of Keynesian theory. Undue emphasis is placed on the odeas of Keynes himself and not enough attention is given to their subsequent modification. For example, the rate of interest as a determinant of investment is central in the *General Theory*, and in this light Gillman discusses it at some length. But much of Keynes' thinking on this point was later discarded by his followers, whose criticism is simliar to some of that which Gillman offers. Typical is the comment of Lawrence R. Klein (*The Keynesian Revolution*, Macmillan, New York, 1952, p. 172):

> Keynes was long in favor of manipulation of the interest rate in order to stimulate the desire to invest. Such policies are based on the assumption that investment is sensitive to changes in the rate of interest, but . . . all the evidence, theoretical and empirical, suggests that the investment schedule is interest-inelastic today.

Consequently, many Keynesian economists have reverted, at least partially, to the traditional theory of interest and attempted to combine this with Keynesian concepts. A similar process has occurred in relation to other aspects of Keynes' theory. Paul A. Samuelson, regarded as a leading Keynesian, describes it in general terms in his widely-used textbook as follows:

> In recent years 90 per cent of American economists have stopped being "Keynesian economists" or "anti-Keynesian economists." Instead they have worked toward a synthesis of whatever is valuable in older economics and in modern theories of income determination. The result might be called neo-classical economics and is accepted in its broad outlines by all but about 5 per cent of extreme left-wing and right-wing writers. (*Economics: An Introductory Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1955, p. 212.)

In addition, some aspect of Keynesian theory, notably the concept of deficit spending, have undergone considerable elaboration and sophistication during the past two decades. These and similar developments, in our opinion, are insufficiently reflected in Gillman's treatment. Yet it is these modern versions rather than the original theory which form the basis of present-day economic policy (see, for example, Neil W. Chamberlain, "The Art of Unbalancing the Budget," *Atlantic Monthly*, January 1966).

It is regrettable, too, that Gillman devotes little attention to the concept of state monopoly capitalism as such. To be sure, he refers at a number of points to the state as the guardian of the economic interests of the monopolies and to the intimate connections of monopoly and the state. But he does not develop systematically the concept of the state apparatus as an instrument for enriching monopoly capital at the expense of all other sections of the population and the character of the resulting anti-monopoly struggle. He tends therefore, we believe, to minimize the potentialities of this struggle. While he recognizes that "monopolies should . . . be fought, at least, for their grosser abuses," he tends to equate the idea of curbing monopoly with the fight to restore competition by way of the anti-trust laws and he concludes: "The 'fight' against monopoly cannot be to *reform* it. It can only be to transform it— to transform its private power into public power. That is, the fight has meaning only as a means of transforming capitalism into socialism" (pp. 152-153). To place the question in this way is in our opinion to miss the significance of the strugggles now shaping up in our country, struggles which lead in the direction of curbing monopoly through the imposition of democratic controls on its operations, nationalizing key industries and other such measures. It is to overlook the role of the democratic anti-monopoly movement of today in relation to the fight for socialism.

One might also find points of difference on one or another detail, which it is not possible to discuss within the confines of this review. However, such considerations are secondary, and they do not detract from the essential soundness of Dr. Gillman's analysis.

A. W. FONT

Facts For Folks

If someone asks you: "Do you have *LFB* 17 by LRA?" don't look blank and thereby reveal your unworldliness. Reply: "Of course I have *Labor Fact Book* 17* compiled by Labor Research Association" and show you are with it.

The present reviewer is the proud owner of a complete set of these compact volumes—seventeen of them standing in a row on our bookshelf. They date back to 1931 (*LFB* 1) and have appeared faithfully every two years (some of ours, we freely admit, were acquired retroactively). Let it be stated that these trim little books are among the least dusty in our generally dusty collection —for they are among the most frequently used.

The *Labor Fact Books* are valuable to you even if you possess (which is unlikely) or have access to (which is doubtful) the kind of sources used by LRA in compiling *LFB*. You would have to ploy through volumes of statistical abstracts, census analyses, trade union convention reports, Federal

**Labor Fact Book* 17, prepared by Labor Research Association, International Publishers, New York, 1965. Cloth $3.75, paper $1.65.

Reserve Bank reviews, expensive copies of *Fortune,* and endless other such sources—not to mention the drudgery of being a daily reader of the *Wall Street Journal* —in order to find the facts so conveniently arrayed in *LFB* 17. The *Labor Fact Books,* incidentally, supplement rather than repeat each other. That's why you don't just throw them away like superceded issues of an almanac. Instead you preserve them as volumes of permanent reference value.

There are probably not more than half a dozen pages of tables in the *LFB* even though it is crammed with statistics and facts, facts, facts. Instead of serving up raw tabular matter, the editors have boiled down the material and present it in highly readable paragraphs. And the compilers of *LFB* do not pretend to sterile objectivity. The *Labor Fact Books* are not compiled by computers but by the lively human beings over at Labor Research Association. They have a point of view, and they do not hesitate to comment in a few words or by the use of a pointed quotation, to call attention to the social significance of what might otherwise be a cold and lifeless "fact." For instance (on the 1965 budget): ". . . tax reform, so loudly proclaimed as a feature of the Revenue Act of 1964 was dropped in favor of income tax reductions which did not remove the chief burdens from low-income taxpayers. But if over-kill capacity is 'national strength,' then national strength is consistently promoted again . . ." (p. 15). Or they quote the Joint Economic Committee of Congress: "The success of American agriculture has helped everyone but the farmer" (p. 10).

Some of the sub-headings are more revealing than the chapter headings* in indicating the living contents of this people's almanac: "Profits in Prosperity," "City Worker's Family Needs," "Conscience on Vietnam," "Nightmare in Mississippi," "Protecting the Foreign Born," "Women in U.S. Unions," "Record of the 88th Congress."

In closing this review we must contribute one sad statistic ourselves: the price of the clothbound volume has gone up from $3.25 to $3.75 since the last issue. At the same time we happily report that it is available in a stoutly constructed paperback for only $1.65, the same as two years ago.

*The chapter headings are: Economic Trends, Labor and Social Conditions, Peace Issues and Activities, Negroes and Civil Rights, Civil Liberties, U.S. Trade Unions, Political Developments.

A. W. FONT

New Trial for Joe Hill

The story of Joe Hill has become so much a part of the legendry of the American labor movement that there must be many persons who are not quite sure whether there ever really was such a man or whether he is just someone of whom they may have "dreamed last night."

There really was a Joe Hill, of course. Joe Hill was the pen name of Joseph Hillstrom. In 1902 Hillstrom had emigrated to the United States from Sweden, where he was born in 1879 and christened Joel Hagglund. His place in labor history has been assured in part by the songs he wrote, which still are heard on picketlines and at rallies, and in part by the fact that his vigorous young life was terminated by a firing squad. For this the Utah "copper bosses" and the Mormon church can be held mainly responsible.

There have been many frameups in the course of American labor history but there is no "classic" frameup. That is to say, there is none which embodies all the most typical features of such cases. The Haymarket Case, the Haywood Case, the Sacco and Vanzetti Case, the Tom Mooney Case all present different patterns of judicial and extra-judicial procedure. But in each of these cases, and in the case of Joe Hill as well, there was present one common feature: the determination of the capitalist legal machinery, having once grabbed a potential victim into its works, to use any means, however unscrupulous, to obtain a conviction. And, again without scruple, to make it stick.

In his new book on Joe Hill*, Philip S. Foner shows how the machinery worked to destroy, physically, a true working-class hero.

The Industrial Workers of the World, better known by its initials as the I.W.W., was less than ten years old when Joe Hill was arrested and charged with murder in January 1914. Joe had joined the organization in 1910. Until his life was untimely ended by his executioners he had lived in the manner of many rootless proletarians of his day, performing the tough jobs available to the migratory worker in industry and agriculture, finding employment wherever the freight trains carried him over the face of the country.

The I.W.W. was the militant bond among workers such as Joe Hill at that time. It afforded a flexible form of unionism which suited the needs of the migratory worker, although its membership was by no means confined to them. To many of its members it was

*Philip S. Foner, *The Case of Joe Hill,* International, New York, 1965, pp. 127. $1.45 (paper), $3.50 (cloth).

more than a union: it was the revolutionary organization which would usher in a future industrial society free of bosses and exploitation.

Early in its history the I.W.W. discovered the value of music and song as an agitational and educational aid in its organizing and leadership work. Its meetings, indoors and out, made effective use of topical songs, written to make a point and generally set to some already familiar tune, as a prime method of getting over the I.W.W. message.

Joe Hill was working as a longshoreman in San Pedro when, in 1911, he wrote his first known song (which is also probably his best and most durable). It was "Casey Jones—the Union Scab." Joe became one of the most popular contributors to the famous I.W.W. *Little Red Song Book.* (In the 1913 edition of the song book appears, among others, Joe Hill's "The Rebel Girl," written out of his affection for our own late Elizabeth Gurley Flynn who was then, at the age of 23, a seasoned veteran of the labor movement.)

Joe Hill was living in Salt Lake City in 1914 when a grocer, John G. Morrison, and his son Arling, were murdered in Morrison's grocery store. No robbery was committed and there were strong indications that revenge was the motive for the shooting. Several suspects were picked up and released. Two "respectable" neighbors of Morrison who were known to be his enemies were never taken into custody. But a few days after the murders, Joe Hill fell haplessly into the hands of the law and from then on the furies of capitalist justice hounded him relentlessly.

Dr. Foner's book recounts in convincing detail the sequel to Joe Hill's arrest. Once his captors learned that they had in custody an active member of the I.W.W., Joe's fate was sealed. The rules of evidence and fair trial procedure were ignored sufficiently to enable a willing jury to bring in the required guilty verdict.

The second half of *The Case of Joe Hill* is mostly an account of the defense campaign which tried to save Joe's life. It was slow in starting, for Joe himself at first insisted the whole matter was personal and that his defense did not warrant the expenditure of funds which might otherwise be used for organizing. By April 1914, however, he accepted the necessity for a mass defense as being important to the I.W.W. as well as to himself.

Foner shows how this campaign, from a slow and modest beginning, grew into a great international struggle. The crass frameup of Joe Hill engaged the sympathetic attention of the Swedish Minister in Washington and he became one of Joe's most vigorous and influential partisans. President Woodrow Wilson appealed to the Governor of Utah to grant a stay of execution and such a reprieve was reluctantly granted. But Joe was not given the second trial he sought. Two days before the execution, President Wilson again appealed for further consideration by the State

of Utah, but this time his intervention was rudely rejected. Joe Hill was shot to death by a firing squad on the morning of November 19, 1915.

Hill, after his conviction by a hostile court, always insisted that given a second, and fair, trial he could prove his innocence. He never got a second trial in Utah but he has gotten it, at last, in Philip Foner's book.