

AUGUST, 1970

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE RANK-AND-FILE UPSURGE

Gus Hall

SOCIALIST COUNTRIES AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

James E. Jackson

REVOLUTION IN THE ARAB WORLD

Tom Foley

CRITICAL REMARKS ON A "CRITICAL THEORY" [MARCUSE]

Robert Steigerwald

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION: LIARS INCARNATE

Herbert Aptheker

80¢

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Gus Hall

The Rank-and-File Upsurge: A New
Page in Working-Class History 1

James E. Jackson

The Socialist Countries and the Class
Struggle in the Capitalist Countries 15

Tom Foley

Revolution in the Arab World 26

Robert Steigerwald

Critical Remarks on a "Critical Theory" 33

Herbert Aptheker

The Nixon Administration: Liars Incarnate
(Part II) 43

BOOK REVIEWS

Oakley C. Johnson

The Rebel Thirties 55

H. C. Steinmetz

Churchill Revisited 59

Gaylord C. Leroy

Christopher Caudwell: A Marxist Critique 63

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

The Rank-and-File Upsurge: A New Page in Working-Class History

The 900 delegates who attended the Rank-and-File Conference at Chicago on June 27-28, representing the organized base of the rank-and-file movement within the trade unions, made important history. The Conference marks a new chapter in militant working-class history. However, it was not the beginning of this important development. It was, in fact the product and reflection of the unprecedented rise of special grass-roots organizational forms that workers have developed to meet the challenge of sharpening class confrontation.

The Chicago Conference gave a national focus to this upsurge. But of course it was more than a reflection. It gave the movement new impetus and direction. It gave birth to new organizational forms on a national scale. The newly elected National Coordinating Committee of some 130 men and women from shops, mines and mills adds a new dimension to trade unionism. It is a movement that will revitalize and remold the trade union movement. Right from the start it stated:

We are a movement in the labor movement. We exist to help build, strengthen and unify it, to help defend it from attacks by the Nixon Administration and big business, to help democratize the trade unions through the elimination of racism in all its forms and by supporting maximum control over the affairs of the unions by the membership. . . .

The rank and file *is* the labor movement. There can be no revitalization of the trade unions without the maximum involvement of the membership. Organized labor cannot decisively defeat the corporations' anti-labor offensive without bringing the power of its million-fold membership into motion. This is our aim: to move our unions into effective action in defense of the best interests of the entire membership.

Thus the delegates placed the question squarely on the table of the conference and made it a priority order of business for the working-class movement as a whole.

The delegates represented the very best that there is in our trade unions, the very best of the working-class forces. They were the most militant, the most articulate—the leaders of the new rank and file of labor. Of the delegates 35 per cent were Black workers, 27 per cent were women workers and about 33 per cent were young

workers. They came from every industry and trade, but 70 per cent were from the basic industries. They came from more than one half of the fifty states.

The New Rank-and-File Movement

In many ways it was a conference without precedent because it reflects a movement without precedent in working-class history.

What is there in the class struggle, within the trade union movement that gives rise to these special forms of struggle? There are, of course, problems in each industry, in each trade and profession that give rise to special forms of struggle. But these rank-and-file forms have now sprung up everywhere—in steel, in auto, in the building trades, amongst the teachers, the longshoremen and the teamsters. From this it is obvious that there are underlying critical problems and challenges facing the working class and the people as a whole, problems in the structure of the trade union movement as a whole.

This present unprecedented working-class, grass-roots upsurge and the new problems of the class struggle are related to the new stage in the decay of U.S. capitalism. There is a set of interrelated problems arising from the crisis development of capitalism. The list of problems to which there are no solutions keeps getting ever longer.

In this situation old remedies are no longer realistic and the old forms and levels of class struggle are insufficient. Therefore life gives birth to new solutions and to new forms of struggle. This new rank-and-file movement is such a new form and it is seeking new solutions to the crisis. It is therefore an historic movement that inevitably arises from the very essence of the new stage of the crisis and of sharpening class contradictions within U.S. capitalism.

When the trade union movement does not fully measure up to the challenge of a new period and when the trade union structure does not provide the forms for rank-and-file power, new forms will inevitably arise. In the history of the U.S. trade union movement this type of development has been the rule and not the exception. There are objective factors that give rise to this relationship of forces. The basic cause, of course, lies in the class-collaborationist policies of the great bulk of the trade union leadership. This leads to unnecessary economic compromises. It leads to acceptance of the class enemy's position in politics. It leads to acceptance of the class enemy's ideology. These weaknesses are clearly evident in the acceptance and the promotion of racism within the trade union movement. They are evident in the support for capitalist candidates for public office. These are fundamental factors.

But there are other factors that weigh upon and tend to influence even well-meaning officers on all levels. These officers of necessity must be involved in negotiations and carrying out of labor contracts. These contracts are entangled in a web of laws and governmental regulations. Within the trade union officialdom this tends to blur class lines. It creates hesitation and a backing down from positions of sharp class confrontation. It tends to tie the officers in a web of legalities. Local union officers are also restricted by the bureaucratic structure of national unions.

These are objective factors that tend to influence and mold the nature and the role of trade union officers. They tend to create a gap between the officials and the rank and file. They are, therefore, also part of the objective framework that gives rise to the need for rank-and-file movements. Honest trade union officers who want to fight against these factors, against these pressures will welcome an active rank-and-file movement. These are influences that are always present. But when the crisis and the contradictions deepen, these relationships between the leadership and the rank and file tend to become sharp and explosive. This results in new and special forms of struggle. It is this that we are witnessing in the rise of the rank-and-file movement today.

In most unions it is impossible, and at best difficult, for individual members to express their sentiments. The special forms give the rank and file a chance to speak as a united force.

The Thirties and Now

Each stage of a deepening crisis gives rise to new forms of the class struggle. In the 1930's the working class was face to face with critical problems. Prosperity was around the corner that was never reached. The old bureaucratic trade union leadership did not recognize the unemployed or the problems of job security. Old solutions were not enough. The old forms of the class struggle had become outdated. The old craft trade union structure was not only outdated but because of its policies of class partnership it had become an obstacle. The old level of militancy was not enough. The open class partnership policies pursued by the unions, the lack of working-class politics, had become obstacles to meeting the new problems.

But the class struggle burst through these old barriers. The propellant was the rank and file. The new militant mass trade unions were built by the rank and file. Most of the leadership and the structure of the CIO appeared on the scene only after it was obvious to everyone that the workers in the basic industries were going to build new forms and pursue new policies of militant struggle. This is the really

meaningful history of the CIO. The history of most of the leaders was one of years of resistance to organization of new unions, years of wavering and hesitation, maneuvering and compromising. After the unification of the AFL-CIO the united organization settled back into a new pattern of conservatism, of class collaboration and opportunistic compromise. This again created new problems for the rank and file.

Now U.S. capitalism has entered a new stage of crisis development. There are new critical problems facing the working class and so again old remedies are no longer solutions. And again the old forms of the class struggle are not enough. The level of trade union militancy, the classless politics of its leadership, the lack of class unity, and the bureaucratic trade union leadership structure again do not measure up to the problems of today. In total, they do not meet the present level of developments. And so it is that life has again given rise to a movement that is breaking through the old barriers, the old class structure. It is pushing to break with old forms and methods of class struggle.

And again, the power and the initiative comes from the rank and file. This new movement, while in the best tradition of the U.S. working class, is also without precedent in many ways. This is because the problems are different, because the trade union structure and level of development are different, but mainly because the rank and file have learned from the past experiences. There is a more determined feeling about making the special rank-and-file forms a permanent feature of our trade unions.

The present rank-and-file movement has already the most extensive network of organizational forms. But it is above all without precedent in its potential. It possesses the realistic possibility of making a fundamental change in the nature and essence of the trade union movement. It has within its scope the power to change the trade union movement from its present class-collaborationist, narrow economic nature to a working-class movement led and influenced by its most militant, Left-progressive, Communist sector. This potential is present in the existing currents and trends. It is propelled by the inner logic of the sharpening class confrontation.

Roots of Rank-and-File Action

The working class faces many serious economic problems. Automation keeps chewing up jobs. Job security is of deep concern to all workers. This process has created a dead-end economic situation for millions of workers and especially for Black, Chicano, and Puerto Rican workers. The development of automation has qualitatively added to the problems of the working class. These solutions require

qualitatively new approaches to such basic questions as hours of work and wages. They require fundamental shifts in the approach to economic demands. The trade union leadership's approach has been to retreat and accommodate to the monopolies on this question. While the rank and file do not have the specific answers, they demand a new approach to their solution. Nixon's answer is more production from each worker. Increase in labor productivity means speedup. For this purpose he set up a government speedup board called the National Commission on Productivity. It is significant that many leaders of the trade unions eagerly joined in this government industrial speedup project. To the rank and file, these attempts and the attitude of trade union leaders are of grave concern.

The U.S. policy of imperialist aggression has emerged both as a serious moral problem and an urgent economic problem for workers. Their sons are being killed. The priorities of the government are war priorities. These are resulting in escalation of taxes and the cost of living. In spite of these clearly anti-working-class priorities, most of the trade union leadership supports them either openly or by remaining neutral. This is cause for growing anger and a mood of revolt in the ranks of labor. It leads to the crystalization of special forms, through which the rank and file can express their anti-war sentiments.

The military-industrial complex continues its policies of racism against Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican workers, both in their hiring and upgrading. The Nixon Administration, in support of its racist "Southern Strategy," is moving to roll back even the small gains in civil rights. The gap of racial, economic, political and social inequality is widening. Most of the trade union leadership gives its support, again either openly or by remaining silent. There is the continuation of these racist policies in the trade union structure. On the other hand, in the rank and file there is a growing awareness of the need for working-class unity. Because of the sharpening confrontation, class unity has become an urgent matter. Many now see racism as an instrument of class division. The Black workers are in rebellion against these policies. It is this that has given rise to the special rank-and-file forms of Black caucuses and committees. Thus racism in its many forms is of growing concern for the rank and file.

The Nixon administration is pushing for every possible kind of anti-labor laws. These include the free and easy use of the anti-labor injunction, further restriction of the right to strike, compulsory arbitration settlements, and the barring of the trade union membership from having the final say on labor contracts. These proposed laws present real dangers to the trade unions. But again, the leader-

ship goes about its merry way. The Meany-Lovestone clique has joined Nixon in supporting laws that would bar the membership from voting on contracts that affect their very lives. All this is of serious concern to the rank and file.

The Wagner Labor Act and Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, under which labor achieved such great gains in the organizing drives of the 1930s, were emasculated after World War II by the Taft-Hartley Act and later even more by the Landrum-Griffin Act. Thus, the government intervened for the employers and established government controls over the unions. This has recently been further emphasized by employer domination in the National Labor Relations Board and by giving support to union-busting "right-to-work" laws.

The government is more and more dominated by the forces of monopoly. Its actions are an even more negative factor in relation to the quality of life of United States workers. But the trade union leadership continues its policy of supporting the politics and the politicians of the class enemy. These policies are a source of growing concern and unhappiness to the rank and file.

Because of these developments the mood of rebellion has been growing among the rank and file. They have waited for leadership from any level of the trade union movement. The rank-and-file workers were ready to support the promise that was expressed in the formation of the Alliance for Labor Action, but it has largely remained a promise. The mood of concern, frustration and rebellion has been growing. That it would find some organizational expression was inevitable. When the old forms, the old structure, and the old levels of militancy, unity and politics do not serve the level of struggle required to meet the new challenge, new forms are inevitable.

Increasingly, the workers have taken things into their own hands. They have voted down contract proposals that had been adopted by the leadership. They have called rank-and-file strikes—strikes that have been organized and led by the rank and file. They have organized rank-and-file committees and caucuses. In ever growing numbers they are rejecting the old leadership slates. Such slates have recently been defeated in unions like the New York Painters and the Los Angeles Electricians. The Chicago Conference was the gathering on a national scale of this growing rank-and-file movement.

Leadership Opposition

Only a handful of middle-layer trade union officials identified themselves with this movement. The rest showed opposition and great fear. This fact only further raised the concern of the rank and file.

There is good reason why many trade union officials fear an active

rank and file. But why should any honest trade union leader have fears about this movement? It is a movement within the trade unions. It adds a new, healthy, vigorous and progressive dimension to trade unionism. Why should any honest trade union leader fear *such* an active rank and file? This movement is obviously not motivated by shallow, abstract, factional considerations about trade union leadership. This is not dual unionism. This is not anti-unionism. Of course, trade union officials who will not join the struggle to meet the challenge of this crisis, officers who will continue as of old, will no doubt be retired through the efforts of such a rank-and-file movement.

Even some of the better trade union leaders showed fears about this Conference. These are leaders who speak about the need for "an active rank and file." But in many cases it seems they are for an "active rank and file" only if it is not led by the rank and file. They are for an "active rank and file" if it is contained within the present structural confines of the unions controlled and led by the elements of a bureaucratic officialdom. But the rank-and-file movement of today cannot be confined to such limited and narrow structural forms.

The comments on the Chicago Conference by one such leader are revealing. After saying he is not concerned either about Nixon's anti-labor policies or about the rise of conglomerates he then said:

I cannot quite reconcile the support of the so-called Rank-and-File Conference to be held in Chicago *ostensibly* for the purpose of doing the work *national unions are supposed to do*. It is a rump conference. I see it as a sign of *drifting back* to where the labor movement was being *divided up* more and more instead of being united on a national basis and I refer specifically to the ideas of the T.U.E.L. and T.U.U.L. Such divisions, calling it rank-and-file or anything else, I doubt will do any good. (Emphasis added.)

Many things could be said about such a statement. It shows utter confusion about the past and the nature of the present state of affairs. To speak about the Conference as "ostensibly for the purpose" is to use the weapon of the enemy. This is an obvious attempt to raise questions about "ulterior motives." This is a hint of the old "red herring."

As to the charge that the Conference is "for the purpose of doing the work that national unions are supposed to do." That is well put. That is just the point. The rank and file is forced to find new forms of "doing the work national unions are supposed to do" because the national unions are "supposed to" but don't.

What about the charge that "it is a rump conference"? If it was "a rump conference" then so is the rank-and-file movement, and so

are the caucuses and the other organizational forms this movement is taking in every industry and trade. If the writer of the statement goes so far as to say that rank-and-file forms are all "rump" forms, then of course we have a fundamental difference about the nature of the class struggle and the nature of the trade union movement. It means he has moved into the camp of class collaboration and "business" trade unionism, which is a "rump" movement on the top away from the path of struggle. The Chicago Conference did not set up any "outside" organizations. The Conference and the rank-and-file movement are as much a part of the trade unions as anything can be. The new dimension that it adds to trade unionism should be welcomed by all honest trade union leaders.

It is a mistake to view anything that disturbs the old structure as a "rump" movement. Without such movements the trade unions would still be where they were with Gompers. And this brings us to the question of history as related by this trade union leader. The Trade Union Education League and the Trade Union Unity League were Left- and Communist-led formations of a rank-and-file revolt against the old reactionary, encrusted, narrow and bigoted leaders of the old craft unions. These Left formations were a decisive factor in building the organized force that finally broke the back of the reactionary leadership clique that through terror and bureaucracy sat on the executive boards of a few narrow craft unions. From these positions they joined the open-shop employers in opposing any union organization in the fast-growing mass production industries. From my own experience I know the union in the steel industry was at that time made up of only a few hundred skilled men—the highest paid. They barred the rank-and-file steel workers from membership. The steel workers had to break through this inner barrier to the class struggle.

It is sad that a trade union leader who himself is a product of the struggle against that old bureaucratic barrier now refers to it as "when the labor movement was being divided." This is an Alice-in-Wonderland concept of history. The very brightest and proudest moment in the building of the trade unions, a period of labor's greatest revitalization, a period of its greatest breakthrough, is turned into a period of "dividing the trade unions." On second thought, I am sure no one will insist on such an interpretation of history.

No honest observer or participant can deny the bureaucratic and stifling nature of the trade union structure. The CIO, because of the pressures of the rank-and-file workers, created a more democratic structure for the unions in the mass production industries. However, since the uniting of the AFL-CIO, the unified structure has generally reverted back to extreme bureaucracy. Slowly the membership has been pushed to where it has very little power.

Trade Union Democracy

The rank-and-file movement is a reaction to this state of affairs. It is not a matter of abstract rights. There is a growing awareness that only an active rank and file can sustain an active militant trade union policy. A trade union without an active rank and file wheels and deals from positions of weakness. The need to have an active rank-and-file movement is not new. What is new is that its emergence has become the most crucial question facing the working class. This is because there can be no revitalization of the trade union movement without its simultaneous democratization. In this spirit the Rank-and-File Conference stated:

This kind of labor movement is possible only if it is truly democratic. The real signs of a democratic labor movement are:

The right to strike when bargaining fails to settle any grievance in a reasonably short time.

The right of the membership to a final say on all contracts and collective bargaining agreements must be written into union constitutions.

A strong steward system; one steward for no more than 25 workers; and a system of stewards councils by union and by geographic area—local union stewards councils and local overall city and county stewards councils; statewide single union stewards councils and all-union statewide stewards councils; national single union stewards councils and all-union national stewards councils. This is the best guarantee of union democracy and membership control over the affairs of the unions and the labor movement as a whole. Such a structure, based on full equality and representation of white, black and other minority group workers, would make rank-and-file committees unnecessary, for the membership would then have a clear, unobstructed means of direct expression on all matters.

The elimination of all racist practices in all walks of union life; the participation in meaningful numbers of black and brown workers alongside their white brothers and sisters at all levels, and especially policy-making levels of leadership.

The fullest involvement of women and youth in all walks of union life. . . .

Some trade union officials have often stated that they would do differently "if only the rank and file would support them." They say their hands are tied because of lack of rank-and-file support. Many times there is an element of truth in these statements. But does it not follow that such officers of the trade unions should now all the more support the rank and file movements, because this is the fulfillment of their "wish"? If they don't support these movements then all the talk about wanting to act differently is just

that—talk.

Honest trade union leaders should take a new look at this movement. The factors that give rise to it are not transitory. They are deep and basic. Its rise is both inevitable and explosive. What motivates the working class is clearly stated in the speeches and documents of the Chicago Conference. The Declaration of Labor's Rights states:

One. The right to organize into unions, to collective bargaining on wages, hours and the conditions of labor, to sell our labor or to withhold it in one or another form of work stoppage, are the inherent rights of every trade union man and woman. . . .

Two. American workers as a whole, white and black, and of every national origin and race, never had these rights granted to them from on high. . . .

Three. Even then, these legal gains are not won for all time. Big corporation interests in the government have always tried to break down our legal defenses and to shackle labor once again.

Recent Supreme Court decisions widening the powers of federal and state judges to issue injunctions forcing workers back to the machines are aimed at denying us the right to strike over grievances to improve our conditions of labor. . . .

The stacking of the Supreme Court, the Justice Department, the National Labor Relations Board, the Bureau of Mines and other government agencies with pro-big business, anti-labor, and often racist representatives. . . .

The Nixon legislative program for laws which would deny union members the right to vote on contract settlements, to outlaw multiple union bargaining, and to impose settlements under a so-called "emergency disputes" plan are aimed at destroying real collective bargaining and to make a mockery of the right to strike.

The Nixon economic program calls for "wage restraints" and greater productivity in the name of fighting inflation.

U.S. policies of imperialist aggression were sharply condemned by the Conference. This position clearly reflects the growing anti-war sentiment in the ranks of labor. It is expressed in this form because the trade union leaders have blocked its expression in any other form. Thus, the delegates declared:

We oppose the tragic war in Southeast Asia which has cost more than 43,000 American lives and many more thousands of Vietnamese lives, which is the cause of ever-mounting inflation and taxes and the erosion of our living standards and domestic tranquility. In their support of the invasion of Cambodia and the war in Vietnam, certain leaders of the AFL-CIO neither consulted the membership, nor speak for it.

Black-White Unity

One of the most significant features of the rank-and-file movement has been the growing unity between Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican and white workers. This is a class unity that is being hammered and steeled in the fires of the sharpening class struggle. This new unity is growing to the extent that the white workers are shedding influences of racism as they discover it as a tool of the employers. This new unity grows because the Black workers reject the concept of separatism. The Black caucuses have all moved in the direction of influencing the whole class towards unity and united struggles. This new unity grows as the class consciousness grows. This growing class consciousness in the ranks of the working class is the most formidable barrier against racism and white chauvinism in all its forms, in all sectors of our life.

This new class unity was clearly evident at the Chicago Conference. It is significant that all attempts to create divisions were rejected. The actions and statements of the Conference reflect this new understanding and new unity. One statement said:

. . . we call upon our unions and all organized labor to join hands with the black freedom movement, the Chicano and Puerto Rican freedom movements, the students and professional people, the peace movements and the farm movements in a mighty coalition comprising the majority of Americans to compel a complete change in the direction of governmental policy away from war, repression and racism, and towards peace and the expansion of democratic rights.

In reality there were two rank-and-file conferences in Chicago which became very closely interrelated. The significance of this relationship cannot be overstated. A week before the National Rank-and-File Conference there took place a very important local conference of over 300 Black trade unionists. This conference endorsed the National Rank-and-File Conference. And it adopted a militant statement on the struggle against racism. This statement in turn, was adopted by the National Rank-and-File Conference. The relationship between these two conferences is a reflection of the growing working-class unity on a new level. The statement adopted by the two conferences said in part:

Today, in the age of freedom for oppressed nations around the world, the hour has struck to close the door on the remains of slavery once and for all; to open a new era of full equality and dignity in all areas of industry, in the communities and in the labor movement.

The essence of the new freedoms we seek is economic, social and political parity with our white brothers and sisters NOW.

Both of these conferences adopted as their own the mass Petition Against Genocide that was initiated by a previous conference held in Chicago, the National Conference Against Repression.

This does not mean the struggle against racism is over. It does not mean we can be satisfied that everything is being done that is necessary. Racism and racist practices are not over in industry. Racism continues within the trade unions. But what must be seen is the significance of this new, powerful movement and that it cannot itself succeed unless it makes the struggle against racism a matter of principle and places it in the very center of its work. These conferences have molded a new weapon with which to fight chauvinism and racism.

The new spirit of working class unity was expressed in one of the keynote speeches:

Workers are different. Workers are brothers and sisters and they belong in the same house, even when they have honest differences. We want one labor federation cleansed of racism once and for all. We want a labor federation where our union sisters have their rightful place in leadership. We want a federation where you don't have to be 65 years old to sit on the executive council. We want a federation with fighting leadership, not a federation that endorses a wage-freeze and awards an honorary hard-hat to the worst anti-labor President we've ever had. . . .

There's been an unprecedented growth of more or less permanent and stable rank-and-file organization in a very wide variety of forms and we sort of represent where that's at right now. I think outstanding in that growth of rank-and-file unionism has been the Black caucus movement. This is an historic development. Historic, because it places before the labor movement a question that cannot be dodged—the issue of racism in the unions. It puts the organized strength of the Black workers behind justice on the job and full citizenship in the union. And now what we white workers have got to do is see to it that our white brothers and sisters understand that this is in our interests and we need to join and fight side-by-side with our Black brothers and sisters.

Political Spectrum

The rank-and-file movement has its political spectrum. They were represented at the Conference. The Conference was mainly of the Left and center forces. In the rank-and-file movements generally, the Right element is missing. In this relationship the Left forces are the initiators. They provide the movement with militancy and

understanding. They give leadership to the non-Left sector. This is, in fact, the key to their success. They are the most effective where they avoid the trap of empty radical rhetoric. They are the most successful where they understand that they are the key force in the rank-and-file movement but also that they are not the only force.

This was a serious working-class conference. The attempts to disrupt the conference by some small groups of Trotskyites and other way-out disruptive sects were not successful. For example, an attempt was made to stampede the Conference into calling an on-the-spot general strike on the issue of war. These sects would not agree that the Conference should work to reach a point where a call would be a realistic one. They would not agree that the trade unions are a necessary ingredient to be involved in calling a general strike. Their attempts to disrupt behind a radical-sounding cover were rejected. This is not the end of the disruptive efforts from the Right or the "Left." The rank-and-file movement will continue to face the problem of disruptive forces trying to either pull it out and separate it from the trade union movement by empty radical rhetoric, or by the Right-wing forces who will attempt to push it out of the trade union movement by such tactics as red-baiting or calling it a dual union movement. If the coordinating committee carefully watches against these pitfalls these disruptive moves will fail.

The Conference was a reflection of an ongoing struggle. It created a new instrument for the class struggle. It represented both the organized base of the rank-and-file movement and the spontaneous combustible element that is present.

The fulfillment of its great promise rests with the leaders and cadre of this movement. It rests with the militant and the more advanced elements of this movement. It is going to take a lot of hard work, organization, mobilization and initiative. This determination is clearly stated in a letter the two co-chairmen sent to the participants after the Conference had finished its work. It says in part:

Through your efforts and cooperation, we have all come through an historic conference. Given that same effort and cooperation to now carry forward the great aims of this movement, you are destined to be a participant in making a great change in the trade unions of our country. Together, we can make the trade unions MOVE in defense of our needs and interests; together, we will make it a DEMOCRATIC labor movement.

Whether all this will come to pass depends on what we do in the next few weeks. The great enthusiasm and momentum of our conference must not be allowed to peter out. Now is the time to:

Organize large REPORT-BACK meetings in every locality. . . .

Build and extend your local and area coordinating committees. Elect a representative steering committee.

Conferences and movements make history if they are supported and sustained by the powers, the currents and the trends that make history. Conferences make history if they become a factor in the further development of such trends. Measured by this yardstick the Chicago Rank-and-File Conference can become one of the most meaningful events of history.

Some years ago C. Wright Mills was reported in an article in *Ramparts* (August 1965) as saying: "For Marx the proletariat was the history-making agency. Now any fool can see that it's not true." Also: "Look, in order to develop a New Left we have to kick this labor metaphysic."

The growth of the rank-and-file movement and the successful Chicago Conference is new proof that even a fool should now see that Marx was right. The working class is "a history-making agency."

The July issue of *Political Affairs* was incorrectly designated as Vol. XLIX, No. 5 instead of Vol. XLIX, No. 7. It should be considered as No. 7. The current issue is accordingly designated as No. 8.

The Socialist Countries and the Class Struggle in the Capitalist Countries

The questions which I shall speak to have to do with the correlation between the quality of Communist Party leadership in the socialist countries and the cause of the struggle of the working class in the advanced capitalist countries. That is to say: how the vanguard role of the Party and the leading role of the working class exerts an influence upon the world revolutionary process when that party and class operate from a position of state power.

Marching at the head of their class—the working class—and rallying to their banners the great masses of the toiling farmers, the oppressed nationalities and all the forces of progress of the nation, embracing the broad rally of the youth and intellectuals, the Communist parties have already delivered a third of mankind from the penury of capitalism and established a community of socialist states which stands as *the most determinative political reality* in the world today. The very presence of the socialist sector of the world attests to the way the relationship of forces has shifted in favor of the world working-class revolutionary cause.

This most obvious fact of all has brought great benefits to mankind as a whole.

Only the fact that aggressive centers of world imperialism have to calculate on the opposition of a powerful collective of countries in which the working class holds power accounts for the failure of world imperialism in general and U.S. imperialism in particular to have unleashed four or five more Vietnam wars for political conquest, territorial aggrandizement and colonial restoration. But the power of the world socialist system is far greater and more meaningful than the simple arithmetical expression—one third of the world's people—can convey.

Each socialist state is born with a moral superiority over even the oldest and most accomplished capitalist state and each day of its life is marked by some new capacity to serve the needs of man. Every success registered by the Communist parties in leading the working people of hand and brain in the socialist countries to new rungs of

* Text of a lecture presented at a conference of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, held in Berlin, German Democratic Republic, in June 1970.

achievement in the economic, cultural and social upbuilding of the new society further enhances the capacity of socialism, of the working class in power, to provide the workers in the capitalist system with evidence of the viability of the socialist alternative to rule of the monopolists.

The Sword and the Dollar

The policy of aggressive intervention in the internal national concerns and assaults upon the sovereign integrity of other countries is the general operational policy of the ruling circles of U.S. imperialism. Behind the two-faced mask of Nixon's demagoguery and double-talk the stern-jawed line of what Professor Seymour Melman has dubbed "Pentagon Capitalism" in his new and significant book of the same title, is unmistakable. This imperialism of the Sword and the Dollar "both breeds and needs foreign and domestic crises."

The imperialist ruling circles in the United States, which have elevated the Pentagon to a major presence in their policy determinations, have no projection for America's future other than additions to the chain of Vietnam wars and nuclear confrontations. This tendency of the governing clique of U.S. monopolists to seek to impose the answers they desire by resort to police force at home and military incursions into other peoples' countries abroad has been given new expression in recent weeks. Out of the barrels of the guns of the Washington ruling circles has come not security and order for the victims of their aggression, but the opening of new fronts of battle abroad and a deepening general crisis at home.

Nixon's sneak invasion of Cambodia behind the back of an already smoldering public opinion he had sought to assuage with a lying declaration that he would promptly begin large-scale troop withdrawal from Vietnam, was something more than a testament to the weight which the military exerts on White House decisions. It was also no doubt intended as the tossing of a bone to the increasingly fretful wolves of Wall Street where the graph of falling stock prices has been taking on the configuration of the dragging tail of a sick dog. ("If I had money," Nixon was reported as saying, "I would buy stock." Whether anyone took his tip or not was not reported, but the market quotations fell ten per cent the day the press carried his comment!)

The expansion of the U.S. war in Southeast Asia from Vietnam into Cambodia and Laos, and the pressing of Thailand's mercenaries into the fray have converted the war against Vietnam into a war of the entire Indochina peninsula against all the expeditionary forces of U.S. imperialism and its subservient arms-bearing vassals. The unconscion-

able cynical dispatch of U.S. soldiers on aimless missions, to kill and be killed, as a stock-manipulating device and as a conciliatory gesture to his war-loving generals brought him no honors for his "trickiness." Rather, what came forth from the people was an explosion of wrathful demonstrations and protests such as have never occurred before in the history of the country.

Especially vociferous in their instant protest were the youth of the country. Attacking the students as "bums," Nixon and Agnew incited the lyncher types among the National Guardsmen, the police and his mythical silent majority—in real life the Birchites, racists and the embryonic-fascist cabal. In quick succession came the Guardsmen's murder of four Kent State University students and the wounding of others, the police killing of two Jackson State College students and the wounding of others, and the execution by shotgun bullets in the back of six young Black people in Augusta, Georgia during a demonstration against another police murder in prison.

The impact of these encounters between a young generation of thirty million Americans and the armed gunmen who are the upholders and enforcers of the government's policies at home illuminated the issues in the instant like a flash of lightning illuminating the night: The crimes that the government's gunmen commit on the campus and in the Black people's ghettos against the peace and freedom advocates is seen as a home-front exhibition of the crimes against humanity which the government orders call forth in Vietnam. ("In My Lai did you kill those babies too?" a reporter asked a confessing GI. "The babies too," he replied.)

An Upsurge of Struggle

To the main active body of the youth of our land the issue is basic, the issue is clear: either with the killers of those who rise to fight for peace and freedom, or with peace and freedom against the killers and the policies of the government that sent them.

There was accomplished with electrifying speed the first general strike of students and entire college communities in the nation's history. The campuses of a thousand schools were transformed into peace and political action centers for the mobilization of the working-class communities of black and white workers, for amassing pressures on Washington for Congress to intervene to impose the people's will against the President's usurpation of power, to stop the war and withdraw the troops. In the first twenty days of May some 5,000 street parades, marches and demonstrations swept across the country and penetrated the most remote places with an outpouring of public clamor to end the war now.

The Communist Party was a respected presence in the whole gamut of actions which blanketed the nation. In a number of activities of major import, the Communist Party played the key initiating role. In the very first days it projected a clear call in a million copies for mass actions against the government's policies in Indochina, relating them to the rising tide of repression against popular liberties and assault on the Black liberation movement at home. It called to the workers to defend their livelihood against the economic consequences of the war-disjointed economy by united support to the students' initiatives in the battle for peace and an end to the Vietnam slaughter. The *Daily World* published successive weekly editions of 100,000 copies each.

How significant were the turbulences of the street actions in May and the long shadows they cast over capitalism's sunny complacency?

If the rattle in the throat of U.S. imperialism was not that of the deadly convulsions of the onset of its general crisis, it wasn't just some little hiccup either. Components of its general crisis appeared in sharp definition, visible and audible, and converging one upon the other. The nature of the crisis revealed these features:

a crisis of confidence between the people in general and the government;

a Constitutional crisis between the executive and legislative branches of the government, caused by Nixon's unlawful exercise of war-making authority reserved to the Congress by the Constitution;

a crisis in relations between the government and the forward motion of the Black citizens seeking equal rights;

a crisis of democracy, of the ability of citizens to exercise their civil liberties against police abuses of authority;

a spreading and deepening crisis between the ranks and the higher officer-commands in the armed forces.

All these superstructural crisis factors are imposed on an economic base which is exhibiting deep-going classical crisis symptoms.

In sum, what the May days in the United States revealed was that there is occurring a sharp-breaking deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. It is a crisis which cannot find resolution in tepid or timorous palliatives which leave all major formations as they were. It is a crisis which will remain and accumulate new and explosive factors and will only find resolution by a radical and fundamental change. It is calling forth movements of mass proportions for the strategic resolution of the crisis which is an acute manifestation of a systemic condition.

On the Right the military establishment and the corporate complex which services it, a big section of the monopolies, would seek to enroll Agnew's silent majority into a neo-fascist force to seek solution of the

crisis at the expense of the livelihood and liberties of the working masses.

The crisis summons the masses of trade unionists, black and white toilers of factory and farm, the youth, the women, seekers of peace and creators of cultural works and enlightenment to rally to its challenge. It calls upon them to compose a new popular combination of progressive power to insure organized resistance to any fascist-style encroachments of reaction, and for advancing toward the political establishment of an alternative system to the war-breeding, wrack-and-ruin reign of the big capitalists and their servitors.

The Economic Crisis

At this point I should like to draw your attention to one feature of the crisis situation in America which is basic and will surely have widespread consequences throughout the world. It is our judgment that the U.S. economy is on the skids of an accelerating slide toward the brink of depression of the dimensions of 1929, such as will shake world capitalism to the marrow of its bones. Already, though yet far from the brink, the convulsions within the economy are generating widespread revolutionary political tensions and signalling a speeded-up process of combining the economic and political struggles of the workers in an ascending spiral of class consciousness and revolutionary perspective.

When looking at the fever chart of the economy in capitalist countries the thing that should interest revolutionaries most, it seem to me, is those broad strokes in the pattern which make for the accumulation of maximum tension and build the case for a revolutionary change. It is not the number of floors the lift of the economy falls from its prosperity level that is of decisive significance. What should interest us first of all is the political effect, the impact on social consciousness, the tension for revolutionary action of the workers and broad masses which the consequences of each measure of decline awaken.

The lift of the economy doesn't have to plunge to the basement before the consequent burdens on the masses become unbearable and the tensions of the class struggle attain a revolutionary pitch. The consensus of the young workers in Detroit today is that capitalism will never live to see the day when they will be reduced to selling apples on a street corner or scavenging for food in the rich people's alleys of Grosse Point. Long before the economic indicators hit the basement, U.S. workers will be sufficiently outraged at the system to upturn it and scrap it for a newer model; this is clearly the mood of the majority of American working men today. This month the unemployment rate in the U.S. has passed the five per cent mark. In the city of Seattle

where the Boeing Aircraft plants have just laid off 31,000 workers, the city rate stands at 8.1 per cent.

Almost a fifth of the young adults who are Black are jobless and in some cities the rate runs to 35 to 40 per cent. For some five million American workers this economic downturn, whatever others may call it, is a *depression* and they will react to it as such. There is nothing on the drawing boards to suggest that there is any early prospect of a job in their future. The unemployment rate is up to its highest level since 1965. The nation's factories are operating at less than 80 per cent of capacity. The real gross national product has dropped in the past few quarters. Inflation races ahead of purchasing power in the hands of the masses, and is still running at better than 6 per cent a year. The stock market, Wall Street's prism of greed, which at best reflects little more than the mood of the business community, experienced a drop in stock prices that was three times greater than that of the 1929 crash. The prolonged distortions of the so-called normal economic balance of the system produced by the expenditures and priorities of waging war against the people of Indochina have incubated a cannibalistic growth in the bowels of the system itself.

The war economy has labored long and threatens now to bring forth a depression monster whose issue can have a consequence fatal to the system itself. In his latest pamphlet, *Hard Hats and Hard Facts*, Gus Hall, after reviewing the primary features of the contemporary economic scene, expresses the opinion that:

We are in another depression. The U.S. economy is in the beginning stages of an economic crisis. All of Nixon's policies are geared to bring on an economic crisis for the workers while helping the big corporations to continue making big profits. (New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1970, p. 7.)

Semantic inventions such as "experiencing a period of clashing economic gears," "economic lurches," "turbulence in the economic equilibrium," fail to paper over the revealed deep-going fissures in the economic base of U.S. capitalism. These fissures signify a threatening economic quake in U.S. capitalism which could precipitously accelerate the already deepening general crisis of world capitalism.

Enhancing the Attractive Power of Socialism

I connect this information and opinion on certain aspects of the unrelieved crisis in the United States to the theme of this conference in the following way:

Not only must we be appraising and modeling our parties in our respective countries to correspond to the needs of leadership for the

normal development of all the arduous tasks of socialist construction and/or the daily needs of the class struggle. We have an added duty to enlarge the margin of excellence of our parties' performances so that we may have a full reserve of influence to assist the masses of the capitalist world to choose socialism through the power of attraction of the socialist states.

In "normal" times the achievements of the workers' power led by the Communist parties in the socialist states inspire the parties and the working class in the capitalist countries in many ways. Even the class enemies are compelled to pay a grudging tribute to the standards of achievement set by the workers in power in the socialist countries. Just recently the editor of *Look* travelled with a photographer in the GDR and last week the magazine carried a several-page photo story. In an interview with one citizen he was told in answer to his query as to what the GDR had proved through all of its toil and triumphs: "We have proved that workers are able to run a state and run it at a profit." The editor attested to the truth of what was said on the basis of the testimony of his own eyes.

The revolutionizing impact abroad of the success in socialist accomplishments in the respective countries is given emphasis by Comrade Walter Ulbricht in his article in the Lenin Centenary issue of *World Marxist Review*. He noted that:

Our citizens are conscious of the fact that the results of their peaceful and creative labor are of the greatest significance for the working people of the West German Federal Republic, and that they in the GDR are the pioneers of the future united socialist Germany. They know that the socialist example and the increasing power of attraction exercised by their state will help the democratic forces in West Germany to carry forward the peaceful democratic alternative to the revenge-seeking policies of West German latter-day capitalism. ("Lenin and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany," *World Marxist Review*, April 1970.)

How much more significant will this power of attraction to the living socialist examples be as U.S. capitalism moves deeper and deeper into the mire of its worsening general crisis. The socialist countries are so many showcases of the advantages of socialism to the workers and oppressed peoples of the capitalist world. The Communist parties of the working classes which have attained state power cannot abjure this role of leadership by the attractive power of the example of their works.

In this regard the first party to lead the working class to power, the party that was the trail-blazer of the uncharted path to the successful

building of socialism, Lenin's first vanguard detachment of the great world-wide army of the revolutionary working class and oppressed peoples, has shown the way. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union stands forth as a model of exemplary service to the progress of the world revolutionary process in the capitalist countries as it has been to the toilers of the whole world.

In his address on the occasion of the Lenin Centenary, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, recalling a vital behest in Lenin's teachings, stated: "Communists can successfully carry out the tasks confronting them only if they come forward as a united and cemented international force." He noted that: "Many obstacles stand in the way of implementation of the international line of uniting the fraternal parties" which command the determined efforts of all parties to overcome so that the full strength of the influence of the world Communist movement can come to bear upon the struggles of the peoples "to solve the basic problems worrying the whole of mankind."

The May events in the U.S. herald the commencement of a mighty new upsurge in the revolutionary struggles of the world working-class movement. The new challenges—both grave dangers and mounting opportunities—demand a speeding up of the process of maximum unification of the forces of the world Communist movement in order that full advantage can be taken of the historic moment.

"To the old world of national oppression, national strife or national aloofness the workers," wrote Lenin, "oppose a new world of unity of the working people of all nations, in which there is no room for the slightest oppression of man by man."

The costs of unity will never be less than they are today. The new revolutionary power that will accrue to the world working class from a further enhancement of its unity can bring forth big new socialist victories.

There is a highly focused effort to treat the question of organizational structure and form as something out-of-date, old-fashioned, conservative, irrelevant. But nature knows of no content without an appropriate form. Indeed, appropriate form adds an additional force as Professor Linus Pauling has demonstrated in his elaboration of "resonance" in chemical structure. And that master craftsman and peerless immortal of the science of revolution, V. I. Lenin, stated in his famous work *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*:

. . . Let me tell you gentlemen . . . that the proletariat is not afraid of organization and discipline! The proletariat will do nothing to have the worthy professors and high-school students who do not want to join an organization recognized as Party members merely

because they work under the control of an organization. The proletariat is trained for organization by its whole life, far more radically than many an intellectual prig. Having gained some understanding of our program and our tactics, the proletariat will not start justifying backwardness in organization by arguing that the form is less important than the content. It is not the proletariat, but *certain intellectuals* in our Party who lack *self-training* in the spirit of organization and discipline, in the spirit of hostility and contempt for anarchistic talk. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 389.)

Strengthening Working-Class Ties

U.S. imperialism is beset by a complex of acute internal disorders. The impact of its economic distemper is aggravating the already serious symptoms of a world economic crisis. As these shadows over the capitalist world deepen, multiple millions of capitalism's wage slaves and victims of monopoly robbery and exploitation will be looking at and comparing the model of the alternative system which you comrades of the socialist countries are erecting. In preparing for confronting this challenge, which you welcome and anticipate, we would suggest further attention be given to strengthening the Party and its working-class "image" in the following particulars:

1. Keep to the forefront its working-class emphasis. It is important to the work of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries that the flag of working-class partisanship, concern and appeal is first among all the banners held forth to the world by the workers in state power.

The necessary intercourse between the socialist states and the capitalist countries, the developing of trade, cultural and other contacts, should go forward as a function of the international working-class role of the workers' state and be made comprehensible to the workers suffering under the tyranny of the heads of those very capitalist states. Care must be taken patiently to make clear to the victims of capitalist exploitation that the working class-led states are not "playing footsie" with their cursed enemies.

We do not think there are ever any circumstances when considerations of diplomacy merit Communist parties of socialist states foregoing the development of relations on the party level with parties of the capitalist countries.

2. Not only do we think that the parties of the socialist countries should constantly dramatize the truth of their reality as centers of working-class power and accomplishment which the capitalists cannot sway or buy, but we think also that they are states and parties with a special sensitivity and concern for the dignity and equality of peoples

of whatever national origin, ethnic or racial distinguishing features, or cultural and linguistic variety. They are unequivocating and consistent in their championship of the equality of the nationalities and the militant enemies of racism in any of its manifestations.

3. We think the parties in the socialist countries should be models of concern for the development and well-being of one another, that their relations should be characterized by mutual respect, fraternity and merited esteem.

Any semblance of the imperialist-generated poison of anti-Sovietism should be anathema to Communist parties of the socialist countries, as it is a telltale mark and the brand of the enemy when it crops up in the name of some opportunist handle or other in the orbit of the Communist parties in the non-socialist states.

The Communist parties help their brothers in the capitalist countries when they shun individualist actions and show respect for international solidarity and a spirit of cultivating the bonds of collective action, of solid "Red Front" in their relations with the world of the class enemy.

The disembowelling of the Communist Party of China by the departure of the Maoist leadership from the tried and proven line of the Leninist science of revolution has not only been a painful burden for the Chinese masses to bear; it has undeservedly burdened the entire socialist community of states. Who can calculate the harm done to the developing world revolutionary movement by the Maoist mutation of the Party's role and program in China and in the world revolutionary arena?

The effect of Maoism on the working-class and Communist struggles in the capitalist countries has been a damaging disservice to the world Communist cause. But it has been a boon to the efforts of the imperialist strategists to foster divisionism among the vanguard forces of the anti-imperialists, who are as never before taking the field of struggle against the oppressive consequences of imperialist rule, for ending the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam, against racial and national oppression and for social progress.

The tragic and shameful course taken by the Maoist leadership stands as a warning bell to all to beware the Lorelei-like appeals of the anti-ideology pragmatists and opportunists to take short cuts or detours from the Marxist-Leninist route to negotiating the difficult channel that leads to the triumph of socialism.

Clearly, one of the most important of the recent contributions which the parties of the socialist countries have made to the furthering of the parties and the world revolutionary process in the capitalist countries has been the great amount of work done in popularizing the achieve-

ments of socialism, in engaging in a really world-wide, mass way in the ideological struggle with the enemies of socialism, and with the distorters and revisionists of the great scientific heritage of Marxist-Leninist teachings.

This great educational campaign takes place in connection with the centennial anniversary of the birth of Lenin. And it is a great satisfaction for me to participate with you in this particular educational event of the Lenin Centenary observations in the GDR.

We American Communists, in our unswerving commitment to working-class internationalism, stand for a relationship among the Communist and Workers parties based on a fraternity of equals. We are for consultation among the parties on the basis of mutual respect. We are absolutely against resort to slander, or to factual intervention by any party in the affairs of other parties. We are opposed to any concept of monolithic unity that would press all working-class parties into one mold. We are opposed to a "polycentrism" entailing several leadership centers in the world Communist movement. We are for the complete independence and autonomy of each party. We declare ourselves bound by no decisions except our own. At the same time, we are fully cognizant of our obligation to defend international working-class solidarity and the interests of the world Communist movement, which require the closest relations with our brother parties.

New Program of the Communist Party USA, p. 128.

Revolution in the Arab World

Profound changes are occurring in the Arab world which are ultimately related to the sharpening contradiction on a world scale between imperialism and socialism. Imperialism is losing its grip on the Middle East, not only in the progressive, socialist-oriented Arab states such as the United Arab Republic and Syria, but in every other part of the Arab world as well. This general Arab movement to break away from imperialist domination would stand little chance of success without the great moral and material support of the socialist countries, first of all the Soviet Union.

In the old days, the imperialists would have drowned this movement in blood. They would still like to. Loss of the Arab world would represent a disaster of unparalleled magnitude for imperialism, in some respects far worse than its loss of China.

China represented a vast potential which imperialism had never fully exploited. The Arab world for more than a half-century has been integrated into the structure of European and U.S. imperialism; Arab oil greased imperialism's wheels and fed its engines and power plants, as Europe discarded coal and turned more and more to petroleum for its industry, armies, navies and air forces. The Arabs also live in the area where three continents come together and where the world's most important air and water routes are located. To lose all this would be a crippling blow to imperialism, a harder blow than it has ever been dealt before. This fact explains to a great extent the chorus of hysterical imperialist outcries about the "Soviet menace" in the Arab world. Without Soviet support, the Arab move to the Left could be defeated.

But this does not entirely explain the internal situation in the Arab world which is producing the general movement of the Arabs against imperialism. That is a difficult and complex phenomenon to analyze and to describe for Americans.

One of the main stumbling-blocks here is that most Americans, including some of the most progressive, have a distorted, stereotyped image of the Arabs and the Arab world. An Arab is a cruel, crafty individual with a pointed goatee and a big, hooked nose, who spends his life on top of his camel counting his oil money, pausing only to threaten to kill all the Israelis. The Arab world is a featureless desert of sand in which the above individuals live. It is not only

illiterate and uneducated Americans who believe in these ridiculous images, but some well-known leaders in the U.S. Left. The tragic aspect of this deplorable ignorance of the Arab world is that it determines political attitudes, which explains some of the apparent "political schizophrenia" the U.S. Left shows between its stand on Vietnam and its position toward the Middle East conflict.

The Arab World

Between the Atlantic Ocean and the Persian Gulf live nearly a hundred million people who might be called or call themselves Arabs, and who live in sharply contrasting environments and societies, some of them as different as Alaska and Mexico.

The outstanding fact about the Arabs is that the vast majority of them, some 70-75 per cent, practice agriculture and are settled on the land their forebears worked before them for centuries. The Arabs are therefore predominantly a peasant, farming people. The idea that they are all nomads is a myth.

There are Arab nomads, of course, but their numbers are swiftly declining. At present they probably represent less than six per cent of the total Arab population. The nomads can be further divided into "camel" nomads and "sheep-and-goats" nomads. The entire life and economy of certain nomadic groups at one time was built around the camel, that hardy, long-distance desert transport animal which they raised for sale. The use of trucks, buses and aircraft in the Middle East in place of the camel has destroyed the economic rationale for these nomadic groups' existence and there are very few of them left today.

The "sheep-and-goats" nomadic groups may be around for some time, but they have always existed on the fringes of settled areas and never ventured very far out into the desert.

This economic change has brought about a significant political change in the Arab world. The "camel" nomads once formed a tough, unified and disciplined group owing allegiance to one leader. Generally, they were better provided with arms and more practiced in using them than any other group. Though their numbers were small in relation to the settled peasant population, they were militarily a superior force. This was especially true in Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Today, it is no longer true and one of the mainstays of feudal power in the Arab world no longer exists.

Every part of the Arab world capable of growing anything is under intense cultivation and usually has been for centuries. This is true of tiny oases in Saudi Arabia, Libya and southern Algeria, where water is carefully husbanded and channelled to produce magnifi-

cent though small crops of dates; it is true of the terraced mountain-side plots of Yemen and southern Arabia, of the lush, California-like valleys of Lebanon, and of the great river-valleys of Iraq and the UAR.

The density of population settled on the land is high, higher than both China and India. In India it is 456 per square mile.

In Lebanon, it is 570 per square mile, and in the UAR's Nile valley and delta it reaches the fantastic figure of 2,200 per square mile. Americans often think of the Arab countries as "new" countries, not remembering that the Middle East is one of the ancient centers of civilization and that Egypt is the oldest continuously-inhabited agricultural area in the world.

But this means that the class structure of these areas has acquired incredible strength and rigidity. Social change in the Arab world must be thought of in these terms, and not in terms of the U.S. or Europe. To change the U.S. means to alter 300 years of history; to change the UAR means to transform the accumulated burden of 7,000 years.

The UAR is at the heart of the Arab world. Geographically it straddles two continents, Africa and Asia, and this gives it unique political and strategic importance. It always was the most heavily-populated of the Arab states and today contains 34 million people so that what affects the UAR in turn affects a large percentage of the Arab people. The UAR was and is the cultural, industrial and political center of the Arab world.)

Under British imperialist rule, 1882-1952, feudalism consolidated its hold on the Egyptian countryside. Cotton, an industrial, cash crop, was best raised on large plantations whose landlords became immensely wealthy while thousands of small peasants were transformed into their tenants. There was a small working class and Egypt had the oldest Communist Party in Africa, formed in 1919. But like much of Egypt's urban population, the working class contained a high percentage of non-Egyptians from all the Mediterranean countries.

The Egyptian Revolution

The revolutionary Egyptian officers who ousted King Farouk in 1952 were neither working-class nor peasant in social origin, but came from the petty bourgeoisie of the towns, perhaps only one step removed from the peasantry. In the beginning, the officers around Gamal Abdel Nasser had only this social origin in common plus their nationalist sentiments, which were strongly anti-foreign.

The potential of the Nasserite group was immense, however, because it had no class ties with feudalism and its nationalist desire to recover

all of Egypt's resources pitted it against the imperialists.

This class position of the Nasser group helps to explain a good many of the zig-zags and sudden changes in the evolution of Egyptian politics from 1952 to the present, for one of the main characteristics of the petty bourgeoisie is its unstable position and consequent waverings between the two basic classes in today's society. Without strong outside support, the Egyptian revolutionaries might have come to terms with the imperialists or with pro-imperialist elements in Egyptian society. Yet this outside support had to be impartial and principled: the slightest intervention in internal Egyptian politics for whatever reason would allow the reactionaries to arouse powerful nationalist, anti-foreign feelings among the masses in order to destroy the revolution. This was an exceedingly thin line to walk, it must be said.

During the period 1955-67, the aid of the socialist countries to the Egyptian revolution provided that impartial, principled support. Most U.S. accounts stress the arms that the socialist countries sold the UAR, although a country located on the most strategic spot on earth does undoubtedly require some means of defending itself.

The fact remains, however, that 85 per cent of Soviet aid to the UAR has been for industrial projects: for iron and steel plants, dams, shipyards, chemical and electronic industries and the like. This aid, to build up the muscles and nerves of a modern Egyptian economy, was bound to have certain long-term political effects. The present author has no "inside" information and has not consulted anyone, in characterizing these expected long-term effects as: 1) the rapid build-up of an industrial working class as a new social force in Egyptian politics; 2) the spread of education and socially progressive ideas among the Egyptian masses; 3) increased political and cultural independence from both local and international capitalism.

In fact, this is precisely what happened. By 1960-61, the process was far enough advanced so that President Nasser could nationalize the "command heights" of Egypt's economy—more than \$1 billion worth of foreign and domestic banking and industry. In 1962, the UAR was officially proclaimed to have a socialist society as its goal. Not everybody was happy about this.

Petty capitalist and feudal elements whose field of action was being increasingly circumscribed by this socialist development went into more active opposition. There was also a new, middle-peasant group who had benefitted from the anti-feudal land reform measures since 1952, and who can only be called "kulaks" who opposed any further progress. Finally, there was what might be called a "neo-bourgeois" group. It included individuals who made big profits from

housing construction and distribution of the products of state enterprises, as well as others who operated in a semi-legal way within the state apparatus and who were busily enriching themselves by peddling "pull." This "neo-bourgeois" group feared any more socialist measures too.

Counter-Revolutionary Efforts

All of these elements had combined before the 1967 war with a plan to overthrow Nasser and to re-establish ties with imperialism. One of their leaders was Shams al-Din Badran, UAR War Minister, who systematically kept all Soviet-trained UAR officers out of command positions in the armed forces. Another was Armed Forces Commander Abdel Hakim Amer, who told Nasser during the terrible days of June 1967 that he could get rid of him without lifting a finger.

This attempt to use the UAR military defeat to get rid of Nasser did not succeed. When Nasser resigned, the masses of the UAR took things into their own hands. On the night of June 9, they poured out into the streets shouting "No!" Nasser and the UAR's anti-imperialists were able to stay in power solely because they had mass support which the pro-imperialists knew they could not move against. Naturally, the most active, vocal and easily-mobilized of this mass support was in the UAR's cities, among the new urban working class.

This became even more clear when the pro-imperialists proceeded quietly to arrest, imprison or remove as many of their Leftist opponents as possible after June 1967, and to boost Zakharia Muhi al-Din as a replacement for Nasser. Zakharia Muhi al-Din was known to favor "de-socializing" the UAR economy, but he reckoned without those whose class interests were bound up with the UAR's continued socialist development.

In the spring of 1968, workers' demonstrations broke out in the UAR metallurgical center of Helwan, near Cairo, and spread to other industrial centers.

The strikes and demonstrations on the surface were to protest the mild sentences given those responsible for the June 1967 military disaster. In reality, they were clearly directed against the UAR's right-wing elements. Nasser, with this backing, dismissed Zakharia Muhi al-Din from all his posts and got rid of most of his followers. On March 30, 1968, a new UAR charter officially confirmed the country's socialist goal and foresaw the transformation of the Arab Socialist Union party, in which Egyptian Marxist-Leninists participate, into the leading force in UAR society.

The significance of these events in the UAR simply cannot be underestimated: for the first time, the UAR's industrial working class, *as a class*, exerted the decisive influence in UAR politics. Its role is bound to increase to the point where it becomes the decisive *class* as well as the decisive influence.

This has happened in a country which contains one-third of the world's total Arab population, a country which is the leading industrial, political and cultural power in the Arab world.

Advances in Other Countries

What exactly does this mean to the Arab world? The spring, 1968 events in the UAR should be kept in mind in going over Arab political developments since that time:

1. In Syria, where the Left wing of the Ba'ath Party came into power in February 1966, and where events have followed a somewhat similar course as in the UAR (see the present author's article, "Syria and the Middle East," *Political Affairs*, December 1968). Syria is going through a period of rapid industrialization; socialist aid is helping to build a huge new dam on the Euphrates River in northeast Syria which will be a "second Aswan." The Syrian Communist Party supports the government and a Syrian Communist, Wasil Faisal, sits at the cabinet level as Minister of Communications.

2. In Iraq, where the new Ba'ath leadership during 1969 evolved in a more clearly Left direction, agreed to Communist demands, and in March, 1970, ended the long, fratricidal war with the Kurdish people. The new Iraqi constitution describes Iraq as a bi-national, Arab-Kurdish state. An Iraqi Communist is now Minister of Justice in the government and the party participates in an anti-imperialist national front with the Ba'ath.

3. In the Sudan, largest country in area in Africa, where the May 25, 1969 revolution brought an anti-imperialist government to power with the open support of the Sudanese Communist Party and the Communist-led Sudanese Workers' Trade-Union Federation (SWTUF). The Sudanese government has proceeded to nationalize foreign banks and industries, to work out a five-year plan for the socialist industrialization of the country, and has taken decisive steps to end the "Southern problem"—the conflict which had existed between the northern and southern regions—on a principled basis. There have been seven attempted pro-imperialist coups in the Sudan since May, 1969, and all have been foiled due to the strong support of the 500,000 members of SWTUF.

4. In Libya, the oil-rich former monarchy in North Africa where nationalist army officers on September 1, 1969, threw out King Idris

and established Libyan control over the country's oil resources. Imprisoned labor leaders were released from jail and unions were made legal—in fact, they were encouraged to strike. The U.S. and Britain were ordered to evacuate their big air bases at El Adem and Wheelus Field. Just recently, Libya nationalized all its internal oil marketing. The UAR, Libya, and the Sudan have formed an anti-imperialist working alliance.

5. In the People's Republic of Southern Yemen (formerly Aden), in August 1969, a group described by the U.S. press as "extreme pro-Soviet revolutionaries" obtained control of the government, basing their power on the 35,000-member Southern Yemen Trade-Union Council, which takes in Marxist-led dockers and oil refinery workers as well as others.

These are only a few of the dramatic changes that have taken place in the Arab world in recent times, since the UAR working class began to show its strength in 1968. The meaning of these events is clear, as clear to the imperialists as it is to anyone else. It is only a question of time until this trend begins to affect imperialist strongholds in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia and a kind of see-saw battle is emerging in Jordan and Lebanon right now for control of the future of these countries.

The Arab people themselves, in particular the Arab working class, have emerged as the greatest threat imperialism has ever known in the Middle East. And it must be said that if imperialism loses out in the Middle East, *every* people will gain, including the American people *and* the Israeli people.

Critical Remarks on a "Critical Theory"*

The critical attitude towards capitalist society characteristic of young Western bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intellectuals today has an objective foundation. The substitution of state-monopoly regulation for laissez-faire and bourgeois spontaneity has given rise to a bourgeois opposition trend which rebels in the name of the freedom of the individual against state-monopoly institutions, without, however, fully perceiving their class nature. The protest consequently is directed against these institutions as such and the opposition is anarchic in character.

The scientific and technological revolution gives added impetus to this critical opposition. The transformation of science into a direct productive force impinges on the role of the intelligentsia and above all of the steadily growing numbers closely associated with production, on their education and training, and their working and living conditions. The intellectuals of the capitalist countries, like the workers, are denied the say due them in deciding the basic issues bearing on the conditions of their life and work. On the other hand, the backwardness of educational systems and the conditions of life in general in state-monopoly capitalist society are a cause of growing discontent among the students, a stratum that is still to take its place in society's labor force. Some sociologists hold that whereas formerly students by and large represented a "pre-bourgeoisie," today they are to a large extent a "pre-proletariat," and this cannot but affect their outlook.

It should also be borne in mind that many members of the strata in question were educated in the spirit of formal freedom ("pluralism" as against "totalitarianism") which the realities of state-monopoly capitalism turned into a fiction long ago. The finest of the young intellectuals, those endowed with an innate integrity, refuse to accept this. Nor are they prepared to bow to the tenets of official bourgeois sociology. But at the same time their social background and mentality molded in the bourgeois pattern turns them against working class organizations. All this combines to create the soil for theories which are opposed both to imperialism and to socialism as it exists today—theories whose adherents conjure up for themselves a "third" ideal to be achieved by employing the political methods of a "third" way.

The Frankfort School

The moods of the young intellectuals who gravitated to the anti-

* Reprinted from *New Times*, No. 24, June 17, 1970.

imperialist opposition in the sixties found a common denominator in the writings of the so-called Frankfort school of cultural and social criticism (Max Horkheimer, Theodor W. Adorno, Erich Fromm, Friedrich Pollock, Herbert Marcuse, and others).

The Frankfort school, so called because its founders began their careers in the Institute for Social Research in Frankfort on the Main, was the product of the specific conditions of Germany between the two world wars.

From the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism, and especially after the October Revolution in Russia, bourgeois ideologues saw the crisis of the capitalist mode of life as a crisis of human existence in general. As their response to this crisis they evolved a philosophical-sociological theory pivoted on the question of "man's being." Thus the social system which perhaps more than any other made a mockery of humanity "discovered" man the moment its foundations were threatened.

The crisis of capitalism was, then, described as a crisis of humanity, of man himself. The reactionary philosopher O. F. Bollnow put it thus: "Many observers agree that the decisive thing for the human being of our time is the consciousness that he is totally defenseless in face of a hostile world closing in on him from all sides. Man has become homeless in the broadest sense of the word. . . . He is gripped by a sense of hopeless spiritual confusion, loss of direction." Although this characterization is applicable not to the human being of our time in general, but only to the man of bourgeois society of the epoch of decaying capitalism, bourgeois philosophers found it logical to search for the true "image of man" in anthropology. And so did the leading exponents of the then incipient Frankfort school.

Whereas the former, bourgeois-revolutionary theory of man, i.e., the theory underlying classical bourgeois philosophy and literature, was a component of an integral philosophy of nature, society and man, the bourgeois theory of man evolved in the period of the general crisis of capitalism is divorced from nature and society. It merely searches for anthropological, "universally human," immutable characteristics.

The old bourgeois-revolutionary theory of man rested on an integral system of philosophical, economic and sociological views. The bourgeois conception of man of the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism is increasingly confined within the sphere of psychology, of psychoanalysis.

A relatively developed political economy was a component of the old anthropology in the broad sense. The present-day bourgeois concept of man does without political economy. And when the latter-day capitalist ideologues find occasion to delve into the economy, a closer

look will reveal that their attention is focused either on technology or the exchange and ownership of goods alone, not their actual production. The process of capitalist production and the class relationships inherent in it, the relations of property (production relations) and exploitation remain beyond their range of vision.

Such was the groundwork on which the Frankfort school crystallized in the late twenties. Its exponents (adherents of "critical theory" as they call themselves), "anthropologized" such basic Marxian categories as matter, practice, and dialectics. This can be clearly traced in the writings of Horkheimer, Adorno, Fromm, Marcuse, Pollock and others.

But an unmistakable dividing line cuts across the bourgeoisie itself. Faced with the threat of fascism, it too went through a painful process of differentiation. The bourgeois humanists reacted to fascism in a bourgeois way, just as they had to the transition from capitalism to socialism which began with the October Revolution. Thus besides the reactionary, fascist variants of the latter-day capitalist concept of man, there emerged also bourgeois-democratic theories vacillating between the opposing fronts, among them the "critical theory" of the Frankfort school. Its representatives made it plain that they dissociated themselves from both fascism and Marxism-Leninism. The object was to ensure the hegemony of bourgeois democracy in the anti-fascist struggle waged by the working class movement and the bourgeois humanists.

On the philosophical and sociological plane there thus emerged, besides imperialist non-Hegelianism, a new variant of Left Hegelianism. The Frankfort school falls into the latter category.

It sought to interpret Marxism as a simple derivative of Hegelian philosophy. The other material and theoretical sources of Marxism were ignored. This made it possible to introduce certain elements of Marxism into contemporary Left Hegelianism. The development of Marxism was ignored, though this did not prevent revisionist pirate raids into the domain of developed Marxism. Those aspects of Marxist theory which did not fit into the Frankfort pattern were rejected as "extraneous accretions of the Engels or Lenin type."

It is this emasculated Marxism which is one of the ingredients of the "critical theory" of the Frankfort school. It has taken over, in particular, precepts of Marxist political economy relating to the process of circulation and distribution. But production proper is completely ignored.

No Man's Land

In assessing the views of the Frankfort school one must bear in mind the complexities of its origins and the peculiar position it occu-

pies "between the fronts." These factors determine its duality. On the one hand, its spokesmen opposed fascism and had to emigrate from Germany, and it produced some interesting critical works on culture and ideology. On the other hand, it has always shied away, to say the least, from the real working class movement and socialism.

In the United States its theories merged with some traditional concepts of British and American sociology. Moreover, the complex situation in the U.S. labor and anti-fascist movement had an adverse effect on the theoretical and political positions of its leading lights—Horkheimer, Adorno, Fromm, Pollock and Marcuse—and through them on their followers (such as Habermas, Negt and A. Schmidt). Later, and this is most important, they also fell under the cold-war influences.

The position of the Frankfort school thus reflects to some extent the key issues at stake in the world-wide class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, though, its opposition to fascism notwithstanding, it has always had a subtle pseudo-Left and anti-Communist and anti-Marxist undercurrent which has become particularly pronounced in recent years.

But for all that it has done much to awaken in the social groups under its influence, including part of the student youth, a critical attitude towards contemporary capitalist society, thereby objectively helping to break down the barriers impeding the spread of Marxist ideas. In its criticism of capitalist culture and in some other spheres it has raised questions that hold the attention of the Marxists as well. All this is to the credit of the school. But at the same time its misinterpretation of Marxism and its negative attitude towards socialism and the working class movement have caused a great deal of harm, bred hostility towards the workers' organized class struggle and socialist organization in general, fostered opposition to united anti-imperialist and democratic action, helped to revive anarchistic principles and methods of struggle and to build up anarchistic groups.

The crucial theoretical and political issue here is the problem of revolution.

In Traven's *Revolt of the Hanged*, the rebels destroy all records wherever they go: "When they all have been burnt, no one will know who he is, how he is called, who his father was and what he owned. . . . Then there will be no more heirs." The point the novelist makes is an uncompromising break with the old world, the world of private property, exploitation and oppression. It would seem that this echoes what Marx and Engels said in the *Communist Manifesto*. "The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas." But is the underlying idea the same?

Certainly not.

Marx and Engels placed the emphasis on the interruption of historical continuity—which is, essentially, the decisive thing in the socialist and communist revolution. But Marx and Engels were dialectical thinkers who fully realized the significance of causal connection in every true process of development, witness if only what Marx said about development from capitalism to socialism and from socialism to communism in his critical comments on the Gotha programme of German Social Democracy.

Here we come to the touchstone of the Frankfort school's "critique" of Marxism which once again underscores the imperative need to engage it in debate. The crucial question is that of the complete break with the past. The exponents of the Frankfort school ask (since we are above all interested in the reasons why they carry weight with the petty-bourgeois Left intellectuals it is immaterial in the given instance whether the question is put in good faith or merely as a demagogic gambit): Has real, existing socialism broken completely with the past? Is the socialist working class movement really the force to effect such a break?

The Frankfort school answers the question in the negative. It contends—this is put most definitively in the more recent writing of Marcuse and Adorno—the real socialism and the real working class movement are incapable of effecting such a break since Marxism was (or still is) insufficiently critical of and not uncompromisingly enough opposed to the existing old world, and not utopian enough in regard to the future order of things. In their opinion this is because Marxism, and in particular Marxist dialectics, stems from Hegel and is insufficiently materialistic (Marcuse). The dialectics of Hegel and Marx, the argument goes, approaches reality, and therefore also the liberation movement, in a way that impedes genuine revolution, ignoring the fact that all revolutions have at some point turned into their opposites simply because they did not first destroy the objective innate readiness of every individual to continue to submit, to allow himself to be oppressed.

Thus, it is argued, Marxism does not go deep enough into the problem of oppression, does not examine it at the level of the individual. Therefore, the contention goes, a different form of dialectics must be found, and above all, a different form of negation (because of this the Frankfort school's dialectics is called "negative"); there must be a different approach to society as a whole, an advance from historical materialism to analysis of the instinct structure of the individual. This is the pivotal question in all of Marcuse's writings, and also in Adorno's more recent works.

Philosophy and Politics

Marcuse's* latest thesis is that the contradiction between our insatiable instincts and the harsh, hostile environment inevitably leads to renunciation of the dictates of instinct. According to him, ignoring of instincts gives rise to our capacity for labor, our culture and technology, all of which consequently bear the imprint of this renunciation, the stamp of suppression. Our thinking too is distorted; we allegedly can think only in one dimension, the dimension of the present reality (hence Marcuse's theory of the "one-dimensional man").

This, he says, applies to revolutionaries, if only because the same repressive technology based on the ignoring of instincts is allegedly inherent in existing socialism as well. Therefore socialism, Marcuse claims, tends to "converge" with capitalism. For true emancipation he deems it necessary first to revolutionize our instinct structure.

This attempt to "deepen," or to be exact, revise historical materialism from the biological, instinct-structure angle extends to all the basic principles of dialectics and leads in politics to petty-bourgeois radicalism which criticizes the Communists from pseudo-Left positions. Negation, the exponents of the Frankfurt school argue, presupposes a complete break with the past which they say is repressive in its totality (this excludes the possibility of there being anything positive in past traditions), since otherwise the past will lay its imprint on the world of the future, impeding the triumph of freedom; the negation should be such as would obviate the need for, or rule out, the negation of the negation. Hence, there must be no connection whatsoever between the old world of enslavement and the new world of freedom.

In these circumstances, these critics of Marxism reason, negation cannot be visualized from within a system, but only from without; otherwise the negation itself would be distorted by the system. The working class movement and existing socialism, they say, are connected with the old system and therefore are not forces of negation; hence there is no point to an alliance between them and the "third," negative force (which includes the students, ghetto populations, white outsiders and the masses in the developing countries). There is nothing but repudiation of the militant anti-imperialist front. Similarly, the use of the existing institutions (parties, trade unions, and parliaments)

* Herbert Marcuse is one of the best-known representatives of the Frankfurt school. Born in 1898 in a middle-class family in Berlin, he studied philosophy and planned to become a university teacher. After the advent of Hitler to power he emigrated to the U.S. During the second world war he was a department chief in the Office of Strategic Services, and later headed a division in the State Department. In 1954 he accepted a professorship in the U.S. He also lectures in West German universities.

and forms of struggle is declared meaningless. Here revision of Marxist philosophy leads to retreat to anarchism (predominantly of the Bakunin type).

Underlying this revision of Marxist dialectics is disdain for the working class movement. As regards existing socialism, Marcuse maintains that socialization of the means of production is not the prime objective of revolution and does not resolve the problem of freedom and enslavement. Incidentally, the same argument may be found in the Godesberg program of the West German Social Democratic Party.

Objectively this thesis sidetracks attention from the basic issues of the revolution. From it one could conclude, for instance, that imperialist aggression and brigandage are engendered by factors other than capitalist property relations. By claiming that aggression and counter-revolution in the final analysis derive from a deformed instinct structure, Marcuse in effect exonerates imperialism, and by defining opportunism as springing from the allegedly inevitable trend towards the "integration" of the working class inherent in imperialism, he objectively justifies the opportunism of Social Democracy. The genesis of governmental power too he links not with social processes, not with the existence of classes and class relationships, but simply with a deformed structure of instincts. Power and organization as such are seen as an inimical force, and since the working class movement in its fight for human emancipation can renounce neither power nor organization, it too is declared hostile to man in its present form.

To reduce all the basic problems of revolutionary struggle to a matter of the instinct structure is to fall essentially in line with the apologists of imperialism and opportunism.

Marcuse's views on power and organization are not merely absurdities to be lightly dismissed. In face of the strength, organization and centralization of imperialism which Marcuse himself underscores (and quite correctly), in face of the power imperialism wields and the state and other institutions it possesses, to dissuade revolutionaries from organizing, or even from centralizing, is to say: let everything remain as it is. The defeatism of such theorizing is self-evident.

Destination Unknown

In his most recent work, *Essay on Emancipation*, Marcuse draws this conclusion from his own theory: we must fight for emancipation, but we do not know what awaits us beyond the present reality—freedom or "totalitarianism." Even leaving aside the fact that fascism already exists, it is in place to ask why we should go into battle guided by a theory that cannot tell us whither we are headed.

As mentioned above, the theory of the Frankfort school is a common denominator of the moods of a whole segment of society—that part of the new petty bourgeoisie, and primarily of the intelligentsia, which feels that it has no future, yet is not prepared completely and unreservedly to side with the socialist working class movement. Marcuse, Adorno, and others like them pursue a line that can be traced all the way back to that ideologue of individualism and anarchism Max Stirner (1806-56); they make a point of dissociating themselves from any general determinant, be it objective laws or the discipline of socialist organization and power.

In this context there is no room for dialectics other than that of categorical rejection of continuity in regard to both the past and the future. The future, Marcuse says, must remain “open.” All the bridges must be dismantled, a new quality must be achieved in a single leap. In his opinion all that exists is equally reprehensible, and any “no” to what exists should be supported. As a result a Nietzsche negation is as valid as that of Marx. And since Marx’s prevision strikes Marcuse as not utopian enough, he simply counterposes to the present reality visions of the future borrowed from Nietzsche and other reactionary philosophers.

It is from this groundwork that the allegedly new, “negative” dialectic emerges. Actually, it is nothing but the old, “qualitative” dialectic of Kierkegaard (1813-55), who saw no difference between quantitative and qualitative forms of change. To all practical purposes it is inverted Bernsteinianism: if only qualitative change is possible, then either every reform is a revolution, or there is no evolutionary, quantitative preparation of revolution through reform and revolution becomes a miraculous leap forward from nowhere.

This pseudo-dialectics rejects all the basic principles of genuine dialectics, the dialectics of Hegel, Marx and Lenin. It divorces reforms from revolution, quantitative change from the qualitative, continuity from discontinuity; it sees the negation of imperialism only outside the imperialist world, but certainly not in socialism.

This “qualitative” or “negative” dialectics is easy to refute. If there are no historical or other links between two different qualities or worlds (“dimensions” according to Marcuse) how can we know anything about the second world? Marcuse’s second dimension is nothing but a conglomeration of negations of the features of capitalism and socialism, and consequently meaningless. It is not surprising that this “negative” dialectics can tell us only that it does not know whether our struggle will lead us to freedom or fascism.

We Marxists can, on the contrary, cite a dozen victorious socialist revolutions. We do not close our eyes to the difficulties involved in

building socialism encircled by a still strong imperialist world, in the conditions of a sharp international class struggle, and burdened with the arduous legacy of capitalism. Neither do we close our eyes to our own mistakes and weaknesses, but none of this justifies flight to pseudo-radical dialectics of the type propounded by the Frankfort school.

Subjectivism and Socialism

The theory of the Frankfort school is a theory of consumers, not prime producers. Hence it is focused on the satisfaction of requirements (in the broad sense of the word) and not the problems of production. For the same reason, it in effect associates revolutionary consciousness with possession or non-possession of things, with greater or lesser opportunities for consumption—in a word, with the poverty or wealth of one or another section of society. Revolutionary consciousness is regarded as a product of the circulation and distribution sphere, not of the sum total of social relationships, and on this basis, through an analysis of consumption, the revolutionary role of the working class, the chief producer of all the wealth of capitalism, is challenged.

Let us dwell briefly on the second main trend of the Frankfort school. Adorno, Schmidt and others claim that Marx considered only society, social being to be the subject of philosophy. Engels, they say, expanded the sphere of philosophy by his dialectics of nature, but this expansion was not necessary, was not called for by the inner logic of the subject, and therefore was alien to Marxism and altered its original character. The result, the argument goes, was the “naturalization,” “dehistoricization” and “disintegration” of Marxism, the loss of its revolutionary essence.

As we can see, the polemics center on the question of what Marx considered to be the subject of Marxist philosophy, his understanding of dialectics, and his attitude towards the philosophical writing of Engels. The Frankfort myth is refuted by both the origin and the content of *Anti-Dühring*. As is evident from his correspondence with Engels, Marx considered the work essential to the very existence of the Party, and persuaded Engels to write it. Although Marx contributed only the chapter examining Dühring’s views on the history of political economy, he was well acquainted with the whole of the manuscript, which Engels read to him, and approved of its publication.

The main philosophical thesis of the Frankfort school is that we can know only that which we do ourselves. Man alone works, changes nature, negates, is dialectically active. Consequently, there exists only social dialectics. Of nature outside the range of our practical activities we know nothing. But how can our dialectical practice influence nature if the latter is governed by other, non-dialectical laws?

Either the dialectics of nature has to be questioned, in which case neither would there be any social dialectics, or the universality of dialectics recognized.

Furthermore, the inconsistency of the Frankfort school is evident in its agnosticism as well. Take the argument that we know nothing of nature external to us. But in relation to man's consciousness his own body belongs to external nature. How then could we have any knowledge of it? If you negate external nature, be consistent about it!

At the heart of this trend lies negation of objective reality and its laws—a negation designed to “put an end” to scientific socialism and replace it with pure subjectivism. What is in question, then, is a petty-bourgeois attack from pseudo-Left, subjective idealist positions against the socialist working class movement.

Our critical attitude does not imply that we do not consider it necessary to study the theoretical works of petty-bourgeois radicals of the Frankfort type. Such study could yield valuable new data on one or another problem. Nor do we propose to ignore the anti-imperialist, humanistic elements in petty-bourgeois radical ideology. And, most important of all, our criticism does not mean that we see no difference between ideology and practical politics.

While considering the continuation of the ideological debate essential and rejecting petty-bourgeois radicalism with its claims to having evolved the only critical theory corresponding to the present conditions of the class struggle, we tirelessly search for concrete avenues for joint-anti-imperialist action. We must be on guard against finding ourselves on the same wavelength with the “liberal” bourgeois critics of the radical petty bourgeoisie. For us the most important thing is anti-imperialist solidarity. This should be borne in mind also on the event of the imperialist enemy employing terror tactics against petty-bourgeois radicalism.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

The Nixon Administration: Liars Incarnate, Part II

One of the particular lies emanating from the Nixon factory-for-prevarication, that space did not allow us to examine in last month's essay, is the allegation concerning fearful “massacres” committed by the North Vietnamese government; Nixon reiterates that one of his major reasons for maintaining the U.S. armed presence in Southeast Asia is to prevent massacre. Younger readers of *Political Affairs* have no way of recalling the nazi propaganda during the Second World War, but surely some who are of the author's generation, may remember that exactly the same “reasoning” came from Goebbels. Indeed, in the editorial he wrote for *Das Reich* (February 25, 1945), the Herr Doctor not only coined the phrase “iron curtain”—later picked up by Churchill and Truman—but also made very clear his deep humanitarianism: “If the German people lay down their arms,” wrote Goebbels, “the people of Eastern and South-eastern Europe, together with the Reich, would come under Russian occupation. Behind the iron curtain, mass butcheries of people would begin . . .”*

It was fitting that the propagandist of the regime which slaughtered twenty million Soviet citizens, seven million Poles, six million Jews and millions of others should have proclaimed that the Reich's army had to fight on so that “mass butcheries” might be averted; in precisely the same way it is fitting that this Nixon—who, were he to wash his hands for centuries would never be able to get the “damned spot” out—should allege prevention of massacre as a reason for persisting in Washington's course.**

It is, of course, simply a fact, as Dr. Jerome D. Frank has put it: “Never before in modern history has so powerful a country rained

* For the quotation and the borrowing of “iron curtain” from the nazis by Churchill, see R. Palme Dutt, *Problems of Contemporary History* (International Publishers, New York, 1963), p. 55.

** Washington hails as evidence of one of its victories, the line of the present Indonesian government. That government came into existence, of course, after one of the greatest slaughters in all history when some 750,000 men, women and children were killed in a matter of a few weeks. Its Minister of Mines is now (early in July) in New York selling his nation's resources to various U.S. corporations.

such overwhelming murder and destruction upon the people of so small a country." Washington's own data show that the U.S. air force has dropped more tonnage of explosives on South Vietnam in the 1960's than the entire Allied Air Force dropped upon Germany and German-occupied Europe throughout World War III!

Characteristically, Nixon's lies grow with the telling: on November 3, 1969, those "murdered" in 1954 by the North Vietnamese came to 50,000; on April 30, 1970 the "slaughter" involved "hundreds of thousands and on May 8, 1970 Nixon said he could not withdraw U.S. troops for fear that this would "allow the enemy to come into Vietnam(1) and massacre the civilians there by the millions." In the *New York Times* of December 6, 1969, Professor George McT. Kahin, Director of Cornell University's Southeast Asia Program, refuted this "massacre" concoction in detail, summing up with the words: "The President's account is contrary to the historical record." Earlier D. G. Porter and L. E. Ackland refuted the allegations at length in *The Christian Century*, November 5, 1969 and showed that in fact it was the imposed regime in South Vietnam, commencing with Diem, which had practiced indiscriminate slaughter. More recently, Tom Wicker, in the *New York Times* (May 12, 1970), showed that Nixon was lying not only about 1954 but also about the allegations concerning slaughters in Hue during the 1968 Tet offensive and concluded that "there is no historical evidence to justify the bloodbath prediction" offered by Nixon. In the United States Senate, on May 26, 1970, Edward Kennedy declared that "the 'bloodbath' argument has become an irresponsible evasion of the real issues involved in reaching a political settlement"; he appended several pages in the *Congressional Record* (pp. S7806-S7811) to show the falsity of the "massacre" propaganda.

The War-Maker Wants Peace

The mass murderer remains at the scene of his atrocities in order to prevent massacre and the rabid war-maker makes war because he wants peace. Again and again this Nixon reiterates that his hand is out; that his magnanimous proposals for negotiation remain on the table. Thus, in his July 1 report on the stupendous military victories in Cambodia (of which more will be said later) he concluded: "We repeat: all our previous proposals, public and private, remain on the conference table to be explored." Once again, the content and the form and the Alice-in-Wonderland quality of this kind of statement from that particular statesman, recalls the equally plaintive remarks of an earlier statesman and unwilling war-maker. This is Hitler talking just before the USSR broke his back with the

Battle of Stalingrad: "I have offered the enemy my hand again and again. . . . We have never demanded anything from them and we have never insisted on anything. I repeatedly offered my hand, but always in vain. . . . We have been drawn into this war against our will. No man can offer his hand more often than I have."

The Colonialist Wants National Liberation

But the most blatant and in many ways the deepest lie of the Washington Administrations that have conducted war upon the Asian peoples for twenty years, and perhaps most glaringly now with Nixon's deliberate creation of an all-Indo-Chinese war, is the U.S. government's insistence that it fights in Asia because it wishes to make it possible for the Asian peoples to determine their own destinies and to establish their own forms of government. This is why the United States put Chiang in Taiwan; this is why the United States maintains 60,000 troops in South Korea; this is why the United States helped bring forth the blood-drenched government of Indonesia; this is why its money and planes and weapons prop up the Thai dictatorship; this is why the United States devastated Cambodia and Laos; and this is why the United States keeps the Thieu-Ky gang in office.

And it is because that Thieu-Ky gang really represents the people of South Vietnam that its foreign minister said: "Without American support this Government would not last five days;" and why Marshal Ky himself, "in one of the unexpected outbursts of candor that distinguish him, put the survival potential of his Government without U.S. support at three days."*

But here are the words of Nixon, as of July 1:

We search for a political solution that reflects the will of the South Vietnamese people, and allows them to determine their future without outside interference. . . . We pledge to abide by the outcome of the political process agreed upon by the South Vietnamese.

Meanwhile, those who head the very "government" created by Washington, financed and armed by it, affirm that without the backing of their makers and the commitment of the might of the U.S. they could not last a week! That "government's" Permanent Observer at the United Nations, in an official statement (December 13, 1967), calls the N.L.F. "outlaws rebelling against a legitimate and legal government"; and Thieu himself, after returning from the Manila Conference with Nixon in June, 1969, orders the arrest of four members of what the *New York Times* describes (June 18) as a "liberal opposi-

* See Alfred Hassler, *Saigon, U.S.A.*, Richard Baron, New York, 1970, p. 135.

tion group," calls a press conference and, reported Terence Smith in the *Times*:

"From now on," the President said, pounding his fist for emphasis, "those who spread rumors that there will be a coalition government in this country, whoever they be whether in the executive or the legislature, will be severely punished on charges of collusion with the enemy and demoralizing the army and the people."

What the U.S. Government Does in South Vietnam

In May, 1970, sixty foreign relief service volunteers in Saigon remonstrated with Nixon over his invasion of Cambodia. In doing so they directed Nixon's attention to the "arrest and torture" of student leaders and the "repeated violent and brutal dispersion" by police and army units of peaceful protest groups. At the same period, under the auspices of the World Council of Churches, a report was made of inducements regularly employed towards the "independence" that Nixon craves—this is the treatment accorded students recently apprehended:

Pins under fingernails; truncheon beatings on knee caps and necks; cigarette burns to nipples and penis; electric shock to ears, tongue, genitals; soapy-water injections into ears, followed by beatings about the head—these are some of the refinements of Thieu-Ky student-justice.

Efforts by the volunteer workers to meet with U.S. Ambassador Bunker or with Deputy Ambassador Burger in order to lay these facts before them and to get U.S. intervention were rejected.*

The English author, Victoria Brittain, writes:**

Saigon today stands as an example of what Indo-China has become with American occupation. To a visitor it is a hell-hole of noise, filth and misery which no one should become accustomed to. . . . The Vietnamese families squatting in shacks along the railway line smell as though they are rotting. In the orphanages the children displaced and lost by the movement of the war are lifeless, stinking lumps of humanity. . . . In Saigon the legacy of American occupation is an emasculated, Westernized city devoid of character. A people without nationhood.

Dr. Gordon H. Orians, an ecologist of the University of Washington and Dr. Egbert W. Pfeiffer, a zoologist from the University of Montana, investigated the effects of defoliation and bombings in South Vietnam.

* *Commonweal*, June 12, 1970 p. 282.

** *New Statesman* (London), May 1, 1970, p. 604.

The vice-president of Adelphi University—whose own specialty for the past fifteen years has been in the area of environmental problems—summarized their findings in an article called, "The Ravaged Soil of Vietnam"; here is the concluding paragraph:*

Perhaps, Vietnam will not be literally destroyed or totally changed by this war, but it has already been irreversibly changed in many ways: bird life, animal life, plant life of various kinds are all disappearing. Farmers are being wiped out, never to return. The countryside is violated in a way never done before to any country. And all of this in the name of "protecting, liberating and pacifying" the country.

Professor Robert Jay Lifton of Yale writes accurately of "the generally indiscriminate killing of Vietnamese civilians by American air bombing and artillery and small-arms fire" so that, as he adds, the atrocity at Son My "is America in Vietnam."**

The fullest treatment, in English, of the barbaric repression inside South Vietnam, practiced against its own people by the Saigon regime at the behest and with the support of Washington, is the new book by Alfred Hassler—executive secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation—to which reference was made earlier.*** Mr. Hassler shows—he does not simply state—that the present Thieu-Ky clique came into power in Saigon three years ago "in a controlled and fraudulent election, complete with censorship, intimidation, and exclusion from the ballot of the two most likely candidates"; and that even so, "they could still get only one-third of the vote." Further, as is well known, the candidate who ran behind the Thieu-Ky ticket was promptly sentenced to five years' imprisonment for suggesting hostility to the present war-course!

Mr. Hassler says—and this can be controverted by no one who has any knowledge at all of reality: "All Vietnamese know that their ablest and most respected leaders outside the Provisional Revolutionary Government are behind bars or in exile and that they will remain there so long as the Thieu-Ky regime remains in power." These leaders include men and women in all walks of life—trade union officials, university personnel, dignitaries from different churches, youth organizations.

* *The Catholic World*, May, 1970, p. 73.

** *New York Times Book Review*, June 14, 1970, p. 2; italics in original. The two books Professor Lifton reviews make this same point: Seymour M. Hersh, *My Lai 4* (Random House); *One Morning in the War*, by Richard Hammer (Coward-McCann). Hammer quotes General Westmoreland's congratulatory message after the slaughter; it "dealt enemy heavy blow. . . . Congratulations to officers and men for outstanding action."

*** The present writer has serious differences with the political analysis of that book, but its descriptive material is important.

A decree law of 1964 outlawed "any individual, party or organization that acts by whatever methods to realize directly or indirectly the goals of communism or a pro-Communist neutralism." The Constitution of 1966 declares: "The Republic of Vietnam opposes communism in any form" and "every activity to publicize or carry out communism is prohibited."

There are about 200,000 political prisoners held by the Thieu-Ky clique (the equivalent of about two and a half million in the United States); these range from pre-teenagers to patriachs in their eighties and include boys and girls and men and women. Torture is systematic and institutionalized; it includes not only practices previously cited but the insertion of bottles and even live eels within the vaginas of women; the torturing of 8-year-old children before the eyes of their parents. That the *New York Times* waited until July 1970 to announce the existence of the so-called "tiger cages" in the prisons (some of them built by the French back in 1862!) is about the normal "deliberate speed" for that paper faced with such unpleasantness.

In May and June 1969 the U.S. Study Team made up of Bishop James Armstrong of the United Methodist Church, Mrs. John C. Bennett, Allan Brick of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Robert J. Drinan, S.J., Dean of the Boston College School of Law, John Pember-ton of the American Civil Liberties Union, Rabbi Seymour Siegel of the Jewish Theological Seminary, Rear Admiral Arnold E. True of the U.S. Navy (ret.), and John Conyers, Jr., a Black Democratic member of Congress from Michigan, investigated prison conditions in South Vietnam; they reported "many thousands" arrested without charges, without hearings, without trials; that "repression . . . continues to be pervasive and brutal"; that "torture and brutality are widespread." Two hundred prisoners were less than 14 years old—one was actually four! This committee reported the existence of "a climate of intellectual, religious, and political repression that has led to the imprisonment, exile, or silencing of thousands of loyal Vietnamese nationalists, persons who are not pro-Communist, but who are critical of the Thieu-Ky Government and who insist upon the right to think for themselves."*

Let the students with fingernails torn out, the women with their bodies torn apart, the eight-year old tortured before her parents, the four-year old "prisoner," flash before your eyes the next time you see and hear Nixon speaking about independence and freedom of choice with ringing voice and sweating face.

* The entire report is printed in the Hassler book, pp. 241-281.

Nixon's Cambodian "Victory"

In the essay from the *New Statesman* previously quoted to convey some sense of the destructiveness of U.S. occupation in South Vietnam, Victoria Brittain, having concluded that it left the Vietnamese "a people without nationhood"; went on at once to contrast that with Cambodia and her article was sent from Phnom Penh sometime after the March coup against Sihanouk but before the massive Washington-Saigon invasion of April 30. She wrote:

The Cambodians have no such void. . . . In dusty Cambodian forest villages the children are gay and curious, the adults are self-possessed and dignified. Nowhere is there the pall of gloom which is never absent in Vietnam. . . . Here in Cambodia, in its very contrast with South Vietnam, the skill and importance of Prince Sihanouk's balancing act over the years comes into focus.

But the Lon Nol government's survival was immediately in serious doubt. H. D. Greenway, a reporter for *Time* from Indo-China since 1967, reported from Cambodia that with the Prince overthrown, "how quickly the Cambodian situation deteriorated!" The *coup* government "encouraged ancient racial hatreds, and shortly, rafts of bloated corpses were floating down the Mekong River." Two members of the National Assembly who had chosen to throw in with the coup government had gone back to their home regions to explain their actions; they "were torn limb from limb by an angry mob"; Lon Nol's own brother was killed by enraged peasants.

Furthermore, peasants had set out for the capital, but "they had been turned back with considerable loss of life by a fusillade from the government troops sent out to meet them. The government announced a figure for the number of people killed, but the major who opened fire confided that he had killed a lot more than that . . . he showed us where other victims had been tied up in rice sacks and thrown into the water."*

General Lon Nol, who had been part of the Right elements in the coalition forming the Prince's government, was not yet certain—with his seizure of power—as to which way he should or could move and the evidence is good that he at least contemplated the possibility of retaining some form of neutrality. It is because of the shakiness of the coup government that Nixon decided to invade; but it is because of the apparent political "unreliability" or uncertainty of Lon Nol that he decided to do so without telling—let alone asking—the head of the government in the nation he was assaulting.

* H. D. Greenway, *The Atlantic*, July 1970, pp. 32, 34.

Once the massive commitment of scores of thousands of troops was made on April 30 (as we showed last month, forays and reconnaissance penetrations had been made into Cambodia from both Thailand and South Vietnam commencing in March) Lon Nol's hand was forced and within about 48 hours he announced he was welcoming the friends from the South and the East. The friends brought, as Greenway wrote in *The Atlantic*, "burning villages, roads clogged with refugees and full-scale destruction."

Sihanouk and forces allied with him have moved to the Left; Left forces, hitherto distrustful of Sihanouk, are one with the national resistance and that resistance—becoming now part of an Indo-Chinese peoples' struggle against U.S. imperialism—already controls over half of Cambodia and rings Phnom Penh within artillery range. South Vietnamese and U.S. planes bomb and strafe everywhere (despite Nixon's lies about various restrictions) and U.S. artillery regularly shells Cambodian territory from the South Vietnamese border—firing upon the "sanctuaries" that Nixon just reported had been wiped out! Lon Nol's forces are almost nil in equipment and morale but the Thieu-Ky forces, paid and supplied by Washington, ravage the country. Civil war, then, complicated with U.S.-Saigon intervention, now encompasses Cambodia and its termination will come only with the collapse of the entire Washington policy of imperialist conquest in Southeast Asia.

Patriotism and "Patriotism"

The likes of Nixon and Agnew are offering lessons in patriotism; one is reminded of the penchant the late Al Capone had for upholding morality.

The likes of Nixon and Agnew, who have never studied anything but how best to advance their own "careers," know nothing of the history of this country. They know nothing of Lincoln's first speech in Congress in 1848 when he denounced the President of the United States for conducting an iniquitous and illegal war against Mexico. Of Frederick Douglass who denounced the U.S. government in words of fire for pursuing that same robber war, in which "The groans of slaughtered men, the screams of violated women, and the cries of orphan children, must bring no throb of pity from our national heart, but must rather serve as music to inspire our gallant troops to deeds of atrocious cruelty, lust and blood."

Frederick Douglass' son, Lewis, denounced the efforts of the U.S. government to suppress the independence of the peoples of Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines in 1899 because "whatever the U.S. government controls, there injustice to dark races prevails" and be-

cause "the expansion of the United States means extension of race hate and cruelty."

Here is how William James described President McKinley's decision to hold on to the Philippines in a letter to Carl Schurz in March, 1900: "the most incredible, unbelievable piece of sneak-thief turpitude that any nation ever practiced." "God damn the United States," said that same William James, in 1902, "for its vile conduct in the Philippine Isles"; such behavior, he said, turned the "stars and stripes" into a "lying rag." Here are the words of U.S. Senator George F. Hoar (Republican, Mass.) in 1902, after the U.S. troops had crushed the Philippine revolt*:

We vulgarized the American flag. We introduced perfidy into the practice of war. We inflicted torture on unarmed men to extort confession. We put children to death. . . . We devastated provinces.

Of course, the then Vice President called such people "simply unhung traitors, and . . . liars, slanderers and scandalmongers to boot," but it was the then Vice President who was the liar and not James and Schurz and Lewis Douglass and George Hoar; the latter were men of honor and true patriots. The Vice President was not worthy to pare their toe-nails; the present Vice President and President belong in the dock as enemies of mankind and, in the first place, enemies of the real interests and needs of the people of the United States.

The Constitution and War-Making

The division of powers is basic to the Constitution. Its source was two-fold: fear of popular democracy; fear of monarchical tyranny. The latter fear is expressed with special force in the care with which the Constitution circumscribes the war-making powers of the President as Chief Executive and the war-conducting powers of the President as Commander-in-Chief. In the former case the Constitution is absolutely explicit in affirming that declaring war requires not only the will and desire of the President but the concurring will and desire of the majority of the Senate. In the latter case, the Constitution places in the hands of Congress—and especially in the lower House, then more directly responsive to the electorate—the power to provide the money with which the President may direct the armed forces and without which he is powerless to do so. And these money appropriations may not be made for longer periods than one year, says the

* The material on both Douglasses (and much related material) is in my *Documentary History of the Negro People in the U.S.* (1951); for that on James, etc., see Robert L. Beisner *Twelve Against Empire* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968).

Constitution, and it says that because of the explicitly-expressed desire on the part of the Fathers to retain partial control over the President even as Commander-in-Chief.

Particularly since Truman, notably under Johnson and intensely under Nixon, the relationship of the President to war-making and conducting has been altered so that increasingly one man has been usurping the power, quite literally, of life and death over the citizens of the United States; this means, in the nuclear age and given U.S. might, the power of life and death over the human race.

With the Right-wing proclivities of the present Administration and the intensely anti-democratic commitments of its chief backers, and with the notoriously adventuristic features of Nixon himself (which go back to his days in Congress and as Vice President) this distortion of the constitutional provisions for declaring and conducting war represents enormous dangers. Now that the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution has been repealed and the State Department no longer even claims SEATO justification for U.S. armed presence in Southeast Asia, there remains, legally, only one possible course of action for the President so far as that presence is concerned: to end it and to withdraw the troops as speedily as technical requirements permit. This constitutional reality is consequential both in terms of the struggle to end the present conflict in Indo-China and in terms of the longer range diplomatic and political functioning of the United States.*

It is related also to the point—made by demagogues such as Agnew—of the “necessity” of “supporting the President when the country is at war.” This country is not at war; this country is *making war* upon others and is shelling and bombing sovereign states; those latter—and especially the Democratic Republic of Vietnam—are resisting such assaults. They have not themselves declared a state of war and they do not seek to force a peace settlement upon a defeated United States in Washington or in Hanoi. They are not bombing U.S. territory and do not want to. They seek only to force the United States to stop the shelling and the killing of their citizens and to get out of their territory; *to go home*. Premier Pham Von Dang of North Vietnam was most serious in emphasizing these points to me; those who are struggling to terminate the fighting in Indo-China should bear this point in mind.

Conclusion

Washington's policy for a generation has been to impose U.S.

* Helpful is Merlo J. Pusey, *The Way We Go to War*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1969; see also the editorial “The War-Making Power,” in the *New Republic*, June 6, 1970.

mastery over the world; it should not be done and it cannot be done. France was driven out of Indo-China because the age of absentee landlordism is over; U.S. attempts to take over from France have failed and they are in fact doomed.

The U.S. effort to have Chinese fight Chinese—for U.S. purposes—resulted only in a huge American investment in the near-corpse that is Chiang. South Korean puppets scream bloody murder when, twenty years after they were installed, the United States suggests the possibility of reducing its garrison of 64,000 troops there.

The U.S. effort at Vietnamization of the war in Vietnam is similarly doomed. With 500,000 U.S. troops the puppets could not prevail. Nixon does not project anything after a reduction—promised for the Spring of 1971—which will still leave some 300,000 U.S. troops shoring up Thieu and Ky (or whatever puppet is then in the Presidential palace). And his effort at Vietnamization, having failed, he has now taken the war massively into both Laos and Cambodia.

Asia is endless and in it live two billion people. The U.S. policy is one of bloodier and bloodier involvement in a hopeless and immoral cause; disaster marks its path and catastrophe is the inexorable logic of its termination. New “sanctuaries” will always reappear; new “dominoes” will always require rescuing.

The United States has the greatest military machine in history; it has spent one trillion dollars in the past generation on weapons; it has a hundred million doses of nerve gas stockpiled in the Army's Chemical Warfare branch near Denver; it has two thousand foreign bases; it has 35,000 military aircraft; it has a dozen systems for delivering tens of thousands of atomic and nuclear weapons—and it is hated by the exploited and the oppressed throughout the world. Forty-one per cent of its young men examined by the Selective Service in 1968 were rejected on physical and educational grounds; its infant mortality rate ranks 18th among nations; ten million of its citizens are never free of hunger; scores of millions of its citizens are subjected to indignity and special oppression for ethnic and national reasons; its basic industries—machine-tool, metalworking, steel, ship-building—are so backward that not only can they not compete abroad effectively, they cannot compete at home with foreign products; its cities are decaying; its transportation system is collapsing; its water and air are deteriorating; its taxes and prices are astronomical—and its President insists that the blessings of this order are to be dominant throughout the world, in the name of freedom!

In Indo-China—and in South Vietnam in particular—the United States government affirms it is fighting to secure freedom for the people there and their right to national sovereignty. But the Thieu-Ky

government is in fact—and nobody denies this—a bloody, unpopular, repressive regime. The opposition to it from workers and students and intelligentsia is universal and the suppression of this opposition is as crass and brutal as history has ever seen.

The government of North Vietnam and the leadership of the N.L.F. have been saying for ten years that the fighting will stop as soon as the United States government has made up its mind that it cannot have its way in South Vietnam. As soon as Washington decides that the people of Vietnam—North and South, for they are one people—want to rule themselves and should rule themselves and that therefore all foreign troops should withdraw from Vietnam, at that instant the fighting stops.

Thereafter, negotiations of a serious nature commence between the United States and the Vietnamese as to the manner and timing of the withdrawal; that is negotiable but the question of the independence and sovereignty and eventual unity of Vietnam is not a subject of negotiation for any foreigner. Vietnamese questions and Vietnamese society and Vietnamese forms of government are matters for the Vietnamese and for no one else.

When that is acknowledged and acted upon by the United States, peace will come to Southeast Asia, but not before.

Heroic resistance by the Vietnamese in the field helps bring this about; growing opposition among the civilians in South Vietnam to the murder-regime of Thieu-Ky helps bring it about; and the massive development of the movement for peace in the United States, with labor and the Black people in the forefront, helps bring it about.

For those of us who live in the United States—and especially those of us who are Communists—the patriotic and the revolutionary duty are one: through agitational, educational and organizational struggle to help bring into being so massive and conscious an anti-war movement as to force a halt to the fighting in Indo China and in this way deliver a smashing blow to U.S. imperialism.

July 10, 1970

BOOK REVIEWS

OAKLEY C. JOHNSON

The Rebel Thirties

I have seen hundreds of anthologies—hundreds of collections of essays, editorials, short stories—and all of them seemed to have something dull about them: a kind of *passé* quality, as of things past, dead and buried.

Not so this *New Masses* anthology of the "Rebel Thirties."* It does, to be sure, bring back memories of the past, but that is not the main point: this anthology sharpens one's perception of the present. It even seems as if it were *about* the present, as if (with slight changes) it had just been written, and was concerned not with the Thirties but the Seventies.

Maxwell Geismar in his introduction pinpoints the documentaries (which I have reference to) as "at the core of the volume and . . . equally of historical importance and permanent literary value." As he reads what Richard Wright says about the Black boxer Joe Louis, he thinks of our other Black boxer, Muhammed

* *New Masses: An Anthology of the Rebel Thirties*. Edited with a prologue by Joseph North. Introduction by Maxwell Geismar. International Publishers, New York, 1969. Cloth \$7.50, paper \$3.25.

Ali. As he reads of the General Motors sit-down strike, he doubtless is aware of the current student strikes against our aggression in Vietnam. As he ponders the culture of the so-called "free world," he cannot forget the role of the Central Intelligence Agency in assassinations and wars.

John L. Spivak's "A Letter to the President," we may add, reminds us of Walter Lowenfels' newer letter-poem of the same title (as well as of all our desperate appeals to the Establishment).

Joseph North in his prologue asserts something like this when he writes that "the aim of this anthology is to help get a bead on the Seventies by revealing the power inherent in our people throughout our most embattled times." To me, that is exactly what the book does.

In one sense, by the way, the prologue is the most striking part of the volume. It answers in a few short paragraphs the slanders of the cowards and of the half-wits against the *New Masses*:

The bill of particulars the prosecutor presents charges us—the men of the Left, the Marxists, the Com-

munists of that time, the rebels who stood with us and with whom we stood—as laying hairy hands on the literature, the culture of that day, and reviling it. We were the despoilers. The indictment says we cared nothing for literature, for truth, for beauty; we were guided by a bleakly fanatic loyalty to an alien philosophy: Marxism, Communism. We believed that the ends justified the means. Our ends were to capture—no less—the parapets of American culture and preach our foreign philosophy from those ramparts. We were infiltrators. We were the unamericans. The indictment says we put a premium on any work that carried “our line,” our thesis, no matter how threadbare the quality—we called it good and we passed it on to the public, counterfeit goods. I have listened to this detraction for a long time. It has galled me. And finally I was compelled to compile this collection of writings and drawings from the *New Masses* to argue my position. (P. 20.)

That is the reason, he says, for this *Anthology*, to let the rebel writers and the rebel artists defend themselves. And their work is good. “I submit that in our time,” the editor continues, “in the Thirties especially, ours was the purest voice in the chorus of American literary journalism. . . . Did we catch the essence of our time? Yes, I think we did. It is in our pages, brighter than it is on the paper of any other journal of that time. This is my contention.” (Pp. 30, 31.) So writes Joseph North.

And for myself, as I read again Genevieve Taggard’s “Ode in

Time of Crisis,” Dorothy Parker’s “Incredible, Fantastic. . . and True,” Michael Gold’s “John Reed: He Loved the People,” Theodore Dreiser’s “What Has the Great War Taught Me?” and Robert Forsythe’s “Redder Than the Rose”—to name just a few among many moving, many striking pieces—I agree with Joe North’s “contention.”

I could make this review more interesting, doubtless, by quoting passages from some of the contributors, but I would be cheating and exasperating the reader. Better for him to read it all.

One service Mr. North does for us: he gives us a brief bird’s-eye history of the literary publications of the Left. He puts the *Masses* first at 1911, followed by *The Liberator*, then the monthly *New Masses* in 1926, then the weekly *New Masses* in 1934. (Incidentally, Joe North was a founder of the weekly *New Masses*, and, after his return from Spain in 1938, its chief editor.) After this came *Masses and Mainstream*, and finally the present-day *American Dialog*.

My only criticism of this capsule history is that he should not have omitted *The Comrade*, founded at the beginning of the century, and continuing for several years. In its first issue, October, 1901, appeared a somewhat ironic greeting from George Bernard Shaw, who hoped that it would “succeed *sometime*; and why not this?” (Emphasis added.)

William Dean Howells also sent a friendly greeting, but objected to the name, *The Comrade*, which

to him “suggests soldiership.” The editors replied that the comradeship they advocated was not at all the fraternalism of military organization, but of political action and social benefit.

The editorial board of *The Comrade* included George D. Herron, one of the founders of the Rand School of Social Science; John Spargo, a Socialist writer; William Mailly, a Socialist Party national office secretary; and Algernon Lee, a Socialist lecturer. It must be confessed that all these editors became Right-wing Socialists in World War I years. But let us remember that *The Comrade* was established immediately after the formation of the Socialist Party of America, and immediately after Eugene V. Debs ran for President of the United States the first time in 1900. *The Comrade* was the first organ of revolutionary American writers and artists, and in truth did much to mobilize intellectuals on behalf of a socialist world view. Eventually *The Comrade* merged with *The International Socialist Review*, and its place in the world of art was taken by *The Masses*, as Mr. North states, in 1911.

I append this historical note only to emphasize more fully the tremendous contribution of the *New Masses*, and the advance that socially conscious literature and art have made generally in our day. It is undeniable, it seems to me, that this advance has been made possible by the wide diffusion of the ideas of Marx and Lenin. That is why this *New*

Masses anthology is an important event of the Lenin Centennial Year.

In view of this, the remarkable—even extraordinary—reception that the critics have accorded this *Anthology* is worth noting.

The Library Journal, which recommends books to college students, describes it as “one of the most fascinating sources of proletarian literature in the 1930’s,” and as “useful for students of American history and literature.” *The New York Times* review, though essentially critical, says, “Many readers will find these reports on poverty, injustice and hopeful struggle enough to move the heart.” It calls attention to the “distinguished” names represented: “Hemingway, Dos Passos, Thomas Wolfe, Langston Hughes, among many others.”

Says Herbert L. Matthews: “An anthology from the *New Masses* cannot help being a social, political and historical document of the first order.” Says Mary Hemingway, widow of Ernest Hemingway, in a letter to Joseph North: “You have resurrected not only the times and thought of the Thirties but their conscience. It is most consoling reading.” Says Pete Seeger: “The *New Masses* was a big part of my own teen-age education, and it’s good to see some of the best poetry and prose and reportage within the covers of an inexpensive paperback, so that the teenagers of 1970 can get a whiff of what some of the previous generation went through.”

Writing in the Chicago *Sun-Times*, Jack Conroy, author of *The Disinherited*, says: "The list of those who found inspiration in the burning issues of the times, and voiced it in the *New Masses* is a long and distinguished one."

The University of Toronto student paper, *Varsity News*, in a two-page review, comments: "The publishing of this anthology is an invaluable service, since it takes us back to the original confrontation with experience behind the myths that have survived."

In Amsterdam, The Netherlands, a trade publication called *Pegasus* declares: "The selection of reportage is of the highest order, and like the other sections, serves to repudiate the cold war charge that the literature of the times was crude and inferior." *Pegasus* adds that this anthology restores to the younger generation "their most valuable heritage."

In some ways the most significant comment comes from a comparison of the *New Masses Anthology* with a similar compilation of pieces from the *Saturday Evening Post*, which ceased publication in 1969. That review, written by Theodore Peterson for the *Journalism Quarterly* of the University of Illinois makes detailed comparisons between the two collections. The *Post's* "commemorative edition," says Mr. Peterson, contains a good sampling of well-

known authors, such as Edgar Allan Poe, James Whitcomb Riley, O. Henry, Edith Wharton, Booth Tarkington, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and others.

But, Mr. Peterson continues, George Horace Lorimer, editor of the *Post*, spent "three decades interpreting Middle-class America to itself," and finally began to "lose touch with his audience." Lorimer, says the review, "was a stranger in the world of the Depression and the New Deal." When Franklin Roosevelt overwhelmingly defeated Alf Landon in 1936, "Lorimer's world was gone forever."

That was the world of the *Saturday Evening Post*. "The world that Lorimer failed to comprehend," Mr. Peterson says, "is reflected in North's *New Masses Anthology*." Peterson then names some of the *New Masses* authors to compare with the *Post* celebrities: "Kenneth Fearing, Theodore Dreiser, John Dos Passos, William Carlos Williams, James Agee, Richard Wright," and, a few lines further, adds Erskine Caldwell and of course Hemingway.

Though asserting undoubted merit in the *Post* writings, Peterson concludes: "Yet reading the two collections in counterpoint, one senses that the *New Masses*, for all its ideological orientation, was more sensitive to the world of the 1930's than the *Post*."

Churchill Revisited

Churchill died January 25, 1965, and sundry psychological aspects of ideology began coming to mind as the American press—in today's style of ruggedly free enterprise—uniformly eulogized him at tremendous length. In referring to the occasion I found myself saying and writing William Randolph Churchill but never made the compensating error of referring to Hearst as Winston. They were both journalists, ideologists, propagandists.

Speaking for the American Institute of Marxist Studies in New York City, April 19, 1965, on some psychological aspects of ideology, I said:

Of course the relation between ideology and propaganda — the names of your adversary's philosophy and information — is a close relationship, and the journalistic character of both in the West increases daily. Ideology used to suggest a philosophy; today it suggests propaganda is symbolized by the image. Churchill was more than a great image but his ideology was so infused with features of personality that it added little or nothing to traditional insular nationalism and imperialism-in-defense.

Just out of office in 1946, in Fulton, Missouri, Churchill voiced the line that ushered in the Cold War.

* A. J. P. Taylor, Robert Rhodes James, J. H. Plumb, Basil Liddell Hart, Anthony Storr, *Churchill Revised, A Critical Assessment*, The Dial Press, New York, 1969, 280 pp., \$5.95.

Often forgotten is the fact that again out of office in early July, 1954, following the death of Stalin, Churchill called for a reversal of U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union. At this peak of McCarthyism his voice cried in a political wilderness that echoed his views of nine years before, and the old man was surprised. Perhaps the difference between Churchill's seeming influence in 1946 and 1954 illustrates the role of the individual in history, mediated as it always is by ideological consonance or dissonance.

Confidence in publishing these remarks derives from the anti-ideological hindsight of English scholars, four historians (appropriately distinguished for works on Beaverbrook, Randolph Churchill, Hugh Walpole, and military history, respectively) and a psychiatrist.* Comment will be divided between the historicity and the psychology of Winston Churchill, with emphasis on ideology.

Intellectually reared on Gibbon, Macaulay, and the demagoguery of his father, Churchill saw his times and acted his roles in clear projection of aristocratic Whig opportunism. As an historian his professional critics also agree that he retrospectively rationalized.

Viewing Churchill as a statesman, Taylor concludes:

Behind the facade of a cheeky individualism, he was essentially conservative. He had great courage, an almost inexhaustible energy, and a generosity of spirit that could

disarm all but the most implacable of opponents. He was fertile in expedients and remained unbowed by adversity. It is difficult to discern in him any element of creative statesmanship. He responded to events with infinite adaptability and persistent enthusiasm. But he had to be driven from without. Churchill had no vision for the future, only a tenacious defense of the past. The British people raised him up, and he failed them. The British ruling classes did their best to keep him down, and he preserved them. He is best described by words which were written about Bismarck in his old age: "He was no beginning but an end, a grandiose final chord—a fulfiller, not a prophet." Perhaps Churchill was the penalty people paid for reading history.

Viewing Churchill as a politician, James concludes:

But although he may have no message for them (both his contemporaries and the present generation), it is to be hoped that they will realize that here was one of the most astonishing men of modern times; that, if the British empire were to die, it was right that it should have had a final blaze of glory; be commanded by a man who would not realize that its great days were past, and who, by this belief, made others believe it as well. In 1931, when Churchill was in eclipse, Harold Nicolson had written of him that "He is a man who leads forlorn hopes, and when the hopes of England become forlorn, he will once again be summoned to leadership." Thus it came to pass. There are times when dreams are better than facts.

But it is in Churchill the historian that we find the ideological

composition of the man, defining ideology as the combination of beliefs, attitudes, and purposes that both legislate and rationalize behavior. Plumb does a good job of describing Churchill's intellectual growth and development from childhood beneath the baroque chimney stacks of his natal Blenheim Palace to his final status as M.P. for Woodford. He reflected not thoughtfully but nostalgically on his ancestors John C. Duke of Marlborough, his caustic father, Sir Randolph C., and "the historical best sellers throughout his long life—J. R. Green, C. M. Trevelyan, Sir Arthur Bryant." (P. 137.)

I would cavil with Plumb on only one detail. He says on the same page, ". . . history was not, for Churchill, like painting, something one turned to for relaxation or merely to turn an honest guinea to meet his mountainous expenses. History was the heart of his faith; it permeated everything which he touched, and it was the main-spring of his politics and the secret of his immense mastery." However, his history was, like his painting, entirely perceptive, albeit romanticized; in this lay its dramatic strength: informative, decorative, nostalgic; and its weakness: shifting but too preservative and uncreative, undialectic, devilishly "idealistic."

Untrained but intensely historically minded, Churchill's writings naively reveal his ebullient prejudices, and enthusiasms. He never, even while applauding the exploit, wondered casually that

during Marx's residence in London his father could successfully sell "Tory democracy" to the British proletariat. Churchill was no Clarendon. The march of science and technology as threatening productive relationships never occurred to him. Ideationally and overtly he battled for his England, his Britain and its manifest destiny, and his career, and the three were one. One must read him and about him ever with this in mind for it is the only consistency discoverable. "History for Churchill provided the dogmas for his faith, the dynamic force which kept him going through the long years of waste and the frightful burdens of power." It was a shallow and romantic history.

Hart, the military historian, fortifies this reviewer's notion of ideological composition being the personal dimension most relevant to Churchill's war-time leadership (and the rest of his life), through the credits he gives him for tactics in World War I and the debits for World War II.

From boyhood, war games fascinated him, but these too, like chess with uncreative players, became replays, especially as he grew older. It was always combat more than strategy that attracted him, the latter emerging in crisis to fortify prejudice, especially against revolution, socialism, and Bolshevism. What he learned from Asquith, Admiral Fisher, Lloyd George, his mentor, and even Kitchener, was useless in World War II, given his softness

toward Mussolini, Franco, and Mannerheim. That he withdrew from appeasement barely in time testifies to his optimism and English-speaking-union spirit more than to any anti-fascism.

"His pugnacity was predominant, and the reverse of prescient." His attacks on elements of the French fleet in disregard of admirals' promises never to fall into German hands must still burn De Gaulle. He, no less than American admirals, was blind before 1942 to the Far Eastern theatre, as he later confessed. His long opposition to a second front in Europe will never be forgotten by Warsaw Pact states. Hart reviews World War II tellingly. Churchill gloried in allied victories to which he contributed, but he was also man enough before he died, in reviewing his political judgments, to say, "Judged by this standard, I am not sure that I shall be judged to have done very well." (P. 225.)

The psychoanalysis of Churchill is admittedly incomplete, failing to account for his courage. It is trite in spots and, of course, speculative in the psychiatric manner. Storr evidences no acquaintance with professional developments since World War II in cognitive psychology, neuropsychiatry, and decision making. Ideological composition of the individual as suggested in 1955 by the conservative American psychologist and psychiatrist, F. C. Thorne, and implicit in Russians from Vigotsky to Leontiev, is yet unrecognized by most academic and applied psy-

chologists, book reviewers, and editors.

Storr has Churchill brave in compensation for a genetically predetermined neurotic depression related in some "dynamic" manner to hostility that rendered him peculiarly vulnerable to the typically British upper-class rejection of youngsters, etc. Winston was hypochondriacal, manic-depressive, altophobic, necrophobic; seemed stupid and obstinate in school; endomorphic and an intuitive extrovert; ate and drank and smoked too much, and during his last five years (and I would suggest ten, since he resigned the premiership in 1955), suffered cerebral arteriosclerosis; but these are not strung together plausibly.

Better are the quotations from C. P. Snow, Violet Bonham Carter, Brenden Bracken, daughter Sarah, and of course Lord Moran, M.D., who knew Churchill well, as Storr never did at all. Particularly apt are quotations from Churchill himself.

In *Savonarola*, his novel, written when he was 23 and transparently about himself (for what else could have been of interest at that age or nearly any, with Churchill), he describes the worry and fatigue of the hero and asks melodramatically if his public work was worth it. "The struggle, the labour, the constant rush of affairs, the sacrifice of so many things that make life easy or pleasant—for what? A people's good!! That, he could not disguise for himself, was rather the direc-

tion than the cause of his efforts. Ambition was the motive force and he was powerless to resist it." Most revealing and prophetic.

Ambition is not a psychiatric term these days, any more than ideology, but it seems informative and explanatory of fatigue and depression, especially given a weak constitution and childhood escapes into history. "We are all worms," he told Lady Violet Bonham Carter, "but *I believe* that I am a glow worm." (My emphasis.) Storr's discussion of this egocentric conviction of a great fate is convincing:

One of the most remarkable features of Churchill's psychology is that this conviction persisted throughout the greater part of his life until, at the age of sixty-five, his phantasy found expression in reality. As he said to Moran (at England's finest hour), "This cannot be by accident, it must be design. I was kept for this job." If Churchill had died in 1939, he would have been regarded as a failure. Moran is undoubtedly right when he writes of "the inner world of make-believe in which Winston found reality." It is probable that England owes her survival in 1940 to this inner world of make-believe. The kind of inspiration with which Churchill sustained the nation is not based on judgment, but on an irrational conviction independent of factual reality. Only a man convinced that he had an heroic mission, who believed that, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, he could yet triumph, and who could identify himself with a nation's destiny could have conveyed his inspiration to others.

Implicitly all five authors, despite differing theories of history and personality, support the thesis that a knowledge of the ideologi-

cal composition of public characters is essential to an understanding of history. Marx made it clear in *The German Ideology* long ago.

GAYLORD C. LE ROY

Christopher Caudwell: A Marxist Critique

David N. Margolies, in his recent book* regards Christopher Caudwell as the most important of the three major English Marxist critics of the 30s (the other two are Alick West and Ralph Fox), and he proposes here to give an account of Caudwell's aesthetics, concentrating chiefly on ideas about the function of art.

A merit in the book is Margolies' sound Marxism, including a good feeling for dialectics, as we see for example in the passage where he seeks to demonstrate that Caudwell's understanding of the relationship between art and society was more dialectical than that of Plekhanov. Margolies is entirely free from vulgar Marxism. "Judging literature according to temporary political standards," he says, "is not only bad criticism—it is also bad Marxism." In his role of critic of Caudwell, Margolies is serious and exacting. He states frankly that Caudwell's discussion of English literature is not extensive, and he speaks also of Caudwell's "dreadful writing," "muddy prose," and

the lack of organization, even down to the paragraph.

The heart of the book is an account of Caudwell's views concerning the function of art. This includes a thesis concerning primitive society, where art is held to harness the instincts for the requirements of the harvest, or perhaps to resemble a tool. "The tool adapts the hand to a new function . . . the poem adapts the heart to a new purpose." Some may feel that this subject belongs more to the anthropologist than to the student of literature. But in the main we are concerned with Caudwell's account of art in advanced societies. It molds the consciousness, organizes the emotions in the interest of adaptation to an ever changing reality. By making us more conscious of causality it enables us to act with greater freedom. Art creates an illusion which is turned into reality. "Caudwell saw that art, through an illusion, changes men, and changed men change the world to make that illusion a reality." Margolies' discussion of this theme is to be compared with that of Andrew Hawley, who in addition describes Caudwell's debt to I. A. Richards and offers an extensive comparison between Caudwell and the

* David N. Margolies: *The Function of Literature: A Study of Christopher Caudwell's Aesthetics*, International Publishers, New York, 1969, \$4.95.

early Kenneth Burke.* The treatment by Margolies in the present book includes a discussion of the function art *will* have in an advanced socialist society. Through the same process of creating an illusion which will in turn be changed into reality, art will function as an instrument through which man makes himself.

The focus of this book is narrower than it might be. For example, Margolies makes important points by comparing Caudwell with Plekhanov (origins and function of art) and Bukharin (the distinction between poetry and science), but we do not get a very clear notion of the grand features of Marxist aesthetics. Of course, it was not part of Margolies' purpose to write about this; nevertheless, the larger dimension would have added a good deal to the book. How odd it is, for example, to read a book on Marxist aesthetics which makes no mention of Lukacs.

One is left with some dissatisfaction also in regard to the treatment of the main disorder of modern art in the West, that is, with the theme of modernism. Margolies does make points that have a connection with this. He shows that in Caudwell's view capitalism has come near to destroying the function of art. He picks up the thesis that the predicament of the artist in the 19th century was

* Andrew Hawley, "Art for Man's Sake: Christopher Caudwell as Communist Aesthetician," *College English*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (October 1968), pp. 1-19.

that, while responding to the misery of the world, he could not break with the class that was causing it. He writes of art for art's sake as an escape from this predicament. He records Caudwell's view that thrillers and certain kinds of love stories have a function similar to the one Marx attributed to religion—they are an expression of real misery and at the same time a protest against it. He writes of the bad art that satisfies the instincts without expanding consciousness—or even deadening consciousness. This is much, but the remarks are scattered, and we are left in the end with the feeling that Margolies has not organized his own thinking on this subject. One reason may perhaps be that he appears somewhat out of touch with the recent developments in East European Marxist aesthetics.

Margolies' treatment of revolutionary art could also be stronger. He surely gives us only half the truth when he says that Caudwell saw little value in revolutionary art and believed that for a great flowering of proletarian art we must necessarily wait until communist consciousness has been fully developed. Margolies does not understand the role of partisanship in art as well as Caudwell did. He thinks that Caudwell's extraordinary last chapter in *Illusion and Reality* is one of the poorest in the book. But it is here that Caudwell writes about the importance of understanding art in terms of class, the importance of practice in changing consciousness, and

the relationship between art and revolutionary politics. The reason Margolies lets us down is probably again that he is out of touch with recent developments in East European criticism. (Andrew Hawley, incidentally, is not much better. He confuses the issue by attributing to Caudwell what appears to be his own view concerning socialist realism; he says it would make literature a branch of science, serving to illustrate truths about objective reality reached by other means. This will not do as a characterization of Caudwell's thinking, and if it represents Hawley's thinking all we can say is that he is out of date.)

Unfamiliarity with recent East European criticism also leads Margolies to the most serious slip

in his book, the statement that we should think of art as primarily subjective. To think of art as primarily subjective has been a leading characteristic of *bourgeois* aesthetics in the last century, but the Marxist view is different. The essential feature to stress, for the Marxist, is the *dialectic* between the subjective and the objective. The proportions will vary enormously, but can one think of a single artistic work in which the critic can afford to consider *only* the subjective component?

These shortcomings aside, this new study constitutes a significant American contribution to Marxist scholarship, a field in which every sign of advance is to be welcomed as augmenting the intellectual resources of the Left.

T H E *African Communist*

Published quarterly

in the interests of African
solidarity, and as a forum for

Marxist-Leninist thought throughout

Africa by the South African Communist

Party — 50 cents a copy; \$2 for one year
subscription; \$3 via airmail.

IN THE U.S.A.:

Imported Publications, 1730 W. Arcade Place,
Chicago, Illinois 60612

NEW PAMPHLETS

- HARD HATS AND HARD FACTS** by Gus Hall
A "man-to-man talk" by a former "hard-hat" construction worker about the real meaning of the recent actions in New York "in defense of the flag" and what construction workers must do to truly protect their interests.
24 pages—25c
- OUR COUNTRY IN CRISIS—THE PEOPLE MUST ACT!** by Gus Hall
Report to emergency meeting of Communist Party National Committee, May 16-17, 1970, on political and Constitutional crisis created by invasion of Cambodia and violent repression of dissent.
40 pages—40c
- THE FIGHT AGAINST THE NIXON-AGNEW ROAD TO DISASTER** by Gus Hall
Report to National Committee of Communist Party, U.S.A. January 16, 1970.
48 pages—60c
- NEW PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.**
Complete official program adopted by the 19th Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A.
128 pages—50c
- OF THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE**
Pictorial highlights of fifty years of the Communist Party, USA, 1919-1969. Includes 143 photographs and illustrations, plus brief history. 9" x 12" booklet.
32 pages—\$1.00
- BLACK AMERICA AND THE WORLD REVOLUTION** by Claude M. Lightfoot
Five recent speeches showing the growing revolutionary character of the Black liberation struggle and its relationship to the world-wide revolutionary process.
96 pages—90c
- LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS** by V. I. Lenin
Centennial edition, with an introduction by Gus Hall and a history of the famous Letter by Art Shields.
40 pages—45c
- ENTER FIGHTING: TODAY'S WOMAN** by Clara Colón
A Marxist-Leninist view on the struggle for women's liberation.
96 pages—85c
- WORKING-CLASS APPROACH TO WOMEN'S LIBERATION** by Gus Hall
Talk at meeting of National Women's Commission, Communist Party, U.S.A., January 5, 1970.
16 pages—30c
- THE FIGHT AGAINST TROTSKYISM** by Hyman Lumer
A brief history of Trotskyism, and a discussion of its counter-revolutionary role in the United States.
16 pages—20c
- ABOUT THE IDEA OF A PALESTINIAN STATE** by Emile Touma
Analysis, by an Arab leader of the Communist Party of Israel, of various proposals for establishment of a secular Palestinian state.
16 pages—15c

At bookstores or order from

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

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

WRITE FOR COMPLETE LIST