

OCTOBER, 1967



PLITICAL
AFFAIRS

THE ROOTS OF NEGRO OPPRESSION
Gus Hall

ASPECTS OF THE CRISIS IN HIGHER EDUCATION
Bettina Aptheker

THE REVOLUTIONARY FORCES OF COLOMBIA
Alberto Gomez

THE RANK AND FILE AND LABOR'S RESURGENCE
James West

**STYRON-TURNER AND NAT TURNER:
MYTH AND TRUTH**
Herbert Aptheker

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLVI, No. 10

OCTOBER, 1967

Betty Gannett, Editor

Hyman Lumer, Associate Editor

CONTENTS

Gus Hall

The Roots of Negro Oppression 1

Bettina Aptheker

Aspects of the Crisis in Higher Education 9

Alberto Gomez

The Revolutionary Forces of Colombia 19

James West

The Rank and File and Labor's Resurgence 34

Herbert Aptheker

Styron-Turner and Nat Turner: Myth and Truth 40

COMMUNICATIONS

Alberto Moreau

Appraising the Middle East War 51

BOOK REVIEWS

Victor Perlo

Capitalism Unlimited vs Communism 57

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 799 Broadway, Room 618, New York, N. Y. 10003, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

The Roots of Negro Oppression

What are the basic primary causes of Negro oppression? Who is responsible? What are the forces in our society that sustain and perpetuate this evil system of a special oppression against 20 millions of our people? What are the forces that make Negro Americans victims of discrimination and segregation in every phase of life, the special targets of police brutality and fascist terror?

The rebellion of the poor—the intense, militant struggles centered in the big city ghettos—has drawn a sharp focus on these basic questions. The rebellion has brought a deep national crisis to the surface. Detroit, Newark, New Haven are but sparks on the surface of a developing, deepening confrontation. They are sparks from a movement, a cause, that is moving toward a progressive solution to a question history has now placed on the order of the day. How fast and how complete the solution will be will be measured to a large extent by the understanding and the consciousness of the forces fighting for it.

Pinpointing the Enemy

Therefore, to know the primary causes, to be able to pinpoint the enemy, is a matter of very practical importance for the development of those tactics and alliances without which victory is not possible. To probe into these causes is the purpose of this article. In the space of one article, of course, it is possible to deal with only a few of the many sides of this question.

The people of our land want honest answers. Their inquiry is sincere. Increasing numbers of our people are ready to draw the necessary conclusions. They can be won for progressive solutions.

The same cannot be said about the ruling circles of our country. The corporate establishment is hell-bent on misdirecting the inquiry, on covering up the real causes. These people are for a whitewash. They are out to create an atmosphere, a mass state of mind, in which a reasoned inquiry is not possible. Instead of an inquiry for the purpose of combatting racism, they are for heightening the tensions of racism. They want to turn the rebellion into a "white-black" riot.

For the corporate structure, racism has always been an instrument of its rule. It is the men of big business who have created it. It is they who perpetuate it. The ghettos are of their making. Now they

are out to use the struggle by the victims of their racist policies to heighten racial tension, to increase racial prejudices, in order to continue to divide and rule.

In addition to the extraction of superprofits from the victims of racism, for capitalism racism has always served as a means of diverting the workers from the struggle against their real enemy. The clearest example of this is the conditions in the South. For generations large sections of the poor whites have lived in utter poverty, only because the rich landlords have been able to direct their attention away from the responsibility of those governments for their own miserable status by the injection of racism.

A most important feature of the rebellion of the long, hot summer has been that in spite of the high tensions, in spite of racist influences, in spite of the deliberate efforts by the ultra-Right forces within and outside of the police departments to turn the struggles into racial conflicts, they have not been successful. In the eyes of the mass media, the "big news" has been the blowing up of every remark or act, no matter how insignificant, that tended to heighten racial tensions. The mass actions have not been struggles between Negro and white. In fact, there have been increasing signs of Negro-white unity in action. These significant developments, however, have not appeared in the news stories.

Without an understanding of the root causes and the forces within our society that force people to rebel, it is impossible to wage a successful struggle against such forces. One must know who the enemy is in order to defeat him.

Thus, one cannot help but admire the groups who get together and go into the ghettos to "clean up a block." The clergy who initiate such actions do so with the best of intentions. But such efforts are not solutions. In fact they are misleading, since the cause is not that the people living in the ghetto have themselves failed to clean it up. They are fruitless because they do not come to grips with the real cause. Any action that does not lead to an inquiry into the basic causes does not lead even to temporary solutions. Mass actions must lead to inquiry that in turn can lead to even more meaningful mass struggles. Such is the path to victory.

What is the line of inquiry the corporate powers want to obstruct? It is one that moves in the following direction: What is that makes for ghettos? Why should tens of millions of Americans be forced to live in rat-infested, dilapidated, rundown tenements without elementary conveniences or facilities? Why is this in the first place the lot of black Americans? If the answer is poverty, what then is the

cause of poverty? Why is there such poverty in the midst of plenty? If the answer is unemployment, low wages, high prices, high rents and taxes, what then is the reason for unemployment and low wages? And again, why is the percentage of Negro Americans in the unemployed and low-wage categories so large? This line of inquiry leads to the very doorstep of the real cause, the real culprit. It is a guide to deciding who is the real enemy and who are his accessories.

For Marxists this is not a new discovery. But for the millions it is a necessary line of inquiry and an important and a necessary discovery. This line of inquiry will lead from a level of spontaneous actions to a conscious line of struggle pinpointed on the basic cause.

At the end of such a line of inquiry the people will find the culprit: the corporate system of capitalism, a system by which the few rob the many. It is this system that creates unemployment, that results in low wages, that jacks up the level of prices, rents and taxes. And it is this system, this capitalist structure, that adapted from slavery the special system of oppressing the Negro people and fitted it into its system of exploiting the workers. It is a system for the express purpose of robbing the poor. This entire corporate structure exists for the sole purpose of getting from the people as much as possible and giving back to them as little as possible. It thus makes the handful of rich richer and the millions of poor poorer.

The very economic basis of capitalism is exploitation. The basis of capitalist ideology is to justify and to facilitate the exploitation of the workers by the capitalists. The basic politics of capitalism is a politics of exploitation. It is a politics and a political structure that preserve and perpetuate this exploitative system. In short, the whole capitalist establishment is an instrument of exploitation.

But why repeat such elementary truths? Again, only to point out the special responsibility of Communists, of Marxists. These truths are not known by the millions who are in struggle. This is a side of capitalism that remains hidden. It is very carefully camouflaged. All "establishment" inquiry stops at this border. It is a safe bet that the Presidential commission appointed to investigate the summer rebellion in the ghettos will not enter this arena of inquiry.

Responsibilities of White Americans

The crisis has forced all Americans to re-examine their responsibilities. That white Americans have a special responsibility there can be no doubt. How this responsibility is placed is a very important question. The purpose of placing it is to win white Americans for

putting an end to the system of discrimination against their Negro fellow-Americans and thereby creating a united people's force for overall progress.

By and large, Negro Americans are to one degree or another in the struggle. The challenge at this point is to win a larger section of white America. Negro-white unity is one of the keys to a victory over Jim Crow. A correct understanding and the acceptance by white Americans of their special responsibility is a primary factor in building such unity.

The *New York Times* in a double-column editorial states the question as follows:

White Americans, of course, must share the greater burden of responsibility. They are the majority group and *they control most of the levers of political, economic and social power in this country.* Moreover, it is the white man's sins and commissions that are the *root* of much of this summer turmoil. (Emphasis added.)

It is progress that this organ of monopoly does not place the blame on the victims of the oppression. But it does not mean that the *Times* is now ready to print the real truth. In fact it is nothing more than a shift from one camouflaged position to another.

The *Times* takes a half-truth and twists it into a protective shield over the real culprit. The half-truth is that white Americans do have to face up to a special responsibility for the continuation of the Jim Crow system. The responsibility does not, however, result because "they control most of the levers of political, economic and social power in this country." This is the *Times'* way of covering up the fact that a *small group* of white Americans do control the monopoly corporations which in turn control the "levers of political, economic and social power." The *Times* wants to cover up for the system of capitalism. What direct power do the mass of white Americans have over jobs, prices, taxes and rents?

The *Times*, speaking as an ideological voice for capitalism, wants to cover up the sins of capitalism by referring to the sins of white Americans. The *Times* tries to cover up the capitalist, corporate, dictatorial control of the "levers of political, economic and social power" by making it appear as if an undifferentiated classless mass of white Americans had such power and control. The *Times* is for everything—as long as it in no way weakens the real power and control of the capitalist monopolies.

Now what is the special responsibility of white Americans in the struggle to end all practices of discrimination and segregation against Negro Americans? It starts from the fact that the system of special

oppression of the Negro people continues *only* because white Americans have been and continue to be accessories in the crime. They are the human force through which the system of oppression operates. Some by choice, others by force of circumstance, white Americans have become participants and accomplices in the deeds of racism.

The *Times* editorial is a vivid example of how the crimes of U.S. capitalism are carried on in the name of white Americans. Therefore white Americans have a special responsibility to end this shame. Negro freedom must become the cause of all Americans.

The perpetuation of the Jim Crow system is possible only because a section of white Americans supports it by acts of racial violence, or because an even larger section is seemingly neutral and thereby supports the evil. Without this the oppression of Negro Americans could not continue for long. White Americans are responsible for the system of special oppression of Negro Americans in the same sense that all Americans are responsible for the dirty, unjust war being conducted against the people of Vietnam in their name. White Americans are as responsible for the acts of oppression when they do not join in the struggle to end discrimination as Americans in general are for the continuation of the war in Vietnam when they do not act to end it.

But the basic responsibility for the imperialist policy of aggression in Vietnam and the policy of discrimination and segregation against Negro America is not that of a "whole people." The roots are in the system of capitalism. They are in the very inner nature of capitalism. For capitalism it is an additional form of exploitation. It is a means for extra profits. The people, either by support or silence, become accessories to this crime.

The Struggle against the Ideology of White Supremacy

No ideological struggle is easy. But for forces on the right side of history no ideological battle is hopeless. White chauvinism has deep roots in our society, but it is not unconquerable. In fact, considerable progress has been made during the past years. And it will be burned out with the rest of the clutter of capitalist class ideology.

For progressive white Americans to give up the struggle against the ideology of white chauvinism "because it is hopeless" means that they have themselves become victims of the ideology. The aim of bourgeois propaganda is exactly to create a feeling of hopelessness.

No, it is not a matter of hopelessness. It is a rather a matter of continuous struggle, a matter of developing ever new approaches, a matter of using the new experiences of people to deepen their understanding of the ideological question.

What are some of the general features of this struggle?

The purpose of an ideological struggle is to win people for action. The aim of a struggle against the ideology of white supremacy is to win white Americans to do battle against the practices which that ideology fosters. An ideological struggle in the abstract limps.

It is a many-sided struggle. It is many-sided because the poison of white supremacy penetrates and affects every facet of our lives. It poisons the moral climate. It affects our moral and ethical standards as a nation and as individuals. Thus it is a moral issue. Further, the concept of white supremacy rests on a total falsehood; therefore it is a matter of fighting for scientific truth. It is also a legal and constitutional question because the oppression takes place by side-tracking and trampling on every premise on which the Constitution rests. And the cruel practices of Negro oppression are in contradiction to all accepted practices of civilized people. Hence it is a matter of basic human rights.

The fight against the ideas of white chauvinism must become the cause of all progressive forces in society because the system of oppression is a primary obstacle to all social progress. It is a matter affecting the immediate and long-range self-interests of the great bulk of the American people. It is a matter of many-sided self-interests, of our urgent self-interests as a nation. The struggle amongst the millions must be related to each of these facets.

To relate the question of ideology to issues of self-interest does not in any way minimize the need to conduct the struggle on more general grounds. There is a sense of shame and moral dissatisfaction that grows out of the use of double standards, out of the conflict between stated and accepted general concepts contained in trade union resolutions, pronouncements of religious bodies and other documents of democratic organizations on the one hand, and the racist practices on the other. This sense of shame is important in creating an atmosphere in which the ideological struggle can be waged. But when white Americans can be concretely shown, on the basis of their own experiences, how the ideology that sustains the system of oppression of Negro Americans has a blade that cuts into their own self-interests also, the battle is on solid ground. A firmer commitment will come with the realization that one's moral and ethical position is in harmony with one's deep self-interests.

An understanding of the basic roots of the system of oppression and the ideology of white supremacy is primary in winning white Americans for the struggle. As class consciousness grows, as more Americans come to understand that it is capitalism that is the primary

cause of all social evils, the understanding that it is also the root source of the special system of oppression of the Negro people increasingly becomes a vital element in the struggle. This basic understanding is key in winning white workers for the fight. The realization that the roots of their problems can be traced to the same source, to the same class, can go a long way toward destroying racist concepts. The Negro-white composition of our working class is an important factor in this struggle and in fact will increasingly become the pivotal element in it.

Progressive Americans must never tire in seeking new ways of explaining that the ideology of white supremacy is a deliberately propagated body of thought, artificially injected with a very specific purpose. Workers can understand this when it is explained to them as something designed to divide the working class for the purpose of weakening it. Democratic-minded Americans can be made to understand when they are shown concretely how racism serves as the primary instrument of the ultra-Right, fascist forces, an instrument with which they seek to penetrate the ranks of white Americans in their efforts to destroy the democratic rights of all Americans. It is an instrument with which the Dixiecrats have subverted and corrupted democratic processes for generations.

These are some of the facets of the struggle against the ideology of white supremacy. In this struggle, it is obvious that one of the special responsibilities of Marxists is to expose its class roots, to expose it as a class weapon, a weapon for the specific purpose of extracting ever bigger profits.

White Americans who are progressive, who are in the ranks of the Left, who are members of our Party, are not immune to the influences of the ideology of white chauvinism. I do not agree with those who say it must always be present in all white Americans. But it is clear that there must be a continuous struggle, a perpetual alertness against the penetration of this poison.

Because Communists and many others in the Left *do* understand the class nature of its roots, and because of their general world outlook, they reject it. So it does not appear as a full-blown ideological position, but rather as an influence. Ideology influences actions, for good or bad. Even small influences of wrong ideologies have negative effects. In the Party and in the ranks of the Left, chauvinist influences result in a lack of participation in the struggle for Negro freedom. They lead to a cutback in political initiatives, especially initiatives to move white Americans into the struggle. They give rise to paternalism, to lack of sensitivity to the problems resulting from

the ever-present ideology and practices of white supremacy. They dull the ability to see or grasp the character of acts that rise from the influence of white chauvinism. They result in a failure to see the special responsibilities of white progressives or Communists in the struggle against chauvinism.

In the Party, ideological struggles can and do take place on a higher level than in broader circles. But even in the Party and on the Left, if they are conducted only on the level of internal discussion, they are bound to limp. The influences of white chauvinism in the ranks of progressives can be most effectively fought when such forces are actively engaged in the struggle against all acts of oppression and when they are participating in the struggle against the ideology of white supremacy in the ranks of the millions. These struggles should never be placed into separate compartments.

The most effective way of fighting against smoke is also to fight the fire. If they don't fight the fire, such fighters will be engulfed by the smoke. In a way it can be said that how serious one is about eliminating the smoke can be determined by how seriously one fights the fire.

Such then, are the responsibilities of progressives and Communists in the all-important struggle against white chauvinism.

CORRECTION

In the article by Pat Bell, "Mexican-Americans in the Southwest," which appeared in the September issue, an unfortunate error appears on page 47. In the quotation from Reies Tijerina, the last sentence, which now reads "Here, they tell us to use violence," should read "Here they tell us not to use violence."

Also, the last name of Rudolph "Corky" Gonzales was misspelled "Gonzalez."

Aspects of the Crisis in Higher Education

The unique characteristic of man is his ability to reason, to think, to make judgements. Knowledge is not a pleantry or a pastime, it is a necessity. The greater man's knowledge, the greater is his freedom. The greater the knowledge and understanding of masses of people the greater their ability to wage the battle for socialism. To learn is not the right of the rich, it is the right of the people.

The Perversion of Education

We must place the question of education high up on our agenda of priorities. We must view the perversion or the denial of education as a criminal offense against a people. By education we are referring not only to vocational training for a job, but also to an education which offers youth the full spectrum of human knowledge. What a loss America has sustained by the fact that millions of her youth—Negro and white, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American—have never gotten an education worthy of the name, have never developed to their full potential, have never really known the joy of living!

Listen to the argument of Dr. Du Bois, made sixty years ago in his *Souls of Black Folk*:

I sit with Shakespeare and he winces not. Across the color line I move arm in arm with Balzac and Dumas. . . . I summon Aristotle and Aurelius and what souls I will, and they come all graciously with no scorn nor condescension. . . . Is this the life you grudge us, O knightly America? . . . Are you so afraid lest we find the Promised Land?

We should not view education as solely the means to learn a trade. Job training, whether it be mechanical skills or professional skills is an important part of education. But it is not the only thing. Notions of some professional educators that education is a mass-production assembly line to turn out skilled technicians are unacceptable. We do not accept such notions for minority youth or for white youth. The struggle must be for quality, integrated, free education, free from business and reactionary domination.

One of the murals of the great Mexican artist José Clemente Orozco shows skulls and skeletons attired in academic robes surrounded by books and bones. The mural depicts the American university as a center of death. Its indictment is as harsh as the reality.

In recent years, especially since the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley in 1964, the fact that American universities and colleges are controlled by the largest and most reactionary agricultural, industrial and banking interests in the nation has become a recognized fact.* At the present time it is necessary to explore what this control has meant for higher education in the post-World War II period of the cold war. The present crisis in American education is many-sided. The crisis involves the quality and content of education, and the availability of education to large numbers of young people. The crisis is a direct result of the big business and government control of the educational system.

The central conflict arising in the university and college system flows from the fact that the system is under the control of a corporate elite seeking its utilization to maintain and service a reactionary system. On the other hand, the concepts of progress, of enlightened thought, of creative endeavor, are inherent in the idea of education and in the idea of the university. It is from this central contradiction between the control of the university, and the traditional and progressive functions of the university, that the source of the contemporary struggle is found. Much of the ideological justification and the technological weaponry of the cold war comes from the universities and colleges.

Professor Hans J. Morgenthau, in the *New Republic* (November 26, 1966), remarks:

Large segments of the intellectual world have indeed been silenced or corrupted. . . . Three factors account for the susceptibility of the intellectual community to remaining silent and being corrupted: the conformism of American society, personal ambition, and inducements which the government holds out to those who do not openly dissent.

Illustrative of the perversion of American universities are these thoughts published by Professor Franz Schurmann of the Berkeley campus of the University of California in the same journal, December 3, 1966:

* See B. Aptheker, *Big Business and The American University*, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1966; A. Levin, *Political Meddling and the Florida Board of Regents*, published by SSOC; H. Aptheker, "Academic Freedom in the U.S." *Political Affairs*, July 1965.

. . . the university is hardly an academic community, and is becoming less so each year. The multiversity philosophy simply expressed a reality. Through contractual and other relationships with government and business, the university has taken onto itself interests and goals which depart sharply from the basic academic values.

Examination in closer detail of the university and college system will prove the point.

War Research

In an excellent book, *In the Name of Science*, (Chicago, 1966) Professor H. L. Nieburg of the University of Wisconsin carefully explains and documents government and corporate relations with university research projects. We read, for example that "the Rand [Corporation] was established by the Air Force after the war time success of 'operations research.' . . . Starting from an initial base of 255 employees and a budget of \$3.5 million in 1948, Rand grew by 1962 to 1,150 employees and an annual business of \$20 million. About 70 per cent of its current activity is for the Air Force and includes brainstorming future generations of weapons and 'paper' analyses of new strategic and tactical doctrines." (P. 245). Part of the research for the Rand Corporation is done at universities and colleges. Rand makes grants readily accessible to qualified graduate students and/or faculty.

In 1951 the Air Force requested the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to establish the Lincoln Laboratory for electronics research and development. Nieburg goes on to explain that ". . . the Army and Navy got into the act soon thereafter, the former creating the Research Analysis Corporation in 1961 under the aegis of Johns Hopkins University, the Navy establishing the following year the Center of Naval Analysis at Philadelphia's Franklin Institute." (P. 247.)

What Professor Nieburg documents, and what the reader begins to understand, is the degree of competition among professors and different universities and colleges to secure contracts from the defense department or large corporations for research. In other words, the cooperative effort of scientists, the cohesion and mutual respect of academicians, is destroyed in this rat race for profits and money. Nieburg describes the "brochurism" of the faculty—by which he means the process of professors composing brochures describing a proposed research project and then offering their brain-child to the defense department much as a prostitute offers her body.

The story is not yet fully told. Michael Klare, writing in the *National Guardian*, January 4, 1967, points out that:

Many universities become dependent upon federal funds for maintenance and expansion. In 1960, 83.5 per cent of Cal Tech's budget was supplied by government funds. For MIT this support was 81.1 per cent, for Princeton 75.3 per cent, for the University of Chicago 63.8 per cent. Moreover, the intensity of military-oriented research on campuses is illuminated by viewing the list of American universities who were among the 500 contractors listed according to net value of military prime contract awards for research, development, test and evaluation work, as recorded by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year, 1966.

We list here a few of these:

<i>University</i>	<i>Value of Contracts</i>
Johns Hopkins University	\$50,393,000
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	\$47,308,000
Stanford Research Institute	\$30,693,000
University of Michigan	\$19,492,000
Columbia University	\$16,203,000
University of California	\$16,149,000

There are 93 universities and colleges that are listed in this category of military research contractors by the Department of Defense. By 1964 the federal government was spending in excess of \$1½ billion for university-conducted research—most of it through the defense department. "As Federal money became available many universities set up autonomous, semi-secret research institutions. In these centers scientists have participated in development of thermonuclear weapons and guided missile systems." (*National Guardian*, January 4, 1967.)

Not all research goes directly for military use. Not all is classified or secret. There is in all research an overlap between what can be used for peaceful purposes and what can be used in war-making. The central factor, however, is that virtually all research is financed by the defense department, and the scientists have exercised almost no control over the uses to which their discoveries are put. Moreover, if our primary concern was for the peaceful application of scientific advance it would seem logical to assume that federal departments like that of Commerce, or that of Health, Education and Welfare might finance such projects.

The University of Pennsylvania through the Institute of Cooperative

Research has been conducting research for the Defense Department on the adaptation of chemical and biological weapons which have found their use in Vietnam. *Sunday Ramparts* disclosed in a front-page story on January 29, 1967 that there is a "unique" marriage between the biology department of the University of California at Berkeley and the Naval Biological Laboratory in nearby Oakland. According to *Ramparts*, "Bubonic plague and contagious air-borne diseases wed them."

The student newspaper at the University of Connecticut, the *Daily Campus* wrote, on November 7, 1966, of research underway on its campus into the synthetic production of LSD and other psychedelic drugs in the department of pharmacy. The department has been commissioned by the Defense Department "to research LSD production techniques concurrent with experiments presently being conducted on US troops to determine the effects of psychedelic drugs in chemical warfare."

Professor Melvin Calvin of the Department of Chemistry and Molecular Biology at the Berkeley campus of the University of California is presently on the Board of Directors of the Dow Chemical Company. Dow Chemical produces napalm—the new "better" version, presently in use as an antipersonnel weapon in South Vietnam.

When Professor Calvin was confronted by university students and urged to resign from Dow Chemical he defended his position by asserting that "a woman or a child is as dead from mortar fire, or shrapnel, or a simple rifle" as from napalm. This appalling declaration has, happily, not characterized the response of all American scientists.

The *New York Times* reported on February 15, 1967, that a petition submitted to the President and signed by 5,000 U.S. scientists, including 17 Nobel prize winners and 127 members of the National Academy of Sciences, urged that the following steps be taken:

Institute a White House study of over-all Government policy on chemical and biological weapons;

Order a halt to the use of antipersonnel and anticrop chemical weapons in Vietnam and;

Re-establish and categorically declare the intention of the United States to refrain from initiating the use of chemical and biological weapons.

While there has been, then, corruption and perversion of the life of the academic community, there have also been the beginnings of a movement to reassert the principles of an academic community.

There can be no apologies and no polite phrases uttered for the projects of death undertaken in an intellectual community supposedly dedicated to the peace and prosperity of mankind.

The CIA

The Department of State, the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency have in recent decades had significant influence on the life of the academic community. Their efforts have further corroded the integrity of the intellectual.

Counter-insurgency techniques have formed a big part of the research conducted primarily in the behavioral and political science departments. In 1965 the Defense Department spent \$20 million on research in the behavioral sciences, much of it research in foreign countries. One of the classic examples of such an effort was Project Camelot financed by the Defense Department. The Project was conducted through the American University in Washington, D. C., and was directed by Professor Rex Hopper. Project Camelot was begun in Chile, 1964-1965. The primary purpose was to develop techniques for the prevention of social revolution. The Chilean Congress conducted a full-scale investigation of Dr. Hopper and his so-called scholarly endeavors. The Congress declared the effort a violation of its national sovereignty and an exercise in espionage, and threw the professor out of the country.

It is common practice for American professors, after completing several months of study in a foreign country to stop off in Washington for what is called a "debriefing session." The professor will get a few extra dollars for the information he discloses to the Department of State. An example of this kind of thing is an anthropologist who studied tribal conflicts in an African nation. The CIA and the State Department are also interested in tribal conflicts but for obviously different reasons. Professors have made this "debriefing" a common practice and in doing so have become essentially spies, not scholars.

The exposé of the CIA subsidy to the National Student Association (for the details see *Ramparts*, March 1967), and the concurrent release of the CIA-front foundations, has led to information about the extent of the CIA involvement in the domestic affairs of the nation. The *New York Times* commented on this editorially, February 20, 1967: "Now, through the deviousness of CIA operations, thousands of scholars, students, unionists and professional leaders discover long after the fact that they have performed unwitting and undesired duty as secret agents." It is to be added that we are also

discovering the numbers of students and faculty that were witting agents of the CIA.

Professor Raymond J. Sontag of the history department of Berkeley admitted in a letter to the *Daily Californian* that he had worked for the CIA from 1951 to 1953. Some might recall the writing of Professor Sontag in a State Department publication he co-authored in 1948 with J. S. Beddie on *Nazi-Soviet Relations 1939-1941*. It was one of the leading documents contributing to the Cold War. The *only* documents used by Professor Sontag came from the Nazi archives. On February 25, 1967 the Chancellor of the Berkeley campus, Roger W. Heyns, endorsed the role of Professor Sontag and stated that he thought that "the student has the responsibility to cooperate with the CIA." This is from the liberal chancellor of one of the nation's most distinguished universities!

Ramparts, in April 1966, in an article written primarily by Warren Hinckle, disclosed the nature of the CIA project undertaken by political science professors at Michigan State University. It is here that one gets a sense of the content of CIA projects, and an understanding of the nausea gripping NSA members. The MSU professors were responsible for the training of the Diem police force, requisitioned arms for the South Vietnamese puppet government, and established the VBI—the Vietnam Bureau of Investigation or the secret police. This project was conducted from 1955 to 1963. It certainly is reassuring to know that the Vietnamese were well-trained in the American way! We will now first begin to uncover the role of academicians from the United States in the CIA operations in the Congo, Guatemala, Cuba, Iran and Iraq, ad nauseum.

Neil Sheehan in the *New York Times*, February 19, 1967, wrote of the CIA having financed, in addition to the National Student Association, the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, the National Education Association and Policy Research, Inc., whose president is Dr. Evron M. Kirkpatrick, also executive director of the American Political Science Association. It was also disclosed in the same article that there were five people serving on the board of directors of the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs, which foundation was established as a CIA front, primarily to give funds to NSA. Among those five individuals is Dr. Buell Gallagher, President of the City College of New York.

Richard M. Hunt is an assistant dean of the Harvard University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. The San Francisco *Chronicle* (February 20, 1967) disclosed that Dr. Hunt is the head of the Fund for International Social and Economic Education, which fund re-

ceived \$25,000 from the CIA through the J. Frederick Brown Foundation, one of the CIA fronts. The money was used for "an undisclosed project in Latin America."

On February 20, 1967 the San Francisco *Chronicle* reported that "The Free University of Berlin in the American sector of West Berlin was used by both the Central Intelligence Agency and U.S. Army Intelligence to recruit American and foreign students for what members of the agencies often called 'part-time' work." The work consisted of students travelling into the socialist countries for the purpose of gathering desired data. Students received \$50 to \$100 a month for their services, and tragically, many became dependent upon the extra money so that they never kicked the "habit" of spying.

Institutions of higher learning in this country have become the ideological and technological centers for the carrying out of the cold war. The facts prove the case. Fundamentally, the result has been that the universities have lost their political independence and their intellectual integrity. Faculty professionalism and preoccupation with contractual relations has made undergraduate teaching a nagging responsibility. Likewise, the content of education, and the quality of education have been severely distorted in this cold-war era.

Class Composition of the Classroom

On the whole, higher education in the U.S. is the privilege of the more well-to-do segments of society. There are at present almost six million college students in the United States. Of those six million only 200,000 are Negro. And of the 200,000 Negro students half are in all-Negro or predominantly Negro institutions in the South.

The American Council of Education recently issued a report on the national freshman class of 1966 which indicated that 40 per cent of all families in the U.S. have incomes of less than \$6,000 a year while 80.5 per cent of the college students come from families with incomes greater than \$6,000 a year. There are millions of young people who never get near a college, or are able to attend for only a year or two at the most.

This occurs at a time when higher education is required increasingly to get decent jobs. The U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, stated that since the decade in 1952, professional jobs requiring 16 years or more of education rose 67 per cent; technical and semi-professional jobs requiring some education beyond high school rose 40 per cent and jobs filled by high school graduates rose by 30 per cent. It is true today to say that the right to learn is

the right to live. It is also a fact that the educational facilities as presently constituted are in no way able to meet the growing demand. There is, indeed, a financial crisis in the funds available for higher education. Ten institutions in the U.S. receive 80 per cent of the endowments to higher education—and of course those ten institutions are not the junior and city colleges. Moreover, some "enlightened" Right-wing Governors such as Ronald Reagan have proposed budget cuts and tuition charges which would severely cripple education. Such proposals are classic examples of class legislation, for it is the poor and working-class youth, Negro and white, who will be the first excluded from a college education.

We are really just beginning to grasp the full extent of the crisis which grips the system of higher education. It involves the governance and control of the university, the content and nature of education, the uses of the university, and the dire need for the rapid expansion and democratization of the university and college system.

Part of the dynamic for change exists within the university itself. The academic community is part of the revolutionary age in which we live. The anti-Communist mania, the racism, the anti-revolutionary posture of American policy, and the treating of Marxism as criminal are no longer tenable positions for the honest scholar. This reactionary and racist scholarship of the cold war finds itself in sharper and sharper conflict with world realities. It is to the everlasting credit of the academic community that a section of its students and faculty opposed and continue to oppose the present U.S. aggression against the people of Vietnam.

It is simply a fact that one-third of the world is socialist. It is a fact that there is not a country in the world in Asia, Africa or Latin America that does not have its national liberation movement. In these cold war decades the absurdity and horror of a third world war is obvious to the world, and to members of the academic community. Profound changes in thought are occurring within that community. Radical students have clearly made a major contribution to creating a fertile soil in which such new trends could grow.

In 1962, Professor of Sociology C. Wright Mills wrote in *The Marxists*: ". . . there is no positive *ideal* held by Marx that is not an altogether worthy contribution to the humanist tradition. . . . Karl Marx's principles are clearly among the animating principles of Western Civilization." (Dell, New York, pp. 26-27.) Mills likewise pointed to the impact of the ideas of Marx on the world so that ". . . total societies and the ways of life of millions of people have been basically transformed. Today, these ideas inform the offi-

cial creed of what were once the most backward countries of Europe and Asia but which are now the ascendant powers of the Euro-Asiatic continent." (P. 27.)

Dr. Erwin Roy John, director of the Brain Research Laboratories, New York Medical College, wrote in *The Nation* (March 21, 1966), after returning from an extensive journey through Cuba:

The questions which Cuba raises will be raised again and again in the years to come. Are we to maintain our hostility and opposition to all future revolutionary movements? My own conclusion, based upon what I have seen and tempered by the desire to learn more, is that the Cuban Revolution merits our support and approval.

And finally, in further illustration, Dr. Mel Mendelssohn, assistant to the President at New York City Community College, wrote in *Commonweal*, January 13, 1967: "In our psychotic pre-occupation with the 'Communist menace' we have lost sight of the economic and social inequities throughout the world, violated international accords, and subverted the democratic process we claim to promote, both at home and abroad." The phenomenal success of the American Institute for Marxist Studies, and the growing interest in Marxism, socialism and revolution are further indications of what is new in the academic community.

The new trends reflect the growing consciousness of the intellectual community of what is new in the world. Once grasping the new realities there is the desire to seize upon them for the benefit of mankind. That is, after all, what the intellectual is supposed to be about. Given the nature of the control over the system of higher education, the intellectual—student and faculty alike—is faced with the task of fighting to break with the CIA and the military. He must cleanse himself of twenty-five years of cold war prostitution. In the process of self-liberation he will transform qualitatively the nature and structure of higher education. It is the beginnings of that process that we witness today. It will continue, and in the end, it will triumph.

The Revolutionary Forces of Colombia*

The upswing in guerrilla struggle in Latin America ushered in by the victory of the Cuban revolution has made a closer examination of the problems involved an urgent necessity. If in analyzing the problems of revolutionary armed struggle we once turned mainly to the experiences of other continents (this is not to say that their example no longer plays an important role), today the Latin American revolutionaries have accumulated experience of their own in this type of struggle which, besides having ensured victory in Cuba, is gaining momentum in other countries of the continent. Profound assimilation of the Cuban experience (especially at the stage of the armed insurrection and conquest of power) and its comparison with the experience we have gained in our specific national conditions should help us to carry our own revolution to victory, to the winning of power.

We propose to dwell on the development of the armed action movement in Colombia, on the still limited experience of this movement which is as yet weaker than the enemy it faces, and on the tasks facing it, and to give an idea of its growth.

In doing so we by no means suggest that our experience should be regarded as a pattern to be followed everywhere.

Any social phenomenon should be examined in its entirety, in the process of its rise and development. Further, it is essential to view it in the light of the current phase of the history of the country in question. For if things were to be examined through a prism of ready-made answers and these answers did not agree with the real facts of life, the investigator would be bound to sacrifice faithful depiction of the reality to his a priori schema.

The popular armed struggle is governed by laws common to all national-liberation wars which cannot be disregarded at any stage of the struggle. But besides this each such war, every guerrilla movement inevitably bears the imprint of the country in which it takes place. It would be a mistake mechanically to apply the experience

*Reprinted, slightly abridged, from *World Marxist Review*, April 1967. In view of the widespread discussion of the subject, particularly since the recent Conference of the Organization of Latin American Solidarity (OLAS) in Havana, we present this account of the guerrilla movement in Colombia for the information of our readers.—Ed.

of other countries. Many tragic examples have taught us this lesson. We must not equate social processes of the same type taking place in two different countries, necessary though it is to utilize the experience of one to accelerate the other. For instance, the experience gained by the people of China in their liberation war cannot be regarded as identical with the struggle of the Algerian people, or the experience of Venezuela equated with that of Guatemala, even though in both cases the enemy—U.S. imperialism—and the strategic aims are the same. It is obvious that guerrilla struggle cannot develop in exactly the same way in two countries if the processes engendering this struggle differ. In one case it may be a matter of a group of revolutionaries taking to the mountains determined from the outset to overthrow the existing regime, and in another (as in Colombia) of the gradual development of the peasant movement into an armed political struggle.

From Armed Self-Defense to the Guerrilla Movement

Forms of struggle are not invented, they are not conjured into being by people unacquainted with the concrete situation. They stem from this situation. What is required of the revolutionaries is the ability to find the forms which are objectively necessary and to direct their development along revolutionary channels.

The policy known as mass self-defense is not an invention of the Colombian Communists. This form of struggle was evolved by the peasants themselves. By supporting it and incorporating it in its own line—not as an aim in itself but as a means of advance towards higher forms of struggle—our Party showed that it had its finger on the pulse of Colombian life and took cognizance of all of its aspects.

Mass self-defense is deeply rooted in the social struggles of our peasantry. As a movement it first emerged nearly twenty years ago. Originally the peasants' response to the official policy of violence (*La Violencia*) which has been the country's scourge since 1948, it started as a spontaneous movement without any clear-cut political aims, essentially amounting to a manifestation of inter-party strife between the Liberals and the Conservatives. But in 1949 the Communist Party issued a call to the masses to reply with their own organized violence to the violence unleashed by the reactionaries. The slogan found a response among the peasant masses. The peasants themselves gave it practical embodiment in the guerrilla movement. This movement, features of which were the heroism of the guerrilla fighters and the primitive weapons they had at their disposal, soon had nationwide repercussions.

In the early fifties more than 1,000 peasant families from other areas gathered in the district of El Davis, Tolima Department, in the Central Cordillera. The adults were organized in the Party, the young people in the Communist Youth organization, the children in the so-called Sucre Battalion, and the women in their own committee. This was the first closely-knit armed group to embark on guerrilla action. Soon the entire southern part of Tolima Department was gripped by guerrilla warfare. Many outstanding fighters, such as Manuel Marulanda, Ciro Trujillo, Isauro Yosa, Alfonso Castaneda (Richard), Jacobo Prias Alape (Charro Negro) and Isaias Pardo, got their baptism of fire in El Davis. This was the first major center of guerrilla struggle in Latin America led by the party of the proletariat. The present guerrilla movement is carrying on the traditions of these fighters.

However, the first stage of the armed peasant movement (1949-53) also had features which retarded the all-round development of the struggle. The movement had neither a united military-political leadership nor a clear-cut program aimed at winning power. It was rather a conglomeration of groups which had considerable manpower resources but were politically disunited. Joint planning of the struggle was out of the question. The Liberals, Conservatives and Communists each led their own movements, pursuing, moreover, entirely different aims. For the liberal bourgeoisie the guerrilla movement was a means of stepping up inter-party struggle which fostered the illusion that only a military take-over could solve the problems at issue. The Conservatives mainly sought to use their combat detachments to maintain the dictatorship. The Communists worked to unite the diverse groups, and in the Boyaca Department they managed to convene a conference of guerrillas but were not able to achieve their aims on a national scale.

The year 1953 was one of painful experiences. More than 5,000 guerrilla followers of the Liberal Party who had been operating in the eastern plains surrendered to the dictatorship of Rojas Pinilla. Later other Liberal detachments followed suit. The Communists, although fewer in number and forced to retreat to Southern Tolima, continued the struggle. Charro Negro, Isauro Yosa and Manuel Marulanda launched operations in the zone that later came to be called Marquetalia. Ciro Trujillo moved into the Cauca department, an area inhabited by Indians with traditions of peasant struggle. The latter zone was later named Riochiquito.

The Communist Party led the guerrilla war at its second stage (1954-57). For more than six months positional warfare was waged

in Villarica and Conday against numerically superior troops of the enemy. Bitter fighting went on for every meter of terrain. When further resistance became impossible, many of the peasants moved south, to the Tolima and Huila departments. Subsequently the guerrillas were redeployed in Meta and Caqueta departments. The march was effected by mobile groups which fought the enemy through 1955-57. A column under the command of Alfonso Castaneda moved into the El Pato and Guayabero districts.

Owing to the treachery of the Liberal leaders most guerrilla groups had laid down arms by this time and as a result contact had been lost between the revolutionary forces in the countryside and those in the towns. Moreover, the new government, which had demagogically proclaimed the slogan "Peace, Justice and Freedom" and announced an amnesty for all who had borne arms, succeeded in sowing illusions among the masses. In these circumstances the guerrillas who had not laid down arms could not carry on in the old way without risking being isolated from the masses and hence doomed to certain defeat. Because of this the detachments in the mountain areas of Marquetalia, Riochiquito, El Pato, Guayabero and other places which the army had not been able to overrun entered upon a new phase of the struggle. Their armed core was once again turned into a self-defense organization to protect these areas where hundreds of peasant families and former guerrillas fleeing from government reprisals had taken refuge. The new settlers, without any aid from the state, cleared the mountain slopes and jungles, planted crops and set to raising livestock. In time these zones became major suppliers of produce for nearby markets. This was the situation of the peasant rebels when a new political climate set in with the fall of the dictatorship in May 1957.

The Communist Party was the only revolutionary force that remained in the thick of the struggle throughout these difficult years. However, as distinct from a number of other countries, in Columbia no consistently unitarian and relatively stable Left movement capable of ensuring a genuinely democratic outcome of the struggle against the dictatorship could be built up. Owing to this the imperialists and the Colombian bourgeoisie succeeded, even though the peasant guerrilla detachments had not been defeated on the field of battle, in finding a solution which, while essentially changing nothing, on the face of it offered a way out of the crisis.

The Camargo government (1958-62) pursued a dual policy towards the guerrilla areas. On the one hand, measures were taken towards what was called rehabilitation of the "zones affected by the violence." The key elements of this policy were infiltration of the peasant areas

by means of credits for promoting production and housing, and lavish dispensation of promises. Rehabilitation was selective and aimed at winning the political support of sections of the peasantry, especially the ex-guerrillas and their leaders, or at least neutralizing them. On the other hand, districts whose population continued to regard the government with distrust were denied economic aid. The local organizations in these areas were persecuted as before and many of their leaders, especially ex-guerrillas, were murdered. Beginning with 1960 this dual policy became the basis of the "military-civilian action."

The government saw a threat in the existence of the self-defense zones. It realized that they were not a sign of relative equilibrium in the class balance, but a manifestation of class struggle. Consequently, a plan of aggression against these zones began to be elaborated in 1957. It envisaged five stages: civilian action, economic blockade, military action, unification of the zone, and its "return to the orbit of national life." In 1960-63 the government began to carry out this plan. An offensive was first launched against the numerous armed bands which the army itself had previously used to terrorize the villages but which by this time had broken away from its political control.

At the same time the troops easily dealt with groups of young patriots who, influenced by romantic idealism, had taken to arms ignoring the actual conditions in which they had to operate. In Marquetalia, however—and this is an indicative fact—the resistance offered by the self defense detachments (backed by a nationwide protest movement against the aggression) repulsed an expeditionary corps of 7,000 men in early 1962 and compelled the enemy to give up the operation.

To the setback suffered by government forces in Marquetalia and the general strengthening of the Communist-led peasant self-defense movements the reactionaries retaliated with the cry that these areas were "states within the state," "independent republics," which it was imperative to destroy. The events following the launching in May 1964 of a military offensive against these "independent republics," an offensive which opened with the second attack on Marquetalia, once again showed the real nature and significance of the peasant self-defense movements.

Life in the self-defense zones was in no way idyllic. The inhabitants, mostly peasants who had moved there to escape the terror, had no illusion about "class peace," nor had they any faith in the good will of any government. They knew the perils of life under constant attack by the landlords and the army. But they chose this life be-

cause they knew that in our country the democratic peasant movement had no chances of developing unless it relied on its own armed organizations. Hence, the people in the self-defense zones were always on their guard. Military training was carried on systematically. There was a high sense of discipline which proved equal to every test. The peasant movement, while not seeking to initiate hostilities, replied without hesitation to every provocation engineered and every crime committed by the reactionaries in these districts. It is not by chance that in the most gruelling years of *La Violencia*, when the peasants were hounded over more than one-third of the country's territory, the government forces could not penetrate into the districts controlled by the Communist-led self-defense detachments. On the contrary, the conditions ripened in these areas for an armed class movement with the object not of upholding narrow partisan, parochial interests but of serving the exploited masses and fighting for the social revolution.

Moreover, the self-defense movements do not confine themselves either to the bounds of their particular zones or to simply defending the peasants' right to the land. They are primarily revolutionary political organizations resolutely opposed to the landlord-capitalist system, and their influence extends to large areas. Their aim is to win over the masses, to enlist them in the class struggle, and to channel their energies to the overthrow of oligarchic rule. Were it not for this their adversaries would never have labeled them "independent republics." Although besides the peasant movements led by the Communists and other revolutionary groups there are many other peasant organizations, the reactionaries are leaving these alone for they present no danger to the existing system.

There are a number of questions which are frequently asked: Why didn't the peasants embark on guerrilla struggle after 1957? Why did the preparatory stage last so long? Why did they wait for the government to resort to armed aggression before taking guerrilla action? Did the Communists not regard the self-defense zones only as a propaganda expedient and seek to avoid a direct clash with the government?

A review of the experience of our country supplies the answers to these questions. We Colombian Communists never expected the peasant masses to take to arms on orders issued from the towns. Our peasants had to learn by their own experience. They had seen for themselves what war means. And they joined the armed struggle only when they realized it was the only way out, when this struggle was imposed upon them by a class enemy resorting to violence

to save himself.

It should be borne in mind that the acquisition of land and even active endeavor to acquire landed property exert an "appeasing" influence on peasants. The peasant listens rather than talks, he is distrustful and exceptionally observant. When he finally becomes convinced of the need for one or another solution, he becomes a dynamo of energy and willingly leaves his family and plot of land and throws himself wholly into the struggle. The Communists could not artificially spark off armed struggle, as some leftist groups insisted we should in the early sixties. We waited for the proper moment, when the Party's call to reply with guerrilla action to the aggression launched against the peasant zones had found a response among the masses, and when this moment came guerrilla detachments with a large radius of action sprang up in the Central and Eastern Cordilleras. The peasants realized the need to transform the self-defense zones into guerrilla territory and hence fully supported these detachments.

We never expected the self-defense zones to be impregnable from the military standpoint. On the contrary, the possibility was foreseen that they might fall into enemy hands. At the same time, however, we regarded them as a base for a future movement, centers of a popular armed movement which today are stronger than ever owing to the very logic of events.

Marquetalia: A Trial of Strength

The test of a policy is practice. Marquetalia was a test which proved the correctness of our policy. The army threw the full weight of modern weaponry and its experience in anti-guerrilla warfare against it. But Marquetalia, too, had prepared for guerrilla warfare. It was not simply a matter of resort to arms on the spur of the moment, for the leaders of the area were well acquainted with past experience, had made a study of the success scored by the enemy, and from the outset were guided by a clear-cut concept of guerrilla war.

Before the aggression Marquetalia itself had not been a zone of military action. But the work done earlier by its leaders in *peripheral areas* had laid the groundwork for the subsequent operations. And this groundwork is an important factor today as well.

The peasant population of Marquetalia was not left to the mercy of fate either before or after the invasion. At no time, however, was it proposed to have women and children accompany the guerrilla detachments or to burden these detachments with the peasants' live-

stock and personal belongings. The evacuation of the families was planned in advance so as to leave in the zone only those able to bear arms. The families were taken to neighboring areas where they play an important role in rallying support for the fighting men.

The mobile guerrilla units extended their radius of action, sending out their representatives in advance to persuade the peasants not to abandon their plots. Despite the efforts made by the government to win over the people in these peripheral zones, the latter are continuing to give strong support to their fellow-peasants in the guerrilla units. The correct policy pursued by the revolutionary movement has borne fruit.

In conformity with the overall policy of preparing for guerrilla action (a policy subsequently pursued in other zones as well) intensive work was done to build up stocks of supplies for the future detachments. Large stores of provisions were cached in the mountains. Six months after the beginning of hostilities the supply service was taken over by specially organized zones.

A plan of hostilities was worked out in advance. The army found itself facing detachments subdivided into groups operating both inside and outside the traps laid by the troops. The guerrillas engaged the government forces the moment they entered the zone. Although the army eventually occupied Marquetalia, it encountered minefields and ambushes everywhere, suffering telling losses under constant harassment. The guerrillas soon moved into the mountainous and jungle country. The government forces now lost contact with them, while the guerrillas had the enemy's every move under observation. Although the army occupied the central part of Marquetalia, it could not cordon off the entire 5,000 sq. km. area, and the initiative in the choice of the battlefield passed over to the guerrillas.

On July 20, 1964, at the height of the fighting, a guerrilla assembly was held which put forward an agrarian program envisaging the winning of power by the people in the process of the agrarian anti-imperialist revolution. And on September 30 the first conference of guerrillas and self-defense detachments of the South established the Guerrilla Bloc of the South consisting of six detachments. Summing up the experience of Marquetalia, the conference declared with a sense of gratification that "five months after the first stage of the offensive against Marquetalia the mobile guerrilla units achieved complete victory over the government's anti-guerrilla tactics."

The conference declared further that "the revolutionary armed action movement, which has adopted tactics based on mobile guerrilla operations, is an invincible movement capable of standing up to the

far superior forces of the enemy, witness the situation in Marquetalia where the peasant detachments are fighting 16,000 government troops."

Marquetalia acquired symbolic significance. It inspired a broad solidarity campaign throughout the country. Gaining a military-political victory over the government, Marquetalia not only ushered in a new stage in the guerrilla movement but stimulated the emergence of new guerrilla detachments. Its experience in the conduct of warfare (the fact that 200 enemy officers and men were killed or wounded in the course of a few months is indicative) was taken over by other zones, which began preparing for action and to strike at the enemy even before they were subjected to attack (El Pato, Guayabero and South Tolima). Reorganizing the self-defense movement into a guerrilla movement, these areas are now working to expand and consolidate the guerrilla detachments.

New Phase in the Guerrilla Movement

Early in 1965 a new guerrilla movement sprang up in the department of Santander in the North—the Army of National Liberation led by student youth. The next phase of the struggle was ushered in with the establishment of the FARC* at the Second Conference of the Guerrilla Bloc of the South in April 1966.

The conference attached much importance to the study of the tactics and strategy of the enemy (primarily questions relating to "preventive" war, "military-civilian action," and encirclement and airborne operations). A study of the experience of the enemy and the evolution of his tactics, in a word, of his concept of counter-revolutionary war, is essential in order to counter it with a tactics and strategy of revolutionary war according with the Colombian conditions. The conference also discussed the policy of the guerrilla movement towards the masses and to Party building in the zones of hostilities.

The meeting drew up rules for FARC, set up a military-political headquarters and elaborated a unified organizational structure. The decisions of the conference can be summed up as follows: (1) founding of FARC; (2) establishment of a general guerrilla headquarters; (3) elaboration of the inner structure of FARC and its rules; (4) adoption of a program for FARC; (5) elaboration of an operational plan including the following points: (a) military action in the former self-defense zones by the six existing fronts; (b) penetra-

* Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Columbia. Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia.)—Ed.

tion into new zones to set up bases for operations; (c) establishment of new guerrilla blocs; (d) creating an extensive area of guerrilla action; (e) combining self-defense with guerrilla action; (f) organizing self-defense detachments where the situation is not yet ripe for guerrilla action, and (g) coordinating action in the countryside and in the towns.

Proceeding from the strategic aim of the Communist Party—the conquest of power—the conference charted the perspectives of the guerrilla movement, which is destined to become the core of a people's army, the principal instrument for achieving this strategic aim.

The Balance Sheet

The Colombian army operates on three fronts: military, political and ideological. It has trained its staff officers in anti-guerrilla tactics, placed these experts in the leading positions and charged them with stamping out the guerrilla movement. But regardless of the lavish expenditure of manpower and public funds, they have failed to achieve their aim.

In 1964-65 the army mounted four major operations, against Marquetalia, El Pato, Riochiquito and Guayabero, in which 16,000, 5,000, 12,000 and 5,000 troops respectively took part. In August last year thousands of troops were deployed to encircle and mop up sections of El Pato and some parts of Huila Department. For weeks on end villages were bombed and strafed, crops destroyed, and hundreds of peasants arrested. A curfew was proclaimed in 21 southern municipalities.

At present the government has thrown 25,000 troops against FARC. The operations are directed personally by President Restrepo, who has visited the areas of hostilities to bolster up the morale of the troops. It is quite likely that the punitive forces will be increased and the scale of the repression expanded. But while conducting military operations, the army continues to use the "reformist" devices of what is called "military-civilian action."

The guerrilla movement on its part works in the following three directions:

(a) *Military activity*, which is a basic function of our detachments in the zones of hostilities, is aimed at wearing out the enemy by means of ambushes, attacks on roads and taking hostages. This keeps the enemy in a constant of tension and prevents him from concentrating forces in any particular spot. The object is to win the support of the peasants generally, who see in each action of

this kind an expression of their own protest against the existing regime. Peasants who have been driven from their land, forcibly evacuated to other parts of the country, or compelled to move to the towns see in the guerrilla detachments their leader and champion, a force that deals blows at those responsible for their plight. Needless to say, the guerrillas seek to extend their radius of action and to carry operations to zones where the conditions are favorable for them.

The operations conducted in 1966 yielded good results. We hit hard at the army in Colombia and Baraya (Huila), Vefalarga, El Pato, South Tolima (in the Central Cordillera), and in the areas of Planadas and Gaitania. The guerrillas display a high degree of mobility, vanishing into the hills after each blow. The governor of Huila Department wrote in *El Espacio* on August 23 last year that the situation was "extremely serious; the entry of the army only causes the guerrilla forces to disperse," and added: "Huila, especially the area of the Eastern Cordillera, has become a Sierra Maestra where international Communism is preparing its forces to expand operations on Colombian territory." And on September 2 the same newspaper wrote: "In June, July, August and September this year 26 encounters took place between FARC and the Colombian army."*

(b) The *political activity* of the guerrilla movement is aimed at extending its sphere of influence and thereby paving the way to increasing its radius of action. This work is carried on in areas where military action would not be well received from the outset by a substantial part of the local peasantry. Colombia, and especially its rural areas, is subdivided not only administratively but also according to political allegiances. There are traditionally Liberal, Conservative, Rojist** and Communist zones. Within the spheres of influence of the bourgeois parties and the oligarchy there are districts where the peasants are armed in support of the army. The guerrillas avoid encounters with these peasants and concentrate on neutralizing them. This work is highly important in order to deprive the army of armed peasant support.

Consequently, we are striving to build in these zones organizations

* This year has been marked by a further intensification of guerrilla action. In particular, guerrillas belonging to FARC wiped out on March 3 a unit of the Sixth Brigade of the Colombian Army near Algeciras. Government troops lost 16 killed and 6 wounded. This operation, comparable to the FARC action near Vegalarga at the end of last year, is one of the most serious defeats for the anti-guerrilla forces since the beginning of the guerrilla movement.

**The Rojists form a reactionary movement which is now in the opposition; it is headed by Rojas Pinilla, the former dictator.

corresponding to the present phase of the struggle in order to neutralize traditional hostility toward our movement. There are, of course, no ready-made formulas to go by. How to go about it must be decided on the spot.

The guerrilla detachments are organizers of the masses. Whenever they enter a zone where the conditions are ripe for organizing the peasants, they set to work at once, proceeding from simple forms of organization to the more complex. First committees are set up to carry on the struggle for immediate economic demands (building of schools, roads, etc.). As our influence grows problems of a political and military order are posed—such as organization of self-defense or armed groups, and building contacts between the peasant youth and the guerrilla detachments.

The underlying principles of our mass work are:

(1) respect for the property of the peasants—provisions are paid for unless they are voluntarily donated;

(2) defense of the peasants' interests; respect for women and for religious beliefs; help in solving the delicate problem of boundaries between plots, as well as family problems, all of which eventually establishes the guerrillas as peasant counsellors.

A correct approach to the local population is of decisive importance. The guerrillas should set an example as champions of the peasants' interests. The peasant may allow his sons to join a combat group, but he will closely watch the behavior of every guerrilla. For he cannot forget the misdeeds of earlier detachments. He also remembers the roving bands which plundered their homes and raped their women, and the army patrols that left their farmsteads stripped clean as if invaded by locusts. In view of this the statutes of FARC stipulate that the guerrillas must always be exemplary in their behavior.

Each new guerrilla combat operation is added proof to the peasants that the enemy is vulnerable! it stimulates the growth of their consciousness and their active opposition to the regime. And each political operation strengthens the guerrillas' foothold in the old zones and helps to extend their influence.

(c) In some zones a serious *ideological* struggle is under way between two concepts—anti-communism as the ideological basis of preventive war and the ideas of communism, the proponents of which are the guerrilla leaders adhering to Marxist-Leninist positions. Our propaganda is winning over many of our former opponents. The guerrilla movement carries on work even in the enemy ranks to persuade the soldiers—who, after all, are workingmen in uniform—to turn their weapons against their real enemy. A distinction is drawn between the

ordinary soldier and the special anti-guerrilla trooper in order to neutralize those who otherwise might become our enemies.

The Worker-Peasant Alliance

We proceed from the reality, not from preconceived notions. Our guide is the Marxist-Leninist precept concerning the need to build the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. The absence of this alliance in the past enabled the reactionaries to paralyze popular actions in the earlier phase of the armed struggle (1949-53 and 1954-57). One of the shortcomings in the past was the weakness of the revolutionary movement in the cities. The ruling classes took advantage of this, and when the military dictatorship of Rojas Pinilla fell on May 10, 1957, the fruits of the popular struggle were reaped by the bourgeoisie, which put a "national front" government in the saddle.

But it would be an act of sheer desperation if because of this we were to anathematize the towns and surrender them to the class enemy. It should be borne in mind, first, that 52 per cent of the population live in towns (moreover, there are 17 cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants each). Second, there is the example of the spontaneous uprising of the urban masses which began on April 9, 1948, when the Liberal leader Jorge Eliecer Gaitan was murdered. Some towns were in the hands of the workers for several days. And we know how important a role the mobilization of the urban masses played on May 10, 1957, when the dictatorship was overthrown. In recent years there have been numerous strikes of workers and students, and major actions have been undertaken by teachers and clerical workers. Hence the importance we attach to work in the towns. This work is a component of our policy of combining diverse forms of struggle.

The guerrilla movement is well aware that it *alone* cannot carry out the revolution. Guerrillas know from experience what it means to act in isolation. A victorious revolution calls for the unity of the people, and there already are signs that this unity is growing. Every action by workers, students or teachers helps the guerrilla movement. As the headquarters of FARC have declared on repeated occasions, every action taken by the working people is inseparably linked with the struggle waged by the guerrillas.

Leading Role of the Communist Party

No claimants to political leadership of any movement can expect to succeed unless they throw themselves into the thick of the struggle,

No group can really take the lead merely by declaring itself to be the vanguard. We Communists have always made it clear that we do not consider ourselves to be the only revolutionaries. On the contrary, we have always extended a fraternal hand to all those outside our ranks also fighting against imperialism.

Colombia is the scene of a life-and-death struggle. In the center of this struggle is the guerrilla movement headed by FARC and its headquarters. The united military-political leadership of FARC follows the line of the Communist Party as set forth in the decisions of its central bodies. To meet the requirements of the revolutionary process in our country, the Tenth Congress of our Party centralized the leadership of armed action in the rural localities. The leading positions in the headquarters of FARC are held by such tried and tested fighters as Manuel Marulanda Velez, Ciro Trujillo, Jacobo Arenas and Isauro Yosa, all members of the Central Committee of our Party. Our combat planning, based on the decisions of the inaugural conference of FARC, takes cognizance of both the concrete situation and the general situation in our country. It is not by chance that 48 per cent of the delegates to the Tenth Congress were peasants, some of whom have been waging armed struggle since 1950. It can be said that the revolutionary armed struggle in our country is largely the result of the work done by the Communists.

Playing its part in the thick of the armed struggle, forging ahead from success to success—and committing inevitable mistakes as well—our Party has consistently charted the basic course of this struggle. It evolved the tactics of mass self-defense which led on to guerrilla action. We created the FARC, which first emerged at the time of the aggression against Marquetalia and crystallized thanks to the experience accumulated by the Guerrilla Bloc of the South. FARC is destined to develop into a people's army and play a decisive role in winning power for the people.

The Party and the guerrilla detachments are at one, they interweave and are interdependent. By strengthening the Party we also strengthen the guerrilla movement. And when the guerrilla detachments gain in influence, so does the Party. All Party organizations throughout the Cordillera help the armed units solve the problems confronting them. Every Communist in the zone of hostilities is a guerrilla behind the enemy's lines. Whenever a detachment moves into a new locality, provided the conditions are ripe, it lays the groundwork for a new Party organization. Conversely, in areas where guerrilla action has not yet begun but the political base exists, the Party paves the way for the guerrillas to move in. Every zonal, municipal

or district committee in the theatre of hostilities works to strengthen the guerrilla movement. Party organizations are as necessary to the guerrillas as the air they breathe; they are a pre-condition of successful operations. *The "Secret" of the indivisible unity of the Communist Party and the guerrilla detachments is that the Party and its leadership are in the center of the armed struggle.*

Some Lefts at one time insisted on beginning armed action everywhere. But when it actually began and the peasants were in greater need than ever of support and concrete aid, these people were not available. Their exhortations were not matched by deeds. Some of them now consort with the bourgeoisie. Others unconditionally support all the economic and repressive measures of the government, repudiating the very demands they once put forward. This happened because politics can rest only on realities, not on myths. The merits of each are measured by his concrete participation in the revolutionary process.

One hardly finds anyone today who believes that because the guerrilla movement is headed by Communists it will lose popular support. Experience has shown that the guerrilla movement led by our Party has extended its radius of action and penetrated into zones where Liberal and Conservative influences used to predominate and also into areas where there formerly were neither self-defense organizations nor any sign of Communist influence. The guerrilla movement is developing into a factor uniting the democratic forces. By working to build a united front of all groups carrying on the armed revolutionary struggle, FARC is helping to translate into reality the Party's call for a patriotic national-liberation front. Only such a policy can ensure the victory of the revolutionary movement.

The Tenth Congress of our Party pointed out that a specific type of revolutionary way *combining all forms of struggle* is opening up before Colombia, and stressed that in the overall context of this way *popular armed action will develop into the main form of struggle against imperialism, to win power.* FARC is paving the way to a people's army. We Communists are working to realize this perspective. We are fighting for an independent, sovereign Colombia based on socialism.

The Rank and File and Labor's Resurgence

It was at the UAW Special Collective Bargaining Convention in Detroit on April 20 of this year that Walter Reuther said: "The power of this union is not in Solidarity House. It's not in your local union headquarters. It is inside the rank and file of this union."

Reuther made this basic observation in his talk on the upcoming contract negotiations with the auto industry. The corporations, he said, would be impressed with but one thing: "the power of our organization and its will to bring the solidarity of that power to bear upon the collective bargaining process."

This sound appraisal of the real source of strength of the union, its rank and file, applies with no less force to the subject of Reuther's unprecedented second major address to the Convention's 3,000 delegates, that of the auto union's relations with the AFL-CIO Executive Council consequent to the UAW's initiative for a resurgence of the labor movement.

For the renovation and revitalization of the labor movement can and will come to fruition primarily as a result of a tremendous upsurge of movement on issues by the rank and file in which the Left and Communists are component parts.

All past history of the labor movement shows that it takes a big surge forward when the membership moves *en masse* on the vital issues of the day. It was a vast army of *volunteer* worker-organizers on the job and in the communities that did the major portion of organizing the unorganized in the CIO and impelled the whole labor movement forward in the thirties.

Today, the muscle and power of the unions have been sapped by a myriad of restrictive labor laws and hamstringing contract clauses. Only the concerted, militant action of the membership can cut through this dense undergrowth and restore that power and strength.

Rank-and-File Movements

The complex nature of the new problems facing the trade unions as a result of automation and other new technology and the need to organize the unorganized, especially in the South, is such that no

amount of money and lawyers, let alone reliance on paid organizers alone, can effectively do the necessary job. Only the rank and file, in its great numbers, unity and motion, can solve these problems.

The question of what kind of rank-and-file movements are needed is already being answered in life. In general, as one would expect, they are movements on issues that vitally affect the interests of the working class as the workers see them. These are developing both on the job and in the communities. They are so widespread that no one knows all of them.

On the job, the most characteristic movements are: to bring working conditions in line with minimum standards of physical and mental health (including a struggle over what those minimums are), especially on the production lines in trustified industry; as part of this, the struggle against arbitrary "management prerogatives" which deny the union any say in the organization of production as it affects health and safety; for upgrading of Negro workers, eliminating jim crow jobs and opening new areas of employment to Negroes and other oppressed minorities; for the shorter work week; for restoration of the right to strike over grievances when arbitration procedures fail to resolve them in a reasonably short time; for strengthening the steward system; and so on.

Examples of such on-the-job movements are seen in the more than twenty committees, caucuses and locals which advanced their own proposals for the new auto contract; in the thousands-strong production worker demonstration, coming off the job to march on the UAW convention in support of their demands; in the 200-strong contingent of Chicago auto workers taking time off to join the Detroit demonstration, organized by the young leaders of Ford Local 551; in the scores of Negro caucuses and committees for equality on the job and in the union in steel, auto and other unions; in the Teacher's Action Committee (TAC) of more than 150 in the Chicago Teachers Union, who act as the yeast for militant policies and democratic procedures in that local; and in numerous other developments.

On many vital issues, sections of the working class often express themselves by active participation in community-based movement as well as on the job. This is particularly the case in the struggle to end the war in Vietnam and the fight for peace. It is also true of the civil rights struggles, of the fight against poverty and for upgrading the incomes, housing, education and cultural life in slums and ghettos. And it is true of the fight for jobs for Negroes and other minorities, for organizing the unorganized, for shifting the tax burden to corporate wealth and on many other issues.

Among such community-based movements are the Labor Peace

Committees, whether independent or affiliated with the Labor Division of SANE. There are the affiliated chapters of the Negro American Labor Council, COPE and DRIVE committees where they are year-around membership-based organizations, as well as the local Independent Labor Political Action Committees and Labor Committees for New Politics. And there are the community tenant unions, committees to combat poverty, labor committees on taxes such as the Illinois Labor Committee for Fair Taxes, and others.

All of these are examples of labor and community-based movements having immense potential for involving and activating the rank and file. Their growth and effectiveness would not only promote their own programs, but would also go far toward influencing the course and direction of the labor movement. The proliferation of such movements in and around the trade unions, and the coordination of their efforts on a national and regional scale, would be a decisive factor in effecting the resurgence of labor, in bringing the UAW initiative to life.

The new rank and file movements have a powerful attraction for the young workers. They are, in fact, a chief answer to a question of major concern to unions today: how to involve and educate young unionists.

Workers, including Left workers, are not immune to the traditional tendency of the older generation to forget its own youthful years in judging the new young generation. It is commonplace to hear older unionists, especially officials, criticize the youth "for not appreciating what we old-timers went through to found and build the union, to win the wages and conditions we have today. They're not satisfied and keep raising hell for more!" One trade union official said with deep earnestness: "If only we had the New Left student youth in the labor movement!"

Well and good, but why overlook the treasure in labor's own home? To be sure, today's young workers are dissatisfied, want more, are restive. The fact is, thanks to the struggles of the older generation of unionists, today's standard of living is much higher than that of the thirties; but then, so is the cost of living. And especially, today's youth are using the same yardstick to measure the adequacy or inadequacy of income and conditions that the older generation used in its youth, namely, its needs are in accordance with the given standard and cost of living of the times.

It was this which propelled the young workers of the thirties into militant struggles, and it is this very same process which is going on today. And in it the labor movement and its rank-and-file locomotives have a rich seedbed for resurgence.

The young workers, judging the labor movement in terms of how well it meets youth's needs today, are a natural and powerful base

for rank-and-file movements and struggles, in the course of which they can be most receptive to education on the history and principles of trade unionism. A renovation and revitalization of the labor movement without the young workers is inconceivable. It is no accident that many rank-and-file movements are led by young unionists.

The new rank-and-file movements are distinguished by new features which, in embryo, foreshadow some essentials of the pending labor resurgence. Among these are the following:

1. The new movements usually differ from the old caucus-type movements in that they do not set out as anti-leadership or oppositionist groups. They are primarily "for" movements, that is, for one or another positive program on vital issues facing the working class or a section of it. If they become "anti," it is primarily against the companies or a particular policy of government. They become vehicles for replacing union leadership only to the degree that incumbent leadership is deaf to, blocks or oppose their efforts and objectives.

2. They are non-exclusionary. They welcome the participation of all workers who agree with their programs and have something positive to contribute. Experience shows it has become commonplace to invite or accept the participation of the Left and the Communists.

What many labor leaders have said off the record and on: that it was a mistake to get rid of the Communists, that the labor movement needs the stimulus of Communist ideas and the devotion and voluntary activity of the Communists, is taken seriously and acted on by many rank-and-file movements. This is a clear indication that official policy for the exclusion of Communists, now codified in many union constitutions, can and will be rendered inoperative and in good time rescinded altogether. An omen of this was the resolutions sent from a number of locals to the August convention of the American Federation of Teachers, calling for repeal of such a clause in that union's constitution.

Sure signs of the impending labor upsurge are evident in the re-emergence of class-struggle approaches as well as in changes for the better in attitudes to Communists. This was reflected in a speech to the 1967 convention of the Western Regional Council of the International Woodworkers of America by International President A. F. Hartung, fully endorsing the UAW initiative and sharply criticizing the AFL-CIO Council for "having Lovestone and Brown . . . running around, trying to upset governments and overthrow leadership in the trade union movement [abroad]." He said further: "I think the labor movement must be the leader in whatever way they can to try and further peace on earth and good will to men because the rich are not interested as they are getting too much money out of wars."

Eschewing red-baiting, he reminded his audience that he had been called a Bolshevik when he was a member of the I.W.W. Turning to Vietnam and criticizing U.S. policy there, he said: "I can't for the life of me buy this idea that every time a group of downtrodden people go out and fight for a little more bread, maybe a little more straw in the roof of their huts, that they all of a sudden turn into Communists."

Thus, it is not accidental that the first meaningful, although sometimes halting, steps to repudiate red-baiting and anti-Communism in the labor movement are the inevitable concomitants of a return to militant, class-struggle approaches to the problems of the class and the nation. But, as with all other questions of labor resurgence, the full restoration of the rights and equal citizenship of Communists in the trade unions depends first of all on the maximum development of the rank-and-file movements, practically all of which operate on the principle of non-exclusion, of unity in action of *all* workers on mutually-agreed upon issues and policies.

Concentration Policy

The historic initiatives now beginning to unfold for a resurgence of the labor movement call for a renewed Communist initiative toward the working class. The Communists have a most important contribution to make. It is an historically proven fact that even a small Communist Party can play a decisive role in the resurgence of the labor movement and in helping to bring about a qualitative change to a new, advanced status of the working class. Such was the case in the thirties. And as in that decade, the Party could today emerge as an influential force in the life of our country, this time even more so.

For this, it is necessary fully to re-establish the policy of concentration called for by the National Committee. It is necessary to absorb the *essence* and *principles* of the concentration experiences of thirty years ago, and to avoid mere mechanical repetition of the past and purely administrative concepts of concentration.

It is only when the policies and daily activities of the Party are fully in accord with the chief historic task facing the working class at the given time, and are directed to fulfilling that task, that the Party can in fact play a decisive role. The policy of concentration is the means for bringing this about, for making the Party near and dear to the working class. It is when this happens that the working class responds by making the Party a large and powerful mass influence.

In its essence, the concentration policy is the means whereby a small party, by concerting and concentrating its strength and efforts

on the most important problems, at the key and decisive points, can help to move those sectors of the working class whose initiative influences, inspires and leads the whole class and other anti-monopoly forces beyond its ranks. These key sectors of the class are the workers—especially the production workers—in basic, trustified industry such as steel, auto, electrical, transportation and others.

The object of the concentration policy is to help the working class achieve the revitalization of the labor movement and advance to a new day of political pre-eminence in the nation, without which it cannot solve its immediate and long-run problems.

The horizons of the concentration policy must be as broad as the new frontiers awaiting conquest by the labor movement. Today's labor movement must concern itself with the new problems arising out of new technology on the job, with peace, civil rights, urban renovation, taxes, pollution, etc.

The various rank-and-file movements touched upon above are the instruments being fashioned by the workers in the ranks for the attainment of their goals and for trade union resurgence. The first task of a concentration policy is to relate to these movements, to draw into them the maximum number of workers from the decisive sectors, to give them a labor base and orientation, to help shape their course and direction. A concentration policy divorced from these movements is no concentration policy at all.

American imperialism, persisting in its ruinous foreign and domestic policies, continues to sharpen all problems to a degree which will soon approach the point of a qualitative change. The mood in the Negro ghettos was expressed by a West Side Chicago Negro woman: "Things can't go on this way any more; there's got to be a change." This is the mood that has also begun to generate on the production lines in auto and in the basic production units of steel. It finds its echo in the fields among the Mexican-American agricultural workers, in Puerto Rican ghettos of the big cities, in the run-down areas of Northern cities inhabited by southern white in-migrants.

It is reflected in the search for a new means of political expression to fulfill the people's demands for peace, equality, security and democracy, in the call to the New Politics convention, in growing disillusionment with the established political machines of both old parties.

The year 1968 will mark a big step forward in the struggle against the rapacious policies of the ruling class, in the forging of broad people's alliances for economic, social and political advance in conditions of world peace. And vital to all this is the resurgence and leadership of the labor movement.

HERBERT APTHEKER

Styron-Turner and Nat Turner: Myth and Truth

History's potency is mighty. The oppressed need it for identity and inspiration; oppressors for justification, rationalization and legitimacy. Nothing illustrates this more clearly than the history-writing on the American Negro people.

At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th—with U.S. monopoly capitalism aborning and feeding especially on the ravishment of the South, with the last of Populism being crushed and the memories of Reconstruction and its betrayal still fresh—there appeared at frequent intervals the outpouring of the Dunning-Fleming school (based at Columbia University). Stout volume after stout volume was published, with the accoutrements of the highest scholarship, treating in general and then State by State the post-Civil War generation; their assumptions were the inferiority of the Negro and the sanctity of private property and their conclusions justified the K.K.K. and glorified the Bourbon.

These tomes having prepared the ground, popularization came through fiction and film—notably Dixon's *The Clansman* (1905), read by scores of thousands, and its film version, *Birth of a Nation* (1915), seen by tens of millions. The point here was the bestiality of the Negro—almost literally (indeed, in 1910, in St. Louis a Christian divine produced a volume whose theme was the non-humanity of the Negro, as shown in its title, *The Mystery Solved—The Negro a Beast*).

With the turning into the first decade and beyond of the new century—after Du Bois' *Souls of Black Folk* (1903) and the founding of the Niagara Movement (1905) and the NAACP (1909-1910), Booker T. Washington's death (1915) and the First World War, plus U.S. entry therein (1917) and the employment of hundreds of thousands of black troops in France, while the Dunning-Fleming-Dixon image of a kind of barbaric brutality was not expunged, along with it and increasingly to the fore came the no less mythical concept of utter passivity, docility and imitateness. This, also, of course, was based explicitly upon the idea of the immutable and biological inferiority of the Negro.

The masterwork in this school was that by U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery* (1918), reinforced by the essentially similar effort from

the same man, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (1929). Here emerged—again with full scholarly accoutrements—the picture of the plantation South as marvelously placid, wonderfully attractive and resting upon the labor of a people—black people—who were the world's most natural slaves; people who simply delighted in chains—and so serene was the society that no one really noticed chains, let alone heard them rattle.

Phillips's work did not sell many copies but few authors have been more influential. All Americans who went to school from about 1920 to about 1940 were presented essentially the Phillipsian version of slavery; protest came only from the Left and from Negro scholars themselves, especially Du Bois, Charles Wesley, and Carter G. Woodson. The latter was the guiding spirit from its founding (1915) of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History which through its Journal, other publications and yearly Meetings combatted the chauvinist stereotypes but the white world, including the organized historical profession, deliberately ignored or was quite oblivious of all this.

The most successful popularization of the Phillipsian mythology was Mitchell's *Gone With the Wind* issued at the close of the rebellious 1930's and in 1939 put out in motion picture form with the greatest publicity campaign ever undertaken up to that time. The novel and the film were read and seen by hundreds of millions; the film itself was reissued in its original version five times, and in a remade 70 mm. version is to be reissued—again with tremendous fanfare—in October, 1967. Meanwhile, in professional circles, an effort at the rehabilitation of Phillips has been undertaken with his 1918 volume reissued in 1966, in paperback by Louisiana State University Press, plus a laudatory introduction by Prof. Eugene D. Genovese; the same scholar delivered a very positive estimate of Phillips' work in a session devoted entirely to him at the December 1966 Meeting of the American Historical Association.

The substance of the Phillipsian view, though not his biologically-based racism, fits well into the latest rationalization for patterns of segregation and discrimination. In the 1940's this took the form of the massive volumes by Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma*, whose analysis put the problem in the "hearts and minds of the white people" and so made it into a "dilemma," i.e., an insoluble problem. Significant, too, in this regard, was the slight volume with the ambitious title, *The Negro in the Americas*, by Frank Tannenbaum. The latter work was remarkable for its cavalier disregard of mere facts which helped sustain the conclusion that slavery in the United States

was especially dehumanizing and had in fact succeeded in making its victims into the image cast by their masters.*

The 1950's and 1960's have witnessed the growth of a literature—notably that produced by Hannah Arendt and Bruno Bettelheim—insisting that oppressors, in this case, nazis, succeed in making their victims over into the image which rationalized the efforts at victimization in the first place. These writers, as Tannenbaum, do not permit mere facts and data to stand in the way of their generalizations.

Reinforced by psychological works reaching similar conclusions—like *The Mark of Oppression* by Lionel Ovesey and Abram Kardiner—there has appeared in history-writing the effort associated with the names of Tannenbaum, Stanley Elkins and Genovese to affirm that the Phillisian version of American Negro slavery was substantially accurate, though its presentation was “marred” by the author's racism. We now are being told that the enslavement itself—particularly the form of it prevalent in the United States—was of such a nature as to produce “Sambo” in fact. The image offered is that of one who is savage and docile at the same time, who is emotionally and psychologically sick, filled with self-hate, permanently injured by family deprivation, who grovels and smashes, who writhes and twists, to whom sadism is purification, who is preoccupied with sex in its most putrid and/or perverse forms, above all, one who is eaten up alive with self-abuse and self-contempt. The source is a psycho-social environmentalism rather than the now rather thoroughly discredited defective gene theory; but the result is identical—is “Sambo.” In terms of the struggle against jim crow it is necessary to remark that the ruling class want “Sambo” (which is why it created the myth in the first place) and will welcome him quite regardless of how he came into being.

* * *

The fictional image of the Dunning school was *The Clansman*; the fictional image of the Phillips school was *Gone With The Wind*; the fictional image of the Elkins school is William Styron's *The Confessions of Nat Turner* (Random House, New York, 1967, \$5.95).

Few novels have had more advanced to-do made about them than *The Confessions*; interviews of the author have appeared in magazines and newspapers throughout the country—including the *New York*

*On Myrdal, see this writer's critique, *The Negro People in America* (International Publishers, New York, 1946.) Note also the role of the so-called “Agrarans” in the 1920's and 1930's in idealizing the Old South. William Faulkner actually suggested that the return of slavery would be of distinct benefit to Negroes—quoted in the *New York Herald Tribune*, November 14, 1931.

Times. *Harper's Magazine* for September, 1967 used 52 pages to publish a considerable section of the novel prior to its release date, October 9. The Book-of-the-Month Club, in its *October News*, announces the book as its November choice; clearly, this is a million-dollar property.

Ghetto uprisings crackle throughout the nation. What more appropriate and more functional than a novel ostensibly based on the life of the slave whose very name symbolizes rebellion; especially if the novel, as Mr. Clifton Fadiman, in the aforementioned *Book Club News*, correctly says, shows us the “strange, mad mind of Nat Turner,” offers “a passkey to the dark dungeon of his sexual imagination,” demonstrates that “the overwhelming majority of the slave population refused to follow him,” makes clear that “the rebellion itself would have been pathetic had it not been so stupid and brutal,” and that its only result “was to be expected: greater repression of the Negroes.” Yes, indeed, with these values and estimates and generalizations, the novel does “throw some light,” as Mr. Fadiman does not fail to point out, “on the bleak dilemmas of our own anguished era,”—or at any rate the kind of “light” that Club and Mr. Fadiman have been laboring for so many years so sacrificially to throw on this “dilemma.”

Certainly, Mr. Styron's book would seem to be elucidating Turner's mind and imagination—mad and sick, as Fadiman says—for the book is written as though it is Turner who is narrating. Mr. Fadiman thinks Styron has managed complete identification or empathy; this, he tells us, is the novelist's “central achievement.” Actually, whatever this book is, it certainly is not Turner as the available evidence presents him, and it is certainly not the slave society of 19th century Virginia, where Turner lived and whose foundations he shook, which are in this novel.

Shall we excuse this on the grounds that it is, “after all, a novel”? I think not, because there *were* authenticated Confessions by Turner, and it is these upon which Styron explicitly founds his book and from which he quotes some portions—not always accurately. Further, the book is prefaced with an Author's Note in which the reader is told, “During the narrative that follows I have rarely departed from the *known* facts about Nat Turner and the revolt of which he was a leader” (*italics in original*); and the extract in *Harper's* carries an Editor's foreword wherein one reads, “. . . Styron has adhered to the known facts of the revolt wherever possible.” On the contrary. . . .

* * *

One of the very well established facts concerning the slave, Nat Turner, is that he fled from his owner in the mid-1820's, stayed away about a month and then, moved by religious qualms, returned to the

service of his earthly master. We know, too, that upon his return he was berated for this by many of his fellow slaves—they said he was a fool to have come back and, as Turner said, “they murmured against me.” No hint of this central experience is in the novel. Especially important here—and elsewhere in the original *Confessions**—is the evidence of the anti-slavery feelings of his peers; this also is not in the novel.

Perhaps one of the most dramatic moments in the actual *Confessions*—for that matter, in American history—comes when Turner’s court-appointed investigator demands to know from him whether or not he sees now—in jail and in chains—that he was mistaken in what he had undertaken, especially since he is soon to be executed. The interrogator himself reports Turner’s reply: “Was not Christ crucified?” This direct, simple and great flash is not in the novel.

Where Styron does quote from the *Confessions*, he is accurate with two exceptions, together quite revelatory. He has Turner saying that “my mother strengthened me” in a belief in his special capacities; the actual *Confessions* has Turner saying, “my father and mother”: the two italicized words are omitted. A little further along, Styron quotes Turner as saying that “my mother” and others offered the opinion that with his marked “sense” he would develop into a difficult slave; but actually in the *Confessions* at this point one finds “my grandmother.” At still another point, Mr. Styron has Turner say, “I never laid eyes on my grandmother”; Turner, however, not only “laid eyes” on her but remembered her rather well and specifically says that he “was much attached” to her.

In fact, while American slavery certainly dealt awful blows to the family structure of the slaves, it never fully destroyed it—in large part because of the women’s ingenuity and resistance; and a rather unusual feature of Turner’s life—well documented—is that he remembered both his father and his mother and a grandmother, too. The father—also a slave—fled and made good his escape (this fact is in the novel) but he did not do so before having left a clear mark on the memory and the consciousness of his son. All this may be in conflict with elements of the Kardiner-Ovesey view and the Moynihan thesis, but that is the fault of the view and the thesis—not of Nat Turner!

*Made in a Virginia prison to a court-appointed interrogator after Turner’s capture. The full text, including all appendices, is in my *Nat Turner’s Slave Rebellion* (Humanities Press, New York, 1966). The body of this book was written in 1936 as a university master’s thesis; at Mr. Styron’s request this writer lent that manuscript to him some years ago—it was kept several months and then returned with a warm letter of appreciation.

In the *Confessions*, Turner mentions his father and mother in connection with another unusual aspect of his life; he states that they taught him how to read (a perilous and illegal undertaking). Turner adds that this was accomplished so early in his life that he could not remember when it occurred; he adds that he polished up his literary prowess at odd moments, especially from the books of white children. This may be contrasted with one of the emphasized episodes in the novel—that Turner is educated by his master who in his benevolence wished to experimentally demonstrate that Negroes could learn to read and write.

There is repeated reference in the novel to the Great Dismal Swamp, lying in the southern part of Southampton County—locale of the revolt—and extending into North Carolina. Styron has Turner reject this as a possible refuge for the discontented slaves, insisting that to reach it and to survive therein were not possible. The historical fact is that the Swamp *was* the refuge, for generations, of fugitive slaves, many of whom not only made it but survived in it, carved out a community life therein, resisted capture and used it as a base from which to launch punitive expeditions against plantations. Indeed, many contemporaries thought—when the Turner uprising became known—that it was in fact another such assault.

The Turner rebellion cannot be understood unless it is seen as the culminating blow of a particular period of rising slave unrest. Such periods were never absent in the South for long; they appeared and reappeared in waves and the Turner cataclysm was the highlight of one such wave which commenced about 1827 and played itself out in 1832. In the *Confessions*, indeed, the interrogator specifically asked Turner about this and whether his outbreak was part of other such efforts just past and others perhaps impending. Turner said no to this but added in a perfectly straightforward way that since he had been moved to rebel, others similarly situated might also be similarly moved. This reality conflicts with the novel’s insistent theme as to the uniqueness of the Turner manifestation of slave unrest; the theme is false.

An important feature of this marked unrest just before the Turner outbreak was that it resulted in the reinforcement of the already massive machinery of control—a machinery never mentioned in the novel but fundamental to an understanding of slave militancy and protest, especially the odds mounted against their manifestation. Not only were new repressive laws passed—just *before* the outbreak—but additional police measures were taken at the specific requests of southern Governors, including the Governor of Virginia. Furthermore, this reached the highest levels of government, so that at the orders of the Secretary of War, federal forts were reinforced in the Spring of 1831

both in Louisiana and Virginia—and Turner and his men rose up in August.

None of this fits a pattern which weaves through the novel—and has been stated by its author explicitly elsewhere—that the system of slavery “dehumanized the slave and divested him of honor, moral responsibility and manhood” and that “the character (not characterization) of ‘Sambo’ . . . did in fact exist.”* Certainly, in the novel the bulk of the slaves are made into “Sambos” and I am afraid this *is* characterization; that it is not character is demonstrated by the historical record of the Negro people in the United States both during and after slavery.

The novel is permeated with the most chauvinist stereotypes and descriptions of black people; that they are put in the mouth and mind of the slave rebel Nat Turner does not make them more palatable. We offer examples—the Negroes are: “God’s mindless outcasts” (p. 27); “most Negroes are hopelessly docile” (p. 58); “addled, distraught, intimidated throng” (p. 99); “sloppy, uncomprehending smiles” (p. 103); “as stupid as a barn full of mules” (p. 104); “stupid and brutish inertia” (p. 202); “docile equanimity” (p. 223); “like animals” (p. 224); “ignorant, demoralized, cowed” (p. 276); “spiritless and spineless wretches” (p. 398). Styron puts this in Turner; but there is absolutely nothing in the contemporary record to substantiate any of it. Rather, whenever Turner speaks of his fellow slaves—relatives or others—he speaks of them with respect and in some cases affection.

The character of Will, which plays so vital a part in the novel, has no resemblance to anything history shows of the Will who participated in the Turner uprising. While Styron makes him “that mad black man” (p. 9), finally engaging in a power-play with Turner, in the actual *Confessions* one meets Will through Turner’s mouth only when—just before the launching of the attack—he found Will as a newcomer among the conspirators. Turner says only that he greeted Will and asked him how he came to be there and that Will replied that freedom was as valuable to him as to any man and that he meant to try for his. This, says Turner, was enough to put him in my confidence and Will joins the fray and loses his life. All this is to be contrasted with the lustful, sadistic, crazy figment that appears and reappears with filth in his mouth and blood on his hands through page after page of the novel.

The novel emphasizes in many ways that Turner was able to recruit only about 70 or 75 men, while the County held over 7,000 slaves of

whom many hundreds might physically have been expected to join. But the records of history—unlike the novel—do not show efforts at recruitment, other than the original handful of six. It is these six who commence the uprising, in one parish of the County; and in a day and a half of desperate struggle actually are joined by perhaps seventy more. All things considered, including the system of control, the stakes involved, the apparent lack of prior preparation—this argues for discontent so deep that scores would actually risk their lives in order to express it.

Perhaps the single most gross distortion in this novel, is its repeated and graphically described references to the arming of “loyal” slaves by the masters to resist the rebels; in the novel it is these armed slaves who are most consequential in actually suppressing the rebellion. And towards the volume’s close, the court-appointed investigator taunts Turner with this “fact.” Furthermore, Turner is shown as pondering those taunts and agreeing with them; indeed, at one point (p. 400) Styron has Turner say, “*yes, Gray* [the questioner] *was right,*” and it is Styron who italicizes these words. This, however, is made up out of whole cloth; there is no evidence of this whatsoever and had anything even remotely resembling this occurred one may be certain it would have been emphasized in the contemporary accounts—especially in the newspapers. There is not the slightest hint of this at all and of course nothing like this did occur or could have occurred. Furthermore, to believe that anything like this could have occurred and to offer it shows an absolute and complete misapprehension of the nature of American slavery.

One of the themes of the novel is the uniqueness of the event it describes. *Harper’s Magazine* on its September cover refers to the Turner uprising as “the single effective slave revolt in American history.” The author’s prefatory Note refers to the Turner event as “the only effective, sustained revolt” and in the body of the novel itself one reads that never before had “these people . . . risen up” (p. 387)—a thought repeated further on (p. 410). This is false. Quite apart from repeated plots—some of them involving thousands—that were nipped in the bud there were many actual uprisings—arms in hand—from Virginia in 1691 to Mississippi in 1864; all this apart from uprisings in coffles, aboard domestic slave-trading vessels, the massive participation of runaway slaves in the Seminole Wars, and the persistent phenomenon of maroons everywhere in the slave region.

The novel spares no details in describing actual killings—and insurrections are not pretty. Insurrections by black slaves, however, are not any more ugly than those by other oppressed people, and Fadiman’s choice of words for this one—“stupid and brutal”—indicates

*These are Styron’s words in his review of my *American Negro Slave Revolts*, in *New York Review of Books*, September 26, 1963.

his own severe limitations though they accurately reflect the novel's spirit. The specific remark attributed to Turner in the novel, that he felt a "divine mission to kill all the white people in Southampton, and as far beyond as destiny might take me" (p. 258) again is Styron and not Turner. On this, we do have the words of Turner as quoted not by Gray in the *Confessions* but by the editor of Richmond's leading newspaper of that period—the *Enquirer* (November 8, 1831): "Indiscriminate slaughter was not their intention after they obtained a foothold, and was resorted to in the first instance to strike terror and alarm. Women and children would afterwards be spared, and men too who ceased to resist." Pertinent, too, is the fact that the Governor of Virginia, in a letter to the Governor of South Carolina (dated November 19, 1831) stated that the Turner rebels had spared a family of poor whites, who were, said the Governor, "in all respects upon a par with them."

* * *

What is the reality of Turner? We have written of this at length elsewhere but may here summarize the known facts. He was a slave as were hundreds of thousands with him; he was more gifted than most and had a more complete family life for a longer time than most. He was religiously inclined as were all his contemporaries; he had his early doubts as to what to think of the institution of slavery but like his father before him came to actively detest it. In this he was encouraged by his family and fellow slaves. He was born and matured in a Tidewater county of Virginia, with about as many slaves as white people and with a relatively high number of free Negroes. It was a County where Quakers had been numerous but by the time Turner had reached manhood they had left slave territory. As he comes out of adolescence, depression befalls the South and becomes intense in the Tidewater counties and especially in Southampton. Unrest intensifies and the slavery question induces growing excitement—in Virginia, in the nation, and internationally—having in mind, as examples, the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1829-30, the appearance of David Walker's pamphlet (1829), the beginnings (1830) of the National Negro Convention movement, the launching of *The Liberator* (January, 1831), the intensification of the British Anti-Slavery movement and the news of repeated slave outbreaks in the West Indies.

Slave repression machinery is intensified, there is a mounting break-up of slave families and the increased sale of slaves to the far South from eastern Virginia. Despite this, the depression induces so large a movement of whites from the seaboard regions of the South that the proportion of blacks to whites grows.

In the midst of this, the idea of armed rebellion takes hold of Tur-

ner, is passed on to a handful of comrades who quickly agree and when actually launched, gains recruits quickly and results—despite very poor arms—in massive casualties inflicted upon the slaveowners and their families.

This outbreak was another in the endless roster of blows by the insulted, oppressed and exploited for freedom and for dignity. It affirmed yet again the sacred spark of protest; it helped shatter the indifference of most in the nation; it assisted in precipitating the era of crisis not to be resolved until a desperate slaveholding oligarchy turned to armed counterrevolution and was forcibly suppressed by a nation that finally understood its own salvation required emancipation.

Every fact we have—every piece of evidence whether from Turner or his jailers or the white contemporaries who edited newspapers or governed states or managed plantations—shows clearly that Turner the slave rose in rebellion against slavery. Turner hated slavery and desired its termination. Turner took seriously the words of the Bible—the first shall the last and the last shall be first; God created all nations of one blood; God so hated slaveowners that he sent plagues upon their first-born sons; he so loved slaves that he parted the seas to permit them to escape; and he so loved justice and hated oppression that he gave his own Son up to the Cross as a symbol of that love and that hatred.

So long as resistance is preferred to submission, liberty to slavery, so long as Mankind can thrill to the exclamations—Give me liberty or give me death; rather die on your feet than live on your knees—just so long will Mankind—unless blinded by racism—hail the short, black, 31-year old slave named Nat who denied guilt to the faces of his executioners, went to the gallows calmly and achieved immortality.

That Nat Turner did exist and was real; he shook the earth in his brief span on it and the sons and daughters of the people who produced Cato and Gabriel and Denmark and Nat again shake the earth with the demand for freedom.

* * *

We wish to add a further word about a point made by Styron in his already mentioned review of my *American Negro Slave Revolts*. This is to the effect that presenting "the slave in revolt"—rather than what the plantation system "must have" done to them—*i.e.*, made them "docile," "childish," "irresponsible" and "incapable of real resistance"—is but another element in the "white man's ever-accommodating fantasy." I do not again wish to go into the historical data, and it is there that the answer lies, of course.

But I do wish to take up the notion that Styron here expresses—and others have also—that the rejection of the Phillippian mythology

and the projection of the views associated with the present writer, is the result of "white man's fantasy." Such a position reflects as much sheer ignorance as it does chauvinism. I say that because while it is true that there were white men and women who denied the concepts of docility—of "Sambo"—including in the pre-Civil War era, John Brown, and in the 20th century some of the Left like Robert Minor and Elizabeth Lawson, Bella Gross and James S. Allen, and others like Frederic Bancroft and Kenneth W. Porter, the original work in this area was done by black people.

This goes back before the Civil War to people like David Walker, Henry Highland Garnet, Frederick Douglass, William C. Nell. Above all, it becomes clear in the present century. Here appears on the top of any list, W. E. B. Du Bois, who by 1909 was challenging the Dunning school and had published his *John Brown*, Woodson who by 1915 had founded the Association for the Study of Negro Life and who attacked the Phillips work on slavery as soon as it appeared. It includes, in alphabetical order—and to give only examples (dates indicating time of appearance of revelant works)—Bontemps (1936); Brawley (1921); Sterling Brown (1930); J. C. Carroll (1939); Hollie E. Carter (1936); John W. Cromwell (1914); Asa H. Gordon (1928); L. J. Greene (1941); L. P. Jackson (1930); J. H. Johnston (1931); L. D. Reddick (1937); W. S. Savage (1938); L. D. Turner (1929); G. W. Williams (1883). There is hardly an issue of *The Journal of Negro History* from 1915 on which did not contain rejection of the "Sambo" myth and insistence upon and data to establish the fact of resistance. Indeed, if a personal note may be again mentioned, the fact is that it was Woodson who, when this writer was very young, most encouraged him and even undertook to help educate him. It was his Association which awarded this writer its history citation back almost thirty years ago.

I am confident that the rejection of "Sambo" is accurate. I am confident that the picture of the slave in the United States as being characterized by discontent and marked frequently by militancy and significantly by outright rebellion is accurate. But I am certain that the rejection of the first and the projection of the second came originally and most consistently and most significantly from the minds of Negro scholars down through the years.

September 23, 1967

COMMUNICATIONS

ALBERTO MOREAU

Appraising the Middle East War

The war in the Middle East and its aftermath have raised anew some fundamental questions of principle within the broad people's movement not only in our country but also in Israel itself.

The *Worker* editorial of June 25 correctly points out that "emotionalism and national chauvinism have been substituted for sober appraisal of the realities of the situation within certain circles, including supporters of the Left." Hyman Lumer's analysis in the July issue of *Political Affairs* makes a much-needed objective and sober appraisal. He expresses a deep understanding of the people's concern for the fate of Israel but cautions against a nationalism that pits Jew against Arab, a national chauvinism that blinds people and reduces them to impotence in the struggle against the real enemy of the Israeli and Arab peoples.

Anti-Arab racism is a great obstacle to understanding the basic causes of the war. For racism is a terrible poison. It dims the power of reason, it denies the most elementary rights of man and justifies monstrous crimes. Hence the need to discuss publicly, on a principled basis, the nature of the Middle East war, the national liberation struggles of the Arab peo-

ples and the role of the Soviet Union in the Middle East. In this connection it is worth recalling Lenin's advice to the Russian delegation at the Hague Conference in 1922:

It must be explained to the people how great is the secrecy with which war arises and how helpless the ordinary workers' organizations are in the face of war . . . even those organizations that call themselves revolutionary. (*Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, Vol. X, p. 316.)

Two diametrically opposed views persist on the nature of the war. One is that for Israel it was a war for its very existence, a defensive war. The other is that it was a war of aggression by Israel, planned, egged on and supported by imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism. The first view labels the Arab countries as aggressors whose leaders have more than once declared the liquidation of Israel as their aim. As evidence of aggression, those who hold this view cite the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba and the massing of Arab military forces on Israel's borders. The Mikunis-Sneh group in Israel declared on June 6:

After the battles which broke out between the Arab and the Israeli armies, the Communist Party decided its position in regard to the

military situation according to the political goals of the two sides: on the part of the United Arab Republic and other Arab governments this is a war to destroy the State of Israel and on the part of the Jewish people this is a war to preserve the existence, security and right of independence of the State of Israel. (*Morning Freiheit*, June 18, 1967.)

The *Morning Freiheit* has also characterized the war as one of self-defense. This position, I believe, is one lacking in objective analysis of the forces involved and marked by national chauvinism. But if some on the Left were caught in the avalanche of imperialist propaganda, the clear-headed forces for peace saw in the war the danger of a world war stemming from Israel's aggression. The correct position, in my opinion, was that presented by Gus Hall in *The Worker* of June 11. The basic causes, he wrote, are the same as in Vietnam and in Latin America. And while he branded as irresponsible the declarations of some Arab leaders calling for the destruction of Israel, he wrote:

The governments of the United States, Great Britain and Israel are lined up with the oil monopolies. The governments of the USA and Great Britain are direct representatives of the thieves and the present government of Israel is a willing accomplice and accessory.

In Israel the voices against aggression made themselves heard despite government repression, arrests and intimidation. On the day the war broke out, Mr. Vilner, member of the Knesset and

general secretary of the Communist Party, charged the Eshkol-Dayan-Begin clique with launching the war against Egypt. (*L'Humanité*, June 12.) On June 22, the Central Committee of that party assessed the causes and character of the war as follows:

The war which was started by the Eshkol-Dayan-Begin Government is an aggressive war, which was planned beforehand together with the governments of the USA and Britain and with the support of the West German government. (*The Worker*, June 16.)

Mikunis leans on Lenin to support his position. He says:

Lenin taught us to define our attitude towards a war according to the political aims of the belligerent parties. The political aims in the case of this war between the Pan-Arabic front and Israel were and remained very clear: on the part of the people of Israel it was and remains a war for its existence, for its life. (*Morning Freiheit*, July 2. Emphasis added.)

It is true that Lenin refers to the need for understanding the political aims of the belligerent parties to understand the character of wars. But this is not the whole story or the kernel of the question. Lenin said:

Marxists differ both from pacifists and anarchists in that we recognize the necessity of an historical study of each war individually, from the point of view of Marx's dialectical materialism. (*Collected Works: The Imperialist War*, International Publishers, New York, p. 219.)

He said further:

"War is politics continued by other (i.e., forcible) means" (Clausewitz). . . . Rightly, the Marxists have always considered this axiom as the theoretical foundation for their understanding of the meaning of every war. (*Ibid.*, p. 224.)

Even a superficial study of the historical events preceding the Middle East crisis shows that the general aim and historical direction in the Arab world is political and economic independence from imperialism. This is especially evident in the advanced countries of the UAR and Syria. It is the historic road resulting from the irreconcilable contradiction between the oppressed Arab peoples and their imperialist oppressors.

As with all liberation movements and revolutions, we must see their predominantly progressive features which must be supported, while we combat their secondary, negative aspects. The negative aspect of their nationalism, which expresses itself in this case in "destroying Israel," must particularly be rejected and combated.

On the other hand, the role of the Israeli ruling circles has been that of a tool of the imperialist powers. In addition, they have harbored expansionist designs of their own, as revealed by the outcome of the war of aggression. For many years, Israel has cast its vote in the UN against the independence of African and Asian countries. And within Israel the Arabs have been subjected to a racist oppression which extends also to the Sephardic Jews.

Israel's Aims

On May 17 the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Syria, after noting U.S. imperialism's hatred of the progressive Syrian regime and the work of the CIA in Syria in cahoots with the Israeli leaders, states that "everything indicates that the aggressive American imperialist circles decided to rely in the first place on armed aggression through Israel's intermediacy." (*Nouvelle Critique*, June 1967.) This is corroborated by none other than Israel's General Yitshak Rabin, who declared on May 12: "As long as the ardent revolutionaries of Damascus are not overthrown, no government will feel secure in the Middle East." (*Ibid.*)

The Communist Party of Israel, in the statement referred to above, says:

The principal aim of the war was to bring about the fall of the anti-imperialist regimes in Egypt and Syria, to sever the connections of the Arab countries with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and to protect the concessions of the foreign oil monopolies and the strategic bases of the Western colonial powers in our region.

Mikunis, however, delivered a blistering attack on Vilner in the Knesset, in which he said:

. . . that Israel has worked in conjunction with imperialism is only a falsification, a conscious deception. The whole world knows that the war broke out against the will of America, England and France, and that it was a just struggle for the existence of the State of Israel. (*Morning Freiheit*, July 7.)

Arguments are widespread that the danger of "liquidating Israel" was so serious and imminent that the Eshkol clique was compelled to wage a "preventive war." The *Morning Freiheit* of June 22 advanced this analogy: "Is Israel an aggressor when she adopts measures to insure that she should not find herself in the same position as did the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941?"

But this is only an apology for the imperialists and for the Israeli aggression. It falsely compares the Arabs with Nazi invaders. While the declarations of "liquidation of Israel" are frankly irresponsible and contrary to the anti-imperialist character and aims of the Arab liberation movement, they have also been grossly exaggerated, distorted and often taken out of context.

The "blitzkrieg" conclusively proved that the war was not "preventive" on Israel's part. Israeli leaders have always flattered themselves on their knowledge of their adversaries' plans. If so, they surely knew that the Arab countries involved lacked the means to wage such a war.

The imperialist war plan was also revealed by *Figaro's* special correspondent in Israel, who relates that the Israeli newspapers had prepared in advance the headline "Egypt Attacks Israel" for the morning issue of June 5.

The ugly hand of the CIA was revealed in the arrest of two Syrian mercenaries, Hatoum and Jamaa, at the height of the war. These agents confessed that the U.S. was to play the main role in

the plot to liquidate the government of Syria.

Arab Liberation

Part of the campaign to win the minds of Americans is the unabated appeal to anti-Arab chauvinism. We are told again and again of the "backwardness" and "primitiveness" of the Arabs. But an objective understanding, free of anti-Arab chauvinism, of the mounting liberation struggles of the Arab peoples can help us to see the causes of the Middle East crisis.

The anti-colonial liberation movement, following the victory over the Nazis, swept the continent of Asia and Africa. The Arab world is part of it, delivering hard blows against imperialist interests. In 1952 the anti-imperialist revolution in Egypt opened a new chapter. There followed the downfall of the reactionary governments of Syria in 1954 and Iraq in 1958. In Yemen, since 1962 a struggle has gone on between pro-imperialist and republican forces. And in Syria, after long and painful years of advances and setbacks, in February 1966 there came into power a progressive, anti-imperialist regime under whose leadership more than 80 per cent of industry has been nationalized.

The imperialist powers are bent on reversing this onward march. It is in this light that we must see the attack of Britain, France and Israel on Egypt in 1956, the sending of U.S. troops into Lebanon in 1958 and the present Israeli aggression.

The UAR, which has become the bulwark of the Arab liberation front, has acquired, despite contradictory currents, a clearly defined progressive and revolutionary character. It has gone through three stages of development: the period of national independence, 1952-1956; the eradication of the last vestiges of imperialism within the country, 1957-1961; and the present period of "social conversion." There has been a process of overcoming both objective difficulties and unscientific ideology, including that of Nasser.

In 1962 the UAR adopted a Charter of National Action, with Nasser as one of the leading architects. Important reforms have been introduced, including the occupation by workers and peasants of important posts in management and on all elective bodies. The Charter indicates the new orientation towards socialism:

The socialist solution of economic and social underdevelopment in Egypt and the revolutionary approach to progress was not a hypothesis based on free choice; the socialist solution was a historic inevitability imposed by reality and by the hopes of the masses as well as the changing nature of the world in the second half of the twentieth century. (*African Communist*, No. 27, 1966.)

The Nature of Arab Nationalism

Arab nationalism has a double character: local nationalism in each country, the content of which is political and economic liberation; and the nationalism that as-

pires toward the reconstruction of Arab unity in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and peaceful coexistence. Both aspects develop in an unremitting struggle between the forces of imperialist-feudal-bourgeois society and the forces of revolutionary development.

The question is often asked: how do you explain a united Arab front including both anti-imperialist elements (the UAR and Syria) and reactionary feudal rulers like Feisal in Saudi Arabia and Hussein in Jordan? How can such a united front be called anti-imperialist?

The character of a national movement, however, must be judged not abstractly but in terms of its relation to the general interests of the world revolutionary movement. Arab unity today plays *objectively* an anti-imperialist role, even though it includes countries headed by reactionary monarchs. This point was expressed by Stalin in his *Foundation of Leninism*, written in 1924:

The revolutionary character of a national movement in the conditions of imperialist oppression does not necessarily presuppose the existence of a revolutionary or republican program of the movement. The struggle the Emir of Afghanistan is waging for the independence of his country is objectively a *revolutionary* struggle despite the monarchist Emir and his entourage, for it weakens, disintegrates and undermines imperialism. . . . For the same reason, the struggle the Egyptian merchants and bourgeois intellectuals are waging for the independence of their country is objectively *revolutionary*

despite the bourgeois origin and bourgeois calling of the leaders of the Egyptian national movement and despite the fact that they are opposed to socialism. (*Leninism*, International Publishers, New York, Vol. I, pp. 67-68.)

It is within the broad anti-imperialist unity that the revolutionary elements carry on their struggles against the feudal and pro-imperialist rulers. Arab Communists, in an exchange of views (*World Marxist Review*, September 1964), asserted that Israel is a threat to the independent Arab states because of its aggressive policy, but at the same time they categorically opposed all calls for "driving Israel into the sea," saying:

Clearly, this is an unprincipled position. In effect, it is the position of the Arab bourgeoisie and the Arab nationalists. They suggest no concrete solution that would satisfy either the Arab peoples or the peoples of Israel, who are faced with the same enemy—the Arab and Israeli reactionaries in the service of imperialism.

Thus both the Arab Communists and the Israeli Communists headed by Vilner and Toubi adhere to the principles of proletarian internationalism, an integral part of which is to work for the defeat of the pro-imperialist, reactionary forces in one's own country as a conditions for freedom and progress in the Middle East.

BOOK REVIEWS

VICTOR PERLO

Capitalism Unlimited vs. Communism

An important trend among the intelligentsia, seeking to avoid participation in direct confrontation resulting from the monumental world struggle of today, is to seek its smoothing out—its adjustment through reforms which presumably provide many of the advantages of socialism for the masses while preserving for the capitalists their power and privileges. Robert Heilbroner's latest book* is an important example of this trend.

His book consists of two essays. The first, "Capitalism in America," is devoted partly to proving that big business still runs America, but mainly to claiming that it has lost its sting. It has stopped getting bigger, it has stopped exploiting labor, it is becoming more moderate, it has become less interested in or able to influence politics. Simultaneously, ideological opposition to the business system has virtually vanished. Loyalty to capitalism, "admiration for the great corporation, and the deference to the successful businessman are likely to continue to dominate our social mores for a long while" (p. 57).

* Robert L. Heilbroner, *The Limits of American Capitalism*, Harper & Row, New York, 1966, 148 pp., \$4.95.

So for the next two generations at least, little change can be expected in the system, and a revolutionary substitution by socialism is out of the question.

The second essay, "The Limits of Capitalism," sets bounds to possible changes within this solidly esconsed, mellowing, capitalism. Any reforms must preserve the privileges of the capitalists. Poverty may be "substantially alleviated" by a more "benign" capitalism, by increased doles and reconstruction of slum areas, over an extended period (pp. 83-4). Extremes in income distribution will continue. Capitalist economic planning, involving government manipulation of armament and public works spending, is apt to increase, especially if the technological revolution causes an employment crisis. This planning is unlikely to encompass the problems and possibilities stemming from the technical-scientific revolution, because of the "limitations of the capitalist imagination" (p. 98).

The conflict between communism and capitalism will continue to dominate international affairs. More developing countries will go socialist in the next generation or two. American big business is no longer militantly expansionist, so

the danger of world war as a result of that conflict is diminishing. Little wars like Korea and Vietnam may continue, owing to the influence of militarists and politicians on both sides. But over the long run, when countries stop going communist, the danger of nuclear war will recede.

The scientific-technical explosion is a "revolutionary power" that will "render impotent the citadel of capital and yet [be] irresistibly attractive to its masters . . ." (pp. 113-114). This power will render most human labor superfluous, undermine the market, and make centralized social control inevitable. In the quite long run, therefore, capitalism is likely to give way to a science-dominated social system, otherwise undefined. Beyond that, in the very distant future, measured by centuries, will come a struggle for creation of a society "whose overriding aim will be the cultivation and enrichment of all human beings" (p. 134).

The overall picture is one of an increasingly bland world in which struggle will be neither possible or necessary, in which generally progressive changes will take place as a consequence of objective changes in productive forces, without the significant political intervention of people. The dominant forces making and shaping this new world, Heilbroner suggests tentatively, may emerge from the "new elites," the military, the professional experts, and the government administrators.

There is virtually no documentation or other indication of re-

search and scholarly analysis. Professor Heilbroner specializes in the "all reasonably informed men know" kind of assertions in which the book abounds

Communism versus Capitalism

Heilbroner projects some basic truths, notably the fundamental character of the communist challenge to capitalism. This challenge, he states, consists not in military or nationalist threats, but:

"It is the presence of communism as a viable social system that has dispensed with our institutions of privilege, and that therefore faces capitalism with the living refutation of their necessity. In a fundamental sense, communism puts capitalism on trial before the bar of history—not with the advantages of a new society claiming the future but with the disadvantages of an old society hanging onto the past . . . communism has demonstrated the mutability and historic transiency of our particular social order, and that that social order can never again feel entirely secure in its claims to permanence and legitimacy" (pp. 101-2).

Continued advances of socialist economies will increase the attraction of communism in developing countries over the next generation, says the author. But he sees the challenge as a danger, not as a hope for liberation. He condemns "the expansive nationalism, the aggressive and uncompromising philosophy, the political or military ambitions of the two great Communist societies," and

asserts that "capitalist performance on many fronts is manifestly superior to that of communism" (pp. 101-4). In his view, the communist alternative will only be real in countries which remain underdeveloped. Latin American countries which achieve "full-fledged" capitalism will escape the menace. For Western Europe and the United States, he does not even consider socialism as a possibility.

Echoing every commercial press journalist, Heilbroner speaks of the "still dreary life" in the USSR, and talks of the happy future when "the worst is over" and no more countries will go communist" (p. 109).

Denial of Exploitation

Heilbroner's most basic analytic weakness is his unwillingness to recognize capitalism as a system of exploitation based on private ownership of the means of production and wage labor. He defines it as the "business system"—a mere tautology—in which big business dominates. Big business, he says, has stopped exploiting labor and stopped deliberately pushing little business out. It concentrates its exploitation on "the consumer . . . in extracting more profit from a sales check than from a pay check" (p. 44-46).

Big corporations have given up the 12-hour day, assembly-line speedups, anti-union discrimination, poverty wages, etc.; therefore, he claims, exploitation has stopped. Actually, big business

has moderated—never abandoned—these practices only where and to the extent forced by labor struggles. Overtime hours, systematically enforced in war industries, have undermined the eight-hour day. The most brazen anti-union discrimination continues in the South and in many other places where the corporate giants erect most of their plants. Poverty wages continue not only in small sweatshops, but in huge agrobusiness enterprises. And all of these conditions of extreme oppression and impoverishment are being expanded daily in the mushrooming enterprises of U.S. big business in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

But this does not get to the root of the matter. Exploitation of labor is a Marxist concept, and a social scientist discussing it should at least explain it accurately. The *existence* of exploitation depends neither on the level of wages nor on the specific conditions of labor. As explained by Marx, capitalist exploitation becomes possible when the worker, deprived of means of production, is forced to work for wages for a capitalist owning the means of production. Exploitation consists of the worker being paid for his labor power only a part of the value-equivalent of the hours he works, with the excess appropriated by the capitalist. Marx's rate of surplus value, or rate of exploitation, is the ratio of this excess to the wages paid. If a worker adds \$50 of value to the materials he works with in a day's time, and is paid a \$20 wage, the rate of surplus value

is 100 x 30/20, or 150 per cent.

Wages in American industry are much higher, and working hours are shorter, than 60 years ago. But the productivity of labor has increased by a wider factor than these two changes combined. Thus the rate of exploitation of labor is greater now than then, not to speak of the super-exploitation of labor in the overseas empire of American big business, where the rate of surplus value often exceeds 1,000 per cent, probably an all-time historical high.

Heilbroner asserts that "it is now generally acknowledged, including by most Marxists, that the level of wages reflects workers' productivity more than any other single factor, and that this productivity in turn is primarily determined by the quantity and the quality of the capital equipment" (p. 77).

All sorts of self-styled "Marxists" have not only discarded Marx's labor theory of value, but have abandoned the entire working class to the Establishment. Labor productivity sets an upper limit to wages, but is not its decisive determinant under capitalism. Labor productivity in Japanese shipbuilding is higher than in American shipbuilding, and more Japanese than American steel is made with the most modern oxygen converters, but Japanese wages are one-fifth the U.S. level. Uniroyal, Di Giorgio Corporation, La Casita Farms, are among the big corporations using the very highest technology in agriculture, while employing vicious police re-

pression to enforce starvation wages on the workers. IBM, that paragon of cybercultural paternalism, uses U.S. occupation forces to enforce \$20 *per month* wages on workers matching U.S. productivity levels in Far Eastern electronic factories.

Heilbroner's thesis of the exploitation of "the consumer" instead of the worker is a reversion to primitive apologetics. The profit extracted from the exploitation of labor is *realized* when the commodity is sold. The existence of monopolies makes for a redistribution of profits in their favor, and for the overall increase in profits. But in fact, more billions of profit are realized in the process of sales to other monopolies and to the government than in sales to individual consumers. Prices charged worker-consumers are merely the denominator of the measure of real wages paid, the reflection in the worker's living standard of the process of exploitation which took place in the factory or office.

Treatment of Poverty

In the current fashion, Heilbroner distinguishes between "wage poverty" and the poverty of the unemployed and the ill (Galbraith's "case poverty"). Using his wage-productivity tie, he argues that wage poverty is a secondary and dwindling factor in the United States. As productivity rises in a generation or two, wages will automatically follow and wage poverty will end. Other types of poverty will be harder to deal

with, but still may be eliminated "partly through income transfers and partly through the creation of a more benign environment, within the limits of capitalism three or four decades hence . . ." (pp. 83-4).

The reasoning is not clear-cut, but may be approximated as follows: heretofore redistribution of capitalists' surplus would not suffice to end poverty, but with the tremendous advance of science and technique, this will become possible in a generation or two, with a little political push from the "new elites within capitalism" (p. 83).

Marxists never relied on income redistribution as the decisive means for ending poverty and raising living standards. Socialism is needed to give full sway to modern forces, permitting both such a rapid rise in productivity and in the constructive use of output as to transform living conditions radically and swiftly. But the technocrats of the 1930's were right when they said that even then the United States had enough capacity to provide a decent life for all, to eliminate poverty in the ordinary sense of the word. America has had the productive capacity to eliminate poverty rapidly for at least a generation.

Poverty is a social phenomenon, a direct product of the capitalist system of exploitation. Poverty is absolutely worse—in its depth and in the percentage of the population afflicted—in the United States than in many other advanced capitalist countries, because the power of the capitalists

is greater and that of the working class weaker here than in those countries. Poverty in the United States is reenforced, and given its most bitter shape, by the rampant racism nurtured and engendered by big business for both domestic and international reasons.

There may be more starvation among Negroes in today's South of modern industry and mechanized agriculture than in the 1920's of the mule and the peckerwood mill.

Poverty in America will be decidedly alleviated not through the further progress of science, nor the mellowing of capitalists, but through a higher level of labor struggle, and especially by the rising of white American workers to the task of fighting against racism.

Imperialism

Heilbroner purports to explain Lenin's theory of imperialism, but with vital omissions—the domination of monopolies and finance capital, the growth of state-monopoly capitalism, and the decisive role of the export of capital. The vast scope and profitability of U.S. foreign investments, dwarfing anything existing when Lenin wrote, is simply missing, except for passing mention of "jealously guarded interests" in oil regions. Heilbroner claims that the imperialists no longer need to defend their properties by force of arms because of protection by "government insurance" (!!!). As if government foreign investment insurance were anything but a sec-

ondary fallback provision, a fig leaf for the military "insurance" that really counts! When the U.S. marines blasted into the Dominican Republic to hold it for the Rockefellers' sugar company, there was no mention of "government insurance." Nobody relies on the "investment treaties" the U.S. thrusts on its puppet governments in South Vietnam and Thailand, least of all the U.S. corporations that are crashing into these lands on the heels of the U.S. troops.

Wars are caused, says Heilbroner, by reactionary politicians and militarists of all social systems, and not by big business, or at least not mainly by big business. To buttress his contention of pacific tendencies of U.S. big business, Heilbroner cites data from my *Militarism and Industry* concerning the balance between munitions and foreign investment profits, on the one hand, and the tax costs of U.S. foreign policy, on the other hand, for the largest corporations. In the cited book I explicitly and amply stated and documented my view that the balance of all interest, including the statistics cited, resulted in big business overwhelmingly supporting militarism and the cold war. But Professor Heilbroner has elected to misuse my data and to cite me as Marxist authority for absolving big business of aggressiveness.*

* Perhaps Heilbroner's misuse of my writing is preferable to those liberals fearful of contamination with Marxists who use my data without acknowledgment, or try to hide its existence. But I must re-

Granting some merit to "the notion of a belligerent capitalist imperialism," albeit divorced of big business sponsorship, Heilbroner claims that this is only one of many sources of aggression, and lists as having initiated "aggressive actions" since 1945 a series of ex-colonial, imperialist and socialist countries, without distinction. "Russia, Indonesia, the United States," are among those mentioned as having started aggressive wars (p. 106). Thus Sukarno's empty threat to "crush Malaysia," backed by trivial guerrilla actions, is put on a political and practical plane with the United States' massive invasions of the Dominican Republic and Vietnam. Presumably "Russian aggression" refers to the brief and localized intervention of Soviet troops stationed in Budapest by agreement with World War II allies to halt a fascist coup as they were obliged to do by the same agreements. A nasty echo of Dulles-Rusk propaganda!

Heilbroner recognizes that at least a levelling off of the arms race is necessary for major reforms in the United States. But

cord a further criticism of Heilbroner on this score. He first used the extract from *Militarism and Industry* in *Commentary* (April, 1966). I explained this misuse in a letter published in *Commentary* (August, 1966), and in a *Worker* column (June 12, 1966). Heilbroner wrote me a courteous letter explaining why he did not want to rebut my *Commentary* letter, but most discourteously failed to remove or modify his misuse of my material in his book, or to acknowledge therein my objection to it.

he considers it likely that militarization of the economy will intensify during the next decade, and pins his vague hopes of a possible ultimate relaxation on a variety of factors, all of them independent of the actions of the American people. Thus he stands aside from, and offers no encouragement to the American peace movement, that new and rapidly growing factor in American political life which is so vital to the future of our own country and the world.

The danger of nuclear war stems solely, and of lesser wars mainly and essentially, from the aggressive drive of imperialism, mainly United States imperialism, which is the decisive obstacle to peace and disarmament in the world today. Essays on American capitalism which miss this point avoid the most urgent feature. Heilbroner puts hope for peace on domestic psychological factors, such as the growth of "isolationism," on the substitution of more "pressing" problems, like air pollution(!), and on the continuation of "fragmentation" in the "Communist world" (p. 110). These "factors" are either irrelevant or counterproductive—the Mao Tse-tung split has encouraged U.S. aggressiveness immeasurably. A particularly encouraging feature of the present situation is the increasing recognition by the U.S. peace movement of U.S. aggression as the main source of the war danger. Professor Heilbroner contributes nothing to the extension of that vital understanding.

After Capitalism What and How?

In his final section Heilbroner suggests that *perhaps* a couple of centuries hence, capitalism will change to something else, as an automatic result of the development of the scientific-technical revolution.

There is no need to wait centuries, or any time, for the productive forces to ripen for socialism. They have been at that stage, in the advanced countries, throughout this century. The means of production outgrew the capitalist mode of production long ago. In 1916 Lenin, after describing the large-scale international coordination of production and distribution by the larger corporations, concluded:

It becomes evident that we have socialization of production, and not mere "interlocking"; that private economic relations and private property relations constitute a shell which is no longer suitable for its content, a shell which must inevitably begin to decay if its destruction be delayed by artificial means; a shell which may continue in a state of decay for a fairly long period (particularly if the cure of the opportunist abscess is protracted), but which will inevitably be removed. (*Imperialism*, International Publishers, New York, 1939, p. 127.)

The removal of the shell has been delayed a long time in most (not all) advanced countries, and the decay has gone furthest in that country ripest for socialism, the U.S.A. This applies both to its inner life, and to the interna-

tional excesses of U.S. imperialism, which horrify the entire world and millions of decent Americans.

Marxists have always combatted the notion that capitalism would collapse of its own weight, or gradually change with the essential agreement of the capitalists. By suggesting that it will, and by suggesting the futility of trying to hurry the process, Heilbroner helps to spread passive acceptance of capitalism among his readers. Insofar as he concedes the possible ultimate involvement of social forces in the transfer to another system, Heilbroner, like Galbraith, Sweezy and others, denigrates the role of the masses of labor, and relies on the professional elite.

Marxists regard the professional people not as an "elite," but as an important sector of wage labor, exploited by capitalism. We fight for their alignment with the working class as a whole. We consider that only in such an alignment can they be part of a force that will be strong enough to change the course of history, end poverty, stop imperialist war, force disarmament, bring about a socialist transformation of society, and create conditions in which science and culture can flourish as never before.

Despite their higher average wages, professionals have as much as any other layer of the working

class to gain from socialism and communism, *considering all aspects of life, especially those which are most vital to the creative person.*

Heilbroner confuses the present relatively passive political role of most of the trade union-organized U.S. working class, dominated for the moment by reactionary capitalist apologists, with that of the world working class. He confuses the ideology of workers with their objective role, their consciousness with their struggles. Recent events in Western Europe and Japan prove the tremendous power of the working class, militantly organized and with a socialist orientation, to improve economic conditions and even foreign policy in capitalist countries—and to do so with the participation of major sections of the intellectual workers.

The future course of history will prove capitalism much less stable and long-lived in the industrially developed capitalist countries than Heilbroner thinks—nor is the system relatively immortal in these United States. It will not fade away into some vague "sciencism," but will be uprooted in revolutionary fashion by the American people, who will then build socialism and communism—social structures in which science will play a leading role in raising life to a new dimension of freedom and fullness.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP

Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation (Act of October 23, 1962: Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code).

1. Date of Filing: October 1, 1967.
2. Title of Publication: **POLITICAL AFFAIRS.**
3. Frequency of Issue: **Monthly.**
4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 799 Broadway, Rm. 618, New York, N. Y. 10003
5. Location of the Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers: 799 Broadway, Rm. 618, New York, N. Y. 10003.
6. Names and Addresses of Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor:
 Publisher: **POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUB., INC.,** 799 Broadway, Rm. 618, New York, N. Y. 10003.
 Editor: **BETTY GANNETT,** 799 Broadway, Rm. 618, New York, N. Y. 10003.
 Associate Editor: **HYMAN LUMER,** 799 Broadway, Rm. 618, New York, N. Y. 10003.

7. Owner (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual must be given.)

POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUB., INC., 799 Broadway, Rm. 618, New York, N. Y. 10003.
HYMAN LUMER, 799 Broadway, Rm. 618, New York, N. Y. 10003.

8. Known Bondholders, Mortgagees, and other Security Holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of Bonds, Mortgages or other Securities (If there are none, so state): None.

9. Paragraphs 7 and 8 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner. Names and addresses of individuals who are stockholders of a corporation which itself is a stockholder or holder of bonds, mortgages or other securities of the publishing corporation have been included in paragraphs 7 and 8 when the interests of such individuals are equivalent to 1 percent or more of the total amount of the stock or securities of the publishing corporation.

10. This item must be completed for all publications except those which do not carry advertising other than the publisher's own and which are named in Sections 132.231, 132.232 and 132.233, Postal Manual (Sections 4355a, 4355b, and 4356 of Title 39, United States Code).

	<i>Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 Months</i>	<i>Single Issue Nearest to Filing Date</i>
A. Total No. Copies Printed (Net Press Run)	4,550	4,550
B. Paid Circulation		
1. Sales through Dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales	3,005	3,005
2. Mail Subscriptions	1,495	1,495
C. Total Paid Circulation	4,500	4,500
D. Free Distribution (including samples) by Mail, Carrier delivery or other means	none	none
E. Total Distribution (Sum of C and D)	4,500	4,500
F. Office use, left-over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing	50	50
G. Total (Sum of E & F—should equal net press run shown in A)	4,550	4,550

I certify that the statements made by me are correct and complete.

BETTY GANNETT
 (Signature of editor, publisher, business manager, or owner)

NEW PAMPHLETS AND BOOKS

FOR A MEANINGFUL ALTERNATIVE

By Gus Hall

Report to the June 10, 1967 meeting of the National Committee, Communist Party U.S.A. on Vietnam, The Middle East, Negro Freedom, Economic Welfare, The 1968 Elections.

64 pages - Price 50c

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

by Hyman Lumer

Masterful analysis of the Israeli-Arab conflict, its sources, its significance in the context of the present world situation, and proposals for its solution.

24 pages - Price 25c

WHITHER CHINA?

By R. Palme Dutt

The noted British Marxist analyzes the political and ideological struggles in China, differences in the world Communist movement and perspectives for unity.

48 pages - Price 40c

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, VIETNAM AND CIVIL RIGHTS

by Herbert Aptheker

The historic tradition of the Negro people of condemnation of U.S. wars of aggression and the continuation of this tradition today.

16 pages - Price 20c

•
At your local progressive bookshop or by mail from

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

32 Union Square East, Room 801 New York, N.Y. 10003

Add 15c postage for single items, 5c for each additional item. Orders for \$2 or more postage free. N.Y. City residents add 5% sales tax, N.Y. State residents add 2% sales tax.