

JANUARY, 1968



POLITICAL
AFFAIRS

ON THE 100th ANNIVERSARY OF MARX'S "CAPITAL"

Erik Bert

Hyman Lumer

Victor Perlo

IN SUPPORT OF THE ARAB PEOPLES

Herbert Aptheker

LABOR SPEAKS OUT FOR PEACE

George Meyers

SAN FRANCISCO PEACE REFERENDUM

Margrit Pittman

NEW YORK TEACHER WALKOUT

Sam Gould

Joel Marvin

50c

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLVII, NO. 1

JANUARY, 1968

Betty Gannett, Editor Hyman Lumer, Associate Editor

CONTENTS

<i>Hyman Lumer</i> Marx and the Historic Role of the Working Class	1
<i>Victor Perlo</i> Will American Labor Lead The Socialist Revolution?	16
<i>Erick Bert</i> Galbraith's Defense of Capitalism	29
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i> In Support of the Arab Peoples	38
An Appeal to the Conscience of the World	42
Declaration of Conference in Support of Arab Peoples	43
<i>Sam Gould and Joel Marvin</i> The New York Teacher Walkout	47
<i>George Myers</i> Labor Speaks Out for Peace	53
<i>Margrit Pittman</i> The San Francisco Peace Referendum	58
Index 1967	64

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.

Marx and the Historic Role of Working Class

Karl Marx's two greatest theoretical discoveries, it is commonly acknowledged, are the materialist conception of history and the law of surplus value. Together, they form the very core of Marxist theory. Nor are they unrelated; on the contrary, it is the materialist interpretation of history which forms the foundation of Marx's monumental economic edifice, of which the concept of surplus value is the cornerstone.

The Builders of Socialism

In his preface to *The Communist Manifesto*, written forty years after its first appearance, Engels briefly summarizes the essence of Marx's historical materialism. The summary concludes with these words:

. . . the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; . . . the history of these class struggles form a series of evolutions in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles. (International Publishers, New York, 1948, p. 6.)

What is noteworthy in this is that it is the special role of the working class—to free mankind of all exploitation—by which Engels defines the present stage of social development. It is this concept which is central in the thinking of Marx and Engels, and which fully converts socialism from a utopia to a science. This centrality was noted by Lenin, who wrote: "The main thing in the doctrine of

* This article and the two which follow it were presented as papers at a conference commemorating the centenary of the appearance of Volume I of Marx's *Capital*. The conference was held in New York City on December 16, 1967, under the auspices of *Political Affairs*. The text of a fourth paper, presented by James E. Jackson, will be published in a forthcoming issue of the magazine.—*The Editors*.

Karl Marx is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of a socialist society." ("The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx," *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, p. 86.)

The *Manifesto* declares, first, that it is the working class which is the one real enemy of capitalism. "Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product." (P. 19.)

Secondly, the *Manifesto* asserts, the victory of the proletariat necessarily means the end of all exploitation, all oppression:

. . . The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby every other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property. (P. 20.)

In other words, the struggle for socialism is the *class* struggle. It is the struggle of the working class for political power, for the establishment of a working-class state through which exploitation and the class struggle will be abolished. That this is the essence of his contribution is made clear by Marx in his well-known letter to Weydemeyer of March 5, 1852, in which he wrote:

And now as to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society nor yet the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove: (1) that the *existence of classes* is only bound up with *particular, historic phases in the development of production*; (2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the *dictatorship of the proletariat*; (3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the *abolition of all classes* and to a *classless society*. (*The Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, International Publishers New York, 1942, p. 57.)

This historic role of the working class reappears, twenty years later, in the concluding section of Volume I of *Capital*. In the famous passage in Chapter XXXII, "The Historical Tendency of Accumulation," after referring to the process of primitive accumulation in which a mass of individual producers is expropriated, and then to

the subsequent process of accumulation and centralization of capital, Marx continues:

. . . Hand in hand with this centralization, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever extending scale, the cooperative form of the labor-process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labor into instruments only usable in common, the economizing of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialized labor, the entanglement of all peoples into the network of the world-market, and with this, the international character of the capitalistic regime. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolize all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working-class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated. (International Publishers, New York, 1947, pp. 788-789.)

From all this it should be amply clear that the concept of the proletariat as the revolutionary class in capitalist society, as the bearer of socialism and the emancipator of society from exploitation and oppression, is not incidental to Marx's social theory but is the very heart of that theory. Thus it is that Marxism itself is generally defined as the world outlook of the working class.

The Objective Status of the Working Class

Whence stems this special role of the working class in history? It lies, says Marx and Engels, not in some innate nobility of workers but in their objective status in capitalist society. In *The Holy Family*, written in 1844, they state:

. . . The question is not what this or that proletarian, or even the whole proletariat at the moment *considers* as its aim. The question is *what the proletariat is*, and what, consequent on that being, it will be compelled to do. Its aim and historical action is irrevocably and obviously demonstrated in its own life situation as well as in the

whole organization of bourgeois society today. (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1956, p. 53.)

Capitalist production only then really begins . . . when each individual capital employs simultaneously a comparatively large number of laborers; when consequently the labor-process is carried on on a large scale and yields, relatively, large quantities of products. (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 311.)

Cooperation as such, he goes on to say, produces a qualitative change in the productive process:

. . . the sum total of the mechanical forces exerted by isolated workmen differs from the social force that is developed, when many hands take place simultaneously in one and the same undivided operation, such as raising a heavy weight, turning a winch, or removing an obstacle. In such cases the effect of the combined labor could either not be produced at all by isolated individual labor, or it could only be produced by a great expenditure of time, or on a very dwarfed scale. Not only have we here an increase in the productive power of the individual, by means of cooperation, but the creation of a new power, namely, the collective power of the masses. (*Ibid.*, pp. 315-316.)

Out of cooperation grew the system of manufacture with its ever-greater division of labor and the emergence of what Marx termed the "collective laborer." Manufacture in turn was transitional to and provided the material basis for the rise of machine production—for the industrial revolution which gave birth to modern large-scale industry. All this represents an uninterrupted process of growing socialization of production, extending through the successive stages of capitalist development and continuing at an accelerated pace in the conditions of the new scientific and technological revolution.

The other aspect of the capitalist mode of production, embodying the old, is the private ownership of the means of production, a form of ownership carried over from the previous period of individual production, and private appropriation of the social product. From the very beginning, this form of ownership and appropriation comes into conflict with socialized production, a conflict which becomes progressively sharper as socialization proceeds. Here is the basic unity of opposites which comprises the capitalist mode of production and is the basic contradiction immanent in it.

Since private ownership means production for the private profit of the owner, the contradiction finds expression in the process of capitalist exploitation—as Marx demonstrated, in the extraction of surplus value

from the employment of wage labor. It finds expression in the existence of a mass of proletarians who, possessing no means of production, can live only by selling themselves piecemeal to the capitalists on the latter's terms, namely, that they produce both their own means of subsistence and a surplus to be pocketed by the capitalist class. And it finds expression, consequently, in irreconcilable antagonism between the two—in the class struggle in which the old and the new in conflict are materialized, so to speak, in the contending classes.

On the part of the working class, this is objectively a struggle against capitalist exploitation. But to end its exploitation, the working class must itself take over ownership of the means of production. And this means of necessity *collective* ownership, since capitalism embodies, in Marx's words, "the transformation of the instruments of labor into instruments only usable in common."

In short, the basic interests of the working class *as a class* are served by instituting a form of ownership which corresponds to socialized production and thus abolishing the particular form of the contradiction between the forces and relations of production inherent in capitalism.

It is in this sense that Marx regards the working class as revolutionary in distinction to all other classes—that its objective interests lead in the direction of socialized ownership while those of all other classes lead in the direction of private ownership on a growing scale. The working class represents the new relations of production corresponding to the new character of the productive forces; the others all represent the old relations—they are conservative in character.

It is the evolution of the central contradiction between socialized production and private appropriation which forms the essential basis of the content of Volume I of *Capital*, the basis of what Marx refers to in his preface as "the ultimate aim of this work, to lay bare the economic law of motion of modern society." This he finds in the process of capitalist accumulation which, with the mounting socialization of production, leads to the ever greater centralization and concentration of capital in the hands of an oligarchy of wealth at one pole and the reduction of a growing majority to the status of wage workers at the other. The increasing mechanization of production brings in its wake the emergence of an industrial reserve army whose growth is a measure of the growing incompatibility of the capitalist relations of production with modern technology. And with this, he arrives at the end of the road for capitalism. "The expropriators are expropriated."

Thus, in the thinking of Marx, the role of the working class is a necessary consequence of his whole theory of social development. It is not merely one of a number of independent theoretical propositions but

rather a central doctrine on whose validity the entire theoretical structure hinges.

Is Marx Outdated?

Today it has become fashionable in many diverse circles to reject this particular concept of Marx, to contend that it is no longer the working class which constitutes the revolutionary force in capitalist society, while professing to adhere to the Marxist theory in other respects. The forms this rejection takes and the arguments presented for it are many, as are the substitutes offered for the working class. Within the scope of this paper it is impossible to deal with the whole gamut of these; I shall confine myself, therefore, to two current versions: those of Paul M. Sweezy and Herbert Marcuse.

Sweezy's latest elaboration of his views is contained in a paper entitled "Marx and the Proletariat," presented at the Socialist Scholars Conference held in New York on September 9-10, 1967 and published in the December 1967 issue of *Monthly Review*. In it he states:

In the eyes of many people . . . this theory of the revolutionary agency of the proletariat is the weakest point of the whole system. They point to the fact that the English and other Western European proletariats, which Marx considered to be the vanguard of the international revolutionary movement, have actually developed into reformist forces which, by accepting the basic assumptions of capitalism, in fact strengthen it. And they note that the proletariat of what has become the most advanced and powerful capitalist country, the United States of America, has never developed a significant revolutionary leadership or movement, and shows fewer signs of doing so today than at any time in its history.

In his opinion, these observations, which he thinks cannot be seriously challenged, indicate not necessarily that Marx was wrong but rather that his theory has been misinterpreted and misapplied. He argues that Marx did not regard the proletariat as being revolutionary from its birth, but believed it acquired this quality at a certain stage of capitalist development, namely, with the emergence of machine industry. In the period of manufacture, Sweezy asserts, the skilled detail worker was limited in vision. "Craft consciousness rather than class consciousness was the hallmark of a proletariat so composed." Moreover, manufacture tended to be conservative technologically, a conservatism that ended only with the industrial revolution.

It was machine production which replaced the handworkers with cheaper unskilled labor of a more uniform character, and slowed the demand for wage labor by replacing it with machinery. "This means

a fundamental change in the economic power relations between capital and labor, to the enormous advantage of the former. . . . It is the capitalistic employment of machinery, and not merely capitalism in general, which generates the modern proletariat as Marx conceived it." Thus, he concludes, manufacture is marked by a conservative technology and a non-revolutionary proletariat, modern industry by a revolutionary technology and a revolutionary proletariat.

Marx, he continues, evidently thought the revolution would occur during the stage of machine production attained in his day and hence probed no further. However, in the prolonged absence of a revolutionary situation, the development of machine production has proceeded far beyond that level to a point where the revolutionary character of the working class has become progressively reduced.

First, technological advance has substantially reduced the proportion in the work force of blue-collar manual laborers, who predominated in Marx's day, but who now, in the most advanced industrial countries, constitute "a small minority." And this minority is capable, moreover, of producing a potential surplus of growing proportions.

Secondly, it has given rise to a great variety of new categories of jobs: on the one hand, technicians, skilled maintenance workers, researchers, engineers, etc., associated with the new technology; on the other hand, a growing mass of non-productive service workers, ranging from government employees and teachers to personnel in sales, communications media, finance, personal services, etc. In the United States today, these "probably account for close to three quarters of the employed non-agricultural labor force." And all this has been accompanied by a substantial rise in real wages over a period of time.

Hence: "Once again, as in the period of manufacture, the proletariat is highly differentiated; and once again occupational and status consciousness has tended to submerge class consciousness." Only a dwindling number of blue-collar production workers continues to possess revolutionary potential, and even this potential is progressively lessened by the trend toward more education and better-paying jobs for the new generation.

But the question arises: if not the working class, who *does* constitute the revolutionary force in modern capitalist society? This role Sweezy assigns to the masses in the countries exploited and oppressed by world imperialism. Exploitation is now a global phenomenon with growing superprofits reaped from the peoples of the oppressed countries, and with part of the spoils used to bribe a share of the workers in the imperialist countries—a share which "could be extended to a majority or even all the workers in the industrialized countries."

In short, it is the oppressed peoples who are now the "gravediggers of capitalism" while the proletariat of the oppressing countries is more and more drawn to accepting and supporting the system of oppression.

Such are the views advanced by Sweezy in the name of correctly interpreting Marx. Those of Marcuse are somewhat similar. They are contained in a recent paper entitled "The Obsolescence of Marx," presented at an International Symposium at the University of Notre Dame in April 1966, and published in *Marx and the Western World* (Nicholas Lobkowitz, ed., University of Notre Dame Press, 1967).

Marcuse starts by saying that in his opinion the title of the paper, an assigned one, should have a question mark at the end. The basic ideas of Marx, he contends, have with one exception been validated. He summarizes these in a series of five propositions, of which the first four have, he believes, been corroborated by the facts of history. The fifth, however, has not. It states: "This cycle [of war and depression] can be broken only if the laboring classes, who bear the brunt of exploitation, seize the productive apparatus and bring it under the collective control of the producers themselves."

The basic contradictions of capitalism exist and operate as Marx maintained, but today, in the advanced industrial countries to which the last proposition applies, "the laboring classes are in no sense a revolutionary potential." In these countries, he says, a rising standard of living has been brought about by "the overflowing productivity of labor . . . and the new means of profitable waste" thus opened up, also by the "highly effective scientific management of needs, demand and satisfaction . . . which operates most forcefully in the publicity and entertainment industry," which "has become part of the basic productive process and of the necessary costs of production" and without which "vast quantities of goods would not be purchased." Thanks to these factors, "the vital need for revolution no longer prevails among those classes that as the 'immediate producers' would be capable of stopping the capitalist production."

However, this does not in Marcuse's view break down the validity of Marxian theory. In support of this contention he presents the following remarkable passage from Marx's *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, written in 1857:

As large scale industry advances, the creation of real wealth depends less on the labor time and the quantity of labor expended than on the power of the instruments set in motion during the labor time. These instruments, and their powerful effectiveness, are in no proportion to the immediate labor time which the production requires; rather their effectiveness depends on the attained level of

science and technological progress or the application of science to production. . . . Human labor then no longer appears as enclosed in the process of production; rather man relates himself to this process merely as supervisor and regulator. He stands outside of the process of production instead of being its principal agent. . . . In this transformation the great pillar of production and wealth is no longer the immediate labor performed by man himself, nor his labor time, but the appropriation of his own universal productivity (creative power), that is, knowledge and his mastery of nature through his social existence, in one word: the development of the social (all-round) individual. *The theft of another man's labor time on which the social wealth still rests today* then appears as a miserable basis compared with the new basis which large scale industry itself has created. As soon as human labor, in its immediate form, has ceased to be the great source of wealth, labor time will cease, and must of necessity cease, to be the measure of wealth; and exchange value must of necessity cease to be the measure of use value. The *surplus labor of the mass* [of the population] has then ceased to be the condition for the development of social wealth, and the leisure of the few has ceased to be the condition for the development of the universal intellectual faculties of men. The mode of production which rests on exchange value then collapses. (Berlin, German Democratic Republic, 1953, pp. 592 ff.)

"Nothing is said here," says Marcuse, "about class struggle or impoverishment; the analysis of the collapse of capitalism is focused entirely on the internal 'technical' dynamic of the system, in a word, on the basic tendency of advanced capitalism toward automation." This technological development makes possible the development of socialism on a higher level than Marx had envisioned. Present-day capitalism is already surpassing the basic features of that of Marx's day and approaching the state of affairs described in the above quotation. Much of what Marx thought possible only under socialism has in fact developed under capitalism.

A revolution is still necessary, but it is not the working class which is its instrument. Industrial labor is no longer identical with the impoverished classes, as the Marxian concept implies. Hence it is no longer the development of class consciousness but the development of "consciousness as such" which "appears to be the basic prerequisite of radical change."

In the light of this, Marcuse sees as the principal revolutionary force today the exploited masses in the industrially backward countries an agricultural proletariat subjected to the kind of exploitation described by Marx and conforming to his idea of the agent of revolution.

Other forces include a) the political labor movement in countries like France and Italy, whose "new strategy" seeks to extend labor's role in management of key enterprises within capitalism, leading to control by the workers themselves; b) in the United States the underprivileged strata; and c) the "oppositional intelligentsia." Together, these four constitute the "syndrome of a revolutionary potential," to which may be added the existing socialist countries.

So much for the views of Marcuse. While his and Sweezy's ideas possess some elements of truth, I believe they are fundamentally in error. Let us proceed to look into them.

The Meaning of "Revolutionary"

First, it is essential to distinguish between the revolutionary *character* of the working class and its *consciousness* of its historic role. The fact that in the period of manufacture the mass of the workers tend to express only craft consciousness in no way alters the fact that since socialized production already exists the solution to their problems already lies objectively in collective ownership of the means of production. Not only is that necessity present from the outset; it also finds conscious expression almost from the very beginning, a point stressed by Engels in his *Anti-Dühring*:

. . . although, on the whole, the bourgeoisie in their struggle with the nobility could claim to represent at the same time the interests of the different sections of the workers of that period, yet in every great bourgeois movement there were independent outbursts of that class which was the more or less developed forerunner of the modern proletariat. For example, the Thomas Münzer tendency in the period of the reformation and peasant war in Germany; the Levellers in the great English revolution; in the great French revolution, Babeuf. Alongside of these revolutionary armed uprisings of a class which was as yet undeveloped, the corresponding theoretical manifestations made their appearance; in the 16th and 17th centuries, utopian portrayals of ideal social conditions; in the 18th century, actual communistic theories (Morelly and Mably). The demand for equality was no longer limited to political rights, but was extended also to the social conditions of individuals; it was not merely class privileges that were to be abolished but class distinctions themselves. (International Publishers, New York, 1939, pp. 24-25.)

To be sure, it is with the development of machine industry that the proletariat emerges in full flower and that scientific socialism—the basis for the development of class consciousness in its fullest sense—makes its appearance. However, the revolutionary character of the

proletariat does not suddenly come into existence at this point, but has, as Engels notes, clearly defined roots in the earlier stages of capitalist development.

Nor does the continued advance of technology in modern times, leading to the new technological revolution, reverse this process of development. True, it brings about important changes in the composition of the working class, but these do not in themselves warrant any conclusions that the working class is becoming "less revolutionary."

The facts concerning the status of the American working class today are presented in the paper by Victor Perlo. Suffice it to say here that they bear out neither the thesis of the vanishing blue-collar worker nor that of the affluent proletariat. Nor do they support the notion that the majority of American workers are bought off and corrupted with the spoils of imperialism.

Of course, the center of gravity in the working class has shifted markedly in the direction of unproductive labor. But this is a necessary consequence of the rising productivity of human labor, and was already noted as such by Marx.

Secondly, the growing proportion of clerical, technical, engineering and scientific workers in manufacturing are no less a part of the production work force than are the blue-collar workers. Their growing influx represents simply the fact that with advancing technology manual labor is increasingly replaced by mental labor—a fact also clearly recognized by Marx in his day.

True, this leads to a mounting heterogeneity of the working class and the entry into it of a growing mass of individuals who tend not to look upon themselves as workers. But this is only one side of the process. On the other side, it is also a process of proletarianization of intellectuals, depriving them of their independent status and increasingly reducing them to the status of wage workers.

The requirements of advancing technology come into constant conflict with the capitalist relations of production because the central purpose of the capitalist in introducing new machinery is to cut his wage bill by replacing skilled with less skilled workers or by eliminating workers altogether. This conflict sharpens as capitalism develops, and it becomes particularly acute with the rise of automation.

The capitalist strives to replace the semiskilled worker displaced by automated equipment not with a technically trained worker but with another semiskilled worker taught only to watch lights and push buttons. He strives to meet the need for added skilled maintenance workers by degrading the skilled crafts and by replacing highly-paid journeymen with lower-paid workers with limited training. The work

of skilled office workers is reduced to mechanical, repetitive operations by the introduction of increasingly elaborate office machinery, and that of the growing body of engineers is progressively reduced from creative work to routine tasks. Further, it is not only the blue-collar workers who are being displaced by automation. More and more, in their "war on paper," the big corporations are using computers to replace not only masses of clerical workers but also a whole intermediate layer of management employees.

All this is accompanied by growing pressures to hold salaries down and to extract greater quantities of labor. Increasingly, the lot of these white-collar workers approaches that of the blue-collar workers. Hence in growing measure they are driven to recognize their status as workers, to organize and to struggle against the downgrading of their status.

At the same time, the growth of the corps of technical and scientific personnel at one end is far overshadowed by the mass displacement of workers at the other. From this threat no one is immune, and the wiping out of jobs of workers with decades of seniority is becoming more and more common. Those displaced are in very large part driven either into low-paying, insecure service jobs or into the ranks of the chronically unemployed. Thus the chief effect of automation is to accentuate the process of creation of the industrial reserve army.

The effect of all this is not to lessen but to sharpen the class struggle. Marcuse overlooks this when he interprets Marx as presaging the collapse of capitalism with no reference to the class struggle. What Marx points out in the quotation from the *Grundrisse* is that the advance of technology ultimately makes it possible to produce vast quantities of use values with minute quantities of human labor. With this, their exchange value as commodities approaches zero, and hence an economic system based on the production and exchange of commodities becomes unviable. Indeed, such a level of technology is compatible only with communist relations of production.

But Marcuse takes this out of its context, namely, that these increasingly powerful means of production continue to be owned by a capitalist class which strives to maintain the character of the products as commodities—to keep their prices up in the face of their declining exchange value and to maintain the rate of profit in the face of the shrinking proportion of investment which goes into the purchase of labor power. These efforts to maintain and augment the extraction of surplus value can only be made at the growing expense of the working class. Such is the role of monopoly price fixing and of the mounting economic intervention of the state. And the growing resort

to waste as a means of absorbing the rising surplus, particularly through huge military expenditures, is also at the expense of the workers.

Thus does even the mere approach to ability to produce an abundance of goods with a minimum of labor give rise to what has come to be called the "paradox of plenty." And thus does it place ever more sharply before the masses of wage workers the necessity of removing the obstacle which stands between them and the enjoyment of the abundance which their joint efforts are capable of producing. Hence, long before the state of affairs described by Marx is reached the sharpening of the contradictions arising from private ownership will compel the working class and its allies to put an end to it.

The idea advanced by both Sweezy and Marcuse that exploitation has now shifted to the toiling masses in the oppressed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and that these have therefore become the main revolutionary force for the overthrow of capitalism, is likewise not valid. National oppression is not merely a matter of exploiting wage labor abroad. It is the oppression of a *people*—of all classes—and the resulting struggle is not a class struggle but a multi-class national liberation struggle. Its goal is not socialism but national freedom. In itself it is not anti-capitalist but anti-imperialist. In such countries the class struggle exists, but it develops within the framework of the fight for national freedom.

In addition, the national liberation movements are no substitute for the struggle of the working class in the imperialist countries. They cannot lead to the overthrow of capitalism in a country like the United States; that can be accomplished only by the appropriate forces *within* the country. Revolution can no more be imported than it can be exported. Moreover, without such struggles in this country the successes of the forces of national liberation must remain limited.

Changing Forms of the Class Struggle

Sweezy's writing off of the working class is not confined to the United States but extends to all advanced capitalist countries. Even in countries like France and Italy the working class is viewed as reformist, not revolutionary (this is also implied in Marcuse's "new strategy" characterization). The basis for such a position, in the face of the fact that in these countries the workers are overwhelmingly for socialism and the great majority belong to or support their respective Communist parties, is presumably that these parties are engaged in parliamentary struggles, strikes, demonstrations and other

mass actions in alliance with other forces instead of organizing armed revolt.

Here we encounter a profound failure to recognize that as capitalism develops the forms of the class struggle also develop and change. This point is made by Engels in *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850*, in which he compares the conditions of 1895 with those of 1848. He says:

. . . [History] has . . . completely transformed the conditions under which the proletariat has to fight. The mode of struggle of 1848 is today obsolete in every respect. . . .

The time of surprise attacks, of revolutions carried through by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses, is past. Where it is a question of complete transformation of the social organization, the masses themselves must be in it, must themselves already have grasped what is at stake, what they are going in for with body and soul. The history of the past fifty years has taught us that. But in order that the masses may understand what is to be done, persistent work is required, and it is just this work that we are now pursuing. (Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1950, Vol. I, pp. 113, 123.)

Since Engels' day the changes have been even more profound. The growing socialization of production leads to the emergence of monopoly capital, which exploits and robs all sections of the people, and to the development of state monopoly capitalism, which directly utilizes the machinery and resources of the state for that purpose. These developments give birth to a new contradiction, that between monopoly and all other sections of the people. This finds expression in the anti-monopoly struggle, a democratic struggle to curb the power of monopoly. It is intimately interlinked with the class struggle, and it is within this framework that the movement for socialism develops. At the same time, the growing economic role of the state thrusts the class struggle itself increasingly into the political arena, bringing with it the need for political alliances and the tying of the working class more intimately to the democratic struggles of other sections of the people.

Those who, in the name of updating Marx, argue that the working class has outlived its revolutionary character, fail to see these very real changes in capitalism and the changes in the class struggle which arise from them. Baran and Sweezy, in their book *Monopoly Capital*, reject the concept of state monopoly capitalism. And they write off today's democratic struggles as a futile exercise in reformism, failing to see the connection between reform and revolution.

Hence, because no one is at this moment storming the citadels of U.S. capitalism, they contend that nothing is really happening, despite the great upsurge of democratic struggles—of the peace movement and the Negro freedom movement. They similarly see the great democratic struggles in France and Italy as “reformist,” unable to discern within them the strengthening and maturing of the forces of socialism toward the not too distant days of the ripening of revolutionary struggles.

Indeed, they resemble those of whom Lenin wrote in 1913:

Certain people [after 1905] who were inattentive to the conditions of preparing and developing the mass struggle were driven to despair and to anarchism by the lengthy delays in the decisive struggle against capitalism in Europe. We can see now how short-sighted and faint-hearted this anarchist despair is. (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, p. 88.)

Today the contradictions of capitalism are rapidly sharpening. The base for opportunism in the ranks of the working class is shrinking, not expanding. The prospects for the growth of class consciousness are increasing, not declining. The incompatibility of the new technology with private ownership is becoming ever more glaring, and the possibilities of making this clear to workers who see no answer to automation are ever greater. But one must work to do so. One must become involved in the struggles of the working class and engage in the consistent, painstaking tasks of organization and education. And one must learn how to adapt oneself to the ebb and flow of struggle and how to fight under all conditions.

There are some, however, who lose patience, who lose faith in the working class, and who therefore abandon these difficult day-to-day struggles and seek “easier” highways to social revolution. Today these become purveyors of various forms of petty-bourgeois radicalism, rejecting Marx's concept of the role of the working class and seeking other “revolutionary potentials” to replace it—what Lenin called a “revisionism from the Left.” And many of them fall prey to modern versions of Bakuninism and Blanquism—to the idea that a dedicated handful of plotters can carry out a social revolution anywhere and at any time.

Such, then, are Marx's ideas concerning the historic role of the working class. What I have sought to demonstrate is that the development of capitalism since his day has not invalidated them but has borne them out.

Will American Labor Lead The Socialist Revolution?

Is labor disappearing in America? Has the white-collar surge left but a scattering of manual toilers? Will automata and computers leave the masses nowhere to go but to the races? Are the remaining workers becoming middle-class appendages of the Establishment? Are all white workers bribed with a share of foreign superprofits, or with jobs producing armaments? Has the working class everywhere, but especially in the United States, lost its revolutionary potential?

Positive answers, insinuated by official propaganda, and blazoned by segments of the intellectual Left, have widespread currency in the United States. Hyman Lumer has refuted them in terms of Marxist classics. I will review them in relation to factual developments.

The Theory of the Vanishing Working Class

The working class consists of those without ownership of means of production, hired for wages or salaries. World-wide the working class is expanding prodigiously. According to estimates of M. Dragilev, a Soviet economist, in the main industrial countries the industrial proletariat alone increased from 10 million in the mid-nineteenth century to 30 million at the start of the 20th, and 90 million now. He estimates the total working class, including nonproductive workers, white collar workers, etc., at 200 million, or 70 per cent of all gainfully occupied persons. An additional 100 million are exploited by capital in the developing countries, which had scarcely any proletarians a century ago.

When Marx wrote, the proletariat was a minority of the population in all countries, and a relatively small minority in most. At the time of the Russian revolution the whole working class, industrial and otherwise, was only one-sixth of the gainfully employed population, and few will deny the leading role of labor in that revolution.

In the United States also, the working class is a rising, and rapidly rising, share of the population. Leaving out salaried managers and officials, whom I classify with capitalists, the wage and salaried workers have increased from 64 per cent of the population in 1900 to 72 per cent in 1940, and 82 per cent in 1966—an overwhelming majority, matched scarcely anywhere. During the last six years alone the number

of workers has increased by 8½ million, or 15½ per cent, while the total population increased only 9 per cent.

A subsidiary theory is the vanishing of the industrial proletariat, the revolutionary core of the working class. Certainly, employment in trade and service industries has been increasing relatively, although the majority of privately-employed wage and salaried workers are still in the traditional industrial areas—manufacturing, mining, construction, transport and communications. But the absolute number of workers in industry is increasing. It has nearly doubled in manufacturing and nearly tripled in construction since 1939.

But, does a change in the sectoral distribution of labor mean a reduction in its revolutionary potential? There is nothing in Marxism which says that the main, decisive sectors must remain unchanged. The postwar decades have seen the adoption of mass production methods by a whole series of non-manufacturing industries, along with a rise in their social and political importance.

In retail trade, the thousands of small, scattered enterprises with a few sales people have been replaced by huge supermarkets with many workers, engaged primarily in the continuation of the production process in the sphere of distribution, rather than in selling. Workers in supermarkets, objectively, might now be considered as equivalent to part of the industrial proletariat, as suggested also by their unionizing and strike activity. There has been a similar growth of industrial-type processes and labor-management relations in many rapidly growing private and government service industries.

An overlapping theory is the supposed replacement of the blue collar, manual worker, by the white collar salariat. Again, the proportion of white collar workers has increased, but not at the pace implied by those who talk of the imminent elimination of human toil. Traditionally, statistics separated salaried employees and wage workers, or manual workers. Now the government has reinforced the concept of the vanishing manual worker by dividing them into three categories—blue collar, service, and farm. At the same time, it has reinforced the white collar total by throwing in the self-employed, officials and executives. Thus an artificially inflated white collar total is shown to exceed an artificially diminished “blue collar” total. Using traditional description, in 1966 salaried employees, excluding officials and executives, comprised 36 per cent, manual workers 63.5 per cent, of the total. In 1940 the corresponding figures were 27.9 per cent and 72.1 per cent. At this pace, it will be near the end of the century before salaried workers equal manual workers in total.

But the main thing is not statistical. With the rise in the number of white collar workers, the objective social and economic differences between the mass of white collar workers and manual workers have dwindled. Today, except for professional employees, the median incomes of the main groups of non-farm workers are within 25 per cent of those of operatives, the most numerous group. Clerical and sales workers, who are white collar employees, average less than craftsmen. Women sales workers average less than women operatives, and male professionals only 50 per cent more than male operatives.

Conditions of labor also become more similar. Stackers and check-out girls in supermarkets, typists and mailers in mass production offices, have jobs close in character to many manual jobs in factories.

Of course, the consciousness of workers lags behind this objective change, but this lag also is diminishing. Relatively fewer white collar workers now regard themselves as privileged than did so a generation ago. The extent of organization and frequency of strikes among white collar workers has multiplied more rapidly than their numbers.

The Triple Revolution

The cyberculturalists, the authors of the Manifesto of the Triple Revolution, claim that automation and the electronic computer will soon displace almost all human labor, leaving a nation of drones supported by government handouts. Their errors are manifold.

They confuse technical possibilities with economic feasibilities. A space ship travels around the globe without a crew. A steamship has a crew of 100. But hundreds of thousands of workers were engaged in building that space ship, programming it, controlling its flight, recording and analyzing the results. The real labor cost of travelling around the globe in a space ship is still a hundred or a thousand times that of travelling around the globe by boat.

Ways can be found of doing almost anything without direct application of human labor. But generally, only those methods will be introduced which involve an *over-all economy* in current and contained labor, at the given stage of development. Even with automation and cybernetics, changes in methods are gradual and limited.

Despite particular dramatic increases in labor productivity (e.g., coal mining), the average rise in labor productivity remains within historical bounds—around 3 per cent per year in the United States, somewhat more in certain other capitalist countries catching up to the U.S. technologically, and around 6 per cent per year in socialist countries.

Even if the gain in labor productivity should reach 10 per cent per year, conceivable under certain circumstances in a socialist society, the need for human labor, and even expanding numbers of workers, would go on indefinitely.

The triple revolution concept restricts attention to the state of technology in the United States, rather than looking at the matter globally. It falsely assumes a lack of intimate connection between the two. The cyberculturalists ignore the vast mass of overwork, excessively intensive and excessively long, performed by tens of millions of Americans. If the workweek were cut to 25 hours, and speedup were eliminated, this would absorb all the increase in labor productivity until near the end of the century.

Most fundamentally, the theory falsely limits human needs and wants to the narrow confines of twentieth-century bourgeois affluence—even as it greatly underestimates the vast effort needed to really achieve that standard for all of the American people.

History shows that man's needs increase and broaden in proportion to his ability to satisfy them. Universal "affluence," in communist society, will merely set the stage for mankind to start out on universally doing really enjoyable, interesting, creative work, the outlines of which we are only beginning to be able to comprehend. One example: Today travel on the globe has become a major form of consumption. Probably within a century, travel to other planets will become a major form of consumption—travel by masses of people scientifically trained, able and anxious to combine scientific work with "sightseeing." In a communist society, where labor will become man's prime need and joy, the boundary between work and consumption will fade—as it already does for the few fortunate souls "happy in their work" today.

Exploitation of Labor

The revolutionary role of labor arises from the fact that it is the most exploited class under capitalism, and that it is united socially in the process of capitalist production, creating conditions under which it can struggle unitedly to end exploitation, and establish social ownership of the means of production.

Those who have written off labor politically argue that the masses are no longer exploited by the capitalists, but have been taken under the wing of paternalistic capitalists, have become "part of the Establishment." Sweezy has dropped the term surplus value, because of its connotations of exploitation. However, the table on the "social surplus" compiled by Professor Phillips for Baran and Sweezy's *Monopoly*

Capital shows it rising from 46.9 per cent of the gross national product in 1929 to 56.1 per cent in 1963.

Official statistics show a decline of 10 per cent in real wages and salaries per unit of manufacturing output between the late 1950's and 1964. Similar downtrends are apparent in other industries. The same tendency can be established over many decades.

Marx stressed the attempts of capitalists to increase the rate of surplus value by prolongation of the working day. Some of the most bitter struggles of American labor have been to shorten the workweek. Big victories were won, and a nominal 40-hour week enacted. But for over 25 years American employers have succeeded to extending the workweek, by use of legal exceptions or by increased use of overtime, often with connivance of union leaders.

The actual average hours of workers who are not part-time workers is around 46 per week, not 40. In 1966 there were 23.5 million workers who toiled over 40 hours per week, constituting 41.7 per cent of all full-time workers. Their average work-week was—55 hours! And this doesn't count moonlighting.

Official propaganda, and some trade union propaganda, conveys a false concept of exploitation, namely that it refers to exceptionally low wages. Certainly a major focus of American monopolies is the extraction of superprofits from workers paid exceptionally low wages here and abroad. But the mass of surplus value continues to be derived from the exploitation of American workers paid ordinary, average wages, at the supposedly phenomenal American working class standard of living. Let's examine that a little more closely.

Labor's "Middle Class" Living Standard

The supposed high living standard and easy working conditions of American labor figure prominently in arguments casting aside labor's revolutionary role. These arguments start from the false premise of an unchanging, universal scale of measurement. Marxism teaches that the value of labor power—the underlying determinant of wages—reflects a historically evolved set of living requirements in each country and period. That scale is higher in the U.S. than elsewhere, but it was always higher. It is also higher than a half century ago, but it is quite impossible to return to a past mode of living. The bourgeoisie, by their selling and advertising, by their destruction of public transit systems, and decent rental housing situations, have *forced* this more expensive, if somewhat higher, living standard on workers.

What is the level of wages of most American workers, in relation

to that historically evolved scale? The latest Labor Department study showed a required \$9,191 annual income to achieve a "modest" standard of living in 1966—some unions call it "shabby but respectable"—for a family of four with one person working.

But 65 per cent of all families whose heads had a job fell below that level in 1965. The majority fell below the figure in all occupation groups except professionals, and even among them 43.6 per cent of the families failed to make it. Among families of operatives, the largest single group, comprising the bulk of industrial workers, the median income was 25 per cent below the required level. Considering only white, non-Spanish-speaking working-class families, the majority fell well below \$9,191.

Finally, one must consider the *conditions of labor*. Marx stressed that the misery of workers was due to many causes connected with the accumulation of capital: "the lot of the laborer, be his payment high or low, must grow worse." (*Capital*, Modern Library, New York, Vol. 1, p. 709.) Of course, as Marx indicated, such laws must always be modified by circumstances, as they have been through organization and struggle. Still, all the conditions making for misery of labor prevail in American industry today—speedup, lack of safety provisions, job insecurity, monotony, excessive hours, degradation of labor, arbitrary bosses, etc. Every intellectual without factory experience should read the account of *Wall Street Journal* correspondent Roger Rapoport's one-week stint at Ford's:

Working on the line is grueling and frustrating, and while it may be repetitive, it's not simple. I learned at first-hand why 250,000 auto workers are unhappy about working conditions. . . . I'm in fairly good physical shape, but I ached all over after each day's work on the line. . . . Nobody seemed to take any particular pride in his work . . . (July 24, 1967.)

He described the breakneck speed of the line, the high-priced, gulped lunch, the frequent violation of safety rules—all in one of Ford's newest, best plants.

Job insecurity is a special evil in American industry, where 15 million workers suffer unemployment at least part of the time even in good years. Employers habitually lay off workers permanently just before they reach pension age. Plant shutdowns are more frequent than ever as monopolies shift operations to government-subsidized southern and rural locations, as well as overseas. The strike struggles of millions of workers each year, despite the labor bureaucracy, shows

the dissatisfaction and willingness to fight of the rank and file.

The above concerns the *average* worker. Far worse is the lot of tens of millions living below the poverty level. Poverty is more extensive here than in most other industrialized capitalist countries, despite the higher average wages, not to speak of the socialist countries, in some of which real poverty, as it is known in this country, has actually been eliminated. Social security standards, medical service standards for workers in the United States are also lower than in most advanced capitalist countries.

Oppression of Negro Workers

Another fallacy is the idea that only Negroes and other non-white and Spanish-speaking minorities are oppressed in the United States, and that this oppression is wholly different in nature than the exploitation of labor. Certainly Negroes suffer *additional oppression* and are robbed in extra ways. But the *main material content of their oppression is exploitation, or more exactly, superexploitation*. The Negroes form a disproportionate share of the working class, especially in the toughest, most dangerous occupations. But their exploitation is yet part and parcel of the exploitation of the working class as a whole.

With the increasing urbanization of Negroes, their mass appearance in major industries, the objective factors making for united action of black and white workers are growing. The subjective obstacles can be overcome more easily, as they are in fact in many strike struggles.

A high degree of Negro-white unity was achieved in the struggles of the 1930's. What is necessary, in advance of the situation prevailing then, is that in the next major upsurge of labor struggles the achievement of real equality for Negroes become a key demand, with insistence on all the special measures necessary to realize that equality. Karl Marx's statement that the worker in a white skin cannot be free while his brother in a black skin is enslaved is truer than ever.

At the same time, perhaps 80 per cent of the workers exploited by U.S. capitalism within the United States are white, non-Spanish-speaking workers. The full liberation of American Negroes can be achieved only as part of and in connection with the struggles of American labor as a whole. Black power will be fully realized—as a free and equal part of working-class power.

Bribery of Workers and Imperialism

Marx, Engels and Lenin wrote about the bribery of a section of the working class—of a “labor aristocracy”—out of the superprofits of imperialism. U.S. imperialism has extended its sway over much of the

capitalist world, and derives unprecedented profits therefrom. Some Left-wingers argue that the bulk of American labor has been bribed, bought into the “Establishment,” ending clear-cut class distinctions and class struggles in this country.

The aforementioned facts about labor conditions and incomes refute that view. But let's examine it more directly. Doubtless some labor leaders and some workers are bribed. An important task for Marxist researchers is to locate and measure this phenomenon. But we can show now that it is necessarily limited to a small fraction of the working class.

Officially reported profits from private foreign investments totalled \$7.5 billion in 1967. Adding the various forms of hidden profits, as analyzed in my book *American Imperialism*, brings the total to \$21.5 billion, which is 5 per cent of total wages and salaries paid in the U.S. Even if it were all used to bribe a section of the working class, only a rather small minority could be paid enough to really satisfy them. But of course, the imperialists make these profits primarily for their own use, using only the leavings for bribing labor leaders and workers.

Enough could be set aside to make a decisive subjective difference to several million workers, if the amount was concentrated among them. This is certainly a serious matter, complicating achievement of labor unity and organization. But it is a far cry from bribery of the bulk of the working class.

However, there is more to the matter. Last century the colonialists exploited Africa and Asia at little cost. The victims were forced to pay taxes to support the soldiers and officials who lived off them, besides providing cheap raw materials and labor for imperialist companies and kings.

Today things are different. The massive growth of the anti-imperialist struggle has put an end to this “idyllic” situation. If U.S. imperialism has multiplied its profits, in comparison with the old British empire, by a factor of perhaps 5, its costs of maintaining its neo-colonial empire have been increased by a factor of—say—100, and are increasing more rapidly than the profits.

Assume the cost to U.S. imperialism as equal to one-half of all “national defense” spending, plus all “international affairs” expenditures. This comes to \$43.4 billion in fiscal 1968, about double the take from abroad.

Naturally, the monopolies get the profits while the people pay the costs. It is clear that no matter how much of the profits from abroad the monopolies use for bribing some workers, labor as a whole, the

majority of the people, are net losers. At the same time, this high cost of imperialism limits still further the extent of possible bribery of sections of the working class.

Nor does this cost-versus-profit calculation exhaust the matter. The export of capital is rapidly becoming a major element undermining the job situation in the United States, and threatening American wage standards.

U.S. corporations are expanding most rapidly abroad, not in a few special areas, but literally in all corners of the capitalist world. Foreign plant and equipment spending by U.S. firms jumped from \$3.7 billion in 1960 to \$5 billion in 1963 and over \$10 billion in 1967. This investment is not just in typical raw material industries, but goes across the board in manufacturing, including the most advanced electronic and chemical industries. In a completely new trend, U.S. corporations manufacturing advanced products of the scientific-technical revolution are developing output by enslaved workers of the Far Eastern neo-colonies—South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong, at wages of \$15-\$20 per month, and this for labor more productive than that of the Americans displaced.

The total foreign output of U.S. companies is now in the neighborhood of \$100 billion per year. Increasingly, the export of capital is *directly* replacing former export of goods, and *directly* substituting imports for formerly home-produced goods. Imports of goods made in enterprises owned by U.S. companies abroad increased from \$3.6 billion in 1957 to perhaps \$10 billion in 1967. Foreign employment by U.S. companies now amounts to about 6 million workers. About one-third of this number, or 2 million, represents net jobs lost to U.S. workers. And some 200,000 added jobs are lost yearly.

Nor can this be regarded as a gain for the other countries, in none of which are the U.S. exploiters wanted. The people would prefer to buy U.S. technology and machines for use in enterprises they own, without having to pay tribute to U.S. giant companies, without having the U.S. military bases and political pressures which come with the investments.

War Economy and Labor

The lure of jobs producing war materials has been a potent factor in the Meany clique's ability to gain tolerance for its cold-war foreign policy. Actually, the employment benefits of militarism are declining, while the costs of that employment to labor are rising.

According to Labor Department figures, there are now 4.1 million civilian workers whose jobs are due, directly or indirectly, to military

spending. *This indicates a 75 per cent higher cost to create a job through military spending than through other government or private spending.* At the same time, the share of taxes paid by workers is rising, under conditions of the cold-war economy. Workers are paying more taxes than they would in a peace economy, and ending up with less employment than they have if the money were spent for useful, peaceful purposes. This finds its expression in the recent decline in workers' real take-home pay, and in the rise of unemployment this year during the Vietnam war. Meanwhile, the employment potential of that war has been exhausted. Unless it spreads to new theaters, war employment will start to decline. Already employment by NASA contractors, squeezed by the Vietnam war, has dropped from 440,000 to 330,000, and will fall further to 270,000 or 200,000.

A major argument of some Left ideologists, pessimistic about the possibility of labor combating a war program, is that with disarmament the country would immediately revert to the mass unemployment of the 1930s. In general, that indicates a one-sided view of the fiscal impact of a war economy. In particular, today, under labor pressure, governments can be forced to engage in civilian job-creating programs, cheaper than arms programs and without the fiscal strain they produce, and much more beneficial to working people.

We can analyze the over-all cost to U.S. workers from the special position of U.S. imperialism as the largest overseas exploiter and most militarized country, by comparison with the situation and trends in other imperialist countries. No other industrial country devotes such a large share of its resources to military activity. Only the United Kingdom (and perhaps the Netherlands) has comparable foreign investments, relative to its size. Foreign investments of Japan, Italy and West Germany, in particular, are relatively trivial, as is the military spending of Japan. Yet the percentage of unemployment in the United States is chronically higher than in *any* of the other leading industrial capitalist countries.

The rate of gain in real wages has dwindled as U.S. imperialism has expanded globally, and the relative position of U.S. workers has deteriorated in comparison with workers in other capitalist countries. Official figures show the following figures on the average annual increase in real take-home pay of U.S. factory workers: 1939-47, 3.0 per cent; 1947-57, 2.2 per cent; 1957-67, 1.4 per cent. These figures overstate actuality somewhat, but we are concerned here with the fact of deceleration, which would still be apparent with more accurate figures.

In contrast, during the past decade the average annual increase in real wages in West Germany, France, Japan and Italy has been of

the order of 4-5 per cent yearly. All-around gains of workers in socialist countries have been even more pronounced. Under these conditions, the much-touted advantages of American workers over their overseas brothers will become *obviously* insignificant in another decade or two. The material basis for illusions that many American workers have, resulting from their officially advertised higher living standard, will disappear.

Finally, the Vietnam war is proving that American workers can no longer be *personally exempt* from the physical sacrifices involved in wars of aggression—from losing in living standards, from being forced to fight and die in far-off lands, from the risk of a devastating nuclear attack on their homeland.

Revolutionary Potential and Revolutionary Role

Objective conditions make the working class, expanded in size and in the breadth of its occupational and geographical distribution, more than ever destined to lead the socialist revolution. These objective circumstances do not, of course, guarantee that workers will achieve the subjective understanding, maturity, unity and militancy required to play a revolutionary role in any given historical period.

But evidence is strong that those subjective conditions are growing on a world scale. The average number of strikers in the advanced capitalist countries increased from 3.5 million yearly in the interwar period to 12.5 million yearly since World War II. The trade unions in these countries have over 70 million members. There are 3 million members of Communist parties, 11 million members of Socialist parties. Communist and Socialist votes total between 25 and 50 per cent of the total (in some cases a majority) in most of these countries.

There have been significant gains towards trade union unity and towards Socialist-Communist unity in a number of countries. The demands of workers more and more include democratization of control of industry, and other measures designed to wrest control of the economy and the state from the hands of monopoly capital.

Recently the *New York Times* gloomily discussed the likely accession of French Communists to a share of power after de Gaulle's departure. The leader of the Japanese Socialist Party predicts capture of state power within ten years.

The relatively rapid gains in living standards of workers in most advanced capitalist countries is a tribute to their high degree of organization and to the revolutionary orientation of so many of them, not a sign of corruption and political degeneration.

We have already seen successful socialist revolutions in such ad-

vanced industrial countries as Czechoslovakia and East Germany, however much these victories may be belittled by the enemies of socialism. We are likely to see socialist revolutions in additional advanced capitalist countries in the lifetimes of most people here.

Today there is the Maoist-Debrayist theory that the only significant center of revolution is the "third world." Well, even here, the essential role of the working class as the leading force, if the revolution is to pass on to a socialist stage, becomes increasingly evident. So far, the closest approach to revolutionary victory on the continent of Latin America has been reached in Chile, and here the leading role of labor among the revolutionary forces is quite evident—as it is indeed in all other countries within the early stages of modern industrialization.

Moreover, a major, indispensable strongpoint for revolutionary movements throughout the "third world" is the support and material aid rendered by the world working class, first and foremost the working class of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Nor should we overlook the aid of French workers to the Algerian revolution, however that may be slandered by some ultra-Leftist phrasemongers.

Perspectives for Struggle and Program

American labor lags far behind workers in other developed countries in consciousness, political organization and level of struggle. Those who deny the role of labor breed pessimism and passivity, which help the Meanys to perpetuate their rule and to extend the lagging of subjective understanding behind objective factors.

Revolutionary intellectuals have a big role to play in helping to deepen the consciousness of the working class, in achieving connections with labor, and helping workers overcome backwardness and illusions. Such a role was played by many intellectuals in the 1930's. Many new leaders, attuned to the new times, are arising also from within the working class, especially among the Negro workers, from among those struggling to organize the most exploited sections of labor, from among those organizing labor peace activities.

The harmful effects of the Vietnam war increase the opportunities for advanced understanding and activity among workers, including war workers. Consider the strikes of Cape Canaveral base workers, of Dow napalm workers, of RCA engineers, the 25 per cent absenteeism and cases of sabotage in war factories reported by the *Wall Street Journal*.

It is important to popularize demands which clarify the link between the material interests of the workers and the fight against U.S. imperialist aggression and militarism. Labor should come out against all

U.S. diplomatic and military protection to U.S. foreign investments, demand the renunciation of treaties granting privileges and advantages to foreign investors, and end all U.S. tax privileges for foreign investments. A special tax should be levied against imports from foreign affiliates of U.S. corporations, to be turned over to the unions of workers affected for unemployment relief and retraining. Punitive taxation should be levied against U.S. corporations using foreign flag vessels.

Cooperative relationships with unions of foreign workers of multinational corporations should be multiplied. Money now spent for so-called "foreign aid," really to aid penetration by U.S. corporations, should be used instead to lend to foreign countries for their own industrialization projects, without strings, creating jobs for workers in this country producing equipment and supplies for these projects. Also, domestic employment should be encouraged by ending the discriminatory barriers to East-West trade.

Labor should demand a government peace program providing more jobs than the arms program, and creating the homes, schools, medical facilities, and other public services and basic necessities now, lacked by tens of millions. Labor should insist on a revival of the principle of the Murray Full Employment Bill of 1946, establishing the responsibility of the government to provide jobs at union wages to all workers not employed by private industry. There should be a special GI bill of rights for munitions workers, with guarantees of alternative jobs, moving expenses when war factories close down, scholarships for college education, retraining, etc. Munitions factories, including aerospace and military electronics factories, should be nationalized, and as internationally agreed disarmament is achieved, converted to the maximum extent possible to peacetime uses.

This *kind* of program—not necessarily every detail outlined above—will help raise the general political level of American workers, make the connection between bread-and-butter issues and the fight against the military-industrial complex and its program of aggression, war and superprofits from superexploitation of foreign peoples, will help provide the link between the peace movement, the labor movement, and the Negro people's movement.

The idea that America will be a stronghold of reaction until the revolution wins everywhere else in the world is contrary to the history of this country, and contrary to the objective trends of world development. The American working class can become a major force for progress and a revolutionary force—not in some dim distant century, but sufficiently soon to be a goal for practical activity today.

Galbraith's Defense of Capitalism

In *The New Industrial State** John Kenneth Galbraith deals with the class struggle and class structure in the United States; with monopoly capitalism, state monopoly capitalism and the military-industrial complex; with the problem of the market, the role of "selling" and the arms budget; and with the relation of capitalism to socialism. The book constitutes an effort to rebuff, without too much commotion, the persistent influence of Marx's analysis of capitalism. He deals, explicitly, in some instances only in passing, with Marx's actual or purported views on the individual capitalist, the concentration of capital, the industrial reserve army, the state, the constriction of the capitalist market, and with Marxist views on military expenditures.

The "Technostructure" Takes Over

The theoretical foundation of Galbraith's analysis is that, as "land" was replaced by "capital" as the "decisive factor of production" a century or more ago, so "capital" has been replaced by "organized intelligence." The proof of capital's dethronement lies, according to Galbraith, in the fact that the "unmitigated pursuit of monopoly profit" is no longer the lode star for capitalist enterprise.

The course of the "industrial system"—Galbraith's term for capitalism—is now set by the "technostructure" of corporate enterprise. The "technostructure" embraces the executives, technicians, scientists and sales personnel who constitute, so to speak, the brain and soul of the corporation. With the usurpation of power by the "technostructure," other goals have replaced maximum profit. The capitalist's goal was maximum profit because he profited; maximum profit is not the goal of the technostructure, for its members are on salary.

The new goals of capitalism, arising from the take-over by the technostructure, are, according to Galbraith: "a serious minimum of earnings" to make "accustomed payments to the stockholders"; a "maximum rate of growth" of the corporation; "savings for reinvestment"; and a "progressive rise in the dividend rate."

But these objectives do not constitute, as Galbraith contends, a new

* John Kenneth Galbraith, *The New Industrial State*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, \$6.95.

goal of our economy. They are simply a diffused and ad hoc translation of maximum profit. To achieve the stated objectives the corporation must obtain an assured and increased profit, to be paid out in dividends, and to provide maximum accumulation of capital for "maximum rate of growth."

Galbraith's dethronement of capital and the elevation of the technostructure to the seat of power is purest fiction. One need only consider the merger movement of the last 20 years, and the mad course of the stock market, to judge whether maximum profit is, or is not, the heart and soul of U.S. capitalism.

The goal of capitalist enterprise is to be seen in its fruits. Galbraith, himself, provides some of the evidence. "Savings for capital formation" accrue chiefly to the corporation stockholders, to the "affluent and rich," he points out. Galbraith argues, nonetheless, that the seat of "power," of "decision-making," lies in the salaried, non-stock-owning technostructure. The capitalist, as stockholder, has been separated from "all effective power," for the "modern corporation disenfranchises its stockholders."

But these allegations do not prove, or even suggest, that maximum profit is not the be-all and end-all of corporate enterprise. Let us assume that the technostructure has all of the "decision-making power" that Galbraith ascribes to it. But the issue is not who has the "power" of "decision-making"; the issue is: "power" over what, "decision-making" about what?

The technostructure's "power" and "decision-making" relate to capitalist enterprise, in which the means of production are capital, the labor is the labor of wage workers, and the surplus value extracted from labor is the property of the capitalists, whether distributed as dividends or interest, or accumulated by the corporation. The goal of capitalist enterprise—maximum profit—is built into the capital-wage labor relationship.

The "New Industrial State" concept, which provides the title for Galbraith's book, is intended as a rebuttal to the Marxist conception of state monopoly capitalism. The "Industrial State," Galbraith says, is a complex which "embraces both the industrial system and the state." At a dozen or more points he describes the merging of the state apparatus and the corporations. But the "inextricable" embrace of the state and the corporations is not an admission by Galbraith that the state is subverted to the interests of capital.

The purpose of the "close fusion of the industrial system with the state" is to mediate the "tasks of technical sophistication," he con-

tends. That is, this "fusion" is incited by technological compulsion, rather than by profit imperatives. The merging of monopoly capitalism and the state represents, he holds, the "socialization" of corporate wealth. In time, he adds, the "line" between monopoly capital and the state "will disappear."

The description of state-monopoly capitalism as technologically-inspired conceals the fact that the vastly expanded state apparatus becomes increasingly the instrument of monopoly capital.

A "Planned" Economic System

Proof that the striving for maximum profit has been replaced by other objectives lies in the fact, Galbraith contends, that "planning" is modern capitalism's mode of existence. Price-fixing, which has been viewed by some as monopoly extortion, is simply a means whereby the modern corporation can plan its growth.

To support the "planning" thesis Galbraith cites the integration of production sequences by individual corporations, the expansion of inter-firm contracts for purchase and sale, and the "control" of "consumer behavior" (sales) through advertising. "We have an economic system which . . . is in substantial part a planned economy," he declares. "The size of General Motors," thus, "is in the service not of monopoly . . . but of planning." Large size is "the general servant of technology not the special servant of profit."

The issue is not, however, whether there is planning or not, by the great corporations, but whether, as Galbraith contends, "planning" has replaced maximum profit as their life's purpose, and whether "planning" has dissolved the basic contradiction of capitalist production. "Planning" becomes the mode of operation of capitalism only by assuming, as Galbraith does, the non-existence of the immanent contradiction of capitalism: wage labor and capital.

Galbraith rejects the "ancient Marxian contention . . . that a capitalist economy suffers from an inherently limited market." "There is in fact," he maintains, "nothing to the Marxian contention." He concedes elsewhere, however, that "management of demand" for "products in general" is essential. "There must be a stabilization of overall demand."

He resolves the contradiction as follows: Capitalism "requires . . . a large public sector for the stabilization of aggregate demand." Such a "large public sector" is the "fulcrum" for the "regulation of aggregate demand." And, then— "Military expenditures are the pivot on which the fulcrum rests."

Galbraith acknowledges that the dependence of the "regulation of demand" on "military expenditures" is "unsettling"; that the "organic relation" of the war budget "to the performance of the economic system leads to unpleasant introspection." "It seems also a poor advertisement for the system and lends comfort to the frequent allegations of Marxists." He denies, however, that there is a blood-kinship between monopoly capitalism and war-waking. Capitalism is not "inherently bloody." The technostructure would just as soon use federal expenditures for un-bloody projects.

But, Galbraith argues, it is not possible to replace the warfare sector of the budget by welfare items. While welfare items could be sufficiently massive, in dollar terms, to replace military expenditures as a pivot for the economy, they can not replace war expenditures as an inspiration for technological innovation. Only space exploration might effectively replace warmaking, in terms of volume and technological sophistication, in the budget. And so he rules out, specifically, schools, parks, housing, greater benefits for the poor and expanded pensions, as adequate replacements for war expenditures.

The Theory of Convergence

Galbraith argues that U.S. capitalism is not the evil thing it is often described as being. It is, he argues, very much like socialism or very much like what socialism really is.

The United States is called capitalist, and the Soviet Union is called socialist, but in reality they both are large industrial nations, engaged in large scale production, with large capital investment; make "growth" their goal; organize saving and investment; control prices and individual economic behavior, and must control wages; engage in broad planning; and create a technostructure to direct industry. These facts point to an "economic tendency to convergence" between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The "tendency to convergence" was discovered by Galbraith by subsuming monopoly capitalism in the United States and socialism in the Soviet Union, under the conception of production-in-general, at the modern level, divorced from the class relations within which such production is carried on.

Galbraith's argument could lead one to conclude, for example, that since the USSR made a soft landing on Venus and the U.S. sent a rocket close to the planet and since both feats require a similar, if not identical, technological foundation, there is an "economic tendency to convergence," not only between the U.S. and USSR, but between

capitalism and socialism.

The implications of Galbraith's "convergence" doctrine are political. U.S. monopoly capitalism is transformed by him into "capitalism without control by capitalists." The Soviet Union is "socialism without control by society." In the U.S. the capitalist stockholders have been emasculated; in the Soviet Union the proclaimed paramountcy of "the people and the Party" is a fiction. As the result of the rise of technology, the technostructure rules in both societies. Galbraith says the USSR is developing along lines similar to those which the U.S. is following; while the U.S. is coming to "resemble socialism." Galbraith argues that the differences between them are "ostensible," are "ideological," or just differences in "ideological billing." At "all fundamental points" they are converging.

The implication is that the struggle against monopoly capitalism, not to speak of the effort to replace capitalism by socialism, is futile, for monopoly capitalism is "converging" with socialism.

There is one portentous uncertainty: the possibility of nuclear annihilation, Galbraith declares. This peril arises from the industrial system, the cold-war image, and the war budget. But this is not an indictment of capitalism, to his mind, for the Soviet Union is historically responsible for the cold war. The U.S. industrial system requires the war budget to sustain technological advance and planning; so, too, does the Soviet Union, for all social systems need military planning.

Denies Historic Role of Working Class

Galbraith favors a "less mortal" alternative. Such an alternative requires "some agency that is powerfully determined" to attain it. The working class of the United States is not that agency, according to Galbraith. He shares this platform with substantial sections of the New Left and of the liberal middle class, with the "Thought of Mao Tse-tung."

Galbraith, and those who share the platform with him, exclude consideration of the workers, historically, as a class; view them only as trade unionists; and see the "trade unions retreat into the shadows." Galbraith states the case for the platform: the decline in U.S. union membership is permanent; the unions have become less powerful and less militant; the corporations have accepted collective bargaining; "harmonious" relations between the big corporations and the trade unions have evolved from the concordance of their interests. He thus excludes the historic role of the wage workers as a class and the fact that the trade unions are, in the U.S., the largest coherent organization

of the people, however inadequate their activities. He sees class collaboration as their manifest destiny.

Galbraith warns that there is no use in looking to the trade unions for leadership because "they are under no particular compulsion to question the goals of the industrial system or the tendency to make all social purpose identical with these goals."

This is ironic, for Galbraith's book obscures the goals of the "industrial system," rejects the contradiction between capital and labor as the essential social content of capitalism, and denies the historic role of the working class.

Galbraith's denigration of the trade unions is abetted by his support of measures to hamstring their effectiveness even on the economic front. He calls for a "system of wage and price restraints." He admits that unions have "long reacted adversely" to such a program intended to keep wages down. To offset this antagonism Galbraith presents wage control as an "inevitable" answer to the "wage-price spiral." He does not ask for control of profits. That is left to the "new" nature of incorporated wealth, which does not seek to maximize profits. Under such self-restraint, control of profits would be superfluous.

Having foreclosed the need for abolishing capitalism, and having banished the working class, Galbraith finds that the "needed changes" in our society "all involve the sensibilities and concerns of the mind." Mankind's fate lies in the hands, or mind, of the intellectuals, he concludes. The "natural . . . interest" in the "needed changes" is to "those who are called the intellectuals."

Among the intellectuals the largest coherent group is the "educational and scientific estate." The Educational and Scientific Estate "connects at the edges with the scientists and engineers within the technosstructure" and, on the other frontier, "with civil servants, journalists, writers and artists" outside the technosstructure. The qualifications of the E & S Estate for the role of savior lie, according to Galbraith, in its size, its "privileged access to scientific innovation" and its "nearly unique role in social innovation."

The purported qualifications are not convincing. The Estate's numbers are not impressive. Its "privileged access to scientific innovation" appears to hint that Galbraith intends that they take over by a general strike, but he does not say so. The "social innovation" to which he refers relates to the run-of-the-mill liberal proposals about trusts, labor, taxes, farm aid, natural resources, of the past three-fourths of a century.

Galbraith offers in *The New Industrial State* a coherent platform to

support the derogation of the working class which is widespread in middle-class circles and applauded in the ruling class. Of necessity, that platform seeks to transform capitalism into a social welfare institution; seeks to dissolve the half-century of contradictory development of U.S. capitalism and Soviet socialism in an un-class "convergence" stew; and conceals the fact that the foreign policy of the New Industrial State is—Vietnam.

If its intent were not pernicious, one could, charitably, ascribe Galbraith's promotion of the Educational and Scientific Estate to become mankind's savior as utopian.

It should be noted that on the theoretical front Galbraith accepts the capitalist's views as legitimate. "Capital" is "capital," "earnings" are "earnings," that is all we know, and all we need to know, Galbraith appears to believe.

It is obvious to Galbraith where the vast accumulation of wealth in the past came from. "The Great Pyramids, Baalbek, St. Peter's, Chartres, Versailles or Cuzco . . . are the results of . . . deprivations of slaves."

But General Motors, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Chase-Manhattan, A & P, Metropolitan Life, are the results of what? Galbraith does not say.

A Defense of the System

Galbraith's *New Industrial State* is, in the last analysis, a pleading for monopoly capitalism. It is true that he cites the ills of our system, especially poverty and deprivation of civil rights. It is true, also, that he warns, emphatically, of the threatening catastrophe of world war. But, as he formulates these admissions, they become, in the case of poverty and the repression of the Negro people, not an indictment, but hangovers of a pre-capitalist social structure.

The threat of World War III, arises for him, not because of capitalism, but because capitalism has been constrained—as has socialism, he says—to find in war preparation the only feasible avenue for high-level technological development.

The innocence of capitalism is proved more directly, according to Galbraith, in that the exploitive and evil characteristics ascribed to it are today untrue. The capitalists have been put out to pasture by the new ruling class, the top executives and management, and the "technosstructure," he declares.

Friedrich Engels said, decades before Galbraith, that the capitalists are superfluous. That had been made evident, Engels said, in the

operation of stock companies, in which the "entire administration is carried out by salaried officials" (*Marx-Engels Works*, Vol. 35, p. 324).

Unlike Engels, however, Galbraith has concluded that, since salaried employees direct the system, its physiology has changed. One might say with equal justification that slavery changed when the slave owner handed his whip to the riding boss or plantation manager. The capitalist system has become, Galbraith avers, a vehicle for the advancement of technology, science, production and, hence, of the public welfare.

It is not ordained, however, he says, that capitalism will follow this path undeviatingly or will avoid the danger of world war. It must be guided. Guidance must come from those who are sensitized to the dangers that confront us and who can lead us from them. The elect are the intellectuals, and especially those within the Educational and Scientific Estate.

The working class is excluded as the emancipating class, because Galbraith sees emancipation not as a historic social evolution, based on the class relations of society, but as a moral or intellectual efflorescence.

Although Galbraith's book is on the bestseller lists his views are not new. In the context of the fundamental contradiction of our social order—that between capital and labor—his is essentially a common garden variety of liberal middle-class reaction.

The rejection of the historic emancipating role of the working class has recurred often in the development of the socialist movement. During the late 1870's and early 1880's, to pick an instance, there developed in the outlawed German Socialist Party a tendency that held, as Engels described it, that "the working class, out of its own resources, is incapable of emancipating itself"; a tendency which asserted that the emancipation of the working class is possible only through the educated middle classes; that, consequently, leadership in the socialist movement should be accorded to the bourgeois and educated stratum (*Marx-Engels Works*, Vol. 34, pp. 403; 104-105; Vol. 35, p. 361).

The foregoing does not implicate Galbraith personally, for he does not even think that the workers need to be emancipated from capitalism. However, he, like the German socialists referred to, sees the working class as benighted, and contends that mankind must look to the educated sector of the middle class for its salvation and advancement.

Engels warned that the proletariat would dissipate its leading historic role if it made concessions to the beliefs and wishes of the petty bourgeois elements which were attracted to the socialist movement. (*Marx-Engels Works*, Vol. 34, p. 426.) The same dangers exist for the working class in the views of Galbraith.

Galbraith has attempted to undercut Marx's views by the well known charge that they are sadly old-fashioned. But, this too, has been said before, long before Galbraith resorted to it. In fact the out-of-datedness of Marxism is almost as old as Marxism itself.

In 1869, for example, less than two years after the publication of *Das Kapital*, Dr. Adolph Held, of the University of Bonn, said that although the book had appeared only recently, it was old hat. Held said the volume was out of date by some 20 years; he found it only "an echo of the movement prior to 1848" (*Marx-Engels Works*, Vol. 32, p. 589).

The issue is not "old-fashioned or new-fangled." The essence of Galbraith's *New Industrial State* is: the transformation of capitalism into a welfare-oriented institution; the repudiation of profits as the heart and soul of capitalism; the absolution of capitalism, particularly U.S. monopoly capitalism, from responsibility for the peril which the world now faces; the contention that socialism is not a fundamental new social order and that the course of social development does not make the working class the decisive, historically chosen, enemy and gravedigger of capitalism.

That, I believe, adds up to a defense of U.S. monopoly capitalism.

... Since the process of production is also the process by which the capitalist consumes labor-power, the product of the laborer is incessantly converted, not only into commodities, but into capital, into value that sucks up the value-creating power, into means of subsistence that buy the person of the laborer, into means of production that command the producers. The laborer therefore constantly produces material, objective wealth, but in the form of capital, of an alien power that dominates and exploits him; and the capitalist as constantly produces labor-power, but in the form of a subjective source of wealth, separated from the objects in and by which it can alone be realized; in short he produces the laborer, but as a wage-laborer. This incessant reproduction of the laborer, is the sine qua non of capitalist production.

Capital, Volume I, (International Publishers) pp. 583-584.

HERBERT APTHEKER

In Support of the Arab Peoples*

Allow me to express to our Indian hosts my deep appreciation for the honor and the opportunity of participating in this most significant Conference.

Three central realities concerning the relationship of the United States of America and the subject of this Conference must be born in mind: a) the U.S. government is the main bastion of what remains of the systems of imperialism and colonialism; b) U.S. imperialism has fundamental military, diplomatic and economic stakes particularly in the Middle East—especially is this true, of course, as concerns the international oil cartel in which American monopolies are dominant; c) half the Jews left in the world, after Hitler's slaughter, live in the United States and one-fourth in New York City—the social, psychological and political results of this are very consequential. To illustrate just one aspect of this reality we mention the fact that for the past ten years in the United States there has been only one daily progressive newspaper and that is in the Yiddish language.

Having briefly affirmed these fundamental facts, let me now, again most briefly, offer the following observations:

1) It is absolutely necessary that it be made clear that the question before us is not one of Arabs versus Jews. The question before us on the contrary is one of imperialism and colonialism versus national liberation and social progress. The question before us is the effort by imperialism to maintain the specially exploitative relationship with the so-called underdeveloped countries, many of whose inhabitants

* Speech delivered at the International Conference in Support of the Arab Peoples, held in New Delhi, India, November 11-14, 1967. The Conference, called on the initiative of the India Peace Council, was attended by 152 delegates from 55 countries and 70 international organizations. It was chaired by Krishna Menon. One hundred members of the Indian Parliament signed the Call, and messages were received from the heads of government in India, Jordan, Mongolia, Cuba, Sudan, Syria, the United Arab Republic, Algeria, Kuwait and Cambodia.

The speech was presented at the opening plenary session of the Conference, attended by some 1,200 delegates and visitors. In addition to it, we present the texts of an Appeal to the Conscience of the World and a Declaration, both unanimously adopted.—*The Editors.*

are "colored" peoples; the latter fact is of great importance in view of the especially racist nature of U.S. imperialism and the fact that inside the U.S. some 25 or 30 million "colored" people are writhing in protest against that racism.

2) It is necessary that it be made perfectly clear that involved here is in no way anti-Semitism, this being absurd as the Arab peoples themselves are of course Semitic. But it is necessary also to affirm clearly that it is not a matter of anti-Jewishness. This should be done with vigor, clearly denouncing anti-Jewishness as the poison it is and affirming knowledge of the age-old use of that poison as the handmaiden of the worst forms of reaction. Simultaneously denunciation must be made of all forms of chauvinism, and certainly the chauvinism directed against Arab peoples which in the main communications media of the United States has reached scandalous and barbaric proportions.

3) Israel's right to existence, *as created by the UN*, and as again recently confirmed by the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, is not in question. The greatest threat to Israel's future comes from the Eshkol-Dayan-Begin government which has made it into a handmaiden of imperialism and colonialist expansionism.

4) Emphasis must be given, with exact data, as to the colossal stake of the oil cartel in the Middle East, and the absolutely fabulous profits extracted therefrom by that predominantly U.S. cartel. In that connection the well-known subordination of U.S. foreign policy to the desires of that cartel should be documented.

5) We must demonstrate that the U.S. government has not only supported reactionary governments in Israel but also reactionary governments among Arab peoples. Thus, the U.S. has provided Saudi Arabia with almost ten times as much arms as it has Israel. Demonstrating this is important for it helps expose the imperialist essence of the Mid-East question rather than its being one of Jews vs. Arabs.

6) It is important to show the organic connection between the aggression of 1956 and that of 1967; this helps expose the conspiratorial and imperialist character of the latter.

7) It is necessary to reiterate that the Israeli Government and the U.S. government in the months and days prior to the June 1967 aggression solemnly affirmed the absence of any intention, so far as the former was concerned, of territorial aggrandizement and, so far as the latter was concerned, its commitment to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states in the Middle East. As events have demonstrated without any ambiguity, both were lying; at any rate the first has appropriated enormous territory from several neighbors

and the second has done all in its power to make possible the retention of the fruits of this ravishment. This blatant violation of solemn pledges repeatedly given by both powers must be exposed continually and without let-up.

8) It is necessary to affirm with the greatest possible vigor and clarity that the first necessity in the present situation is the withdrawal by Israel from all territory it has occupied since June 4, 1967. No aggressor may be permitted to profit from his crime.

9) The recognition of the rights of the refugees must be accorded by Israel and full restitution must be made to them, in accordance with the resolutions of the UN, hitherto ignored by Israel.

10) The irony of history—what Lenin once called “the malicious irony of history”—manifests itself with peculiar force in this matter for here is Israel employing the blitzkrieg tactics of Hitler; here is Israel employing mobile crematoria—known as napalm bombs—upon living human beings; here are Jewish people acting out the roles of occupiers and tormentors of peoples!

11) The so-called “preventive war” argument of Israel must be fully exposed for the propaganda falsehood it is. Here two main points must be made: a) the Israeli action was aggressive and not preventive, as all the evidence increasingly shows and as the disposition and employment of the Israeli forces in June, 1967 make crystal-clear; and b) in the age of thermonuclear weapons and the existence of the UN, such “justification” (which is exactly the “justification” of the U.S. in its atrocious aggression against the people of Vietnam) is absolutely impermissible. It returns us to the unimpeded power politics which produced World Wars I and II and will, if not halted, produce World War III.

12) The facts on the horror of the June war and its aftermath and of the present occupation should be fully documented and made easily available. In this connection, permit me to suggest that we need carefully prepared educational material especially from our Arab friends and the more, the better.

Rarely has such a massive propaganda campaign been undertaken and maintained in the U.S. as in connection with this Israeli aggression. Because of this, and because of the considerations alluded to in the beginning of my remarks, the June events produced considerable confusion and disarray in the U.S. peace movement and among progressive forces in general. This was especially true in New York and in Southern California. Still, note must be made of the fact that there has been some change in public opinion in the U.S. on this matter.

There no longer is the near-unanimity that existed in the first days of the fighting, and the impact of that fantastic propaganda campaign has begun to wear off. The Communist Party of the U.S., I am proud to say, stood up well to this test, did not lose its head and generally conducted a principled educational and political campaign of consistent anti-imperialism. Publications other than Communist have more recently taken fairly enlightened positions. This is true, for example, of I. F. Stone's influential *Weekly*, of the important magazine, *The Christian Century*, of some letters in the *New York Times*, and others.

Within the progressive Jewish population in the U.S. also, sober second thoughts have begun to appear. Israel's isolation in the world community of nations is becoming clearer to them and the impossibility, in a historic sense, of holding to the present line of the Israeli government is also having its impact. There is wide understanding, too, of the unreliability of Israel's present “allies” and a sense that that government's tying itself to the chariot of imperialism bodes ill for its future. I feel impelled to add that the heroic resistance to the chauvinist madness in Israel by the Israeli Communist Party has been impressive and influential in the United States.

The peace movement in the United States—centering as of course it does and should upon forcing the government to end the war upon the Vietnamese people—as it expands and broadens and deepens, produces also re-examination of the U.S. position vis-a-vis the Middle East. I do not wish here to take the time to expatiate on that movement, but it is now a genuinely mass movement, it has great spontaneity, splendid militancy and continues in a most encouraging way to grow. This, together with the magnificent resistance of the Vietnamese people, and the solidarity of all decent governments and peoples, will force the U.S. government to end its present policy in Southeast Asia—or will force a change in that government altogether. This process carries with it pressures for change in that policy all along the line and not least in the areas overwhelmingly inhabited by the Arab peoples.

“The most prominent manifestation of democracy,” wrote Lenin in 1920, “is the fundamental question of war and peace.” Exactly true today; through mass struggle, through popular effort everywhere in the world and in the U.S. in the first place, this fundamental question can be answered in behalf of peace and against the scourge of war.

To fight against imperialism is to fight for democracy. Hence to support the Arab peoples in their struggle for social progress, for national independence, for territorial integrity and sovereignty, is to

support the forces of democracy, of justice, and of peace. Such an effort is the only one worthy of a human being; this effort simply cannot be permitted to fail and it will triumph everywhere, including the United States of America.

An Appeal to the Conscience of the World

What has happened in the Middle East since June 5, 1967 is a sharp challenge to the conscience of mankind. All men of goodwill who want to prevent war and to build a society for human welfare must now speak out and act or be guilty of that silence which gives consent.

While the shame and perfidy of the 1956 Suez aggression was still fresh in men's minds—an action clearly exposing Israel's links with imperialism—another carefully prepared war of aggression and annexation, this time in collusion with U.S. imperialist interests, was launched against the Arab peoples.

Before the actual aggression, there was a world-wide propaganda build-up claiming, quite falsely, that the Arabs were about to attack and crush Israel. The fact is no such danger from the Arab side existed, as Israel's military planners well knew.

If, as Israel pretended, a real and present danger existed, an appeal could have been made to the Security Council for appropriate protection. Instead of such an appeal to the Security Council, a blitzkrieg was launched. Almost immediately Israel announced her intention of annexing large areas of the U.A.R., Jordan, Syria and the city of Jerusalem, where there has been wanton desecration of holy places, and an Israeli call went out to millions of foreign settlers who are citizens of other countries and whose livelihood was not in danger, to come and occupy lands taken by force from the Arabs. The exploitation of the natural resources was started immediately in the occupied areas. This was obviously a predetermined plan of expansion.

The method of warfare employed by Israel was in cynical violation of standards of human decency, now established by the judgments of the Nuremberg Trials, the Charter of the U.N.O. and the Conventions of the International Red Cross. The large-scale use of napalm—"Portable Crematoria"—against civilians, the expulsion of civilian populations, the shooting of prisoners or turning them loose in the desert to die—such actions can not fail to raise memories of the policies of Hitler's Nazis.

We call upon the people of all lands to visualize the appalling plight of the Arabs who have been driven from their homes. For 20 years a

million or more Palestinians have languished in poverty and despair. Now they are joined by hundreds of thousands more. They face death from disease, starvation and cold! Mankind can not tolerate the ever-increasing injustice and misery. It makes a mockery of all human moral values and the ethical teaching of all religions.

In order to avoid a further worsening of the situation which already threatens the peace of the world, we call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops to the positions prior to June 5, 1967. Israel must implement all the U.N. resolutions including those concerning the return of the Palestinian refugees to their homes.

We call upon all men of conscience to speak and act now for the implementation of these just demands so that peace and security can be established for all the peoples of this region.

Declaration

The International Conference in Support of the Arab Peoples, held in New Delhi, India, November 11 to 14, 1967, comprising representatives from over seventy organizations and a large number of leading personalities in Africa, Asia, Europe, Australia, Latin America and North America, after prolonged discussion, concludes that:

The war waged against the Arab people as a whole and particularly against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, in June 1967, was the latest in a series of aggressions committed by Israel. For its policy of aggression Israel has been repeatedly condemned by the United Nations, while no Arab State has ever been condemned. The vast majority of the members of the United Nations again have condemned Israel's latest aggression, but it maintains, in the face of outraged world opinion, an impudent intransigence.

Both the policy of aggression and the intransigent behavior reflect the global policy of imperialism, dominated by the United States Government; the rulers of Israel have made of their Government an instrument of that policy and thus Israel has been and is a focus of war and aggression. That Israel made itself into such an instrument in the war of 1956 is now a matter that cannot be denied by anyone; then it openly performed the role of provocateur in the Anglo-French-Israeli effort to destroy the progressive U.A.R. Government, to seize the Suez Canal, to knife the liberation struggles of the Algerian nation, and to acquire for itself additional territory. In 1967 the attack was more subtly organized but again imperialist powers—the United States in the first place, together with Great Britain and West Ger-

many—financed the attack, armed it and supported it in every possible way, from the presence of the U.S. Sixth Fleet to delaying and obstructing action in the Security Council. Then, too, as now, the object has been to overthrow progressive Arab Governments, particularly in the U.A.R. and Syria, establish hegemony over the Mediterranean area, weaken the world-wide movement for national liberation and to further Israel's insatiable appetite for Arab territory.

The global imperialist and colonialist policy, headed by the United States, manifests itself in counter-revolutionary coups in Latin America, Africa, Asia and, as Greece shows, even in Europe, in the revanchism of West Germany, so much encouraged by Israel's blitzkrieg, in the reactionary terror unleashed against the peoples throughout the vast continent of Africa and, above all, in the genocidal war conducted by the U.S. Government against the heroic people of Vietnam. Israel has played the role of imperialist intermediary and a tool of neo-colonialist penetration into newly-independent African countries under the guise of various forms of "aid."

The imperialist-Zionist propaganda presenting Israel's attack upon the Arab peoples as a war between Jews and Arabs is utterly false. The war represents a reflection of the contest between imperialism and colonialism on the one side and national liberation and social progress on the other. Where chauvinism and racism are present they appear in the propaganda and in the policy of the aggressor and its Zionist essence, and its supporters, especially again the notoriously racist U.S. imperialism. We who struggle against imperialism and colonialism understand well the poison that all forms of racism and chauvinism represent, and we condemn both as we struggle against both.

The imperialist-Zionist propaganda asserting that Israel waged a "preventive" war is altogether false and pernicious. Such propaganda always comes from the mouths of aggressors and occupiers. It was the apologia of Hitler and it is today the essential plea of Johnson in his unspeakable war upon the Vietnamese people. It is now abundantly clear that the Israeli action was aggressive and not preventive, as all the evidence increasingly shows; Israeli authorities, in fact, no longer bother denying this truth. Furthermore, in the age of thermonuclear weapons and the existence of the United Nations, such "justification" is absolutely impermissible. It is a violation of international law, of the U.N. Charter, and returns the world to unimpeded power politics which precipitated World War I and II and will, if not halted, result in World War III.

The source of this global policy of imperialist aggression lies in the class interests of monopoly capitalism. In the Arab world it lies especially in the machinations and wishes of the international oil cartel, dominated as that cartel is by U.S. monopolies. The decisive influence of the oil trusts upon U.S. foreign policy is a well-established fact.

The continued occupation of vast areas of the territory of the U.A.R., Syria and Jordan demonstrate with crystal clarity the aggressive and colonialist purposes of the 1967 Israeli attack. This occupation, in the face of world public opinion and the specific U.N. resolution relative to Jerusalem could not possibly persist did it not have the support, again, of the U.S. Government. Such occupation and such support give the lie to the solemn pledges made by Israel in May 1967 that it sought no territory and the pledges made by the U.S. at that time, that it would not countenance any threat to the territorial integrity of any country in the Middle East. We condemn Israel's repeated refusal to repatriate Arab refugees, while it continuously calls for new immigrants and the establishment of colonies in the newly-occupied territories. These two positions are as contradictory as they are racist.

This conference appreciates the initiative taken by the Government of India in the United Nations on this question. It appreciates the positive role played in and outside the U.N. by progressive and peace-loving states and in particular by the Soviet Union and other socialist states. We also appreciate the role of many non-aligned countries and all others who have supported the Arab cause. We express appreciation also to all who have rallied to the support of the just cause of the Arab peoples, and to the courage manifested by those in Israel who have condemned Zionist strategy and Israel's aggression.

In North America, including the United States, massive peace movements against the war in Vietnam have begun to show an awareness of the connection between that war and the aggressions in the Middle East and an understanding that aggression in one place breeds aggressions elsewhere. We hail the growing anti-Zionism among progressive Jewish masses in many parts of the world.

Having these considerations in mind, the International Conference in Support of the Arab Peoples, meeting in New Delhi, India, demands:

That the Israeli troops immediately and without any conditions withdraw from the territories in the U.A.R., Syria and Jordan they occupied in June 1967, and that all consequences of this aggression be liquidated. We feel this is an indispensable first step; if it is not

rapidly accomplished there is serious danger of renewed armed conflict in the region which, in turn, may threaten global war.

We declare that the measures taken by Israeli authorities in the occupied territories are as immoral as they are illegal and must be condemned; furthermore, so long as the occupation persists, resistance thereto by the inhabitants of the areas involved is righteous and justified. We denounce the statements by the Israeli rulers to the effect that this resistance is engineered by the neighboring Arab states. This manifests the real intentions of the Israeli rulers to find a pretext to renew their aggression against the Arab countries. This is a serious threat to peace.

This Conference denounces the inhuman treatment imposed upon the populations in the occupied territories. It demands compensation from the aggressor for all damages and indignities suffered. This Conference denounces the actions that led to the mass expulsions of the lawful owners of Palestine through methods of terror and condemns the racial discrimination exercised by Israel against the Arabs of Palestine. This Conference calls in general for the application of the decisions adopted by the United Nations regarding the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and their return to their homeland—requirements placed upon Israel at its creation but never implemented by her.

These are essential conditions for the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East and they correspond to the interests of all the people and countries in that region.

We affirm that conditions of peace can never result from a war of aggression; a basic rule if peace is to prevail is that no aggressor may be permitted to benefit from his aggression in any manner whatsoever.

This Conference calls on all peace and liberation forces throughout the world and all people who value humane conduct and decent behavior to join in a mighty and irresistible campaign for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied territories and the implementation of all United Nations Resolutions pertaining to this area. This is a prerequisite for the building of a lasting and just peace in this region, for in the Middle East, as everywhere, such a peace requires recognition of the legitimate rights of the peoples. To fight against imperialism is to fight for democracy. To support the Arab peoples in their struggle for social progress, to national independence, for territorial integrity and sovereignty is to support the forces of democracy, justice and peace.

The New York Teacher Walkout

The rising cost of living and other economic hardships aggravated by the Vietnam war, and the enormous profits of big business, are moving vital sections of the working class into struggle. This includes higher as well as lower paid workers. As a result, in the last number of years, we have witnessed a rising tide of union organization and militancy among public employees in all parts of the country. The Johnson Administration has been moving heaven and earth to curb this rising militancy. This has been equally true of the state and city administration in New York.

On September 1, 1967, a new law prohibiting strikes by public employees—the Taylor Act—went into effect. This law provides for a fine of \$10,000 for each day a municipal union is on strike, the jailing of its leaders, and the abrogation of the union checkoff privilege for a period to be determined by the agency administering the enforcement of the Act. It is in this context that we must view the recent three-week stoppage by the United Federation of Teachers in New York City.

The United Federation of Teachers—Local 2 of the American Federation of Teachers—represents today most of the teachers in the city's public school system. Over 49,000 are members of the union out of some 58,000 school teachers. This, in itself, is a remarkable achievement when one considers that only a short time ago anti-union bias was widely prevalent among teachers. "We are not workers, we are professionals," was the typical refrain. Today, many young people entering the teaching profession are not untouched by the militant struggles of the students. Teachers have been aroused against the callous indifference of the Board of Education to the need of improving the level of education and teaching conditions. Before the strike, the starting salary for a public school teacher was \$5,400—one of the lowest in the nation. Whenever funds are allocated for the building of new schools or the improvement of old ones, the funds were always too little and too late. The phenomenal growth of the union thus indicates that teachers now recognize that only by uniting—and if necessary by striking—could they hope to change their own conditions and the quality of education in the public school system.

Walkout Scores Gains

The walkout was truly a historic battle. For the first time the issues of higher pay, teachers' rights and better education for the youngsters were joined and became the focal aims of the struggle. There can be little doubt that the walkout (termed "mass resignations" by the UFT to circumvent the provisions of the Taylor Act) scored many gains. The UFT was able to win an increase in salary for teachers averaging \$1,350 over the next two years. For all practical purposes, the teachers successfully broke the back of the anti-union law. While the powers-that-be vindictively try to use the law to get back at the union, the teachers have shown that such laws cannot prevent public employees from striking.

In examining the walkout, three important lessons stand out:

1. Professional workers and public employees can win substantial victories through united struggle.
2. The power structure will use every device at its disposal to isolate and divide workers on strike from their immediate allies.
3. Unions that are insensitive to the demands of the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American peoples for full equality stand the chance of being defeated and ultimately destroyed.

One of the major demands in the dispute was the expansion of the More Effective Schools Program (MES) instituted three years ago at the union's initiative. This program involves cutting class sizes, doubling the number of teachers and providing specialized services to guarantee a fuller education for the children in the ghetto. There are presently 21 MES schools in the city.

There can be many criticisms of the MES program: it is confined to the elementary level; it serves a relatively small number of the youngsters who need an enriched education; teachers and supervisors have not been properly trained to employ this program effectively. And yet, it has been the most significant program that the Board of Education was willing to implement. A considerable number of teachers, therefore, felt that the continuation of this program was, perhaps, the most important issue in the strike and they were ready to stay out as long as necessary to settle it.

It was an open secret that the Board of Education was planning to kill MES. Many weeks before the strike, Joseph Alsop wrote in the *New Republic* (July 22, 1967): "The More Effective Schools program which has an extra per-pupil cost of about \$430 a year, is beginning to be nibbled to death by the economy ducks on the Board of Educa-

tion; but no one has sprung to its defense except this writer and, far more importantly, the United Federation of Teachers, who devised this program."

While little was achieved insofar as basically improving the quality of education in the New York City school system (and it would be naive to believe that much could be accomplished during the course of one strike), the UFT scored two successes. It was able to save, at least for the time being, the present MES program and it won the allocation of another \$10 million for this and other programs to improve the quality of education. Even more decisive in the long run, is the fact that the rank and file members learned through this struggle that they have a special responsibility in the fight to improve educational standards in the public schools system.

Fight for Quality, Integrated Education Lags

Despite all types of provocations by the Board of Education and the city administration, the unity of the teachers held firm throughout the three-week struggle. For almost a year the Board refused to bargain seriously, hoping to provoke a crisis which it considered could be readily won. On the eve of the strike Mayor Lindsay obtained a court order to restrain the teachers from walking out. When the walkout began, parents and college students were urged to take over classes and act as strike-breakers. Male teachers were threatened with revocation of their draft deferments. The Board exploited the justified grievances of the parents in the ghetto communities and directed them against the union and the strike. With the help of the local bourgeois press, the Board recklessly magnified and enflamed every difference that did exist, while playing down the support for the strike by such prominent Negro leaders as Reverend Martin Luther King, Cleveland Robinson, president of the Negro American Labor Council, and A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

One cannot ignore, however, the serious weaknesses within the union that enabled the Board of Education to divide the Negro and Puerto Rican community from the union. To a large extent the leadership of UFT must take the blame for this situation. Over the years it has taken no action, or only a very weak stand, in the fight for quality, integrated education to overcome the sharp deterioration of educational standards in the ghetto schools.

With more than 50 per cent of the student body either Negro or Puerto Rican, only some 10 per cent of the teachers come from these

minority groups. The union leadership has done little to help bring additional Negroes and Puerto Ricans into the profession. Negro and Puerto Rican men and women, who are presently teachers, see little desire on the part of the UFT leadership to bring them into the union and involve them in its activities and deliberations. Only one Negro plays a prominent role in the union leadership; no Puerto Ricans are in leading positions. During the mass boycotts for school integration, organized some four years ago, the union was silent. And today, the union leadership is publicly identified as an opponent of community control of schools and is viewed as a firm defender of the status quo.

Unfortunately, many other instances of insensitivity to the problems facing the Negro and Puerto Rican communities could be detailed. On top of this, when we realize that the New York City school system, as is true of the school systems in all major cities, finds itself in a serious crisis and that it is the teacher who the community directly sees when problems are dealt with, one can understand why it was possible for the Board to direct resentment against the UFT. All the more is this possible when the UFT allowed itself to be placed in the position of the silent accomplice, or the fall guy, for the Board of Education.

Some limited headway was made during the strike in dealing with this major problem. As a result of the pressure of the rank and file of the union and the protests of the community, the leadership was compelled to take some initiative in this area—the establishment of emergency schools.

Racist Proposal Enrages Negro Community

But the issue that above all enraged the Negro and Puerto Rican communities was the proposal advanced by reactionary elements within the UFT to give teachers the right to suspend “disruptive” students. This was clearly a racist proposal. Yet the rank and file was able to make significant changes in this proposal so that in its final form it reflects no real change in policy in the handling of “disruptive” students and its racist provisions were removed.

Another important initiative taken by the members was the issuance of many leaflets by locals in individual schools. These leaflets aimed to answer the questions the parents and community leaders had on the walkout and to find common areas of agreement on which the teachers and parents could unite. They were in marked contrast to the initial statements issued from the central office of the UFT which were not only general, but displayed little concern on winning over

the parents in support of the struggle.

The Negro and Puerto Rican communities were split on the walkout despite the fact that prominent Negro leaders and most of the trade unions in the city supported the UFT. Many militants, including SNCC and CORE, opposed the walkout and organized in the community to keep the schools open. They argued that the walkout was a fight between two sectors of the white power structure and the Negro and Puerto Rican youngsters, who urgently needed schooling, were being robbed of their precious education and used as pawns in the dispute. One must basically disagree with this approach.

The role of the Board of Education and the city administration—over the last number of decades—clearly proves that they, not the teachers, are the enemies of the working people and the poor. The basic responsibility for the continued neglect of the schools in the ghetto rests in the hands of the state and the financial interests which control it.

But what is really at issue here is that significant numbers of Negro and Puerto Rican people have lost confidence in the trade union movement as a whole. The reasons for this attitude can be readily understood. Time and time again the labor bureaucracy has sold out the struggle for equal rights. Racism has significant effect in the labor movement, as it has in most of American society. Yet, despite this, the activities within the UFT indicate that there is a growing awareness on this key question among sections of the rank and file. The role of progressives, Left and Communist forces in the labor movement is, however, crucial. It is the responsibility of advanced white trade unionists to fight for unity of labor with all minority groups—unity on the basis of equality. Unions, like the UFT, cannot expect to win future strikes without coming to agreement with the people, especially in the Negro and Puerto Rican communities, around a program of common demands. At the same time, however, one cannot remain silent on the approach adopted by the militants to the UFT walkout. Instead of using their organized strength against the main enemy, exposing at the same time the reactionary positions within labor, and finding areas of agreement for united struggle with the rank and file, they allowed themselves to be used by the Board of Education in its attempt to smash the union.

Unity of Union and Community Can Be Achieved

Unity is needed in the interest of the teachers and the community. And this unity is possible of realization. Already, a new wind is blow-

ing within the American Federation of Teachers nationally. At the last convention, held in Washington over the summer, the delegates came within a hair's breath of defeating the union's anti-Communist clause. A peace resolution was fought for vigorously and won many supporters. Perhaps more important, was the formation of a new caucus within the AFT, concerned with improved working conditions for teachers, with full equality for the Negro people and for an end to racism in the nation's schools. It is significant that this caucus is headed by the vice-president of the Detroit AFT, Edward Simpkins, an active Negro trade unionist. Note should also be taken of the fact that some 6,000 teachers voted against accepting the final contract with the Board of Education. The majority of these teachers knew full well that the contract would be accepted, but they wanted to register their conviction that more could have been done on expanding MES and other demands for improving the quality of education in the schools.

Many in the New Left and among other progressive formations view the labor movement only in the image of the Meany top labor officialdom. But, as we have emphasized time and time again, this is selling the working class short. For the labor movement is above all the rank and file—the men and women in the factories, mines and offices. In the teachers' walkout it was the rank and file that forced the social-democratic leadership to broaden the struggle: to approach other progressive forces, the civil rights leaders and the parents, seeking support for their struggle. It was this pressure that finally led to the opening of emergency schools and the first signs of response to the just grievances of the Negro and Puerto Rican communities.

It is in struggle that workers learn who are their enemies and who are their friends. Progressives and Communists must be in the forefront in support of all strikes of the working class. Above all, it is the responsibility of white forces to recognize that racism has become the decisive tool of monopoly capitalism in dividing the working class, and that from within and without the labor movement they must lead in the fight to combat racism, to build the unity that is needed to win in struggle, especially the unity of black and white.

On the Peace Front

GEORGE MEYERS

Labor Speaks Out For Peace

This conference—a united expression of varied branches of labor—reaffirms that the trade union movement is part of forward looking America; that no matter what the formal resolutions of higher bodies may state, the troubled conscience of the working people cannot be stilled. This conference speaks for millions. You here today will long be remembered as those who had the courage to speak out and the wisdom to be right.

These words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to the National Labor Leadership Assembly for Peace, held in Chicago on November 11-12, are an apt summation of the historic significance of this gathering. For the first time in the United States, a broadly based section of organized labor met to condemn the war policies of the government in the midst of war.

The Assembly leaders had expected a maximum of 350 delegates. Instead, over 550 trade union leaders arrived from 38 states including Hawaii, to tax facilities at the University of Chicago's Center for Continuing Education. They came from more than 60 national and international unions. Some were delegates sponsored by local, state and national bodies; others came as individuals. In addition to local

union officers, there were over 60 top union leaders, including 30 international vice-presidents, in attendance. Two original sponsors of the Assembly, Frank Rosenblum, secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and Emil Mazey, who holds the same office in the United Auto Workers, were speakers. Another sponsor, Patrick Gorman, head of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, sent regrets that he was unable to attend due to a death in the family. UAW Director of International Affairs, Victor Reuther, was active in the Assembly and one of the main labor speakers. Cleveland Robinson, president of the Negro American Labor Council, was a delegate from District 65 of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees and led one of the panels.

From the independent unions, the International Longshoremen's Union (ILWU) delegation was led by its president, Harry Bridges. James Matles, secretary-treasurer of the United Electrical Workers (UE), led a similar delegation. Several Teamsters Union leaders, including Larry Steinberg, former administrative assistant to James Hoffa, and Jake McCarthy, editor of the *Missouri Teamster*, were also present. A Canadian trade

union group was officially represented, as were the Negro American Labor Council and several trade union peace committees.

Eleven high-ranking peace advocates from outside the labor movement were active participants in the Assembly. Outstanding was Dr. King who spoke at the banquet, chaired by Russell Leach, president of the Wayne County (Detroit) AFL-CIO Council and one of its official delegates. UAW's Emil Mazey and U.S. Senator Vance Hartke (Dem.-Ind.) were the other banquet speakers.

At the opening session, Professor John Kenneth Galbraith sharply condemned the war while proposing a series of U.S.-occupied enclaves in Vietnam as steps toward peace. He was followed by Socialist leader Norman Thomas who shattered the enclave theory so thoroughly in a devastating attack on U.S. policies that it was barely mentioned during the next two days. Representative John Conyers, Jr. (Dem.-Mich.), Rear Admiral Arnold L. True (retired), Dr. Robert F. Brown and Professor Seymour Melman were among the other non-labor participants. Senator Eugene J. McCarthy (Dem.-Minn.) addressed the final session of the delegates. While he lived up to his reputation as a "mild dove," the fact that he was considering bucking President Johnson in a number of Democratic Presidential primaries gave added significance to his presence and was widely noted by the press.

Three religious leaders from the

Christian and Jewish faiths had strongly advocated an end to the war in invocations to various sessions of the Assembly. Each stressed the need to intensify the fight against poverty and racism at home.

While the overflow attendance and the top-level caliber of non-labor participants were important to the success of the conference, what made it historic was the high degree of trade union unity achieved around the central question of ending the war in Vietnam. The policy of non-exclusion, implicit at the Assembly's conception, was strengthened as it developed and took concrete form at Chicago, where a variety of AFL-CIO and independent union officers acted as panel leaders, participated in floor discussion and also helped work out the Statement of Policy that received unanimous acceptance.

The spontaneous ovation given Harry Bridges when he rose to speak from the floor was recognition not only of the personal fight Mr. Bridges has made over the years, but of the meaning of his presence as an expression of trade union unity. While no official note was taken, the unity achieved was greeted from all quarters. More than one prominent AFL-CIO unionist saw good portents of future trade union unity of action, and as a UE leader put it, "Two years ago I would have crossed the street to keep from saying hello to some of these [AFL-CIO] guys, and now I'm so happy to be here with them."

Among AFL-CIO unions the UAW was well represented as were the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, the Packinghouse Workers, the American Federation of Teachers, the State, County and Municipal Workers, and many others. New York City's Hospital Workers Local 1199 and District 65 both had substantial delegations. There is no question that United Steelworkers president I. W. Abel's recent shift to support of the war was responsible for a drastic cut in that union's representation. Most USW delegates came from the former Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers section. While steel union officers were theoretically free to attend as individuals, at least several district directors sent out the word to "stay away."

In response to a letter of inquiry, Jay Lovestone, AFL-CIO president Meany's "Secretary of the Cold War," stated that it was "not the practice of the AFL-CIO to send representatives to participate in bodies organized by others where policy decisions are made; we do this inside the AFL-CIO." (This was revealed by Victor Reuther as he questioned AFL-CIO participation in the reactionary American Institute for Free Labor Development, a tri-partite body made up of AFL-CIO leaders, government representatives, and reactionary businessmen.)

While there was substantial participation of Negroes in the work of the Assembly, both from the labor movement and through the

presence of Dr. King, Congressman Conyers and Professor Brown, less than 10 per cent of the delegates were black. Discrimination against Negroes at union leadership level, even among the Left and center forces from which the majority of delegates came, again found reflection in Chicago. While a number were elected to the larger Continuations Committee, an earlier error which left out Negro trade union leaders in the detailed planning of the Assembly appears to have been compounded by the failure to name a Negro to the operational leadership elected to further the work of that body. This serious weakness will have to be quickly corrected if the Assembly is to develop its maximum potential. There is certainly no lack of talented Negro trade union leaders, as their participation in the Chicago gathering well proved.

The number of women trade unionists present was small, though higher than in most union gatherings. Women delegates were active participants in the Assembly and expressed some of the more advanced peace concepts. Considering the high average age of present trade union leadership in the United States, the delegates represented a relatively youthful age level, with many in their late thirties and early forties. A number of young delegates held a caucus after adjournment which decided to press for participation of young radical intellectuals in the trade union movement. However, no plans were made to in-

volve young workers as such directly in the fight for peace, even though they make up a substantial section of such unions as steel and auto.

The Assembly tied the tremendous wave of strikes, the ghetto rebellions, and the other economic struggles which have engulfed the country to the organized drive to end the war in Vietnam. The relationship of the war to the struggles for Negro freedom, against the deterioration of living standards, and against the attacks on the right to strike and on democratic rights generally, was emphasized in the remarks of many speakers, both from the platform and from the floor. They were the principal topics of three of the six panel discussions. The Statement of Policy, which was unanimously adopted, ended with these words: "American labor must play its part in bringing this savage war to a swift and just conclusion, so that we may devote our wealth and energies to the struggle against poverty, disease, hunger and bigotry."

The Statement was well described as "the greatest common denominator" of the various trends that worked together in Chicago, and for which all could vote without reservations. It was not considered the last word but rather a base from which to move forward—in the words of Victor Reuther, an instrument "to stimulate free discussion of all aspects of foreign policy within each and every trade union in the land."

The Statement flatly condemned

the war in Vietnam and the support it gets from top AFL-CIO leadership. It demanded an "immediate and unconditional end to the bombings in North Vietnam" and an "unambiguous statement of intention to negotiate a settlement of the war with the parties directly involved in the conflict, including the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam."

A Continuations Committee of some fifty-odd members was elected. It was agreed to press for the building of Labor Leadership Assemblies in all parts of the country, to hold regional meetings, to work for newspaper ads publicizing the positions taken at Chicago, and to raise funds to publish speeches and other material related to the conference.

It was decided, however, not to publish the speech Victor Reuther made at the final session. In this speech, Mr. Reuther made an all-out attack on the foreign policies of the present AFL-CIO leadership. He castigated its participation in plots to overthrow the Goulart government in Brazil, its maneuvers to split the democratic trade unions of Uruguay, and its sorry role in the Dominican Republic. Selecting his information from a thick stack of file cards, Reuther dealt mainly with the reactionary activities of the AFL-CIO in Latin America. But it was obvious he was revealing only a small part of the sordid complicity of the Meany-Lovestone leadership in attempts to wreck foreign trade unions in the interest of the U.S. monopolies. A key

section of Mr. Reuther's speech dealt with the need of American unions to form ties with unions in other parts of the world in their own self-interest, and to drop the cold-war standards of the Meany-Lovestone leadership. Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Frank Rosenblum, one of the original conference sponsors, stated that he found the speech quite revealing but asked that it be published by the UAW or some other body rather than by the Assembly "in the interest of unity."

The Assembly made it clear that it did not wish to be considered a caucus within the AFL-CIO. However, delegates going to the AFL-CIO Convention in Miami were urged to challenge the pro-war position of the AFL-CIO leadership. Many delegates were openly critical of the Johnson Administration, but any idea of becoming part of a "dump Johnson" movement was rejected.

The concept of "Labor Leadership Assembly" was retained, but full recognition was given to the need to take the fight for peace to the shop steward level and to the trade union membership if the pro-war policies of the top AFL-CIO leadership are to be changed. This should act to spur the growth of rank-and-file trade union committees to implement the actions of the Assemblies. These committees can build membership support behind union leaders who do speak out for peace. Uninhibited by the trade union "protocol" that influences relations between union leaders, they can go directly to the

rank and file of those unions whose leaders for one reason or another are still committed to the Meany-Lovestone policies.

The conference successfully carried out its primary purpose of providing the possibilities for a real challenge to the war in Vietnam from within the ranks of organized labor. And in doing so, it brought a significant section of organized labor in the United States into harmony with labor throughout the world. Not only the trade unions in the socialist countries and under WFTU leadership, but also those of a host of other countries—literally thousands of unions in all parts of the world—have condemned this war of U.S. imperialism in one way or another, increasingly isolating the AFL-CIO leadership abroad.

In the process of fulfilling its purpose, the conference demonstrated the ability to build trade union unity around a specific issue. It is significant that except for a gratuitous condemnation of "Communist, fascist and military dictatorships" by Emil Mazey, there was a total absence of red-baiting. Several speakers attacked anti-Communism for the harm it had done to the labor movement, and there were frequent warnings of the need to guard against efforts to reimpose a reign of McCarthyism in the name of "supporting our boys in Vietnam." The beginnings of the re-emergence of a Left in the trade union movement were also evident, and the possibilities for rebuilding the sort of Left-center coalition that

had made the CIO such a vital force for progress in past years.

In the effort to bring organ-

ized labor to its rightful place in the fight for peace, the Chicago conference was truly a milestone.

MARGRIT PITTMAN

The San Francisco Peace Referendum

"When a major city, San Francisco, in a referendum votes 37 per cent for immediate withdrawal [from Vietnam] it is a stunning rebuke to the government," the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. told the National Labor Leadership Assembly for Peace in Chicago (November 11).

Reverend King's reaction to that vote has by now been widely accepted. What remains is an analysis of the nature of this vote. The analysis presented here is in the context of the Communist approach to electoral policies as outlined in the Draft Program of the Communist Party U.S.A. The Draft Program describes a three-phase development in the political arena. The first two phases were operative and visible in the election under scrutiny.

The first phase is "the focus of popular, mass, democratic movements on exertion of political pressures, on modification of existing centers of political power so as to make them more amenable to popular pressure, on the defeat of the most clearly identified spokesmen of the extreme right," and an intensifying demand for more direct representation at various levels of government.

The second phase is described

as an "advance from political pressure to the contest for political power." This, the program says, will necessitate new political alignments during which the people will come into direct confrontation with "monopoly and its agents in the struggle for political supremacy."

The Size of the "Yes" Vote

First, the election facts: The referendum was put on the ballot by signatures of 22,000 voters and read: "It is the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that there be an immediate ceasefire and withdrawal of U.S. troops so that the Vietnamese people can settle their own problems." The wording, incidentally, was taken from the Dearborn, Michigan referendum in 1966 which had been put on the ballot by the conservative-isolationist mayor of that city.

As elsewhere in the country, the Establishment reacted to the petitions by attempting to deny the voters' rights. Women for Peace reported, in a bulletin from Seattle, that President Johnson had personally intervened with San Francisco Mayor John F. Shelley (a Democrat) to keep the measure off the ballot. As a result,

PEACE REFERENDUM

the registrar of voters refused to accept the petitions, on advice from the City Attorney who ruled the referendum unconstitutional.

But the disfranchisement did not work. On September 19, with only seven weeks left to election day, the State Supreme Court ruled the measure constitutional and directed that it be put on the ballot. By a fortunate quirk of fate, it happened to be the 16th referendum on the ballot and was thus assigned the letter P (for Peace).

Besides the other propositions, Proposition P shared the extraordinarily lengthy ballot with the contest for mayor's office (18 candidates), for six seats on the Board of Supervisors (44 candidates), plus several other local offices.

Also important to the campaign was the fact that two of the three serious contenders for the post of mayor urged a "no" vote on Proposition P. They were Democrat Joseph L. Alioto and Republican Harold Dobbs. The only major candidate to campaign on a "yes-for-P" position was Supervisor Jack Morrison, a liberal Democrat.

Voting was heavy—79.6 per cent of the 317,175 voters went to the polls and 85 per cent of the voters took sides on Proposition P. Of these, better than one third, 36 per cent voted "yes" to register their feeling of no confidence in the government's Vietnam policy.

It must be remembered that the section of the population most heavily opposed to the Vietnam war—the 18-21 year age group—

could not vote and that 15 per cent of those who went to the polls did not vote on Proposition P despite the fact that it was the most heatedly debated issue of the campaign. Failure to vote did not express default but uncertainty about the issue.

But even discounting these factors, the "yes" vote of 78,806 citizens on the referendum represents a great advance over the most massive of the previous peace actions in this city.

On April 15, 75,000 people marched in protest against the Vietnam war, but these had come from up and down the coast and included thousands of young people. Now 78,806 voters of San Francisco alone registered their disapproval of U.S. foreign policy at the polls.

The Attacks on the Referendum

They cast this vote despite concerted efforts to discredit the measure. The campaign for a "no" vote fell into two distinctive parts and illustrates the depth of the crisis of the administration's foreign policy, because neither of the two main thrusts for a "no" vote defended the administration's policy outright. Defense of Johnson's Vietnam policy fell to a relatively small ultra-Right grouping whose vehicle was a Committee for No on Proposition P.

The broad effort to discourage a "yes" vote revolved around two notions and neither offered a substantive defense of the Vietnam war. One was a quarrel with the specific wording of the proposi-

tion, the other an effort to disparage the voters competence of making judgements on foreign policy.

The attack against the wording was directed against those opposed to the war. It offered a convenient cop-out to those seeking solutions short of "withdrawal of U.S. troops." Attacks against the proposition on that basis came from a far-flung front including Alioto (who subsequently won the election) and the liberal Republican morning daily, the *San Francisco Chronicle*. Their argument was that the wording implied unconditional surrender, a loss of face and that, if passed, it would be unworkable in any event.

The other attack, represented by William Randolph Hearst's *San Francisco Examiner*, denied the people's ability to make judgments on foreign policy and played the follow-the-experts game.

To make its case, that paper conducted a poll among U.S. senators, and gloatingly reported replies from 36, of whom 33 had said they would vote "no," two "yes" (Senators Ernest Gruening of Alaska and Stephen M. Young of Ohio) with Senator William Fulbright of Arkansas straddling the fence.

This was indeed a desperate attempt to stave off public invasion into the sacred preserve of foreign policy. And in a sense, this declaration of the right of political judgment was the greatest gain made by this vote. In many past elections foreign policy has played

a role (in San Francisco 71 per cent of the voters gave the nod to LBJ in 1964 in hopes that he might give them peace), but this was the first election of major importance where the people expressed themselves directly on the issue. This is quite different from the 1966 primary elections where peace candidates sought nominations within the two-party system. The vote on Proposition P represented not merely a vote for a candidate and his program, but a declaration of political independence from the two-party system. In this way the campaign was a great step toward phase two of the electoral struggle.

Significant Support Develops

Development of support for the measure is also significant. The originators of the petition had been a group of progressive and Left-wing peace forces, which had undertaken the painstaking task of soliciting the signatures and putting the measure on the ballot. Once on the ballot support started coming from many quarters—the broadest support any single peace action in this city has ever had.

It came from the Left, with exception of those who refused to engage in electoral actions, from liberal Democrats including Congressman Philip Burton, State Assemblymen Willie Brown, Jr. and John Burton, and Supervisor Terry Francois, who was appointed to an unexpired term in 1964 and won the elections this year, becoming the first elected

Negro to the Board of Supervisors.

Support came from businessmen and intellectuals, whose main activity in the campaign was to muster arguments why people should vote "yes" though they did not agree with the precise wording of the measure. It came from such unexpected quarters as the majority of the *San Francisco Chronicle's* editorial staff. Three days after that paper had urged a "no" vote on the measure editorially, 102 of its editorial employees inserted an advertisement urging a "yes" vote.

Labor support came from a few AFL-CIO union locals, from the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and from the San Francisco Bay Area Trade Union Division of SANE. It was the greatest support any peace action has ever received from organized labor here, but it still fell far short of the type of campaign the labor movement has been known to mount on domestic issues.

It is important to the estimate of the labor support, and to an understanding of the dialectic development of the movement on the electoral front, to know that the majority of the unions officially supporting Proposition P also supported Alioto for mayor, despite his opposition to the measure. In this category fell the city's three powerful locals of the ILWU and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Their attitude on the mayoralty race was pragmatic. They supported Alioto be-

cause they felt that he could win and that labor's interests would be better served under his administration than if Dobbs were elected. Morrison, who has a long record of labor support and who has good relations with the labor movement, was not supported because leaders of these unions felt that he could not win. (Morrison received official support from the Painters, Newspaper Guild, Typographical Union and Municipal Employees, but an analysis of the vote shows that working people in their great majority cast a "safe" vote for Alioto.) In a sense the vote for Alioto was an anti-Dobbs vote, because Dobbs was identified in people's minds with Governor Ronald Reagan. This was proven when Proposition P received twice as many votes as Morrison.

The most significant single factor in the whole campaign was, perhaps, the Negro vote. In the three Negro ghettos of this city, the vote was 58 per cent for Proposition P. It showed that the Negro population far more solidly condemns the Establishment's foreign policy, but it is also important to note that even here the same pragmatism operative in the labor movement won the votes. Alioto received a 53 per cent margin in the black community while Morrison polled 33 per cent.

This electoral effort shows elements of both phases of political action described earlier in this article. A week after the San Francisco elections a special election took place in adjacent San

Mateo County, one of the ten richest counties in the nation, that also indicated growth of peace sentiment in the San Francisco Bay Area, but here on the most elementary level. This was a special election for the seat of the late Republican Congressman J. Arthur Younger. In this race, Shirley Temple Black, the hawkish former Hollywood child movie star and now wife of an executive of the powerful Pacific Gas and Electric power monopoly, was defeated by a wide margin by Paul N. McCloskey for the Republican nomination, while the Democratic nomination was won by Roy Archibald. Significantly, both winners ran on a platform of opposition to the Johnson Administration's conduct of the Vietnam war. When the votes were in, McCloskey summed up its significance by saying, "those in charge of foreign policy of the United States should pay careful attention to the results of this election."

It must be mentioned that in this campaign the candidate with the most advanced peace program, former *Ramparts* publisher Edward Keating, who was the West Coast chairman of the Spring Mobilization Committee, trailed Archibald by 8,762 to 14,801 in the Democratic contest.

New Actions Planned

Elections like the one in San Mateo impede the Johnson Administration's ability to continue on its disastrous course and strengthen the right to dissent in the face of mounting attacks.

They shift the center of the dialogue on foreign policy to fuller exploration of alternatives. They also demonstrate the possibility of anti-war candidates as part of the dump-Johnson strategy.

The Proposition P campaign was a more advanced political expression of disaffection with the two-party system than the San Mateo election, but they are both necessary ingredients in the progression that will lead to a real break-away from the two party system.

Discussions of new action among Proposition P campaign workers reflect this diversity of approach. Some threw their energies into the drive to get the Peace and Freedom Party on the ballot, carrying the independence expressed in the P campaign a step further. This state requires signatures of 67,000 registered voters by January 1 to secure a ballot spot for such a party, and some Proposition P workers are now actively engaged in this drive. The other major action now popular among Proposition P workers is support of the anti-Johnson delegation to the 1968 Democratic Convention. This slate, initiated by the California Democratic Clubs but reaching far beyond their ranks, will be presented to the voters in next June's primaries.

One of the yardsticks for evaluating these actions must be consideration of how many of the 79,000 "yes" voters on Proposition P can be involved in such activity and how the wide support

enjoyed by the peace measure can be consolidated into a real coalition.

There are a number of California localities that have already started campaigns to put the same type of referendum on the ballot. Conditions of the peace movement differ, of course, from place to place. However, it should be attempted to add a new dimension to future campaigns. A peace petition could be concretized by calling for establishment of a peace information office (this has been done in some locations) or demanding that studies be made and plans projected for conversion to a peace-time economy. This would serve to rally additional support and intensify the demand for community participation in foreign policy.

There is understandably much discussion about the wording of such measures. Ostensibly it is a quarrel about whether anti-imperialist demands are being made. The wording of Proposition P is a very advanced demand, but there is question if that really imbues those who vote "yes" with an advanced commitment to anti-imperialist goals.

There is, in fact, now a proposal,

promoted by members of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party, that the proposition be put on the ballot again in the next elections. It seems to us that those who favor such a course are not serious about electoral coalitions. They view the electoral process merely as a means for promotion of abstract anti-imperialist views, and not as a dialectical process of development of the electorate.

Communists view the electoral process as a serious arena for challenge to the ruling class. The third phase of this challenge, as projected in the draft program, says that the "conflict between monopoly and the coalition of its antagonists will represent the advance from an attempt to realize the goals and hopes of the people within the constricting bonds of capitalist society to destruction of those bonds, to the socialist reconstruction of society."

Such a perspective, and the careful consideration of the social forces involved, can help realize the maximum advances from recent experiences, not only for forcing an end to the war in Vietnam, but building the demand for a more fundamental change in society.

Index 1967

- Alexan, George**—No More Poems of Death, No More Elegies, May, 14.
- Allen, William and George Meyers**—The UAW Prepares for Action, June, 15.
- Aptheker, Bettina**—Aspects of the Crisis in Higher Education, Oct., 9.
- Aptheker, Herbert**—The U.S. in Vietnam: An Appraisal, Jan., 34; Slavery, the Negro and Militancy, Feb., 36; Racism, Censorship and Freedom, March, 29; The United States Today: An Overall View, April, 35; Vietnam and Civil Rights, May, 32; Socialist and Capitalist Societies: Some Notes, June, 45; The Theory of Peaceful Coexistence, July, 47; The Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, Aug., 47; "Those Whom the Gods Would Destroy. . ." Sept., 51; Styron-Turner and Nat Turner: Myth and Truth, Oct., 40; "There is Such a State!," Nov., 39.
- A. B.**—Proposals for Improvement, March, 53.
- Bart, Phil**—The Rubber Workers' Strike, Sept., 59.
- Barton, Ann**—The Status of Women in the U.S.A., May, 59; An Absorbing Novel, June, 64.
- Bell, Patricia**—Mexican-Americans in the Southwest, Sept., 39.
- Bellamy, Joan**—A Valuable Study of Neo-Colonialism, Feb., 58.
- Boccara, Paul**—Introduction to the Question of State Monopoly Capitalism, April, 25; On State Monopoly Capitalism, June, 53.
- Communist Party, U.S.A.**—On the Jewish Question, March, 52.
- Corvalan, Luis**—Alliance of Anti-Imperialist Forces in Latin America, Sept., 25.
- Editorial Comment**—A Tribute to a Heroic Fighter, March, 2; Stop the Bombing, April, 1; The Party of a New Type, Nov., 1.
- Foley, Tom**—The Problem of Alienated Youth, June, 61; Communists in Asia, July, 64; Arabs and Israelis: The Broken Peace, Aug., 12.
- Foner, Philip S.**—U.S. Radicals Hail October Revolution, Nov., 93.
- Font, A. W.**—The Soviet Union Today, Nov., 95.
- Freedon, Robert**—Comments on "A Cardinal Principal of Marxism," Aug., 60.
- Gannett, Betty**—The CIA—Weapon of the Cold War, May, 19; The Fascist-Military Coup in Greece, July, 35; Material and Moral Incentives, Nov., 71.
- Gomez, Alberto**—The Revolutionary Forces of Colombia, Oct., 19.
- Green, Gil**—The Aptheker Campaign, Jan., 24.
- Hall, Gus**—Some Observations on the Socialist World, Jan., 1; Mass Struggle and the Capitalist State, May, 1; New Politics and Mass Struggles, Aug. 1; The Roots of Negro Oppression, Oct., 1.
- Hamerquist, Don**—Once Again on Alienation, Aug., 57; A First Reaction to the New Politics Convention, Dec., 60.
- Healey, Dorothy**—How to Build a New Left, July, 17.
- Higgins, Joe**—Labor Faces Problems, Feb., 55.
- Jackson, James E.**—National Pride—Not Nationalism, May, 43.
- Johnson, Arnold**—End the McCarran Era!, April, 17; The People March for Peace, June, 1; Toward 1968: The Electoral Arena, Dec., 1.
- Johnson, Oakley C.**—Nat Turner's Slave Rebellion, Sept., 62.
- Kling, Jack**—Further Probing Needed, Feb., 44.
- Komorowski, Conrad**—The Detroit Ghetto Uprising, Sept., 12.
- Krchmarek, A.**—The Cleveland Elections, Dec., 13.
- Kushner, Sam**—The Delano Farm Strike, June, 23.
- Lawrence, Earl**—Black Power and New Politics, Dec., 48.
- Lawson, John Howard**—The Stature of Michael Gold, June, 11.
- Lightfoot, Claude**—The Soviet Union and the Equality of Nations, Nov., 15.

- Lumer, Hyman—The Fight Against Anti-Semitism, Jan., 42; Monopoly Capital: The Baran-Sweezy Model, Feb., 11; The Middle East Crisis, July, 1; The Economics of Rebellion, Sept., 1; The Soviet Union in World Affairs, Nov., 4.
- Martin, Frank—Auto Workers Face the 1967 Negotiations, April, 5.
- Mandel, William—A Reply to Isaac Deutscher, Dec., 22.
- Meyers, George and William Allen—The UAW Prepares for Action, June, 15.
- Midwest Friend—Some Criticisms, March, 55.
- Moreau, Alberto—Appraising the Middle East War, Oct., 51.
- D. N.—The Jewish Community is a Reality, Feb., 47.
- O'Hare, Leo—The Senator from Massachusetts, Jan., 15.
- Pashkov, A.—The Economic Laws of Socialism, June, 31.
- Patterson, William L.—75th Birthday, March, 1; Our Fight is Here, March, 3.
- Perlo, Victor—New Study of U.S. Finance Capital, July, 24; Capitalism Unlimited vs. Communism, Oct., 57; The Economic Reform in the USSR, Nov., 58.
- Pittman, John—The October Revolution and National Liberation, Nov., 27.
- Polikeit, George—The Peace Movement in the German Federal Republic, March, 9.
- Pomeroy, William J.—Portrait of a Turncoat, Dec., 37.
- Proctor, Roscoe—Notes on "Black Power" Concept, March, 36.
- Resnick, Sid—Arab Chauvinism: A Reactionary Ideology, Jan., 50.
- Richmond, Al—Integration or Separation?, July, 59.
- Robeson, Paul—The Power of Negro Action, August, 33.
- Serrof, Morris—A Critical View of Waten on Yiddish, Jan., 58.
- Shields, Art—What I Learned in the Struggles of the Northwest, April, 46; John Reed: A Revolutionary Hero, Nov., 45.
- Stanford, John W.—Viva La Huelga!, Aug., 22.
- Struik, Dirk J.—Technology and Society, March, 62.
- Thomas, Jay—Negro-White Unity and the Communists, May, 49.
- Waten, Judah—Setting the Record Straight, March, 58.
- Weinstone, William—An Evaluation of Gompers, Feb., 52; Changes in the Constitution of the Communist Party, U.S.A., April, 57.
- West, James—Labor and Peace, March, 22; A Cardinal Principle of Marxism, May, 55; Unity is the Watchword, Aug., 63; The Rank and File and Labor's Resurgence, Oct., 34; The Hatcher Election in Gary, Dec., 18.
- Wheeler, George Shaw—A Book of Questionable Scientific Merit, Feb., 26; Competition Between Capitalism and Socialism, Nov., 82.
- Winston, Henry—Forge Negro-Labor Unity, Feb., 1.

IN MEMORIAM

- Alexander Tractenberg—1884-1966, Jan., 12.
- Michael Gold—1894-1967, June, 10.
- Abraham Strauss—1903-1967, Aug., 62.

The February issue of *Political Affairs* will be a special, enlarged issue devoted entirely to the Negro freedom movement, in celebration of Negro History Week. It will include articles by Henry Winston, Gus Hall, Claude Lightfoot, James E. Jackson, Herbert Aptheker, Carl Bloice and others.

NEW PAMPHLETS

IMPERIALIST RIVALRIES AND THE WORLD STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

by GUS HALL

Address in Moscow at November 1967 conference of Communist Workers and Socialist parties sponsored by Institute of World Labor Movement. 24 pages — 30c

BLACK LIBERATION: A COMMUNIST VIEW

by CLAUDE LIGHTFOOT

Report to national conference of Communists on the Negro Freedom Struggle. Discusses nationalism, issues and relation to other movements, significance of electoral struggle, violence and self-defense. 48 pages — 50c

FOR A MEANINGFUL ALTERNATIVE

by GUS HALL

Report to the June 1967 meetings of the C.P. National Committee, discussing Vietnam, the Middle East, Negro Freedom, economic welfare, and 1968 elections. 64 pages — 50c

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS (in English) DER KRISIS IN MITTEL MIZRACH (in Yiddish)

by HYMAN LUMER

Analyzes the Israeli-Arab conflict, its source, its significance in the context of the present world situation, and proposals for its solution.

English — 24 pages — 25c

Yiddish — 24 pages — 35c

AT YOUR LOCAL PROGRESSIVE BOOKSHOP OR ORDER FROM:

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

32 UNION SQUARE EAST, ROOM 801, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10003

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

50 YEARS OF SOCIALISM

Enlarged special issue of Political Affairs on occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Soviet Union. 50c a copy

Order from

POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUBLISHERS

799 Broadway

New York, NY 10003