


MARCH, 1968



POLITICAL
AFFAIRS

THE NLF OFFENSIVE IN VIETNAM

Betty Gannett

THE REVISED McCARRAN ACT

John Abt

THE WORLD STUDENT STRIKE

Michael Zagarell

A NOT SO REVOLUTIONARY STRATEGY

James West

**LESSONS FROM THE SETBACK
IN INDONESIA**

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLVII, NO. 3

MARCH, 1968

Betty Gannett, Editor Hyman Lumer, Associate Editor

CONTENTS

<i>Betty Gannett</i> The NLF Offensive in South Vietnam	1
<i>John Abt</i> Revised McCarran Act Ready to Strike Again	10
<i>Michael Zagarell</i> World Student Strike Against War and Racism	20
<i>CPUSA</i> The Middle East Crisis	29
<i>James West</i> A Not So Revolutionary Strategy	34
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i> A Doomed System	44
Lessons from the Setback in Indonesia	49
<i>Ann Barton</i> A Woman of Social Conscience	62
A Life Spanning A Century	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.

The NLF Offensive in South Vietnam

Striking simultaneously in scores of cities, towns and hamlets throughout the length and breadth of South Vietnam, hitting every major U.S. military installation and airfield, the military offensive unleashed by the National Liberation Front demonstrated before the whole world the rising determination of the Vietnamese people to win the independence so long denied their battered land. The vast scope and devastating force of the military operations, the amazing staying power of the NLF fighting units, knocked into a cocked hat the talk that the U.S. interventionist armies had already turned the tide of the war in their favor.

The battles raged not in the jungles, swamps and rice paddies where, admittedly, the NLF continues to retain the solid support of the peasantry, but in the highly-fortified, U.S.-protected enclaves where the puppet government is purported to have undisputed control. The heaviest fighting took place in the most important provincial capitals, in Saigon proper and in the old imperial city of Hue—areas claimed to have been sealed off from NLF penetration.

The heroic offensive, carried through with magnificent precision and coordination, obviously required great ingenuity and months of planning and preparation. The undetected stockpiling of arms, ammunition and food in the cities, sufficient to supply NLF forces for weeks of fighting could not have been realized without the active assistance of the men and women inhabiting these areas. The full story of this fantastic accomplishment has yet to be unfolded. But even from the meager reports now available, one can glean something of the elan, the amazing resourcefulness and selfless courage with which the undertaking was executed.

In Saigon, for example, it was recalled that an unusual number of funerals had taken place, weeping relatives following the coffins to the cemetery. The interned caskets, it developed, contained not corpses but machine guns, explosives and ammunition needed for the assault. Freedom fighters entered the cities unarmed, dressed in ordinary clothing, on foot or buses, bicycles or taxis and remained undiscovered. The NLF unit which stormed the U.S. Embassy and succeeded in holding it for six furious hours, "rode into Saigon concealed in a truckload of flowers," one American correspondent reported. In the town of Vinhlong, flower pots, sent to decorate cemetery graves, served to

provide the small-arms ammunition for the ensuing battle. Thus, everywhere, with the help of the local populations, the stage was set for the offensive.

The liberation fighters—though greatly outnumbered and under constant bombardment from air and artillery fire and napalm blasts—displayed incredible heroism. On-the-spot correspondents did not try to disguise their amazement and admiration. Insisting he had never been taken in by the “deluge of official optimism,” Everett G. Martin, writing in *Newsweek* (February 12), admitted he was nevertheless “utterly taken aback” by the enemy’s “daring and tenacity—and, most of all, by his ability to coordinate his assaults with a precision he had never before displayed.” He underscored, “the one cold fact the guerrillas drove home last week was that no place in South Vietnam is secure.”

Tom Buckley, in his *New York Times* dispatch (February 2), similarly noted that the well-coordinated offensive demonstrated no part of the country was secure from the military operations of the NLF. Despite the “prevalence of Government informers and security agents,” guerrilla forces were able to carry through their preparations without discovery proving they “still possess highly efficient communications, leadership and cooperation. . . . the Vietcong can still find thousands of men who are ready not only to strike at night and slip away but also to undertake missions in which death is the only possible outcome.”

Charles Mohr (*New York Times*, February 3) spoke of the “courage and motivation of the guerrilla units” and of the “excellent planning and valuable support by Communist agents within the towns and cities.”

Lies About NLF Strength

The White House and its sycophants, not to speak of the Pentagon and its military brass in Saigon, have, for many months, peddled gilded wares to the effect that the Vietnamese patriots were rapidly disintegrating, were undergoing crises in morale, were unable to replace their losses in the field with recruits from the indigenous population and were compelled to rely more and more on the North Vietnamese to do the fighting. The American public was assured that “search-and-destroy” sweeps and the “pacification” program had undermined the former NLF strongholds and that 67 per cent of the population now lived in areas firmly under the control of the Saigon government. We were told that “our intelligence,” through its secret agencies and contacts and information gathered from “defectors,” was

on top of every development, could follow every move in the “enemy camp.”

The U.S. military command issued a 90-page booklet titled *1967—A Year of Progress*, containing “factual proof” that the military strength of the liberation army had reached its lowest level since 1965.

Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert of *The New York Times*, on his return to Vietnam after an absence of two years, wrote a series of lengthy articles describing the progress “our side” had made in 1967. Just ten days before the NLF offensive, Baldwin wrote authoritatively of “unmistakeable indications” that the United States and South Vietnam “are slowly winning at least the military phase of the struggle.” He pointed to the “reduction in enemy strength” and in the “quality of many units” as reflections of a “reduced rate of recruitment and infiltration.” The “bloody battles of the frontiers” signified to this highly reputed military strategist “that the principal efforts of the Communist mainforce units now are being mounted from sanctuaries across South Vietnam’s borders in Cambodia, Laos and North Vietnam rather than from bases in the heart of South Vietnam.” Thus, Mr. Baldwin maintained, the resistance movement had been completely uprooted from its native soil and could no longer operate from within the country.

To perpetuate this hoax, the White House enlisted all the bigwigs who have been or are in Vietnam—General William C. Westmoreland, Ambassador Bunker, his deputy from the CIA, Robert Komer in charge of the pacification program, former ambassadors Henry Cabot Lodge and Maxwell D. Taylor, and a host of others. All mustered arguments to prove the war “can and will be won.” General Westmoreland, on his visit last November, assured Congress and the U.S. public that the U.S. was in fact, “winning the war of attrition,” and in two years, “or less” the withdrawal of troops could begin.

Convinced that the patriots had indeed been driven into their holes, demoralized and defeated, no wonder the American people were taken aback by the massive sweep of the NLF offensive. Instead of demoralization, dispatches from the front reported and TV screens pictured stubborn fighters going to the offensive in the face of all the firepower that U.S. military might could master. The most furious saturation bombardments and artillery fire could not stop the NLF advance. No longer hit-and-run affairs, the battles were stubborn and prolonged. Hue was “retaken” only after a month of tenacious fighting when the ancient city had been pulverized by tons of bombs and napalm, as were many provincial capitals and towns from one end of

the country to the other.

How could the NLF fighting units and guerrilla forces muster such strength, display such courage and fighting spirit, deliver such telling blows wherever they struck? Again Washington officials rushed to provide the answer. The offensive was really a "desperate gamble," a "go-for-broke proposition," the "death rattle" of defeated men. President Johnson, without waiting for a report on the full extent of the offensive, hastened to tell newsmen that militarily the drive was a "complete failure," had little or no "popular support" and furthermore had been "anticipated, prepared for and met." Glibly, he informed the news conference:

We have known for several months now, that the Communists planned a massive winter-spring offensive. . . . We know the object was to overthrow the Constitutional Government in Saigon and to create a situation in which we and the Vietnamese would be willing to accept the Communist-dominated coalition government. (*New York Times*, February 3.)

Realities of the Offensive

If the credibility of the Johnson Administration is today seriously questioned by millions at home and abroad, it is due in large part to such hypocritical disregard of truth. The credibility gap is causing considerable uneasiness not only in the ranks of opponents to U.S. aggression but in many top circles in Washington. A number of Senators openly challenged Johnson's conclusions. In one of the most devastating speeches he has yet made, Robert F. Kennedy called the talk about progress "illusory" and held out little "prospect" for a U.S. victory. Maintaining that the offensive had "shattered the mask of official illusion with which we have concealed our true circumstances," he ridiculed the exaggerated body counts of enemy killed, declaring: "If only two men have been seriously wounded for every one dead . . . the entire enemy force has been put out of action. Who, then, is doing the fighting?" Further countering "official illusions," he asserted:

It is said that the Vietcong will not be able to hold the cities. That is probably true. But they have demonstrated despite all our reports of progress, of government strength and enemy weakness, that a half million American soldiers with 700,000 Vietnamese allies, with total command of the air, total command of the sea, backed by huge resources and the most modern weapons, are unable to secure even a single city from attacks of an enemy whose total strength is about 250,000.

. . . it would seem that no matter how many Vietcong and North Vietnamese we claim to kill, through some miraculous effort of will, enemy strength remains the same.

After showing that the Saigon government could not last a day without U.S. arms, he drew the conclusion that:

. . . a total military victory is not within sight or around the corner; that, in fact, it is probably beyond our grasp; and that the effort to win such a victory will only result in the further slaughter of thousands of innocent and helpless people—a slaughter which will forever rest on our national conscience. (*New York Times*, February 9.)

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, reflecting similar skepticism said the recent events showed there was "not the beginnings of a beginning of a stable political situation." While "the hamlets, villages and the cities are seen to be honeycombed with a National Liberation Front infrastructure . . . which is still intact, and which may well be stronger than ever," the "very survival" of the Saigon government, he declared, "appears more dependent upon American military power than at any time in the past." (*New York Times*, February 12.)

Some columnists spoke out even more sharply. Thus, Drew Pearson, wrote that far from winning, "we have been bogged down and, in effect, defeated by a tiny nation no bigger than Washington state." Actually, he contended, the United States had taken a "shellacking . . . from a nation of 16,000,000." This strike "could not have been accomplished without vast help from a civilian population which has become more and more resentful of Americans." (*New York Post*, February 10.)

Speaking of this resentment in his column the preceding week, Drew Pearson noted that "If a plebiscite were taken today as to whether the United States should remain in the country it is supposed to save, a majority would probably vote 'Yankees Go Home.'"

Thomas W. Pew, Jr., editor of the *Troy Daily News* in Troy, Ohio, who watched the fighting in Saigon from the rooftop of the Eden Roc Hotel, denied the offensive was a failure, maintaining "the Commander in Chief is not on the same wave length with his staff in Vietnam." In *The Nation* (February 19), he wrote:

. . . Far from being a "complete failure," the attack was a skillfully executed and highly successful probe of the combined U.S. and ARVN strength. Its purpose was to confuse, disrupt and test the allied forces and, at the same time, to influence the people. To that extent it was a complete success. . . . Furthermore, the incredibly well-coordinated attack on all quarters of the country at

once tested and proved what must be one of the most highly developed communications systems in modern warfare—all the more fantastic since U.S. intelligence doesn't even know how it operates. The logistics accomplishment of supplying arms and ammunition and food to many thousands of men who are supposed to be operating in a hostile environment without open use of roads and without air power speaks for itself.

Contrary to the boasts of the White House that the liberation forces suffered a major debacle and, by implications, that the U.S. scored another victory, the offensive smashed to smithereens the strategic plans of the U.S. aggressor for 1968 and further undermined its prestige in the world at large. The "search-and-destroy" policy and the lauded "pacification" program were left in shambles and exposed as utter failures. Far from destroying the NLF infrastructure, the offensive was a manifestation of the expansion of NLF strength, not only in its customary strongholds in the mountains and countryside, but in the cities and towns as well. The NLF, as a result of the offensive, established new bases for operation close to every city and town in the country and surrounding all major U.S. military bastions and airfields.

In contrast, the unstable base of the Saigon regime has become shakier than ever. The U.S. imperialists and their puppets could not instill any fighting zeal within the armed forces of Saigon. While large numbers of army men stayed away from the battle altogether, numerous units defected en masse to the NLF, arms and all.

The Tet offensive demonstrated, above all, that the initiative in the war remains firmly in the hands of the resistance movement, and that victory for the aggressor, despite its huge military machine, is as unattainable as ever. The war no longer involves small NLF guerrilla units, nor even battalion or division-size formations. It has become a war of the entire people who regard the U.S. interventionists not as saviors but as colonial oppressors before whom they will never bend the knee. Come hell or high water, the "rich super-armed giant," to use Walter Lippman's phrase, will never succeed in imposing his will on this heroic people.

A Genocidal War

Lippman correctly contends (*New York Post*, December 2, 1967), "We are seeing how a war waged without hope of a military decision degenerates into savagery. . . . There is no terrorism of the guerrilla fighters. There is the terrorism of the bombs which cannot and do not distinguish between civilians and soldiers."

Frustrated by the firm resistance of the NLF forces, U.S. imperialism pursues a ruthless course of genocidal warfare against the people of this small nation. It has already dropped more bombs on North and South Vietnam than it dropped in Europe during all of World War II. About 3,000,000 pounds of napalm—which burns at 1,000 degrees Fahrenheit—are dropped in an average month over South Vietnam alone, burning and scorching everything in sight. The most barbarous methods of warfare—napalm, fragmentation and delayed-action bombs, phosphorous grenades, noxious chemicals, defoliants, poison gases—are employed to scorch the earth, destroy crops, burn homes, murder men, women and children. Hundreds of villages have been reduced to rubble or bulldozed out of existence. Millions have been turned into homeless refugees.

Infuriated by the NLF offensive, the Hitler-like war of extermination was pushed to new heights of intensity. U.S. divebombers rained death and destruction, levelling even the areas which they had occupied. The "limited war for limited objectives" found new justification—becoming a "necessity of war."

"It became necessary to destroy the town in order to save it," said a U.S. major who reduced to rubble the provincial capital of Bentre under a rain of bombs and napalm that killed more than 1,000 civilians and wounded another 1,500. The massive destruction suffered by Hue left 70 per cent of its population homeless—with the dead and the wounded still to be counted. Working-class settlements in and around the major cities were wiped out. "The Saigon suburb of Nonhxa which lies less than a mile from the city airport, looked like Stalingrad," wrote Charles Mohr (*New York Times*, February 4). Numerous other towns and cities were wholly or partially destroyed, with large numbers of inhabitants killed or maimed, and thousands more forced into the already swollen armies of refugees.

One American official put the blame for the vast destruction on the Vietcong. It was their fault, he declared, because they occupied "the hamlets we pacified just for the purpose of having the allies move in and bomb them out." But others were more objective in their appraisal of the stark realities of the new turn in the war.

"The sad and terrible truth of the decision to blow up South Vietnam's cities in order to defend them," wrote Tom Wicker on a rising note of anger, "is that neither Washington nor Saigon has anything to rely on but firepower. With that, they can destroy Vietnam, but they can never save it from Communism, or anything else." (*New York Times*, February 20.)

The self-styled champion of freedom and democracy in Vietnam

has the gall to assure the American people that the NLF offensive only served to further estrange the people because of its "callous disregard for human life."

The People on the Rise

But the contrary is true. Whereas anti-Americanism has been prevalent hitherto mainly among students, Buddhists and sections of the workers, it has now spread to new strata of the population, especially in the cities, which had in the past been cool to the NLF. With it have come new and rising demands for an end to the war and for peace and independence.

Early in January, the Roman Catholic bishops issued a call for an end to U.S. bombings of North Vietnam, declaring: "In the name of God, we cry stop! The North and South Vietnamese Governments must get together, talk together, begin serious negotiations." In mid-January, a proposal to end the war through negotiations was issued anonymously, for fear of reprisals, by a group of professors, lawyers and other intellectuals. In Saigon, a new patriotic front consisting of industrialists, clergy, cultural personalities and people's organizations—the Alliance of National Peace Forces—issued an appeal calling for: 1) the overthrow of the Thieu-Ky puppet regime; 2) the recovery of national independence and sovereignty, the termination of U.S. intervention and the withdrawal of its troops; 3) the setting up of an independent democratic, peaceful and neutral South Vietnam; 4) reaching an understanding with the NLF for joint action to achieve these goals.

Thus as the military resistance of the liberation forces has reached a new stage, new alliances are springing up, which further expose the growing isolation of the Saigon regime and the people's determination to oust the aggressors.

New Dangers

To halt these developments, in the hope of stamping out the resistance, the puppet regime, in collusion with its U.S. protectors, has unleashed a new wave of terror and repression throughout the country. Hundreds of so-called "Communist agents" have been arrested. Leading personalities—supposedly named by the NLF for a coalition government—have also been taken into custody. Thus, Truong Dinh Dzu, the peace candidate who came in second in the presidential elections of last September; Au Truong Thanh, denied a place on the ballot because he was a "neutralist"; the revered militant Buddhist Monk Thich Tri Quang, and a number of labor leaders were arrested.

There is talk of holding "public executions"—another means to "teach the people a lesson."

Actually, the dangers are far greater. The U.S. imperialists, enraged at the audacity of the NLF in launching its surprise offensive and its success in delivering mortal blows, is plotting new provocations, new adventures. The announcement of the imposition of strict censorship on all news from Vietnam—in the interest of "security"—is an evil omen. Pressure increases to invade North Vietnam, to expand the war into Laos and Cambodia. Shipment of thousands of additional troops—with talk of increasing the armed strength by at least several hundred thousand more.

The gravest danger has become pressure from the most reactionary forces in the country and the Pentagon for the use of tactical nuclear weapons—a danger which must not be minimized. The powerful circles determining U.S. policies, having already resorted to every atrocious weapon modern technology has developed, are now pressing for the use of this "ultimate weapon" in order to win the day.

* * *

What we do in our country can contribute decisively in determining the outcome of the battle for freedom in distant Vietnam. Let it not be said of the American people, what was said of the Germans—that we stood silently by while our rulers annihilated another people with impunity. The time to speak out—to act—is NOW, not tomorrow.

In the midst of a crucial presidential elections, every candidate for office—from that of the president to the local official—must feel the wrath of an aroused American people demanding: End the senseless holocaust. Withdraw American troops. Let the Vietnamese people—in the security of peace—determine their own destiny.

A vast campaign of education and action must be organized at once—reaching into every community, every organization, every shop and every union—to win new millions for a reversal of U.S. policy in Vietnam. Let us not be found wanting!

Revised McCarran Act Ready to Strike Again

On December 11, 1967, the Supreme Court decided the case of Eugene Robel, delivering what should have been the *coup de grâce* in the seventeen year fight against the McCarran Act. Yet before the year was out, Congress and the President had resuscitated the corpse, necessitating a new round of legal battles to do away with this legislative monstrosity. A brief review of the government's effort to enforce the McCarran Act against the Communist Party and its members will provide the background for discussion of these contradictory developments.

The order of the Subversive Activities Control Board (SACB) directing the Communist Party to register as a Communist-action organization finally reached the Supreme Court in 1961, after eleven years of litigation following passage of the McCarran Act. The Court decided, five to four, that the issuance of the registration order was constitutional. It held, however, that it was "premature" to consider any of the Party's other constitutional contentions. It even declined to decide whether the registration order was enforceable. All such questions, it said, would have to await prosecution of the Party, its officers and members for refusing to register and to comply with the remaining requirements of the Act.

As Justice Douglas stated in his dissenting opinion, the effect of the decision was "to fashion an extremely harsh rule to fit the Communist Party but no one else." The consequence was to precipitate six more years of litigation in which one McCarran Act provision after another was challenged and eventually invalidated.

In 1964, in the case of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Herbert Aptheker, the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional the section of the Act making it unlawful for members of an organization which had been ordered to register to apply for or use passports. The following year, in the Albert-Proctor case, the Court invalidated the section requiring members of an organization, which had refused to

register as a Communist-action organization and list the names of its members, to register themselves. Then in March 1967, the Court of Appeals reversed the conviction of the Communist Party for refusing to register, holding that the registration order could not constitutionally be enforced. The Department of Justice did not seek Supreme Court review of the decision but announced that, "This case is dead." The announcement likewise resulted in throwing out indictments against Gus Hall and Benjamin Davis who had been charged, as officers of the Communist Party, with refusing to register it.

These victories were followed by the Robel decision invalidating the employment section of the Act. This section prohibited members of an organization which had been ordered to register as a Communist-action organization from holding employment in the federal government, in a labor organization, or in any enterprise designated by the Secretary of Defense as a "defense facility."

Significance of the Robel Decision

The government brought the first and only prosecution under the section against Eugene Robel, a machinist at the Todd Shipyards in Seattle. The Secretary of Defense designated these yards as a "defense facility" in 1962, and the indictment of Robel followed for his "crime" in continuing to work at a job he had held for more than ten years, as the Supreme Court was later to find, "apparently without incident and apparently without concealing his Communist Party membership." Following his arrest, he was released without bond and returned to his job at Todd's where he has worked ever since.

The Federal District Court dismissed the indictment as improperly drawn. The government appealed to the Supreme Court which heard argument in the fall of 1966, and ordered reargument in October 1967 before deciding the case. The opinion of the Court was written by Chief Justice Warren and concurred in by Justices Black, Douglas, Stewart and Fortas. Justice Brennan concurred in a separate opinion. Justices White and Harlan were the only dissenters. Justice Marshall, who had appeared in the case while Solicitor-General, took no part.

The nature of the majority opinion, and the fact that the Chief Justice elected to write it, are highly significant in several respects.

The Court held that to penalize members of the Communist Party by barring them from defense employment "quite literally estab-

* Mr. Abt is one of the attorneys representing the Communist Party in the litigations under the McCarran Act.

lishes guilt by association alone," and thereby violates the First Amendment. This is so, the Court said, because the freedom of association which the First Amendment protects includes the freedom of people to associate together as members of the Communist Party. The government may not inhibit the exercise of that freedom by prohibiting members of the Communist Party from holding employment—even in security-sensitive positions in national defense facilities.

The reach of the decision is emphasized by the concurring opinion of Justice Brennan, a member of the Court's "liberal" wing. He could not agree with the majority because, as he said, "there may be 'defense facilities' so essential to our national security that Congress could constitutionally exclude all Party members from employment in them." He, too, would have held the statute unconstitutional, but only because it was not confined to such super-sensitive facilities. The majority of the Court, on the other hand, refused to concede that the mere fact of Party membership can constitutionally disqualify the member for a job, even in that special category.

The decision is thus a clear-cut repudiation of the pretext for two decades of repression—the pretext that Communists are addicted to espionage and sabotage, advocate violence, are disloyal to their own country and subservient to the Soviet Union. Obviously, if Communist Party membership is not a valid ground for the denial of defense employment, it may not be used as the basis for other forms of discrimination—whether in employment, trade union membership, or in the many other ways that the past twenty years have witnessed. The Robel decision is thus a powerful weapon which should be utilized in the fight for the legitimacy of Communists and Communism.

The decision is important in a second and broader aspect. In the most incisive portion of his opinion, the Chief Justice answers the government's contention that the "defense facility" provision of the Act is justified as an exercise of the authority of Congress, under its war power, to provide for the national defense. "The phrase 'war power,'" the Chief Justice wrote, "cannot be invoked as a talismanic incantation" for by-passing the Bill of Rights. He added:

Implicit in the term "national defense" is the notion of defending those values and ideals which set this nation apart. For almost two centuries, our country has taken singular pride in the democratic ideals enshrined in its Constitution, and the most cherished of those ideals have found expression in the First Amendment. It would indeed be ironic if, in the name of national defense, we would sanction the subversion of one of those liberties—the freedom of association—which makes the defense of the nation worthwhile.

These words carry a clear warning to the Johnson Administration against using the war in Vietnam as justification for stifling dissent. In disregard of the warning, the Department of Justice has indicted Dr. Benjamin Spock, Rev. William Sloane Coffin, Jr. and three others for exercising their First Amendment right to advocate draft resistance. It remains to be seen whether the Court will adhere to the principle so eloquently enunciated by the Chief Justice and apply it in the case of these courageous opponents of Johnson's illegal and immoral war against the Vietnamese people. Needless to say, the strength of popular opposition to the war will be far more influential in determining the outcome than the constitutional arguments of the lawyers. Only recently, the Court gave disturbing evidence of its sensitivity to what it regards as public opinion by refusing to review the First Amendment issues involved in the conviction of William Epton for conspiring to riot and advocating "criminal anarchy" at the time of the 1964 Harlem incidents.

The "Communist Front" Provisions and the Du Bois Clubs

On the same day that the Robel case was decided, the Supreme Court refused to enjoin the SACB from proceeding with hearings against the Du Bois Clubs of America under the Communist-front provisions of the McCarran Act.

Although the SACB has issued orders against fourteen organizations directing them to register as Communist fronts, the Supreme Court has yet to pass on the constitutionality of the "front" provisions of the Act. All but three of the fourteen organizations were forced to dissolve because of their inability to bear the burdens, financial and otherwise, of the SACB proceedings. One organization—the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship—was vindicated by the Court of Appeals which found that the government had failed to prove its case. The proceedings involving the other two—the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born and the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade—reached the Supreme Court after years of litigation only to have it avoid the constitutional questions and send the cases back to the SACB on the ground that the evidence was "stale" and should be brought up to date. The government subsequently dismissed the charges against both organizations and dropped the proceedings.

In the case of the Du Bois Clubs, the Supreme Court again avoided what it called the "important and difficult constitutional issues" on the ground that consideration of these questions was premature and

would be made unnecessary if the SACB were to absolve the Clubs of the charges against them. This decision was prompted, in part at least, by the fact that the future of the McCarran Act was then under debate in Congress. The Court evidently saw no point in undertaking to review the constitutionality of legislation which was about to be substantially amended if not repealed altogether.

Before turning to these Congressional debates and their outcome, attention should be directed to the dissenting opinion of Justice Douglas in the Du Bois Clubs case. Writing for himself and Justice Black, he stated the reasons for enjoining the hearings. The opinion contains such an unbiased view of the Communists and such an unequivocal statement of the reach of the First Amendment that it merits quotation at length:

I see no constitutional method whereby the Government can punish or penalize one for "being a Communist" or "supporting Communists" or "promoting Communism." Communism, as an ideology, embraces a broad array of ideas. To some it has appeal because the state owns the main means of production, with the result that all phases of national life are in the public sector, guaranteeing full employment. To some communism means a medical care program that reaches to the lowest levels of society. To others the communal way of life, even in agriculture, means a fuller life for the average person. To some the flowering of the dance, music, painting, sculpturing, and even athletics is possible only when those arts and activities move from the private to the public sector. To some there can be no equivalent of the unemployment insurance, old age insurance, and social security that obtain in a socialized state. To others communism is a commitment to the atheistic philosophy and way of life. To still others, adherence to communism means a commitment to use force and violence, if necessary, to achieve that kind of socialist state. And to some of course it means all of the projects I have enumerated plus perhaps others as well.

The word "revolution" has of course acquired a subversive connotation in modern times. But it has roots that are eminently respectable in American history. This country is the product of revolution. Our very being emphasizes that when grievances pile high and there are no political remedies, the exercise of sovereign powers reverts to the people. Teaching and espousing revolution—as distinguished from indulging in overt acts—are therefore obviously within the range of the First Amendment.

The members of the Du Bois Clubs may or may not be Communists. But as I said, I see no possibility under our Constitution of

penalizing one for holding or expressing that or any other belief. The Du Bois Clubs may advocate causes that parallel Communist thought or Communist policies. They appear, for example, to advocate the termination of the hostilities in Vietnam. But so far as advocacy is concerned, I see no constitutional way of putting restraints on them so long as we have the First Amendment.

* * *

There is the line between action on the one hand and ideas, beliefs, and advocacy on the other. The former is a legitimate sphere for legislation. Ideas, beliefs, and advocacy are beyond the reach of committees, agencies, Congress, and the courts.

New Revisions of the McCarran Act

The series of court defeats sustained by the McCarran Act discredited it, beclouded its future, and left the five SACB members with virtually nothing to do except pick up semi-monthly pay checks at the not inconsiderable rate of \$26,000 per year. Rep. Rooney (D.-N.Y.) was plainly correct when he called their jobs "about the best around town."

One of these jobs has been held since 1966 by John S. Patterson who owes his appointment to the influence of Senate majority leader Everett Dirksen with his good friend, President Johnson. A *Wall Street Journal* story last July about another Presidential appointment to the SACB which was quietly whisked through the Senate focused attention upon the agency. This time the lucky appointee was Simon F. McHugh, Jr., a young accountant whose only qualification for the job was his wife, Johnson's attractive former personal secretary, described by the *WSJ* as "a particular Presidential favorite."

Demands arose on both sides of the Capitol, inspired as much in the interest of economy as by concern for constitutional liberties, to abolish this do-nothing agency. And although the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) had reported out amendments to the McCarran Act to give it new life and the SACB new business, the bill was given little chance of passage.

Regrettably, the Communist Party which had spearheaded the long, courageous and successful court battles against the Act failed completely to initiate a fight on the legislative front at a moment when repeal was possible. Consequently, when the Johnson-Dirksen team went into action to rescue the Act and the SACB, Congressmen who opposed the move received no encouragement or support from back home.

Dirksen introduced a bill in the Senate to revive the Act by amend-

ments which he said he had discussed with the President who "would like to see this bill pass." After being reconciled with HUAC's companion measure in the House, the legislation passed both chambers in the closing days of the session. The extent of the opposition and the opportunity for repeal that was lost is revealed by the vote—276 to 114 in the House and, with only five Senators present, 3 to 2 in the Senate. Unlike President Truman, who had vetoed the original Act despite the anti-Communist hysteria generated by the Korean War, Johnson signed the amendments without comment.

The primary purpose of the amendments was to rewrite the Act's registration provisions. The courts had invalidated them on the ground that the requirement of self-registration by Communist organizations and individual Communists, under the threat of fantastic daily cumulative penalties, violated the privilege against self-incrimination. The amendments avoid self-incrimination by eliminating the self-registration requirement and the criminal penalties. Instead, the SACB will now "determine" that an accused organization is a "Communist-action" organization (the Communist Party) or a "Communist-front" or "Communist-infiltrated," or that an accused individual is a Communist Party member. It will then publish the name of the organization or individual in the Federal Register and list it in a record open for public inspection. The authors of the amendments hope in this way to preserve the SACB by giving it the function of "exposing" simply for the sake of exposure.

To avoid the necessity of a repetition of the lengthy hearings in the Communist Party case, the amendments direct the SACB to revise the registration order by substituting a "determination" that the Party is a Communist-action organization for the requirement that it register as such.

The insistence of Senator Proxmire and others that it was time to terminate the existence of an agency which had had nothing to do for upwards of two years was dealt with by a novel and peculiar provision known as the Proxmire-Mansfield-Dirksen compromise. This states that the SACB shall go out of existence on June 30, 1969, unless it holds hearings in at least one new case before December 31, 1968. Furthermore, the Attorney General is directed to report to Congress, initially at six month intervals and then yearly, the proceedings he has commenced before the SACB and, if he has instituted none, his reasons for not doing so.

The amendments also rewrite the Act in a variety of other ways. Some of these changes were designed to meet arguments made by the defense attorneys during the long years of litigation.

For example, the definitions of "action," "front" and "infiltrated" organizations are tied in with the Act's findings on the nature of the "world Communist movement," in such a way that the existence of these organizations is dependent upon the existence of a world movement having the described characteristics. The Act finds that the world Communist movement is a monolithic organization, consisting of parties and governments which are subservient to and subject to the iron discipline of the Soviet Union.

Eighteen years ago, when the Act was passed, there may have been some who really believed in the existence of this mythological movement. But no one in his right mind can retain that belief today. Yet if there is no such movement, there can be no "action," "front" or "infiltrated" organizations as these are defined in the Act. The Amendments resolve this dilemma by the simple expedient of reciting that "the findings of fact" of the original Act "are reiterated." As though Congress had the power, by reiterating falsehood, to transform it into truth!

How the New Amendments Will Operate

The amendments also attempt to circumvent the decision in the case of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. There, the Court of Appeals set aside the order directing the Council to register as a "front" because the evidence did not show, as the original Act required, that persons active in its management were likewise active in the management of the Communist Party. To eliminate this difficulty, the amendments now require evidence of nothing more than participation in the management of the alleged front by "one or more" members of the Communist Party, including rank-and-file members.

Other revisions are of a make-work character to assure the SACB of continued—if perfectly useless—business. For example, hearings and the taking of evidence are required even where the accused organizations or individuals admit all of the charges against them. Again, the SACB must conduct proceedings and make a determination against an organization which dissolves after the case is instituted. Moreover, the courts are prohibited from intervening, by injunction or otherwise, with any proceeding until after the SACB has made its "determination."

The amendments also give the SACB and the Attorney General new powers of harassment. Instead of being required to proceed individually against each alleged member of the Communist Party, the Attorney General may now combine an unlimited number of persons

in a single case. Misbehavior before the SACB or one of its hearing examiners, or "so near thereto as to obstruct the hearings," is punishable by one year in prison and a \$5,000 fine. The unheard-of requirement is added that a United States Attorney *must* present to a grand jury any instance of misbehavior that the SACB reports to him. Finally, the Attorney General is empowered to confer immunity on any witness before the SACB, thereby depriving him of the privilege of refusing to testify on the grounds of self-incrimination.

As this is written, the SACB has scheduled the commencement of hearings against the Du Bois Clubs under the amended Act. This, however, will not be a new preceeding within the terms of the Proxmire-Mansfield-Dirksen compromise. And it would be utopian to suppose that the Johnson administration will permit the SACB to commit suicide for want of new business before the December, 1968, deadline. A series of membership cases is the least that can be anticipated.

One further McCarran Act case—this in the foreign-born field—remains to be mentioned. A section of the Act, later transferred to the McCarran-Walter Act, provides for the deportation of any non-citizen who, after entering the country, was a member of the Communist Party. The constitutionality of this provision was sustained by the Supreme Court in 1954 when McCarthyism was riding high. Of the Justices who participated, only two—Black and Douglas—are still sitting, and both dissented. One of the victims of the law is Betty Gannett, the editor of this journal, who entered the United States in 1914 as a child of eight, and who was ordered deported in 1952. She recently brought a proceeding—now in the Court of Appeals—to have the Supreme Court overrule its 1954 decision upon principles established in current cases.

* * *

Thus a new round of struggle against the McCarran Act—in the courts and in Congress—lies ahead. It would be foolhardy to speak of the outcome with certainty in a period that witnesses the increasing desperation and adventurism of the Johnson Administration in the face of the debacle that looms in Vietnam, the growing resistance movement for black liberation and peace, the permanent crisis of our cities, and the upsurge of militance in the ranks of labor. Indeed, there are ominous signs that the administration is preparing to counter the popular demand for fundamental change with a crack-down on constitutional liberty. And it can be expected that, as always, the Communists will be a prime target for the assault.

Yet the current political climate is very different from that of 1950

when the McCarran Act was passed. To cite but one measure of the difference, opposition to the Korean War was mainly confined to the Communists, while today's anti-war movement cuts across almost the entire political spectrum and includes such figures as the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Over the same period, too, anti-Communism as a pretext for repression has worn paper-thin.

Justice Douglas' dissent in the Du Bois Club case takes note of the change.

He speaks of the Dennis case, decided in 1951, in which the Court had sustained the constitutionality of the Smith Act and the conviction of the national leadership of the Communist Party. Noting that the decision was made "at the peak of the notorious witch-hunt in this nation," he adds: "It is not conceivable that the Court [as now constituted] would approve Dennis." It would have been similarly inconceivable for the Supreme Court, in the fifties, to have decided the Robel case as it did in 1967. Certainly, if the principle of that decision is adhered to, neither the remains of the original McCarran Act nor the Johnson-Dirksen amendments can survive.

CORRECTION

The following paragraphs were inadvertently omitted from the article "Marx and the Historic Role of the Working Class," by Hyman Lumer (January, 1968) after the first two lines, top of page 4:

It is particularly important to note this distinction today since many of the present day critics and "improvers" of Marx confuse objective role with consciousness and seek to determine whether the proletariat is "revolutionary" or not on the basis of the level of its class consciousness.

What, then, is the special objective status of the working class from which its revolutionary character stems?

What is basically new in the capitalist mode of production is the socialization of production, the replacement of individual production by cooperation. This goes back to the very beginning of industrial capitalism. Marx writes:

World Student Strike Against Vietnam War and Racism

On January 27-28 almost one thousand students from all parts of the country gathered at the University of Chicago to discuss the calling of an international student strike against the war in Vietnam. Called by the Student Mobilization Committee, this conference was one of the most significant in the history of the student movement. Its significance is tied to a number of points: 1) Its size and breadth; 2) the historic decision to call an international student strike; 3) the formation of a new national organization, Black Youth Against the War and Draft; 4) the incorporation of the fight against racism as part of the program of a predominantly white peace coalition. In these accomplishments the Marxist Left had an important part.

Present at the conference were leading figures from such organizations as Students for a Democratic Society, War Resisters League, Michigan Peace Council, Women Strike for Peace, the YMCA and YWCA, Southern Student Organizing Committee, SNCC, the Chicago Area Draft Resisters, the Du Bois Clubs and many others. Some 80 Negro youth attended, from black anti-war and anti-draft committees and from student groups all over the country. More than 110 colleges in 27 states and the District of Columbia were represented. Also in attendance were large numbers of high school students.

The accomplishments of the conference, which were of great significance, came only after a great deal of struggle and debate.

Early Attempts to Call the Strike

The first attempt to call an international student strike took place over a year ago. Initiated by Bettina Aptheker, spokesman for the Communist Party and a member of the Du Bois Clubs, a conference of approximately 300 predominantly Left youth was held in Chicago to consider this proposal. The conference rejected it and instead called for the holding of international days of student protest, which turned out successfully.

The rejection of the strike was based on a number of reasons. First

was the belief that radicalization among students had not yet gone far enough to warrant such an action.

Another was the position of the Students for a Democratic Society, which opposed any national action as being an obstacle to building local grass-roots movements. Counterposing the anti-imperialist struggle to seeking broad student unity against the war, they expressed doubts about the possibility or desirability of a student strike. Underlying this position is the view that the decisive question is not the war but rather the need to fight now to end the system. On these grounds it is argued that any strike which does not result in winning new areas of power in the university by the students is only symbolic and not radical. Therefore, since a student strike against the Vietnam war and racial oppression cannot close down the universities and so result in greater power, it should be opposed. On the other hand, strikes on campuses in response to attempts by the police to brutalize students in struggles on local issues *have* closed down universities. Therefore, in the opinion of SDS and others in the student movement, these local strikes represent a higher level of struggle than a "symbolic" strike on broader issues.

These ideas were rejected by the bulk of the student movement. The war and racism, it understands, are the critical questions confronting all students. They affect every local and economic issue. They cannot be played down or put aside as secondary issues or in contradiction to local issues. Without confronting the war and racial oppression, there can be no anti-imperialist movement or any major victories to improve the conditions of students. A strike against the war is a political strike requiring a deeper understanding and higher level of interuniversity unity than did past strikes on local and economic issues. Furthermore, as an international strike it helps weld international unity against imperialism.

Overcoming Obstacles to Unity

Consequently the fight for the student strike became intertwined with the fight for a broad united coalition of students against this war, which does not contradict but enhances the anti-imperialist struggle.

Leading the fight against a broad united front at the conference was Progressive Labor, which maintained that a student strike is a diversion from an anti-imperialist movement. In opposing a united front of students against the war, they argued that the Student Mobilization Committee is a top-down coalition and ought to be dissolved. While supporting united front in words, Progressive Labor is opposed to the

unity of mass organizations, considering it an attempt to find a common denominator against the war and therefore watering down the anti-imperialist struggle.

To talk about a united front while attacking the organizations to which masses of students belong, is really to prevent united action and make a united front impossible. This approach the Progressive Labor spokesmen carried into the SDS Convention. Seeing the isolation this would impose on SDS, many SDS leaders who have been working for closer relations with SMC opposed them. The Convention decided to call for ten days of resistance struggle in April. This marked an important shift in the SDS on national demonstrations which they had opposed for several years. The recent successful national mobilizations helped to bring about this change. It was decided that while SDS would not call for the strike, it would not fight against it, and if the strike should be called—as it was—SDS would attempt to find some way of coordinating its activities with it.

Unable to get its full position into the SDS Convention, Progressive Labor sought to do so at the conference itself. With approximately ten of its members on hand a group of twenty young people, mostly SDS members, was organized to issue a position paper presenting alternative approaches. It called on all students throughout the country to support SDS' "ten days that shook the empire" and to dissolve the Student Mobilization Committee. This position was overwhelmingly rejected by the conference which voted overwhelmingly against it, with only about 75 voting for it.

Role of Black Militants and the Struggle Against Racism

Also of critical importance at the conference was the organization of a black caucus with an attendance of some 75-80 students from all over the country. This caucus, rejecting the 50-50 formula of black-white representation in the movement as paternalistic, called for the formation of an all-black anti-war, anti-draft organization which would hold a national convention in the coming months. The first action of this organizing committee was to issue a call to black students for an international strike against the war in Vietnam and in solidarity with black people in the United States. John Wilson, a leader of SNCC, was elected chairman of the organizing committee. On its steering committee are many black students from all over the country. The projected convention is sure to be one of the important developments within the student movement and must be given as much attention as the Student Mobilization Committee itself, if not more.

Among both black and white youth, there was a conscious struggle to avoid any split in the conference like that which threatened the New Politics Conference. But such attempts, based on good will alone, were not adequate to overcome the deep ideological problems which were manifested at the conference, making unity a difficult objective to achieve.

To most black students the formation of the national black anti-war, anti-draft organization did not mean a rejection of black-white unity but a demand for unity on a new basis of equality. It was an attempt to deal with the oppression of Negroes by monopoly capital and with subtle white chauvinism in the movement by building an independent base of black power.

While the formation of such a black student organization is of great importance to the student movement, in some ways the most critical occurrence was the debate which developed over bringing in the fight against racism. Unlike other developments at the conference, this one was not the continuation of a trend but a marked reversal. As many progressives have observed for some time, black-white relations within the movement have been steadily deteriorating. Organizations previously identified only with the fight for black liberation have taken positions against the war, but few demonstrations and few rallies have reflected any new level of black-white unity. Struggles for black liberation show a decline in white participation. For this sharp division, the responsibility must fall on the predominantly white organizations in the movement, particularly in the peace movement, that refuse to deal with the question of racial oppression except in the most minimal way.

Many white radicals applauded groups like SCLC, CORE and SNCC for taking a clear stand against the war. Negro leaders who attacked black militants for taking a position on the war, saying they were attempting to convert the black liberation struggle into an anti-war movement, were criticized by many, black and white. But today many of these same whites are taking the same position in reverse within the peace movement. They argue that any idea of raising the struggle for black liberation as a demand for the peace movement would be an attempt to turn it into a liberation movement, which they oppose as narrowing. This approach leads to an alliance based on inequality of black and white.

Such hesitation flows from a number of causes. First, among whites, there is a natural fear to undertake a difficult and sometimes lonely fight against racist thinking among whites. Nevertheless it must be

done. But underlying the hesitancy is a lack of understanding of the centrality of the race issue in relation to the direction of America and to every struggle taking place today. Seizing on the "parallel movement" approach, some argue that the task is to build a movement among whites today on immediate self-interest questions, confronting racism only at some later time when the need for unity becomes necessary to win power. What these people fail to see is that a movement against the war but not racism has no more chance for success today than did the effort to fight against militarization in pre-Hitler Germany without confronting anti-Semitism.

White radicals have learned this lesson as far as anti-Communism is concerned. Why not with regard to racism? Is it a smaller problem?

Arguments Weakening Struggle Against Racism Defeated

A similar concept is that since the escalation of the war in Vietnam the fight against racism must be temporarily put aside until the struggle against the war has been victorious. Then whites will come back into the struggle and help Negroes. Meanwhile, the struggle for Negro liberation is a secondary fight which, while continuing, must be subordinated to the larger question of ending the war.

In leading the struggle against these erroneous ideas, the Du Bois Clubs played a significant and critical role at the Student Mobilization Conference. They met, however, with sharp resistance, not so much from independent students but particularly from the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance who had mustered every available member to attend the conference.

Arguing what they considered to be a black nationalist position, they opposed any attempt to win white people to fight against racial oppression in the white communities. They maintained that racism is an abstract question, that even Johnson talks against racism. The only role for whites is to support the demand for self-determination for the black people. Since white students and white workers do not oppress black people, there is little they can do beyond such expressions of support. To attempt to win whites to the struggle against racial oppression would only be an attempt by whites to dictate policies to the black liberation movement, violating the right of black people to determine their own tactics and strategy.

While they mouthed radical phrases and talked of black nationalism, in reality their position was a capitulation to racism and the new attacks by the ruling class against the whole movement—attacks based

on racist ideology. They avoided a number of critical questions which the peace movement must deal with and did begin to deal with at the Student Mobilization Conference.

First is the distinction between the fight against racism and the fight against black oppression. While it is true that the source of the oppression of black people is the ruling class, the ideology of racism, propagated by the ruling class in order to rationalize and justify that oppression, is carried by and infects the white community as a whole. This ideology is used also as a weapon against the struggles of whites in all areas. It is the main weapon of the bourgeoisie to divide the working-class movement. It is now the main weapon against the struggle for peace.

Racism is not only used to justify war against colored peoples. It is also the rationale for building police departments in which the Birch Society is increasingly taking control, for building up the National Guard for the handling of "riots." While many whites are convinced that these measures are to be used solely against black people, already the experiences on campuses, at the Pentagon, at draft centers have proven that they will be used also against whites. In placing the "crime in the streets" program as the central question in 1968, Johnson seeks to avoid the critical question of the war, to confuse white people and to divert them from fear of nuclear disaster to a fear of black people who are struggling for their just demands. For this reason, the peace movement must deal with racism as a question not only for black people but as an evil which it must combat in its own self interest.

In those cases where black people have formed separate organizations, it must be recognized that at least in part this is due to the refusal of the predominantly white peace organizations to deal with the struggle against racism and to subtle forms of chauvinism within the peace movement, resulting in a continual tendency to subordinate black people as secondary partners within the movement. Moreover, where black people have formed separate organizations to be more effective in reaching and mobilizing black people in the struggle against the war and the system of black oppression as a whole, white people must still continue the struggle against the ideology of racism which permeates the white community. To assign this struggle to blacks alone is a capitulation to racism, for only whites can deal with racism among whites.

To fight for these concepts within the peace movement was the critical task—and still remains the critical task—of progressives throughout the country. It is to the credit of the Du Bois Clubs that they opened this struggle in a new way as their main contribution to the

Student Mobilization Conference. In an organized way, they brought these concepts into every workshop and discussed them in all panels. Particularly significant was the distribution by the Du Bois Clubs of the article "Racism and the Role of White Radicals" by Bob Heisler, dealing with the responsibility of whites in the struggle against black oppression.

Joining Fight Against War With Fight Against Racism

The sharpest debate took place in the workshop on Racism and the War, which emerged with a unanimous resolution, based on the following three points:

1. The predominantly white workshop endorsed the newly formed black student organization against the war and the draft and called upon the Student Mobilization to give full aid in helping to guarantee its success.
2. The Student Mobilization was called on to inject into the coming spring actions the struggle against racism and its effect on the white community, in particular on the peace movement.
3. The Student Mobilization was called on to undertake to aid and defend black militants who are being repressed by the government in the new wave of attack.

While the unanimous adoption of this resolution was an important development, it did not deal adequately with a number of specific points. When it came up on the floor of the plenary session the next day the first speaker, Robert Heisler, Educational Director of the Du Bois Clubs, made the following proposals: 1. That the Student Mobilization Committee arrange speaking engagements for Rap Brown, chairman of SNCC, at universities throughout the country. 2. That the Student Mobilization Committee organize to aid the defense of the five black Texas Southern students framed for conspiracy to commit murder in an attempt to cover up the racist attack by police on Texas Southern University. 3. That as part of an educational campaign among whites against racism a pamphlet be prepared exposing the "crime in the streets" program of the Johnson Administration and the anti-riot laws.

Although privately many believed that the Student Mobilization should not be taking on such campaigns, this resolution passed unanimously in the conference.

The next debate on racism took place over a resolution introduced by Bettina Aptheker, spokesman for the Communist Party and a member of the Du Bois Clubs. Her proposals were, first, that the call for the student strike should be amended to include support of the right

of self-determination of the black people and a struggle against racism, with the obvious implication that it be directed mainly at white students. Second, the title of the strike should be: An international student strike against the war, racial oppression and the draft.

This proposal was met warmly by the majority of black youth and with great interest by the majority of white youth, but was fought bitterly by the SWP and the Young Socialist Alliance. They attacked the proposal as an attempt to narrow the peace movement and to build a liberal civil rights organization aimed at taking over leadership of the black people.

For more than an hour and a half the debate raged within the conference, with many whites listening intently, hearing a debate on the question of racism developed in greater depth than ever before. Student after student, black and white, mounted the speaker's platform, arguing that if the Student Mobilization Committee was to have any relationship to black youth it must include this demand in its call, and that if the peace movement was to defend itself against the attacks of the ruling class, it had to take on the struggle among whites against racism, that in fact this was the only basis for black-white unity in the movement.

Seeing itself isolated and its position opposed by the majority of black youth at the conference, the SWP retreated. A compromise proposal was then put forward by Linda Morse calling for adoption of two resolutions: first, that Student Mobilization continue as a predominantly peace organization; second, that the conference go on record calling for an international student strike against war, racial oppression and the draft. Both received the unanimous vote of the conference.

Lessons of the Conference

The lessons of this conference are many.

For the first time since the thirties, there will be a student strike. Of course, though it has been agreed to in conference, it will take long, hard work and much skill to carry it through on each campus.

For the first time in years there will take place a mass student action which will mobilize both black and white students. But more significant is that the fact that this unity will be based on a struggle among the white students against racism in their own self-interest, thereby laying the basis for real equality in a coalition. Here, too, while the Student Mobilization Conference was an important step forward for the peace movement, many problems still remain.

The Student Mobilization Conference made an important contribu-

tion in the struggle against racism within the student and peace movements. It still remains to guarantee that these contributions are carried out in life and not left as mere slogans. The slogan against the war and racial oppression must be made a slogan in fact. The struggle against racism must be made part of the struggle for the student strike. Programs must be initiated. Conferences against police brutality should be organized, including students in the peace movement and black activists on black campuses and in the communities. Invitations should be issued for the TSU Five to appear on campuses throughout the country during the week of protest. Rap Brown should be invited to as many campuses as possible. The pamphlet which is being prepared dealing with the "crime in the streets" campaign and its relationship to the war should get as wide a circulation as possible.

This conference is another concrete proof of the critical importance in the student youth movement of a Marxist youth organization based on a working-class approach. The fact that only the Du Bois Clubs were capable of raising these questions shows the importance of such an approach.

This conference should be a clear example to all Marxist youth of the need to have their own organization in order to guarantee the injection of new concepts into the movement and to show that these approaches can be carried out in life. Important is the fact that a group of Marxist youth taking this question up almost alone were able to fight it through and to win wide support from independents. The struggle showed that if it bases itself on principle and on analysis, on understanding the trends and developments in the movement, a minority can make a vital contribution to the movement.

This conference demonstrates that white students can be made to understand their responsibility in the struggle. The struggle against racism can and will become the struggle of the whole student movement.

Lastly, to be successful the strike must be based on a concept of broad coalition. The conference included leading individuals from the YMCA, the Student Christian Movement and many other campus organizations of this type. This new development reflects growing radicalization of the student movement and the new breadth that radicalization is taking. It represents not just radicalization at the top but growing peace activities at the chapter level. No longer is it correct to talk about coalitions of traditional Left student organizations. Now it is possible and necessary to talk about united fronts including fraternities, sororities and religious youth organizations on the cam-

(Continued on page 23)

The Middle East Crisis*

The crisis which erupted in the Middle East last May, culminating in the six-day war in June, had its roots in the intrigues of U.S. imperialism, directed against the present government in Syria in the first place, and against the Nasser regime in the UAR as well. These intrigues, conducted with the collusion of ruling circles in Jordan and Israel, found expression in an attempted coup within Syria by counterrevolutionary forces based in Jordan, coupled with the massing of Jordanian troops on the Syrian border. They found expression also in the Skyhawk bomber deal with Israel, in the resort of the Israeli government to massive retaliations against both Syria and Jordan, and in a growing flood of calls by top Israeli officials for a large-scale invasion of Syria—calls which UN Secretary-General U Thant described as "so threatening as to be particularly inflammatory in the sense that they could only heighten emotions and thereby increase tensions on the other side of the lines."

It was the mounting threat of attack against Syria which led the Nasser government, in fulfillment of its mutual defense pact with that country, to mobilize its troops on the Israeli border, ask for the removal of the UN forces and blockade the Gulf of Aqaba. In this the UAR secured the support of Jordan and other Arab countries. The contention of the Israeli government that the purpose of these actions was an immediate joint invasion of Israel aimed at her extermination, and that hence no alternative existed but to go to war in self-defense against annihilation, is false.

True, demands for the destruction of Israel have been all too numerous in Arab circles, and undoubtedly there are forces in the Arab countries who wish to bring this about. This is especially true of extremely reactionary Arab forces, as the rulers of Saudi Arabia, who call most loudly for holy war against Israel. In this connection it is noteworthy that it is exactly these Arab "leaders" who are actively supported by Washington, London and Bonn. All such declarations must, of course, be unequivocally condemned. The right of Israel to exist as a state is beyond question and must be defended without reserve. Of course, all genocidal propaganda must be absolutely condemned as monstrous. We stand firmly for the peaceful

* Resolution adopted by the National Committee, CPUSA, January 16, 1968.

resolution of all conflicts in the Middle East, based on respect for the right of *all* peoples to exist.

It was not, however, Israel's existence which was at stake here. To be sure, with tensions at a peak and masses of troops mobilized on both sides, matters could all too easily get out of control. But there is no real evidence that the armed forces of the UAR and other Arab countries stood poised to invade Israel. On the contrary, the testimony of competent observers is overwhelmingly to the effect that the UAR had no plans to attack. And there is impressive evidence that the disposition of the UAR armed forces was essentially defensive, not offensive. Of all this, the Israeli government was undoubtedly aware. *This was not on Israel's part a war of self-defense; it was a calculated act of aggression, no less than was the Sinai invasion in 1956. As such, it demands the strongest denunciation.*

Further, the concept of "preventive war" to which the Israeli ruling forces appeal in justification of their actions must be rejected outright *in any case*. Especially in this day of the United Nations and nuclear weapons, "preventive war" can be regarded *only* as a subterfuge for aggression.

The sources of the aggression lie in the Israeli ruling clique's aggressive chauvinist policy of seeking to carve out a purely Jewish state in Palestine at the expense of the Arabs and in collusion with their imperialist oppressors. It is a policy which sees the future of Israel as being secured only through force of arms, which is based on the assertion that "Arabs understand only force." It is a policy which places Israel on the side of the U.S.-dominated oil cartel which extracts fantastic profits from the merciless exploitation of Arab masses, a policy founded on alliances with oil imperialism for the overthrow of anti-feudal, anti-imperialist regimes in the Arab countries. It is a policy which has again, as in 1956, led Israel into a brutal war of aggression marked by indiscriminate use of napalm and wholesale slaughter of Arabs, practices only too reminiscent of the slaughter of the Vietnamese people by U.S. imperialism.

Today the Israeli aggressors sit astride an occupied territory far bigger than Israel itself. And despite their insistence that they sought not territory but only security, they are now actively engaged in incorporating these conquered lands into a "Greater Israel," reducing the one million Arab inhabitants to colonial status and driving many of them anew into the status of refugees. The just resistance of the Arabs to this conquest is met with the blowing up of houses and the destruction of villages, with imprisonments, deportations and killings—with a growing brutality and terror which in turn only fan the

flames of resistance to ever greater intensity.

What has become inescapably clear is that the Israeli military victories, however spectacular, have solved nothing. The hostility of the Arabs has only been multiplied and their determination to regain the lands taken from them is unshakeable. The threat of full-scale war, with its deadly potential of nuclear conflict, is more ominous than ever. The Israeli victory itself has made it only too plain that the policy of force is a dead-end policy, one which can lead only to Israel's destruction.

Force cannot compel recognition or acceptance; indeed, it only plays into the hands of those extreme nationalist elements in the Arab world who seek Israel's annihilation, as well as into the hands of imperialist reaction. It can never bring peace to the Middle East. Nor can it be defended on the grounds that no alternative exists. There *is* another course, for which the Israeli people and all others who are concerned for Israel's security must press.

If Israel is to survive and prosper in the midst of an Arab world she must reverse the present policy and adopt a policy which seeks to become part of that world, to live with the Arab people as equals, in peace and friendship. Such a reversal means an end to alignments with the forces of imperialism, above all of U.S. imperialism—the deadliest foe of national freedom and progress in the Arab world and in Israel as well. It means recognition of the right of the refugees to repatriation or compensation, as repeatedly proposed by the UN.

To be sure, peace demands also an end to the state of belligerency on the part of the Arab states and the recognition of Israel's right to exist. But the initiative belongs with Israel. If she genuinely wishes to negotiate differences, to live in peace, she must first abandon her aggressive policies and give up the fruits of aggression. And on all questions she must be prepared to give as well as to ask.

It is only the victory of the forces of anti-imperialism which will bring peace and justice to the Middle East. The path to Israel's survival, therefore, must be sought through alignment with *these* forces, not with their enemies. Israel's policy must be one of "with the Arab peoples against imperialism, not with imperialism against the Arabs." Moreover, just as the American people are called upon to reject and oppose the Johnson policy of aggression in Vietnam, so are the Israeli people called upon to reject and oppose the present aggressive policy of their own government. Until they do so, they can only contribute to the growing isolation of Israel in the eyes of those who support peace and freedom throughout the world. Israel has already been the object of repeated UN denunciations for her

conduct, most recently for the annexation of the Old City of Jerusalem. If there is no change, the denunciations will only multiply.

It is those who oppose the policy of aggression who best serve Israel's interests, not those who succumb to bourgeois nationalism and engage in justification of aggression as "self-defense." Here, in the readiness to oppose the waging of an unjust war by one's own government, lies the touchstone of a real Marxist-Leninist, of an internationalist.

We greet the Communist Party of Israel, headed by Meier Vilner and Toufig Toubi, which has heroically met this test and today carries the banners of a truly progressive Israel. By the same token, we disassociate ourselves from those who have abandoned the Marxist-Leninist path and fallen prey to bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism, just as did the Social Democrats who, at the time of World War I, supported the aggression of their "own" imperialists in the name of "self-defense."

In our own country, it is essential to do battle against the reactionary, aggressive policies of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East no less vigorously than against its policies in Vietnam. Within the Jewish community in particular, it is necessary to expose U.S. imperialism as the enemy of the Israeli people no less than of the Arab people, and to seek the bending of all efforts toward influencing Israel to abandon its dependence on this false ally. Further, the outbreak of the Middle East crisis has given rise to an unprecedented wave of chauvinism—anti-Jewish and above all Anti-Arab. Both are equally poisonous; both must be equally combatted. It is especially urgent, however, to fight against the alarming surge of extremist Jewish nationalism and anti-Arab chauvinism which today exists in the United States, and which leads also to growing isolation from and conflict with the struggles of the Negro people in the United States and colored peoples generally.

No less poisonous is the upsurge of anti-Sovietism which has accompanied the Israeli aggression. Indeed, the Soviet Union is accused of nothing less than arming the Arab countries with the aim of bringing about Israel's destruction. This is coupled with the allegations of official persecution of Soviet Jews which have for some time served reaction as its prime instrument for promoting anti-Sovietism. But these are outright fabrications, whose propagation can only harm the cause of peace and national freedom and deliver the Jewish people into the hands of their enemies.

The Soviet Union, to be sure, has firmly supported the forces of national liberation in the Arab world, as everywhere else, and has

provided arms to the UAR and Syria for the purpose of defending themselves against imperialist attack. At the same time, the record shows, not only did the Soviet Union stand in the forefront of the fight to establish the State of Israel, together with a Palestine Arab state, but since then has steadfastly sought to restrain those who would resort to force on *either* side and upheld the policy of seeking the resolution of all conflicts through peaceful negotiation. The future of Israel, therefore, lies not in anti-Sovietism but in anti-colonialism which will assure friendly relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

* * *

On the road we have here outlined lie the freedom and well-being of both Israel and the Arab countries, whose interests do not stand in conflict but are closely interdependent, not only with one another but with all the forces in the world aligned against imperialism and war. We appeal, therefore, to the American people and in the first place to the American Jewish people to fight vigorously for those policies which will truly bring peace to the Middle East. At stake, in this age of nuclear war, is not only the future of Israel and the Arab peoples but that of mankind itself.

(Continued from page 28)

pushes. This is a new development. Also important is the fact that these organizations today reject, as did the New Left almost two years ago, all concepts of redbaiting and anti-Communism.

Committees must now be built on campuses throughout the country. Critically important to the formation of each committee will be the struggle for breadth, for the involvement of the same kind of forces in participation locally as were involved in the national conference. Committees cannot be satisfied with only the participation of SDS, the Du Bois Clubs, independent peace organizations, etc., but must also guarantee the participation of black student unions, fraternities, sororities, student government organizations and religious student organizations from the very beginning. In other words it is necessary to guarantee the participation of organizations which in fact represent the entire campus and the overwhelming majority of the students, in this way guaranteeing the strength and breadth and the full victory of the student strike on campuses throughout the country.

With such an approach the world will witness one of the greatest displays of international student unity against imperialism. The student strike will further isolate and weaken imperialism. Everything must be done to guarantee its success!

A Not So Revolutionary Strategy

Last year there appeared in English translation a book by the French economist-philosopher, André Gorz, *Strategy for Labor—A Radical Proposal*,* first published in France in 1964 under the title, *Strategie Ouvriere et Neocapitalisme*.

It won immediate acclaim among some ideologists of the New Left. Herbert Marcuse claimed "the book may go a long way in breaking the parochialism of the American Left and in giving them a wider horizon."

The *Harvard Review* held that, "allowing for certain important modifications, one can view this work as a model for the kind of manifesto that the American New Left lacks."

Barrington Moore, Jr., author of *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, saw the "merit and great appeal of the book" in its ability to project a strategy which avoids the evils of "the futility of gradualism and reformism" on the one hand, and the "attempts to change society by force from above" which "have produced the horrors of Communist dictatorships," on the other hand.

Such hossanas are not so much for the incisive moral indictment Gorz makes of capitalism, which in this day and age is not exactly unique, but for the "new revolutionary strategy" he offers the labor movement. Since the ideas and theories he advances have come to exert some influence among radicals and, even among some who proudly call themselves Marxists, they merit examination.

Gorz's book consists of two parts: the first, and by far the larger, is devoted to elaborating his strategy; the second, is an application of this strategy to the labor movement in the Common Market countries. We limit ourselves to the first and basic part of the book.

Gorz's Main Premises

The chief premises of *Strategy for Labor* may be summed up as follows:

1. Hunger and poverty are no longer the motivating force for

* André Gorz, *Strategy for Labor—A Radical Proposal*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1967, \$5.95.

replacing capitalism with socialism. Capitalism is able to absorb all demand for the satisfaction of immediate needs: the struggle for immediate needs "no longer brings the entire social order into radical question" (p. 4).

2. "The weakness of the working class and socialist movement in all capitalist countries and particularly in France has up to the present been its more or less pronounced inability to link the struggle for socialism to the everyday demands of the workers . . ." (p. 5).

The reason for this, he holds, is that "For at least the past thirty years, the Communist movement has propagated the prophecy that capitalism would inevitably, catastrophically collapse. In the capitalist countries, its policy has been to 'wait for the revolution.' The internal contradictions were supposed to sharpen, the condition of the toiling masses to worsen. Inevitably the working class would rise up" (p. 5).

3. Since socialism will not come in this way, a new model of how to get to socialism is needed. Gorz contends that "labor struggles would indirectly and involuntarily tend to play into the hands of monopoly capitalism if they limited themselves to demands for greater consumption, and if they did not *at the same time* demand power and control . . . in short if they did not challenge the purposes of societal work and capitalist civilization itself" (p. 178). (My emphasis—J. W.) He then proposes a "new strategy and new goals which will indivisibly unite wage demands, the demand for control and the demand for self-determination by the workers of the conditions of work" and which will "wrest from each employer (and from the State) a vital piece of his power of decision and control" (p. 43).

As against "reformist reforms," in which category Gorz places consumption demands and "quantitative reforms," he proposes as a means of winning such pieces of control, "revolutionary reforms" or "qualitative demands" that would "bring into question . . . the workers' condition at the place of work, the subordination of consumption to production . . . the capitalist relations of production" (p. 26).

Criticizing the unions for advancing demands of a "defensive character," he calls on them to put forward demands for reforms which will "provoke crises."

Demanding that workers fight for control of production to determine what shall be produced and for what purpose, Gorz likewise advocates control of government as the means of determining the quality and content of community life.

Such, in brief, is the essence of Gorz's radical proposals.

Structural Reforms

This strategy Gorz calls the fight for structural reforms. The structural reform concept was first pioneered by the Communist Party of Italy and other Communist parties have been elaborating the specific applications of such reforms to their national conditions. But the Communist concept of structural reforms is vastly different from that advanced by Gorz.

The Communists view this fight as one directed at curbing the powers of monopoly and of state monopoly capitalism, a struggle on all anti-monopoly fronts mounting ever higher to the seizure of state power; a concept of the struggle which does not end with victory of an anti-monopoly coalition, but continues in struggle against the forces of monopoly (which will fight ferociously to maintain its power) until capitalism itself is overthrown and replaced with socialism.

Gorz sees the aim of structural reforms as seizing pieces of power, a "progressive conquest of power," in "making power tangible now." In other words, creating islands of socialism which are built within the shell of capitalism and somehow co-exist with it. These he sees as "counter-powers" (here we have the industrial corollary of the "counter community") in which workers learn the meaning of self-power, self-determination and thus come face to face with socialist power as an immediate question.

The chief direction of this progressive (step-by-step) conquest of power is the plant, the community, the locality, in a word, a decentralized direction to guard against the danger of bureaucratic centralization, which Gorz sees as the common evil of all industrial societies, socialist and capitalist alike (his one exception being Yugoslavia).

Gorz's concept rests on a belief that state monopoly capitalism will permit such a progression of power to these islands of socialism.

What we have here, then, is not an unrelenting struggle against monopoly capitalism which ends with the accession to power of the working class and its allies, but a phased, step-by-step encroachment on monopoly power at specific points, entailing a more or less prolonged period of existence on the foundation of capitalism, unchallenged and unmolested by monopoly. Gorz does not discuss the actual taking of power by the working class anywhere in his book. His "radical strategy" leads, therefore, to nothing else but a reform of capitalism. It might be well to recall the early Communist colonies in the United States which, for all their high ideals in subjective motivation, ended up, objectively, with nothing more

than a reformist influence on capitalism. For the capitalist economy which surrounded them was incomparably stronger and was decisively able to engulf and inundate them.

An Elitist Approach

Moreover, Gorz' strategy for "bringing the future into the present" by establishing bits of socialism here and there depends for its success, not on the industrial working class, which he really ignores, but on the technicians and intellectuals who, according to Gorz, are that part of the working class which really sees and understands what is wrong and has the competence to carry out this strategy. His approach is thus an elitist one, underscoring the essentially non-mass struggle and reformist character of his structural reform concept.

That Gorz is not addressing himself to the elimination of capitalism, but to its reform under cover of a radical strategy, becomes evident from his contention that it is not exploitation that is the issue as much as exploitation for *waste*. He wants the workers to fight for the right to produce useful things, to concern themselves with the *quality* of production and consumption. In other words, he wants a socialist man *en masse*, with a socialist attitude to *capitalist* production, *before* there is socialism and as the *means* of progressively getting there. Truly, the cart before the horse!

True, Gorz says, that every conquest of such "autonomous power" by the working class will sharpen class contradictions. But nowhere does he say how. He does not discuss the likely responses of monopoly power to the setting up of workers' autonomous power; that such responses, judging by all past history, would be ferocious and move in the direction of fascism. Nor does he discuss what measures workers would have to take to defend their new-won power. To say the least, this appears to be irresponsible. But it does serve to underscore the conclusion that this strategy is essentially reformist, one of living with capitalism and of capitalism living with it, rather than a life and death struggle between them.

All This, and Syndicalism, Too

Not only is *Strategy for Labor* an elitist design for reformism in radical guise, it is also liberally interlaced with syndicalism, with the idea that the trade unions alone are enough to bring socialism. Thus, he states, "the union, much more than the party, is the body in which class consciousness in a neo-capitalist society is catalyzed and elabo-

rated" (p. 13). To be sure, Gorz tips his hat to the role of a vanguard party, once in a footnote where he speaks of a "radical party," and once in his introduction to the American edition, where he casually refers to the role of "the democratic political party" (?).

But there is no elaboration of the role of such a party in his radical strategy; no defining of the difference between such a working-class party and the unions; no definition of the role of each and the relationship of one to the other.

If his contention that the unions (which are basically organizations of the industrial working class) will bring socialism, without a vanguard party, appears to contradict his reliance on a technical-intelligentsia elite as the human instrument of social change, it does. But this is one of the many contradictions in a book which is a compound of reformism, elitism, syndicalism and communal, local socialism. Yet this contradictory, inconsistent strategy, which really ends up in reformism, is advanced as the answer to what Gorz calls the "crisis of working class theory" today!

The Role of Reforms

Gorz's treatment of the question of reforms is one that abstracts the reform from the *struggle* for the reform. What matters with him is the "magical" quality of a reform. Either it is a "bad" one (quantitative, reformist, consumption, gradualist), with which he identifies both the trade unions and the Communists, or it is a "good" one (qualitative, revolutionary, one capable of bringing the system into question, of producing a crisis) on which his strategy is based. The "trick" is in advancing the right kind of reform. Never mind what the workers may think or whether they want to fight for it or not.

Completely ignored in this concept of reform is the context in which the struggle for the reform takes place: the level of development of the contending forces, the overall economic and political situation in a given country, its international position, etc. And, most important, there is no mention on how such reforms are used to educate the working people, politically and ideologically. For, as Gus Hall puts it: "The answer to whether a demand in essence is reformist or not cannot be found in the demand *per se*. The answer is in how one uses the struggle for such a demand." (Remarks at a Youth Commission Seminar, December 21, 1967.)

Neither the working class, nor Marxism, considers the aim of the struggle for reforms as one to provoke crises. On the contrary, the working class invariably enters into struggle to seek solutions to the

crises and critical situations produced and provoked by capitalism. This is why its struggles, nearly always, *begin* as defensive struggles (exceptions being such great offensive battles as the organizing strikes of the thirties, the great 8-hour day struggles, etc.).

The history of working-class progression toward socialism is one of ever-advancing efforts to overcome the effects of the anarchy of production, the chaos and disorders—small and cataclysmic—of exploitative society, the numerous small and large crises with which capitalism confronts the working class daily.

Alienation and Class Struggle

When workers fight speed-up on the job, they are rebelling against the daily production grind through which the bosses try to get maximum production in every 60 seconds. It is a daily battle in which the workers seek to bring a harmony between themselves and the machines—an elemental striving to end the conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production, expressing an instinctive urge toward socialism. Unlike its forbears, who lashed out against their alienation by smashing the machines, the modern working class seeks to end its alienation by coming to terms with the machines and directing the fight against the owners of the means of production who stand in the way.

The underlying theme of Gorz's book is the alienation of the working class. He does not see in the class struggle the means whereby the working class seeks to end its alienation and that it is the only class capable of achieving it. Rather, he sees the working class as a victim passively accepting its alienation and incapable of understanding it. That is why he turns to the intelligentsia as the elite group which can understand it. Conscious recognition of alienation by those who fight for qualitative reforms is key for Gorz. The actual struggle against the *roots* of alienation—a struggle which will finally overcome alienation whether or not the participants ever heard of the term—does not exist for him.

It is in the course of actual struggle on real, tangible issues—and not vague abstractions—that the decisive sectors of the working class can acquire socialist consciousness, with the aid of the Marxist party. In this manner the working class learns to transform defensive struggles into truly offensive ones—into struggles on the economic, political, electoral and other fronts—for the all-encompassing assault on the citadels of capitalist state power, to end the exploitative system once and for all, and to open the way for building a society in which man

and machine are in harmony because the relations of man to man are in harmony and cooperation.

"Neo-Capitalism"

In the French, the title of Gorz's book is *Labor Strategy and Neo-Capitalism*. This term "neo-capitalism" is an invention which, in Gorz's use of it, obscures the actual state of capitalism in the countries he deals with. What exists in these countries is state monopoly capitalism, a term seldom to be found in Gorz's book.

State monopoly capitalism, as it has developed in the last two decades, represents the economic intervention of the state with the aim of saving monopoly capitalism from its difficulties and contradictions at the expense of the working class and oppressed people. To the degree that the term "neo-capitalism" is used interchangeably for state monopoly capitalism one might justify its use. But Gorz does not use it this way. His usage is tied up with his thesis that modern capitalism, with the help of state intervention, has corrected its old deficiencies, has become more or less stabilized, and is now able to absorb the cost of making concessions to workers' immediate economic, consumption demands, without harming their profits. According to him, under "neo-capitalism"—which he also describes as "mature capitalism"—the difference between classes pertain less to the quantity than to the quality of consumption!

From this concept of capitalism he concludes that the struggle for *more* no longer contains any revolutionary potential. He, therefore, eliminates the struggle for immediate economic demands as a means whereby workers come into conflict with the ruling class, as a starting point from which, along with the fight for immediate social and political demands, the many-sided assault on state monopoly capitalism is unfolded.

To the worker, the fight for *more*—for consumption (quantitative) demands—is not only a fight against existing poverty, but also a fight against being squeezed down into poverty, a constant fight to protect what he has won and to prevent the erosion of his consumption gains through inflation, higher taxes and other indirect means. This entails a fight for immediate social and political demands as well, and carrying the struggle into the political arena.

All this—which we see as an everyday reality of life all around us—Gorz wipes out with one sweep in his assertion that the difference in the amount of consumption between the classes has been reduced to what is an insignificant margin. The reality of the class struggle

and of the anti-monopoly struggle, as it is, and as it is shaping up, is thus obscured and nullified by his concept of "neo-capitalism." Obscured, too, is the fact that the number of victims of monopoly capitalism has grown to a vast array of forces embracing the overwhelming majority of the population. This opens up the prospect of a grand alliance led by the working class, the chief victim of monopoly, for an all-sided, nationwide struggle against state monopoly capitalism.

But to Gorz this is no longer possible. Instead, we must "sneak up" on monopoly, build oases of socialism here and there and slip one over on the wily monopolists who, with state help, are able to buy off all who fight for immediate demands!

Nor is the "neo-capitalist" term a substitute for examining the context of today's struggles: a new stage in the world revolutionary process in which a world system of socialist states has emerged, gaining strength from year to year; in which scores of countries have won or are fighting for national independence; in which a new world relationship of forces has come to the fore.

Strategy Devoid of a Living Context

Nowhere in his book does Gorz subject these realities to any searching analysis in terms of how they affect a labor strategy. Strange indeed is a strategy for labor which ignores the struggle against imperialist war, omits the mobilization of the masses in support of wars of national liberation and limits itself to Western Europe with respect to the internationalization of the class struggle, ignoring Asia, Africa and Latin America. There is not even a whisper in Gorz's book on the urgency today of international trade union unity—which must, of course, include the working class of the chief imperialist power in the "free world," together with that of Western Europe.

As to the role of socialism—as it exists on our planet in the Soviet Union and the other socialist states—with its revolutionary influence on world development, it not only doesn't figure in Gorz's strategy, it is alluded to in passing and then by invidious comparison with capitalism!

Such omissions are no small, casual oversights. They are a deliberate disregard of prime and paramount realities of our times which have the most decisive bearing on the course of all development that cannot be ignored by any revolutionary. Certainly, the reformist and class-partnership labor leaders, like Meany, do not ignore them! But Gorz does not direct his fire at the reactionary position of such labor

leaders on these questions. Completely ignoring the labor-leader guardians of the status quo, he turns his fire on the Communists!

The Intolerability of the System

To assert, as Gorz does, that Communists are "revolutionaries in waiting" because they count on the automatic collapse of capitalism is such a patent falsehood that it requires no documented refutation here. The mountains of evidence that can be compiled to show that Communists, from Marx down to this day, far from holding such a notion, always stressed that the automatic collapse of capitalism could not be expected.

To insist, as Gorz does, that Marx's "law of impoverishment" is the root cause for this fatal Communist weakness, is to peddle confusion thrice compounded. It is a counterfeit to present this question as though Marx held that the tendency toward impoverishment generated by capitalism was absolute and would reduce the working class to pauperism regardless of working class resistance.

Gorz's failure to understand how the tendency to impoverishment actually operates under capitalism leads him to turn upside-down the significance of state intervention into the economy today, to see an easing, instead of a sharpening, of capitalist contradictions at the most basic levels.

For it is the law of impoverishment, operating in concert with other objective laws of capitalist development, discovered and analyzed by Marx and Engels and further elaborated by Lenin in conditions of monopoly and imperialism, which is the fundamental basis for the vast growth of the intolerability of the system of capitalism and for the rapid (historically) acceleration of the worldwide revolutionary process. And it is all this which makes necessary the economic intervention by the state—state monopoly capitalism—in an attempt to save the capitalist system.

The all-pervading growth of the oppressive intolerability of the system (including, but not limited to hunger and poverty in vast areas, encompassing no less than 20 per cent of the population in the United States) that is becoming manifest to increasing numbers of people and creating favorable conditions for a more rapid radicalization of the working class and its allies in struggle.

This radicalization does not come to all sections of the working class equally at one fell swoop. It does not come as the result of this or that particular demand alone; or, as the result of a crisis-provoking act; or, a seizure of a bit of power; or, as the result of

some new, brilliant, untested idea concocted by an individual in isolation from the struggles of the working class.

Radicalization is a process involving the combination of many factors, including the role of a Marxist vanguard party of the working class. It is the presence of such a party which helps to transform elementary radicalization into class and socialist consciousness, defeating the influence of reformism and petty-bourgeois radicalism among the masses, uniting the working class and its allies in the struggles of today around class struggle policies. Without such a party, representing the organized might and unity of the working class, there can be no victorious struggle for socialism.

Within such a context, the struggle for structural reforms is a viable, anti-monopoly concept which, in these times, has great and growing meaning, one that requires far more study and elaboration by Communists and any others claiming to be revolutionaries.

But such is not the context of Gorz's concept of structural reforms. His book, in a word, is a petty-bourgeois, radicalist recipe, the essential essence of which is reformism in a Left guise. Revolutions can't be cooked up to order, not even by a French chef. The working class cannot be expected to perform in accord with the wishful timetables laid down for it, nor to respond to the alluring revolutionary phrase that fails to answer what comes next after we win this reform, qualitative or otherwise.

That the book is hailed by petty-bourgeois radicals is no surprise. That it will meet with little or no response in the labor movements and working classes of France, Italy and the United States, should also come as no surprise.

Marx and Engels described the petty-bourgeois socialism of Sismondi in France as utopian and reactionary. "Ultimately, when stubborn historical facts had dispersed all intoxicating effects of self-deception, this form of socialism ended up in a miserable fit of the blues." (*The Communist Manifesto*.)

This book was discussed by a group of trade unionists in Chicago not long ago. Some found it interesting in that it was provocative and had some ideas "to make you think about." All were agreed that they knew of no workers who would accept it as a workable strategy for labor. As one young worker put it, "This is an *if only* book." Asked what he meant, he replied, "If only my gran'ma had wheels, she'd be a streetcar."

That, I believe, is the measure of its relevancy to reality. Its ideas do not meet the test of life.

HERBERT APTHEKER

A Doomed System

Recently Walter Lippmann was asked: "Are these the worst times there've been in your lifetime? For the country?"

Mr. Lippmann—whose active role in U.S. life goes back to the 1910's—replied:

Yes, I think so. I'm more worried about the state of the country than I think I've ever been before. And it's not because I'm afraid of nuclear war. I don't think we'll get to that. What I see is the disintegration of hope and belief and will—will power and morale . . . we have despair and deterioration. (*New Republic*, Dec. 9, 1967.)

Mr. Lippmann's easy dismissal of the possibility of nuclear war came prior to the recent disclosures that the use of tactical atomic and/or nuclear weapons was being considered in Washington; and the open advocacy of such use by savants like William Buckley, Jr. (*New York Post*, February 22, 1968). But now I wish to comment on Lippmann's theme of disintegration, despair and deterioration.

Mr. Lippmann's worry certainly is justified for the evidences of decay lie all about us. These make up a good part of Archibald MacLeish's new book, *Essays and Addresses* (Boston, 1968, Houghton Mifflin); they find expression in the recent writings of Henry Steele Commager—thus, "we find ourselves not only confused but impotent, impotent intellectually and morally . . . we [have] lost confidence in ourselves, dissipated our energies, dissolved our dreams, substituted anti-principles for principles, and anti-policies for policies . . . we have lost confidence in man." (*New York Times Book Review*, January 28, 1968.)

I think U.S. history does not show another occasion when so prestigious a body as The National Committee for an Effective Congress concludes after examining the state of the nation that: "America has experienced two great crises in her history: the Civil War and the eco-

nomic Depression of the 1930's. The country may now be on the brink of a third trauma, a depression of the national spirit." This Committee found "malaise," "frustration," "alienation," as appropriate words to describe dominant moods; it stated that, "At all levels of American life, people share similar fears, insecurities and gnawing doubts to such an intense degree that the country may in fact be suffering from a kind of national nervous breakdown." (*New York Times*, December 26, 1967.)

The present writer is not professionally equipped, of course, in psychiatric terms, but he wonders if "nervous breakdown" is not more than rhetoric now. Thus, the national newspaper supplement, *Parade*, in its issue dated October 29, 1967, found "Today's younger generation [to be] depressed, disillusioned, disappointed disenchanted with and rapidly alienating itself from the nation's leadership." As for that leadership, surely the signs of breakdown are positively clinical; how else shall one describe the report published in the *Wall Street Journal* (on the day after the 50th Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution!) from its Washington correspondent, Henry Gemmill: "The intriguing thing about folks in Lyndon Johnson's executive branch of government nowadays is not what they're doing—very little new—but what they're suffering: Disenchantment. Exhaustion. Resentment. Listlessness. Terror. Disorientation. Suspicion. Joylessness. Hate . . . Worst of all, a loss of self-confidence." Later in this same dispatch, Mr. Gemmill does not fail to use the word that immediately leaps to one's mind—"paranoia."

The disintegration is most acute in the United States because this country is the bastion of what remains of imperialism; a centerpiece in the British *New Statesman* (October 27, 1967) generalized the matter this way: "The West is a civilization without a philosophy and is rotting at the core because of this." As for analysis, the author, James Hemming, went further than one is likely to find in the "respectable" American press: "Man treated as worker-consumer, however fat his wage packet or salary cheque, is man without dignity, manipulated, degraded man, frustrated man, alienated man. This is exactly where commercialized society has got us."

Marx is not mentioned, presumably because the borrowing is so heavy that acknowledgement was held to be unnecessary! And it is not "the West" because "man treated as worker-consumer" is not confined to the West. This writer visited India, Pakistan, Nepal, Thailand and Hong Kong during the last months of 1967, which is about as far from "the West" as one can get; the manipulation, de-

gradation, frustration and alienation were as vivid as in Britain or in the United States.

Moreover, while Mr. Hemming emphasizes that the matter of income is not necessarily decisive, it surely is significant. Marx did, of course, insist that miseries need not be material alone; that the spiritual and psychological and moral were infinitely important exactly because one was considering *human* suffering.

Still, the reality of the material miseries needs emphasis especially in the United States. For while the myth of "People's Capitalism" has been dispelled and even the President acknowledges the existence of poverty in Golden America, its magnitude and intensity tend to be ignored. Taking even the absurdly inadequate Government figure of a family income of \$3,000 a year as the minimum for "nonpoverty" status, one finds today that one out of every eight persons in metropolitan areas and one out of every four persons in rural areas lives in families below that really impoverished level. Among just rural Americans, at least fourteen millions live in impoverishment, as defined by the Government—of whom, by the way, eleven millions are white persons.

New York City reported, at the close of 1967, that its relief rolls had risen nearly 40 per cent in the preceding eighteen months; the rolls continue to grow by about 14,000 persons every month. As of the beginning of 1968 about 800,000 persons within the five boroughs of New York City were on relief—i.e., one out of ten. Half a million of those receiving public assistance are children, which means one out of five of the City's children. These figures take no account, of course, of New Yorkers who are eligible for relief but have not applied for it; Mitchell I. Ginsberg, the newly-appointed Human Resources Administrator, has stated that there are as many people in this group as there are on the relief rolls!

* * *

Neither Lippmann nor MacLeish nor Commager offer explanations for the unprecedented despair and alienation they describe. Similarly, Hans J. Morgenthau in asking "What Ails America?" (*New Republic*, October 28, 1967) sees "the decomposition of those ties of trust and loyalty which link citizen to citizen and the citizens to the government," but its source is not clear to him, except as this lies in the unspeakable war being waged by the U.S. government against the people of Vietnam. The latter, however, while carrying with it enormous capacity for damage and vitiating of the quality and texture of U.S.

life, is reflective of deeper sources of such damage and vitiating. That is, that the United States government is capable of waging so atrocious a war is itself symptomatic of more basic corruption and rot at its very foundations. True it certainly is, as Dr. Du Bois warned in his characteristically prophetic way, back in 1904, "I believe that the wicked conquest of weaker and darker nations by white and stronger but foreshadows the death of that strength." But the path of racist conquest itself reflects the logic of a structurally parasitic and exploitative social order and there one has, I think, the root of the paranoia now dominating official U.S. conduct and policy.

In biblical language one may speak of the reality of retribution; in psychiatric language, of paranoia; in Marxist language, of antagonism and contradiction and the inexorable trauma these produce.

Something of the difficulties of U.S. ruling-class policy lies in what Senator Fulbright has called "the arrogance of power," and even more in what Senator McCarthy calls "the limits of power."

The heart of the difficulties lies in the fact that that government is one resting upon and serving a system of the private possession of the means of production and the private appropriation of profits. Such relations of production and such motivations are obsolete and therefore regressive. Being historically regressive, its foreign policy is aggressive and the favored domestic policy is more and more repressive.

The obsolescence—manifested in the spread of socialism and the decline of colonialism—means that the aggressive and repressive policies are not only anti-human but also doomed—I mean doomed in a practical sense. They are not viable and so U.S. policy—with all its wealth and power—goes from one disaster to another.

Admitting this for those wedded to the corpse is psychologically impossible; hence, real paranoia appears. That is, since reality is insufferable it is denied and a world whose content fits the needs of an obsolescent order is imaginatively constructed.

Fundamental rationalizations for this insanity are racism and anti-Communism and both are intense in terms of the Southeast Asia policy of the United States. This helps explain the tenacity with which that policy is pressed, despite overwhelming world condemnation and mounting domestic opposition and disillusionment. It also underlines the central significance and the organic connection between both the struggle against racism at home and the struggle to stop the war in Vietnam.

* * *

The alienation that is everywhere apparent may also be viewed as

a sign of health and I think that to view it that way is nearer the truth than to see it—as is usual—as simply a reflection of sickness. Symptoms of sickness, indeed, are themselves physiological forms of struggle against illness; manifestations of alienation on a broad scale reflect the essential soundness of the population which increasingly finds intolerable the anti-human policies of its doomed rulers.

Professor Morgenthau complains rightly that “deception [by the U.S. Government] is being practiced not occasionally as a painful necessity dictated by the reason of state, but consistently as a kind of light-hearted sport through which the deceiver enjoys his power.”

More, deception is now normal because it is needed; the policy is so awful and so doomed that it must be enveloped in falsification. But the masses of people have quite different needs and in time—despite a natural, patriotic bias—will become persuaded that they are being fed a diet of deceit and will demand a change of menu. The populace is becoming persuaded of this and is raising this demand. That is the point of what appears to be alienation and doubt and disillusionment.

The need now is for boldness as well as for breadth and people will respond to both. People are—and have been—responding to both. This is why over 100,000 Californians put the Peace and Freedom party on the ballot in 1968, and why over 10,000 voters in a single district in Brooklyn put the first Peace and Freedom ticket in the United States on the ballot back in 1966.

Indeed, the need for boldness is so great that without it one will not achieve breadth. The state of our nation never needed the passion of the revolutionary more than now. Of course, as William Z. Foster emphasized to this writer, the need of a revolutionary is for both patience and passion. Both come out of conviction and the patience is needed for the staying power and the passion is needed, too. In the 1950's so much energy had to be expended to maintain one's “patience”—to endure—that perhaps some of the energy needed for the passion was lost. At any rate, both are needed now and I would say that in what remains of the 1960's it is revolutionary passion that is required above all. The discontent is there; the searching is profound; the need for guidance is palpable and the opportunities for service from Communists—with all that sacred word evokes of commitment and leadership—has never been greater than it is today, right here in the United States.

February 22, 1968

Lessons from the Setback in Indonesia

At the end of 1965, following what was known as the September 30th Movement, power in Indonesia was seized by the military Right under Generals Suharto and Nasution. Hundreds of thousands of Communists and other patriots and democrats were slaughtered in one of the worst counter-revolutionary terrors the world has ever witnessed. President Sukarno was shorn of his power, the anti-imperialist direction of Indonesia's policy was altered, and the democratic rights of the people crushed.

How this happened is the concern of peoples throughout the world. How was it possible for a mass Communist Party, with some three million members and ten million votes, to suffer such a sudden and overwhelming defeat?

The Indonesian Communists have suffered a terrible setback but the movement still lives. They are patiently rebuilding their forces and working to reorganize their Party. Towards that end they are discussing their experiences and assessing the reasons for their heavy defeat. Some of these assessments have found their way into print and are being distributed in Indonesia itself. One such document has been received in the United States entitled “For A Sound Indonesian Revolution” and issued by a group calling itself “The Marxist-Leninist Group of the Indonesian Communist Party.” We reprint herewith this document, with only minor deletions. We are grateful to the British Communist journal Marxism Today for the definitions of many terms used in the document and other explanatory material, as well as some of the subheads.—The Editors.

Introduction

One year has elapsed since the world was shocked by reports from Indonesia saying that on October 1st, 1965, a military and political action had taken place in the capital of the Republic of Indonesia which has become known as the September 30th Movement. According to those who participated in it, the movement was spearheaded against the subversive plot hatched by the so-called Generals' Council, a group sponsored by the CIA, and aiming to implement criminal plans against the Republic of Indonesia and the Revolution. The September 30th Movement set up a Revolutionary Council comprised of NASAKOM* elements which, they contended, was consistently to carry out the Five Principles of the Revolution, as laid down in President Sukarno's teaching, and to continue the pursuit of an independent, active and peaceful foreign policy against neo-colonialism, colonialism and imperialism.

* President Sukarno's concept of a national coalition government—NAS representing the National Party; A standing for Agama, the religious parties; KOM for the Communist Party.

However, the progressives and revolutionaries in Indonesia and in the world at large began to harbor certain doubts that this movement would promote the revolutionary cause. In effect, it proved to be merely a counter-coup which failed to secure active support by the Party and the working people and, therefore, stood aloof from progressive revolutionary doctrines. In all their actions the Communists follow the ABC of the Revolution according to which it is impossible for any movement to win a victory if its ideals and goals lack the support of broad sections of the working people.

These doubts have proved well grounded and were confirmed by facts. The attempt by the September 30th Movement to engineer a counter-coup failed. The counter-revolutionaries have succeeded in gaining control of the situation and consolidating their forces. A ruthless campaign of white terror ensued which transgressed all the limits of inhumanity. Hundreds of thousands of progressive revolutionaries and innocent people, ranging from babies to old men, lost their lives in this unprecedented massacre. Hundreds of thousands of activists from progressive organizations were thrown into prisons and concentration camps, the top Party leadership, including such prominent men as Comrades D. N. Aidit, M. H. Lukman and Njoto, also fell victim to the terror campaign. In fact, the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI) and other mass revolutionary organizations were paralyzed. The Indonesian Revolution suffered a major setback. Counter-revolutionaries rejoiced in their victory.

The failure of the September 30th Movement has greatly harmed the cause of the national Indonesian Revolution and the international front of anti-imperialism and peace.

Naturally, deep in their hearts all progressive people, and revolutionaries in Indonesia and in the entire world, began to ask themselves how it could have happened that a small group of leaders of the Communist Party of Indonesia, a Party seasoned by a heroic 45-year-long struggle, a Party that demonstrated its strength during the celebrations of its 45th anniversary, a Party that commanded admiration among friends and fear among foes, got themselves involved in the September 30th Movement, which was of a purely adventurist nature, and was used by reaction to strike a blow at the Party, a blow that has stunned it and left it unconscious for a long time. Where does our main mistake stem from? Or has it been preordained that such a tragic fate should have befallen us? Did we have to pay for the Revolution so dearly and in vain?

It is but natural that the revolutionary and progressive forces in Indonesia and throughout the world demand that the leadership

of the Indonesian Communist Party be held responsible, for as the 1960 Moscow Statement says, each party is answerable to the workers and the people of its own country, to the international Workers' and Communist movement.

It is vitally important to study and analyze the development of the PKI during the past few years, putting special emphasis on the negative and positive aspects so as to have a scientifically precise answer to the question: what is the main cause of defeat, and what lesson should be learnt from it both by the PKI and the international Workers' and Communist movement. A correct answer to this question is of great theoretical as well as practical significance to the cause of our Revolution in the future. Like a patient, who can recover only if an effective medicine is administered on the prescription of the doctor who diagnoses the disease, we too, after getting to the root of our trouble and defining our mistake, should take the medicine no matter how bitter it may be. At the same time, we must always seek a way out of our plight and strive to set the pace and rhythm of the Revolution in its unflagging march towards Victory.

International and National Factors

A correct assessment of the Party's success in the sphere of ideology and administration in the past, and an analysis of serious mistakes, which are the reverse side of this success, committed especially during the PKI's recent development—will give us objective guidance in the work of rebuilding the Party in the future; it will show us what we must strengthen and consolidate, and what must be removed from the Party's body.

The objective and subjective factors which have been influencing or determining the course of the Indonesian Revolution may be listed as follows: a) International factors; b) National factors; c) Subjective factors operating within the PKI.

It is, obviously, very useful for the Party and the revolutionary progressive masses in Indonesia always to remember the importance of making a correct estimate of the degree of mutual influence of international and national factors.

In other words, on an international scale, the might of the socialist camp is not merely an external condition which affects the course of events, but, in conjunction with other forces combating imperialism, it determines the main content, direction and individual trends of the historical development of human society in our times.

The *international factors* which have played no small part in pushing Indonesian policies to the Left are as follows:

1. The emergence of the socialist camp which has become the bastion of the struggle of nations against imperialism, for peace and freedom. At the present time the socialist camp towers high above the imperialist camp in all spheres of human endeavor and the life of society.

2. The force of example set by socialist countries in improving living conditions and raising living standards.

3. The progressive trends of foreign policies pursued by socialist countries, i.e., the fight for peace, peaceful coexistence and *unconditional* support of all national-liberation movements in the world.

4. Economic and cultural cooperation between socialist and developing nations, meetings of statesmen and various international forums of all prominent fighters for peace and the independence of nations held on a non-governmental level.

5. Fraternal militant solidarity of the international proletariat and progressive nations of the world with our struggle in Indonesia.

The *national factors* which have objectively catalyzed the revolutionary process in Indonesia are as follows: the existence of strong revolutionary traditions among the Indonesian people; polarization—on the one hand, the impoverishment of the working people and, on the other, the emergence of a rich stratum alongside the comprador bourgeoisie and landowners—which has revolutionized the Indonesian working people and caused a rapprochement between the national bourgeoisie and the people which, in turn, has fertilized the soil for the establishment of a united national front; and, finally, the rallying of the peasantry around the Party.

Subjective factors—the existence of the Party of the working class—the PKI—which has been a vital stimulating force in the development of the revolutionary situation in Indonesia.

The working class and its Party—thanks to their experience in effecting the August 1945 Revolution and due to making their knowledge of Marxism-Leninism more profound and through borrowing ideas from other fraternal parties—demonstrated their ideological, political and organizational maturity, succeeded in providing answers to the crucial questions of the Indonesian Revolution and in laying the correct strategic and tactical foundation for the victory of the Revolution. This foundation was laid at the Fifth National PKI Congress and further developed at the Sixth National PKI Congress.

A Popular Democratic Revolution

The Party correctly concluded that Indonesian society at the present stage of development is a semi-feudal and semi-colonial society (or more mildly, not yet fully independent and semi-feudal). The enemies of the Indonesian Revolution are the class of the comprador bourgeoisie, landowners and capitalistic bureaucrats. Because of the geographic factors which determine the uneven development of the Indonesian Revolution, its progress has taken a long time and has had a complex nature, while to lead this lengthy and complex Revolution the PKI had to follow gradual and cautious tactics in the revolutionary struggle, fighting two tendencies at the same time, i.e., a tendency to surrender and a tendency to adventurism, both tendencies being based on the instability of the petty bourgeoisie, with the PKI having to carry out a well-planned ruthless struggle against both these dangerous tendencies.

As regards its essence the Indonesian Revolution was a bourgeois-democratic revolution of a new type, or a popular-democratic revolution, i.e., a revolution of the broad popular masses led by the proletariat. The leadership of the Revolution should be effected by the working class while its driving force is the working class and peasants, the petty bourgeoisie outside the peasantry, and other democratic elements. These classes, together with the national bourgeoisie, represent a revolutionary force in Indonesia. A government of people's democracy will assume the form of a united national front and will be a joint government of all anti-imperialist and anti-feudal classes. This government will lean heavily on the popular masses and will effect changes of a democratic, not socialist, nature. It will secure national independence and the development of the nation along democratic and progressive lines. A people's democracy in Indonesia can be attained by peaceful means—a possibility which we must do our best to turn into reality, simultaneously increasing our vigilance toward our political enemies and bearing in mind that the class of the bourgeoisie will strive to foist upon us a non-peaceful way of attaining this end. The way out lies in changing the balance of power between the imperialists, the class of landowners and the comprador bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the forces of the people on the other; it lies in arousing, mobilizing and organizing the masses, workers and peasants first and foremost.

It was on the basis of the above conclusions that the general strategic line of the Revolution was determined, i.e., a line of a

united national anti-imperialist front based on union between workers and peasants, a line of building up a party on a nationwide and mass scale, a party fully consolidated ideologically, politically and organizationally.

The Working Class and the Peasantry

The working class must make up the vanguard of the people's struggle. To reach this end, the working class must heighten its activity, educate itself and become a large and conscious force able to render help to the struggle of other classes. The working class must help the peasants in their struggle to obtain land, it must help the intelligentsia in the struggle it is waging for its rights, it must help the national bourgeoisie in its struggle against foreign competition, it must help the entire people of Indonesia in the struggle for national independence and democratic freedoms. The people cannot achieve victory unless the working class of Indonesia becomes a free, conscious and politically mature force, well organized and able to lead the struggle of the nation, unless the people see in the working class their undisputed leader.

To win the peasants over to their side, the immediate target for the Indonesian Communists was the elimination of the vestiges of feudalism. The first step in conducting work among the peasants was to give them assistance in their everyday needs, in formulating their demands. This implies the organization and education of the peasants, so that they might reach a higher level in their struggle. This is the basis for the creation of a union of workers and peasants as the foundation for a powerful united national front.

As was officially recognized, on the national scale the strength of the Party began to grow after it had succeeded in winning a major victory at the elections to the Council of People's Representatives (DPR) and the Constituent Assembly, a fact that made it the fourth biggest party in Indonesia. It was this particular basis which enabled President Sukarno, for the first time, to put forward the concept of "mutual cooperation" (Pemerintah Gotong-Rojong) according to which the Communists had to participate in the work of not only legislative but also of executive organs, both on a central and on regional levels.

Negative Trends in the Party Organization

If we give prominence to the great successes of the Party achieved during the 1954-1960 period, it does not mean that there were no bad symptoms already then.

—Lack of order in the admission of new members. It can be said that each of the rules determining the admission of new members into the Party (Party Statute, Part 2) was violated. According to Lenin, the Party can play its vanguard role only when it comprises the best elements of the working class. However, as a result of the subjective assessment of a mass party as one which has a large membership, the Party admitted new members without sufficiently rigorous selection, so much so that there was little difference between admission to the Party and to various mass organizations. This resulted in the Party becoming oversaturated with petty bourgeois ideology; the organizational purity and quality of the Party dropped. This was further aggravated by the inactivity, or simply lack of, primary Party organizations in villages, which led to a situation where ideological education in the Party in the views and methods of the working class, could not be carried out as it ought to have been.

In primary Party organizations and in the revolutionary peasant organization (BTI) leadership was in the hands of rich peasant elements and petty bourgeoisie of non-peasant origin (employees, village headmen, teachers).

The membership figures contained in the reports were impressively high, although the number of people versed in Marxist-Leninist ideology was rather small. As a result the Party organism began to be infected with bourgeois ideology. That was the reason why after the most trying of ordeals—the third white terror*—many primary Party committees embarked on the road of disbanding their Party organizations—something entirely without precedent in other countries or in the history of our own Party even at the period of terror which occurred during the "Madiun Affair." The main reason was crystal clear: our Party with its large membership had not yet developed into a true Leninist party.

We often talk about the strength of our Party as the largest party beyond the borders of the socialist camp, because the PKI had 3,000,000 members, while mass revolutionary organizations had the following membership: the trade union center (SOBSI) 3,500,000; the peasant unions (BTI) 3,000,000; the women's organizations (GERWANI) 1,500,000 and the youth organization (PEMUDA RAKJAT) 2,000,000 members. The flouting of these figures of strength supported by various inspiring acts such as mass meetings, demon-

* The first white terror was in 1948, after the anti-Party provocation at Madiun. The second took place in 1951 during the premiership of Hatta. The third was that which followed the September 30th coup in 1965.

strations, etc., yielded a good effect in the sense that it boosted the Party's prestige both within the country and abroad, and proved the best attraction for the masses which were still hesitating about whether or not to join the Party.

However, this advertising of strength did more harm than good. The enemy learned too much about it and acted with greater caution, whereas we were not vigilant enough. Our closest allies, the intermediary forces, did not trust us and were afraid lest we should dominate them and take the helm of the Revolution into our own hands. But the greatest damage was done to our own organization. We let down our guard and overestimated our strength. We were sure that our real strength was as great as we had boasted it to be. Miscalculations in the assessment of the balance of forces could lead to political steps fatal to the Party and the Revolution, which actually was the case during the September 30 Movement.

Another obvious drawback in the implementation of the plan for Party building was the failure to reach the targets in collecting membership dues. Thus the Party had no firm financial footing, which should have been provided by membership dues received from the Party masses. Rather it was supported by donations from Party sympathizers in high social positions, private owners, etc.

Undoubtedly, this limited the Party's political freedom with regard to national private owners and some bureaucrats. The problem became even more serious when symptoms began to be manifest of top-ranking Party functionaries turning bourgeois. Most of the leading Party functionaries held good posts in various representative and government bodies. The bourgeoisie deliberately gave them all sorts of privileges, thus making them kowtow to the golden calf. The Party functionaries who picked up these golden sops thrown them by the bourgeoisie lost their high moral qualities and thus weakened their militant spirit in serving the Party cause. A tendency emerged of curbing revolutionary actions by the masses and adapting them for use by the bourgeoisie. This changed the political orientation of the Party which from then on began to seek support not in strengthening the union between workers and peasants, but primarily in wanting "to see whether this or that action would not destructively affect the NASAKOM." This becomes especially clear if we analyze the political development of the Party in the past few years (1960-1965), when there was a growing tendency towards deviation from mass revolutionary actions and towards class collaboration with the national bourgeoisie.

The period of the Party's development prior to the outburst of

the September 30th Movement was marked by the flourishing of these negative tendencies, all extremely dangerous to the safety of the Party and the Revolution. These tendencies are as follows:

1. Increasing penetration of bourgeois ideology into the Party organism and the shifting of the Party's policy to an adventuristic footing;

2. Increasing symptoms of the Party leadership turning bourgeois, which made them lose the Party identity, caused them to sink ever deeper into the bog of self-conceit and bureaucracy, and become drunk with their own achievements.

During the implementation of the three-year plan of Party building we were sounding the alarm to show that the subjective interpretation of the mass Party as a party merely numbering millions of members reduced a Party of the Leninist type to that of an ordinary mass organization. While there were very few proletarian elements in the Party, we were at the same time flooded with hundreds of thousands of new members from among the petty bourgeoisie. The passivity of the primary Party organizations led to a situation where Marxist-Leninist education was ineffective among the majority of Party members. The Party was burdened with petty-bourgeois ideology.

The political achievements of the Party, the mounting "strength" of the united national front with NASAKOM as its axis, the victories at the general elections in the center and in the regions, the improved cooperation between progressive revolutionary elements and the democratic elements such as President Sukarno, the extensive opportunities for performing various important functions in government and economic organs—all this paved the way for the Party leadership to turn bourgeois.

A period set in when it seemed that the financial resources of the Party would never run dry. Apart from financing vital projects, the Party began to subsidize prestige ones as well, which proved more than the Party could afford. The material well-being of the highest Party echelons was becoming even better and there was no reason to complain of the shortage of food and clothing. At the same time, the Party bureaucracy began to thrive on a fertile soil. The working methods became rigid, healthy ideas were nipped in the bud because they were suspected of allegedly bearing the "seeds of revisionism."

Mass Activities Discouraged

All this affected the Party's political activities which produced a paradoxical impression. On the one hand, there was an overindulgence

in leftist phraseology, such as "our determination is stronger than hunger," "crush all the imperialists and revisionists," "let us turn Indonesia into the revolutionary beacon for Asia, Africa and Latin America," etc., while, on the other hand, we tended to depart still further from stepping up mass revolutionary action, engaged in class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and thus were steadily losing our political freedom.

The Party made quite a few gains from cooperation with Sukarno. But this cooperation was also fraught with some negative symptoms. Not infrequently, when analyzing our political successes it was hard to see which of them were the result of our own struggle and which we achieved by borrowing from the President's prestige. Moreover, the Party was being increasingly misled by illusions with regard to Bung Karno (Sukarno) which resulted in the loss of its political independence, the inexorable gravitation toward ideological prostitution, and the alignment of its theory and practices with those of Bung Karno. This, in turn, led to utter confusion in interpreting Marxism-Leninism—and to complete departure from it.

The Party's cardinal mistake in the field of theory was the thesis of "subordinating class interests to national interests (*"Madju terus menggapur imperialisme dan feodalisme"*)—Forward to the victory over imperialism and feudalism). Compliance with this thesis would make it appear that, allegedly, class interests contradict national interests. In actual fact this was a deviation from Marxism-Leninism which teaches us that the interests of our class encompass the best interests of the entire nation.

It is clear that the thesis of the priority of national interests over class interests, the attempts to subordinate the Party Program to the Political Manifesto, the united national front to the NASAKOM alliance, the attempts to "make Marxism the property of the nation"—all this is but a reflection of how deeply petty-bourgeois ideology became rooted in the body of our Party.

The Chinese comrades were not averse to capitalizing on the positive and negative characteristics of President Sukarno, while in doing so they aligned themselves with our Party's leadership to ensure the victory of their petty-bourgeois concepts of political hegemony in Asia and Africa and to replace the policy of the international anti-colonial front and struggle for peace with the "Jakarta-Peking axis."

Petty-bourgeois political views and nationalism have resulted in an inability to correctly understand the burning issues of today, and this crippled the anti-imperialist struggle and the fight for peace

on an international scale, and it hurled Indonesia into the catastrophe of the September 30th Movement.

Relations to the World Communist Movement

As a doctrine, which is not dogmatic but creative, Marxism-Leninism is constantly being enriched with the latest experience of the international workers' and Communist movement as summed up in such militant documents as the Moscow 1957 Declaration and the Moscow 1960 Statement. Both of these historic documents should become the common guiding principles in solving Party problems in each individual country, aimed at achieving the victory of the revolution, and in fighting the common enemy, international imperialism led by the United States of America. In this common cause we are united first and foremost by devotion to Marxist-Leninist principles and proletarian internationalism.

The Indonesian Revolution is part and parcel of the world revolution of mankind in its struggle for socialism and eternal peace. Likewise, the theories of the Indonesian Revolution were elaborated by us through combining the general precepts of Marxism-Leninism with concrete revolutionary practices in Indonesia. However, these theories of the Indonesian Revolution should constantly be put to the test in the process of the development of our Revolution so as to see to what degree they truly reflect the fundamentals of the universal Marxist-Leninist theory. That is why it is by no means permissible to believe that our revolutionary theories are the only correct ones and are not liable to reconsideration.

In the past few decades Marxism-Leninism has gone through an ordeal of major discussions in the international Communist movement aimed at blazing the best trail to follow in its effort to expedite the historical mission of the proletariat. Our true devotion to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism is gauged by our disinterested service to the spirit and the letter of the documents elaborated and agreed upon by all Marxist-Leninist parties, i.e., the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and the Moscow Statement of 1960.

As a member of the international Communist movement, the PKI, which has already demonstrated its maturity, at first held a position from which *a priori* it neither accused nor justified any side in its earnest desire to make a critical study of all the materials and arguments that issued from the already-mentioned major discussion. It also strove to make a contribution of its own to the reunification of the international Communist movement in accordance with the

ideas of proletarian internationalism, having no intention whatsoever of taking a middle-of-the-road position.

Further developments demonstrated, however, that in reality a deviation did manifest itself in the policy of our Party from the above approach. Not only did we fail to become more critical of ourselves, we succumbed to sentimentality and *a priori* justified one side while we preached alienation toward the other. Not only did we fail to elevate the principle of holding discussions and consultations in search of the contradictions in the international Communist movement, but we used the slogan, "Let us turn the major discussion on the international Communist movement into a Marxist-Leninist university on an international scale," to support the idea of an open and broad discussion of internal issues in the international Communist movement before the very eyes of the enemy. Although, officially, our relations remained good and friendly, in actual fact we followed the wrong path by treating as our enemies those whom we believed to be "revisionists" matching in their viciousness and evil the pillars of world imperialism. Each critical thought or argument which failed *a priori* either to justify or accuse the sides was increasingly strongly condemned as "an inconsistent class position reeking of revisionism," to be, naturally, exorcised from the Party. Not only did we fail to stand on our own and strengthen our identity, but rather we became even more ideologically, politically and economically dependent on a certain party. What is more that party was responsible for turning the Indonesian Revolution into a gaming table for its political gambles.

The Character of the Present Epoch

At the beginning we expressed our full agreement with the thesis of the Moscow 1960 Statement to the effect that the chief contradiction of our epoch is the contradiction between socialism and imperialism.

However, the Second Plenary Meeting* of the PKI which took place after the 7th Party Congress,** had drastically changed the Party's stand on this score by declaring that the chief and decisive contradiction of our time is the contradiction between the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America on the one hand, and imperialism on the other. This change was caused by a new orientation, from which it followed that the center of world

* Held in December 1963.

** Held in April 1962.

storms, the center of revolutionary explosion in the modern world lay not in imperialist and capitalist countries but in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is quite obvious, and it is correct to assert, that the flames of revolution are burning bright in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and in the past few years they are especially hot in Vietnam, although this is by no means proof of the fact that the main contradiction in the world today has changed into the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism. The chief world contradiction of our time, a time of transition to socialism, a time of the world revolution, is still the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in general and the contradiction between the new victorious social system (socialism) and the moribund social system (capitalism) in particular, between the proletarian states and the bourgeois imperialist states.

Recognition of the fact that "in our epoch world development is determined by the course and results of the competition between two diametrically opposed social systems" means that:

1. For the international Communist movement, for Communist and Workers' parties, the prime duty is to strengthen the cohesion of the countries of the socialist system, guarding it as the apple of their own eye, and to oppose any actions that may undermine the authority and unity of the world socialist system.

2. For the proletariat in the countries where it is in power—for socialist states—the prime duty is continuously to increase the economic and defense potentials of these states and see to it that socialism preserves its leading role in the field of science, technology and culture, retaliates to any imperialist outrages, thus augmenting socialism's possibilities in the implementation of the tasks of proletarian internationalism, acting as the tried and tested friend of the peoples fighting for their freedom.

All this indicates that making the strengthening of the world socialist system its cornerstone by no means implies that the revolutionary struggle in Asia, Africa and Latin America should be treated as a bastard child. On the contrary, the strengthening of the socialist system creates more favorable conditions for the growth of solidarity with this struggle to which it renders moral and material support, giving the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America economic, cultural, armed and other types of assistance, so that their struggle may end in the victory of the revolutions of Asia, Africa and Latin America at their first and second stages.

(The next installment will be published in the April issue.)

BOOK REVIEWS

ANN BARTON

A Women of Social Conscience

Florence Kelley was a leading woman social reformer of the late 19th and early 20th century. She was outstanding among a comparatively small group of women who were the conscience of an era in which rapidly growing American industry took its toll of the health, well-being and life itself of the growing American working class. Florence Kelley was an avowed socialist. Tireless work against child labor and the "sweating system" was not enough to satisfy her social conscience. She urged the social workers and other professionals of her time to understand the society in which they lived and the warring social forces which were causing the very obvious inequities around them.

In the 80's, she read a paper to a meeting of the New York chapter of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae. She stated: "Shall I cast my lot with the oppressors, content to patch and darn, to piece and cobble at the worn and rotten fabric of a perishing society? Shall I spend my life in applying

palliatives, in trying to make the intolerable endurable yet a little longer. . . . Shall I not make common cause with these, my brothers and sisters, to make an end of such a system?"

She remained a socialist all throughout her life and used her great ability to attack the here and now evils given birth by capitalism. She never compromised with these principles spoken when she was a young woman.

Lillian Wald said of her, "She made her generation think!" She was lecturer and writer and fighter against child labor and other oppressions of the working people. Although she is most closely associated with the fight against child labor, she struck blows for women's rights, and against slum housing and anti-labor laws. She was a founder of the N.A.A.C.P. and was an effective contributor to consumer movements. She was the first woman to become Chief Factory Inspector in Illinois, a position for which she worked, wheedled and campaigned, and in which position she challenged again and again the factory owners and exploiters of labor in Illinois.

Previously, she had become a co-worker of Jane Addams in Hull

* Dorothy Rose Blumberg, *Florence Kelley, The Making of a Social Pioneer*. Augustus M. Kelley, Publishers, New York. 1966.

BOOK REVIEWS

63

House in Chicago, where she conducted forums for working women and brought before the authorities cases of unsatisfactory health and working conditions for working women. When she could not find sufficient response in legal prosecution of these cases, she set to work and achieved her law degree and prosecuted such cases herself.

For a long time Florence Kelley corresponded with Engels. She wrote to him about the developments in the American scene: her interest and then disenchantment with Henry George, the sectarianism of the Socialist Labor Party, from which she was expelled for disagreements with its dogmatic policies.

The birth in America of the Knights of Labor, which quickly increased its membership from 104,000 to 702,000 delighted her. She had long felt dismay that the working class did not more quickly become socialist. She felt the need for a "scientific literature" for workers, and found a current popularized dissertation on Marxism economics (by Henry George) "wretched." The writings of Marx and Engels, she felt, must be made available to the American public. She translated Engel's *Condition of the Working Class in England* and arranged for publication in America. Her letters to Engels, in this connection, according to Dorothy Rose Blumberg, expressed her "deference, self-assurance, quickening political zeal and exasperating (to Engels) political naivete. She still had only an elementary, idealized concept of

the theory and organization of socialism."

During her lifetime, Altgeld traveled his stormy political road, Bellamy's *Looking Backward* made its mark on thousands of minds. Henry George influenced, then retreated from the radical fold. She formed friendships and influenced many able leaders of thought, among them Henry Demarest Lloyd and Richard T. Ely. The arrest of Debs under an injunction of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, in the struggle of the railwaymen which he led in the "depression Spring of 1894," aroused her indignation and sent her into that battle.

Dorothy Blumberg points out that a sheaf of laws against child labor can serve as a monument to Florence Kelley. More can and should be written about this remarkable woman. Too little, apparently, is available on her personal life. The book is a study of the movements and influences which shaped her life. Only a passing sentence tells of her work in forming the N.A.A.C.P. It is to be hoped that more may be written illuminating this aspect of her life.

But the book is a valuable contribution to the story of those who worked for a better life for the American working people. Today when desperate capitalism brings war and disorientation and uses its establishment to spread immorality, cynicism and, in general, an anti-people culture, Florence Kelley's history of devotion to principle, her concern with humanity, and steadfast commitment

is a service to the young. They, of course, are also social pioneers. But they can find in the life-ex-

perience of the Florence Kelleys, much that can inspire, teach, and reflect on their own.

A Life Spanning A Century

The story of Bertha W. Howe, who is now celebrating her 101st birthday, covers essentially the same time period as the story of Florence Kelley. She was caught in the same lively currents of social development and change. The suffragette movement, the single tax idea, concern over the harsh exploitation of children and labor and, most importantly, socialism—were ideas and movements that strongly affected the world in which both women developed. Bertha Howe, as Florence Kelley, became firmly committed to socialism as the theoretical and practical pattern for the future.

"Her life-long absorption with the world around her has unquestionably added to her life span," writes her cousin, Howard W. Washburn. "She has never had time to waste or a chance to become bored with living." She wrote of herself, in 1963, "Every passing year which adds to my own history, I grow more respectful of history in general! And what a time this is in which to be

watching its galloping speed!" In his introduction, Oakley Johnson says she "has achieved superior stature in her own private capacity as a worker and a citizen. She was never elected to an office, was never rich . . . not a college graduate, and not a member of a learned profession."

What has she been? She has been a singularly articulate, active woman, who has given her abilities, most ably, to grass roots work in progressive movements. She has been a part of the knowledgeable rank and file, the life's blood of any organization, without whom organizations cannot flourish. She has spent a long life happily "doing" competently, what was called for, in order to achieve a socially progressive goal.

When musicologists recorded "live" the folk music of this country, they used tape recorders to get the nuances and flavors of the music they were studying and recording. Oakley Johnson turns this method to the reminiscences of Bertha Howe. The book consists, largely, of conversations between them.

She was a stenographer for her entire working life, attached for many years to the Surrogate's Court in New York. "I lived two lives," she says. "One I lived in

**An American Century. The Recollections of Bertha W. Howe. 1866-1966.* Recorded and edited, and with a biographical introduction, by Oakley C. Johnson. Published for A.I.M.S. Humanities Press, New York, 1966.

the Surrogate's Court; the other, my own life, was outside." "Outside," she used her lively mind to understand social forces and then to play her own role in them. She steeped herself in the ideas of such people as Frederick Douglass, Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton. She admired the eloquent Hugh O. Pentecost, who had been expelled from the ministry in New Jersey because he had spoken in defense of Albert Parsons and the other Haymarket martyrs. She recorded, in shorthand, some of his speeches, and pressed their publication. (Hugh Pentecost became a Socialist before he died.) She wrote articles for the *New York Call*, the *Truth Seeker*, the *Conservator*. Throughout her life, she has made known her ideas, through letters to the newspapers and to a large number of friends and relatives, here and abroad.

When she was 40 years old, she joined the Socialist Party. She took part in the first Marches for the Vote (for women) in New York City. She heard the young strike leader, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. Much later she again listened to the adult Gurley Flynn and participated in the activities around the election campaign

tours of Mother Bloor. During World War II she spent many hours collecting clothes for Russian War Relief.

She wrote President Kennedy urging him to release Morton Sobell from prison. She has, most recently, been greatly concerned that the United States withdraw its troops from Vietnam and has persistently so urged President Johnson.

Her recorded sessions with Oakley Johnson are full of Bertha Howe's wit and continuing love of people and of living.

In 1910, she wrote for the *New York Call* "Hearing It Rumble," a parable that laughed at people who could not see themselves reflected in those who lived on the side of a volcanic mountain, and were deaf to the rumbling—people who did not see the significance of the strikes and social movements around them.

Bertha Howe has never been deaf to this rumbling. She has enjoyed every decibel, and in the sound hears a new world aborning. She has devoted a long, joyful, fulfilled and fulfilling life to this emergence.

A book to read, in order to meet a treasure of a woman.

Order Additional Copies of
POLITICAL AFFAIRS

*Pass on to trade union, peace and
freedom militants*

Recent Special issues –

**THE BATTLE FOR
BLACK LIBERATION**



**FIFTY YEARS OF
SOCIALISM**

50c each

A POLITICAL AFFAIRS REPRINT
A REPLY TO ISAAC DEUTCHER
“On Socialist Man”

by William Mandel

25c a copy