

MARCH, 1969

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

PROBLEMS FACING LATIN-AMERICAN INTELLECTUALS

V. Teitelboim

THE STUDENT REBELLION

Bettina Aptheker

ON SELF-DETERMINATION

James E. Jackson Ted Bassett

IRRATIONALISM AND REACTION

Herbert Aptheker

ON LABOR OPPORTUNISM

James West Herb Kay

60¢

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>V. Teitelboim</i>	
Problems Facing Latin-American Intellectuals	1
<i>Bettina Aptheker</i>	
The Student Rebellion, Part I	15
<i>James E. Jackson</i>	
Separatism—A Bourgeois-Nationalist Trap	25
<i>Ted Bassett</i>	
Slogan of Self-Determination Unwarranted	39
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	
Irrationalism and Reaction	44
<i>James West</i>	
Approach to Work with Trade Unions	49
<i>Herb Kay</i>	
Trade Unions—Schools for Socialism	59
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>A. W. Font</i>	
A History of HUAC	63

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

Problems Facing Latin-American Intellectuals*

Fresh flareups of the student movement are reported in a number of Latin American countries. Mexico is going through the biggest and most turbulent student revolt in decades, involving the bulk of the student body. There have been many casualties, some in the fight for civil rights and freedoms, and not merely for purely student demands. The students are giving voice to the thoughts and aspirations of most Latin Americans. Filled with heroism, prepared to meet all odds, they have demonstrated their civic maturity and have written a glorious page in their country's history. Indeed, they have generated qualitative changes in Mexican politics.

Nor is Mexico the only example. No Latin American country is exempt from this student ferment and from the demonstrations that are part of it. In Uruguay the students are standing shoulder to shoulder with the workers in a struggle that has already taken the lives of many young people. Chilean students are fighting a battle which has already injected a new permanent factor into Latin American life. I have in mind the political awakening of university professors and researchers who have now joined the movement for university reform, the origins of which go back to the events in the Argentine University of Cordova a half century ago. They are guided by the credo: the scientist should always face realities, serve his people and work for social change. The movement is assuming wide dimensions.

There is also this important feature: the university, traditionally a center of culture, a classical "factory" producing trained cadres for the ruling classes, is now being drawn into political activity, becoming part of the militant popular movement for fundamental change. And many faculty members, now matching the revolutionary word with the revolutionary deed, see their future in socialism and are joining the Communist Party.

* Reprinted from *World Marxist Review*, December, 1968.

Growth of Socialist Consciousness

The growth of socialist consciousness is not a simple or direct process. Many intellectuals go through what could be described as a preparatory stage. For some it is passive non-conformism, for others it is outright revolt, and there are ample causes for both. Discussing the position of Latin American writers, the Peruvian novelist Mario Vargas Llosa emphasizes: "American reality naturally provides numerous reasons for writers' dissatisfaction and disobedience. For we live in a society of injustice, ignorance, exploitation, crying inequality, misery, moral, cultural and economic alienation. . . ." This harsh diagnosis comes from a non-Communist, but Llosa has a clear understanding of the future. He draws the material for his novels from life, and suggests that other writers "reveal, directly or obliquely, through the portrayal of events, eye-witness accounts, even dreams, fantasies, allegories and nightmares, that this reality is a 'shabby concoction' and has to be changed." In other words, like many of his colleagues, Llosa is passing from depiction of collective tragedy to an appeal for action to strike at its roots. His books are part of revolutionary reality; they are revolutionary weapons. His understanding of the historical perspective has convinced him that "in 10, 20 or 50 years the time will come for our countries, as it already has for Cuba, to live in social justice—the time when the whole of America will break free of the empire that is robbing it, will be free of the oligarchy that is exploiting it, will be rid of the forces that are humiliating and oppressing it." And he clearly states that the only solution—the only realistic and possible one is "for Latin America to acquire, as soon as possible, a feeling of dignity and begin a new life in socialism that would liberate us from the horrors of our present anachronistic situation. . . ."

Another writer, known for his shrewd understanding of the Latin-American spirit and psychology, Julio Cortazar of Argentina, sums up his own career in these words: ". . . I have always accepted socialism as desirable and even necessary, but now I have come to the view that *it is the only modern doctrine based on humanism, on the elementary ethics that are so grossly ignored in the society in which we live. Socialism is founded on the simple, and at the same time incredibly complex principle that humanity will only justify the name when it puts an end to exploitation of man by man. . . .* And ever since I came to understand this vital fact of the human existence, the search for socialism has become my life's duty and mission."

This duty and mission, with all the moral responsibility and urge to

action entailed thereby, have led many Latin-American intellectuals to take a critical view of their position—they have had enough of the rhetoric and lies designed to conceal injustice. And many are abandoning their ivory towers, casting aside ingrained myths about the artist living in a world of his own. They have no desire to squander their talent in "smoke-filled cafes or old-world taverns." Latin America, they believe, must cease to be a vast spiritual backwoods and advance to emancipation and unity. And to contribute to that, they are joining with the people, participating in the revolutionary movement which, they feel, will assure full development of national culture and furnish the conditions for absorbing all the achievements of world culture.

The Influence of Marxism and the October Revolution

The vanguard of the young working class and the intellectuals associated with it were the first to appreciate that independence, political emancipation, economic development and a flourishing national culture that serves the people could be attained only through revolution. This new approach was the result of the preparation of Marxism in the latter part of the 19th century. However, Marxism came to Latin America not as a mature and practical doctrine, but rather as an ideology absorbed, avidly but slowly, by the young proletariat and its intellectual allies. One of the latter, the Chilean historian Benjamin Vicuna Mackenna, wrote in 1870 that the founding of the International was in itself a revolution, a big advance towards socialism, the harbinger of a revolution that will confront the exploiters with the organized workers who will deliver the knockout blow to the entire system of exploitation.

When the people won power in Russia two intellectuals, Jose Ingenieros of Argentina and Lima Barreto of Brazil, spoke with praise of the "maximalists" then the common appellation for the Bolshevik Party. Political organizations were started in various parts of the continent, soon followed by the emergence of Communist parties. Some of them were the result of a split in the old Socialist parties, others the result of a majority decision to convert the parties to communism.

Ever since then Marxism has exerted a growing influence on our intellectuals. They recognized that the old social system and the old way of life were living out their day. Subsequent developments were to confirm this prevision, for socialism became the dominant system on one-third of the earth's surface, and most colonial nations were breaking out of imperialist control. Intellectuals began to realize that

revolution was on the agenda: Cuba was the first to blaze the trail into the future.

Latin Americans saw the triumph of socialist revolution in a large part of the world. Today they witness another revolution in technology, though it nearly always comes to Latin America as an imported commodity. The mass media have brought our people into direct contact with the rest of the world, something quite impossible in the early years of the century. The Latin American of today is in much closer and more direct touch with, and more directly affected by, world issues. In short, the Latin American intellectual of this closing third of a century is a much more active citizen of our age of storm and change, and he is fully aware that *finis* can be written to the continent's drama—its economic backwardness and poverty—only by deposing the ruling oligarchy and—more important still—breaking the stranglehold of American imperialism. And U.S. imperialism keeps close watch on Latin America, that inexhaustible source of valuable and cheap raw materials and Washington's military and political hinterland. Washington is very much concerned over what happens in this southern hinterland. It regards our countries with the same distrust as Rome regarded the dangerous and resentful outer marches of its empire. Now more than ever before, Washington fears a Latin-American revolt, involving both workers and intellectuals. Marti and Rodo, the great 19th century thinkers, warned of U.S. attempts to "swallow" Latin America. Intensified plunder of our continent since then has intensified anti-imperialist sentiment among our intellectuals.

U.S. imperialism hates our intellectuals because they so effectively expose its policies. And the U.S. has sought to neutralize the intelligentsia or buy it over with dollar sops, and in some instances it has succeeded. The imperialists are also trying to impose university control.

There is admiration for those Americans who have come out against the rulers in Washington, solidarity with the Negroes, student and youth protesters, all who demand withdrawal of the U.S. aggressors from Vietnam. But our intellectuals are not falling into the trap set by the imperialist machine.

The Students

In Latin America, as elsewhere in the world, the very concept of the intellectual has undergone radical change. We know that the technological revolution influences not only engineers and technicians, but also people in the realms of art and literature, and, of course, the university students.

In our countries students with working-class or peasant backgrounds are a rarity. The educational pyramid has a very broad base, the mass of illiterate or semi-literate people who at most can boast of two years' schooling. At the apex are the universities, accessible only to a small middle-class minority. Yet despite its class character, and the fact that university education is a costly privilege, many students are affected by the conflicts that are part of our time. Some are depressed by lack of personal and direct contact with production, though many of them do not have to work their way through college. And yet we find the students sharing in the intellectual revolt, protesting against social injustice and the spiritual paucity of the world they live in. They are aware of the need, sometimes consciously, sometimes spontaneously, to change the existing system and way of life. Some never go beyond youthful extremism or nihilist anarchist attitudes, or are content to assert their rights as a generation. But many accept Marxism-Leninism and see their future in inseparable ties with the working class. They join the ranks of the revolution, unhesitatingly and permanently.

In Chile, as in other Latin-American countries, the Communist Party and the Young Communist League draw their members from mines, factories and farms, but a sizeable segment comes from the universities, and nearly always at the height of the struggle. Without overlooking other important aspects of the new situation, we should devote special attention to the fact that our cities, swollen by the influx of peasants, have become the scene of anti-imperialist and anti-revolutionary youth actions. You will find a youth demonstration jeering Nixon, or burning an effigy of Uncle Sam, or pulling down the Stars and Stripes. Mass participation, courage and militancy are distinguishing features of these demonstrations. In many instances they are conducted jointly with workers. The youth has an inexhaustible fund of enthusiasm and, if applied in support of the popular movement, it becomes a viable revolutionary factor.

Ideological controversy and discussion are, doubtlessly, a distinctive feature of political life today. No party, no student group, and no intellectual can shy away from these discussions from the need to take a clear stand on vital issues. And on the most vital issue of all, the Latin-American revolution, we have a wide range of strategic and tactical concepts. Revolution is central to all the discussions, which also touch on the problems of the world Communist movement, new trends in the arts, literature and philosophy, the continent's cultural future and, needless to say, politics and economics. In fact all facets

of the superstructure have become the subject of spirited debate.

For we are living in a period of dialogue and confrontation of attitudes. Far from shunning discussions, the Chilean Communists take an active part in them, seeking answers from class positions and in conformity with their ideological principles to many questions presently agitating the people.

In every Latin American country the spirit of criticism pervades all ideological discussion. There is a constant search for solutions to the problems of our countries and the world. And still another feature—the keen interest in contacts, exchange of views and experience, the urge to understand oneself and one's place in the general scheme of things. In short, the interests of the present-day Latin American go far beyond his country and continent.

The Latin-American Intellectuals

The intelligentsia is becoming an ever wider social strata. Of course, within this strata there is a wide divergence of ideological trends and shades and this necessitates diversified ideological work. In some countries professionals are held in high esteem, their numbers are growing and there appears to be a clear division into differing categories, especially with the emergence of new professionals.

However, the position in education is anything but satisfactory. The number of university and college students is less than one per cent of the continent's gainfully employed population. People with specialized secondary-school training make up less than three per cent, with more than two-thirds of them either school teachers or bookkeepers. "Intellectualization" of manual labor has been a slow and tortuous process. According to some estimates, less than 10 per cent of the continent's 54 million workers and artisans are classified as skilled, and 35 million have had no training whatever. In agriculture, barely 0.1 per cent have higher or secondary training and 80 per cent are classed as unskilled.

Little more than one million of the continent's 250 million inhabitants have had a complete or partial university education; 30 million have had three years schooling, and 37 million less than three years. Out of 8.7 million with secondary school education, 4.7 million did not take the full course, and only 1.8 million can boast of a secondary technical education, in many cases incomplete. For workers and artisans the figure is a mere five percent. Even among executive personnel only 10 per cent are college graduates.

Nor is that the whole picture, for we have to take into account the

quality of the education. And in this respect Latin America is behind, particularly in research, applied science and technology. There is a widespread demand for gearing education to national requirements, and for university reform. The Chilean Communist Party has been championing these demands and this has gained for it considerable prestige; prominent Party members have been elected to executive positions in higher education, something quite new in Chile.

In working for educational reform, we should not lose sight of our ultimate goal of changing the social system, which would make it possible to work out fundamental solutions for all our educational problems. But we should always be in touch with reality, always be mindful of the needs of today and tomorrow. We must assume responsibility for the future of education, a problem that brooks no delay in view of the population explosion—by 1980 the continent's gainfully employed population will have increased to an estimated 120 million. This will mean a larger number of industrial workers and more university graduates—official and conservative estimates speak of an increase of 70 per cent. But in tackling these problems we shall have to contend with the existing system, which is obstructing and hampering educational expansion. If it proceeds at the present pace the gap between economic and educational development, and the gap between Latin America and other capitalist (not to mention socialist) countries will be wider still, unless, of course, there are fundamental changes.

The sole exception, the one bright spot in the bleak picture is Cuba. Cuba has made significant progress in elementary education and in other areas, provides grants for most students, is rapidly abolishing adult illiteracy. Cuba shows what socialism can do in a continent where more than 50 million adults are unable to read or write, where half the child population does not attend school, and of those who do attend only one in five finishes the course; adults average no more than one year of school, more than half of the school teachers lack adequate training. And also these figures: children in the 5-14-year age group make up approximately 25 per cent of the population, whereas in some European countries the proportion is only about 15 per cent. Such are the statistics of the Latin American tragedy.

Far-reaching changes in the allocation of labor are predicted for 1975. Agricultural employment will decline and non-agricultural labor will increase by as much as 58 per cent, with a substantial increase in white-collar workers, in the services and in government employment. A degree of economic expansion is inevitable, accompanied by

mechanization both in industry and office work. Progressive reforms will doubtlessly pave the way to rapid development in education, public health, transport and communications, which, in turn, will require larger numbers of white-collar workers. Today, however, their proportion is much smaller than in industrialized countries.

In 1965, it was no more than 2.7 per cent compared with 5-10 per cent in the developed countries. There is also a considerable difference in Latin America itself. Argentina, Uruguay, Mexico, Chile and some other countries have a comparatively larger proportion of professionals. The figure for Chile is 53,000 university-trained specialists in a population of nine million. The largest group are school teachers (12,000), followed by lawyers (8,500), doctors (5,800) and engineers (4,400). The figures are indicative of the traditional pattern of our society and reflect its economic backwardness and the persistence of 19th century trends. The picture is much the same in many other parts of the continent.

Latin America is experiencing a crisis. Taking place is a general reevaluation of values, ideas and customs carried over from earlier generations. The workers are challenging the very existence of capitalism, and many have joined the struggle to replace it by socialism. Similar sentiments are widespread among intellectuals and the more progressive sections of the population. Ideological struggle, clearly on the agenda, is becoming sharper all the time. There is a never-ending discussion of such problems as the generation gap, the role of youth, the university movement. We Communists regard the latter as an effective and dynamic force and have made it our aim to link it up with the struggle of the working class and the people.

Of course, we do not subscribe to the idea that the generation struggle, and not the class struggle, is the motive force of history. But we are not oblivious to the new forms of the youth movement. True, some of them are highly unconventional and might appear extravagant. But these superficial features should not be allowed to obscure the substance of the movement, its enthusiasm and vigor, youth's eagerness to change the world. And these, we believe, are not incompatible with the basic task of the revolutionary proletariat or with the leading role of the Communist parties. The latter should do everything to find ways and means of using this youthful energy—at times chaotic, over-emotional and extremist in its manifestations—for united action. In doing so we should warn the youth against the false slogan of "youth power." It should be our job to furnish convincing answers to the vexing problems posed by the present social system, including such

problems as family relations, and conflicts which, in an atmosphere of dismay, confusion and disorientation, are apt to reach explosive dimensions. All this makes it imperative to analyze phenomena in various spheres of life and train a new type of intellectual capable of working out solutions to the numerous problems of present-day Latin America.

An Anti-Imperialist Position

In these circumstances, naturally, work in examining and formulating the corresponding revolutionary tenets and propositions must of necessity cover the most diverse realms of science. At a time when the ideological struggle is being stepped up, and with imperialism making repeated attempts to penetrate into all spheres of life and to regain its foothold in the spiritual sphere, we must not lose sight of the need to repel this offensive.

At the Cultural Congress in Havana in January, 1968, the process of transition to anti-imperialist action by the vanguard intellectuals of Latin America clearly emerged. The congress likewise revealed the intelligentsia's and the people's heightened awareness of the struggle being waged by the people of Vietnam, the rising anger at the U.S. aggression. The congress continued the splendid militant tradition characteristic of the Latin-American intellectual of the past, clarifying the relations between culture and national independence; the moulding of an all-around man; the intellectual's responsibility for the problems of the underdeveloped countries; problems of culture and the mass media. It also discussed questions of art and scientific and technical endeavor in the context of the requirements and reality of Latin America.

The Chilean Communists have to win the hearts and minds of the people over whom the monopolies and imperialists are trying to gain ascendancy through their propaganda, either brutal or subtle. Also smooth-tongued reformism, and those who sing the praises of the "miraculous" curative properties of the "third way" are trying to do the same. We must not shirk our responsibility for the destiny of the country's literature and art, its scientific and cultural development which must benefit all the people. It would be erroneous to think that we are the only ones acting in this direction. Moving with us are many kindred forces. The balance sheet will show that the contribution made by the Chilean Communists, by their friends and sympathizers and by progressive intellectuals has stimulated the revival of many aspects of Chilean culture, revitalizing literature, the fine arts, music, etc. We contributed also to the rebirth of the country's rich folklore which

many had erroneously regarded as dying out. Not only renowned men of culture, but also the mass of creative youth are taking part in the popular movement. Culture has become the concern of many.

Delicate Matter and False Theories

We do not forget the truth that literature and art are an infinitely delicate matter which develop according to their own laws not applicable to other spheres of activity. These laws do not allow for sociological over-simplification, do not tolerate sectarian attitudes. At the same time, we regard literature and art as forms and instruments for exploring the human mind, as instruments of human knowledge, as true expressions of the individual, a people, a country and the world. All this compels us to spurn the temptation to turn our backs on reality and evade the crucial issues.

Our concept of the Communist intellectual working in literature and the arts is that of an active figure who combines his creativity with the social struggle, that is, a creator of two kinds—that of the artist and the revolutionary who creates works of art and, at the same time, the new world in the transition from the twilight of capitalism to socialism.

Of course there are many intellectuals in Latin America who are still confused. Dogged by insecurity, frustration and loneliness, they do not see that the world is moving towards a revolution which has triumphed already on a sizeable part of the globe, and which is fermenting in the depths of the capitalist system rent by contradictions.

Since the process of writing, painting or music, in a word, the process of creation, is nearly always considered an individual undertaking, some artists incline to subscribe to the "theory of solitude," to proclaim the individualism of their profession. But the fact is that there are few professions that call for such a high degree of synthesis of world developments, of man in his historical setting, of real life.

At times some of the intelligentsia—either because they overestimate their powers, or are adroitly prompted to do so by the ruling class which needs to disguise itself to continue in power—present themselves to public opinion in Latin America as an *exclusive* social group, independent and standing above classes.

The intelligentsia, as we know, being an intermediate social stratum, does not constitute an independent class. It usually performs skilled, but not productive labor. It does not see how its labor is priced on the market, especially in the under-developed countries. Thus, the intelligentsia forms a part of the exploited, a part of the people, particularly in countries like ours, suffocating in the stranglehold of imperial-

ism which fetters their material and spiritual development, in the strangle-hold of the feudal survivals and of the oligarchies which impose a virtual dictatorship over the mass media.

And so the intellectual in our society is among those who are subjected to maximum exploitation. His position can be likened to that of the convict. Most of them can devote only their spare hours to their vocation, in many cases secretly, for such activity is scorned as being parasitic, sheer idleness, as a mania—sometimes harmless, sometimes dangerous. Art and culture in Latin America are not considered articles of prime necessity.

Despite this, many intellectuals still entertain all kinds of illusions about their role and place in life. Many of them still slavishly worship the past subjectively clinging to it in a vain attempt to halt the process of proletarianization. Contributing to their illusions is the fact that their status continues to be ambiguous, being partly petty-bourgeois and partly proletarians, as they pursue their professions. Also contributing to their false concepts is the system which tries in every way to accentuate and extol the individualistic tendencies of intellectuals. They are flattered, given minor privileges, the significance of which is exaggerated, the formal difference with the workers being underscored at the same time.

However, the process of political awakening among people of mental labor is gaining ground. It could not be otherwise, considering that they come face to face with life, with the need to fight for better conditions, or simply to regain their standard of living (and the march of civilization brings with it new requirements which soon become a natural thing and are taken for granted).

In the course of this struggle the intelligentsia gradually begins to use means, weapons and forms of action characteristic of the industrial workers who, being more keenly aware of their position, having more experience and, able to wage an organized and united struggle, are an example for the intelligentsia. Diverse sectors of working people engaged in mental labor (teachers, students, doctors, university professors) are more and more taking to strike action. The lessons of the class war, often bitter ones, the identity of tactics and common needs assimilated and tested in social battles, in the fight for demands, making a political impact and clarifying things, act as a powerful means of combating petty-bourgeois chimeras. This helps to dispel the illusions engendered by the uncertainty that stems from the dual position of the intellectual.

Latin-American life itself is mercilessly shattering the myths of

those who think they are the "salt of the earth" because they create spiritual values. This reality is telling them in the lucid language of prose that they are working people and that in capitalist society they share the same fate as their "unrecognized" brothers. Like the worker, they do not work for themselves. The intellectual—the creator for whom his work has, as Marx put it, a profound human and spiritual meaning, feels that his labor does not usually provide for his material needs, and that he has to spend the best part of his time and energy in activity distasteful to him. Engaged in this activity he vegetates while enriching others, or spends his days in a civil service with which he is often at odds. His talent is consumed by drudgery in a bureaucratic apparatus. This intellectual is partly engaged in clandestine and unremunerated activity and, although realization of this wounds his pride, he is a semi-proletarian because of the way in which he earns his livelihood. He fully fits Engel's definition of the proletariat in his note to the English edition (1888) of the *Communist Manifesto*: "By proletariat we mean the class of modern wage-laborers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labor power in order to live."

Thus, living and suffering day after day in this society, and victims of a reactionary superstructure, growing numbers of intellectuals are arriving at the conclusion that they must give their social answer, must take a definite political stand and begin to act.

Every ruling class wants the intelligentsia to serve its ends. But as history has shown, particularly at crucial moments when preparations for revolution are under way, many intellectuals surmount the barrier of their origin and, displaying real heroism, go over—secretly or openly—to the side of the most advanced revolutionary class. The intelligentsia is an ally of the proletariat and the peasantry. But its role is not simply one of "enlightened" fellow-travellers or learned standard-bearers. It is an indispensable detachment of the army of the people. Its form of struggle is sometimes specific, its weapon nearly always its profession. And it is thanks to this that the clear and resonant voice of those who have dedicated themselves to the liberation struggle is frequently heard on our continent.

The Communist Position

Our enemies allege that the Communists are opponents of freedom in general, and freedom of creation in particular. Neither the one nor the other is true. In a society that is divided into classes, the individual never has been and never will be free. Although he thinks he is his

own master, he is in fact a slave. He lives in definite historical conditions which hamper the attainment of actual freedom. Even more: the individual himself is a split personality. As a consequence of the exploitation of the majority by the minority, of the division of labor, every individual finds himself in a dual position: on the one hand he is an individuality, on the other, a subordinate person tied to a salary, working to be able to subsist and continue working for another. There takes place what Marx described as the separation of man as an individual from man as a member of his class, in other words, alienation. Can the person who has to work all his life not in his vocation but to enrich another, consider himself his own master? Can he be said to be free? Hardly. He is the slave of another. Today this kind of slavery is called "freedom" and "Western civilization." It is the Communists who want to destroy the roots of slavery, that is, the regime of class exploitation and enable man to attain freedom, the freedom that is forged in the historical process. The transition from the realm of necessity to that of freedom will be effected essentially through the machine which will perform man's work, releasing his energy and enabling him to give rein to his spiritual abilities, and to enjoy the process of creativity and aesthetic values.

It is also alleged that the Communist Party of Chile will establish a dictatorship over the writer and the artist, will impose on them the subject, style and form of creation they must follow. The charge is an utterly false one. Take, for example, Pablo Neruda. Neruda's creative versatility is infinite. He writes about the celestial and the terrestrial. Along with "An Ode to a 50-Megaton Bomb" he publishes his "Hundred Love Sonnets" and "Extravagario," a book brimming with humor and bold experiments. Neruda is a member of the Central Committee of our Party. The Party does not tell the author what subject he should write on. He decides on this himself, following the dictates of his conscience and what interests him, but ever guided by the desire to create profoundly and to give his maximum.

Our Party wants the Communist artist to be a true artist, comprehensive and profound, ever concerned with the individual, the mass, society. Their aspirations should be his aspirations. Art is not the product of the "absolute spirit," or some "divine revelation," just as it is not a supernatural inspiration. It is the product of human consciousness in the broadest sense of the word; and consciousness in turn can only be conscious being which is the very process of life. Life determines the consciousness, the creativity of the artist. The spiritual complexity of a work of art always reflects a definite his-

torical process, is related to life and the sensibilities of the artist, to his talent or genius. The artist perceives the world and expresses its most important aspects. No talent can create a work of art out of nothing. It is in this sense that the struggle and social experience, opening the door of life to the artist and bringing him closer to the people, inspires his muse.

Our Party does not want a literature or an art made accessible by lowering their quality. Our Party wants the Communist artist to be among the best of the best, to produce works bearing the hallmark of maturity and depth.

Sometimes—and this is a good and positive thing—the artist feels the need to participate directly in the struggle, using his art as his weapon. That is why Picasso drew his “Dove of Peace,” sending it to all corners of the earth, and painted his *Guernica*. That is why Neruda is creating perennially topical works, wielding the weapon of true artistic perception. It is to this that we should aspire, to art of the highest calibre.

Our Party has gone far ahead in this respect. When first we joined the Party way back in 1932, it was considered almost a “sin” or a “petty-bourgeois deviation” to engage in writing. The writer or artist pursued his vocation in secret, or gave it up altogether. We have now, fortunately, overcome this absurd sectarian attitude and narrow-mindedness. The Party today regards and appreciates creative work as political activity of prime importance, as the most important work the Communist artist can do. And the writer for his part knows that the Party is proud of his work, that it applauds his creative endeavor. And to those who like to denigrate us, representing us as a band of ignoramuses, we can say: our ranks include—along with the country’s finest workers and peasants, finest women and youth—teachers, professionals, artists and writers. They are among the best of the best and, in many cases not only the pride of Chile, but of many, many other countries.

The Student Rebellion, Part I

Student activism is nothing new in American history. Students have been involved in the great movements for social change dating back to the 19th century. Little known, for example, are the student protests against slavery. In 1834 students at Lane Theological Seminary in Cincinnati conducted a college-wide debate on slavery that the administration banned. Students, en masse, left Lane Seminary and went to Oberlin College. They radicalized that school by forcing the administration to admit both Negro and women students. This student revolt was led by Theodore Weld who later became well-known for his work in the abolitionist movement. A recent paper by Herbert Aptheker details Negro student protests in the 1920’s. And there is ample evidence of massive student protests in the late 1920’s and throughout the 1930’s. By 1939 more than one million college and high school students participated in student strikes for peace. Students of past generations utilized many of the same tactics which are used today—petitions, referendums, sit-ins and strikes. And the college and university administrations responded in like manner: suspensions, expulsions and arrests.

While it is useful and necessary to see the current student rebellion in its historic context it is also essential to examine those features and qualities in the rebellion which are unique to it today. Moreover, it is necessary to observe that the rebellion begun by black students in the South in 1960 and now involving ever growing numbers of black, white, Puerto-Rican and Mexican-American students, revitalized the American Left. The rebellion has drastically altered the political complexion of the country.

We must ask ourselves: what are the new features of the student rebellion? What is the cause of the rebellion? Until we answer these questions, until we understand the laws of motion of this society which produced this revolt, we cannot correctly estimate the role of students in producing social change, or the historic import of this movement.

The article, because of its length, will be done in two parts. The first will deal with the objective character of the rebellion, and the new features of American higher education. The second part

will deal with the ideological trends in the student movement, especially the nature, extent and quality of petty-bourgeois radicalism.

New Features of Student Movement

In brief then, these are the new features in the student movement:

1) In the 1930's, student actions were supportive of the demands of a popular mass movement led by the working class. Students, both black and white, today are the major catalyst in projecting social and political demands in a period when the organized *leadership* of the labor movement is overwhelmingly racist, class collaborationist and supports US imperialist foreign policy.

2) There has been an enormous increase in the numbers of students especially since 1945. This has altered the class composition of the student body in general.

3) Increasing numbers of college graduates are not becoming professionals or private entrepreneurs, but are forced to sell their highly technical labor skills and become wage-earners, forming a new, largely unorganized section of the working class.

4) There has been a phenomenal increase in the number of colleges, universities and junior colleges. These institutions, especially the universities, play a qualitatively new role in American society. Part of this new role necessitates a qualitative change in the role of the state in relation to higher education.

5) Students, through their protests, are for the first time challenging the character and content of their education.

6) The student rebellion occurs in a new epoch in the history of man—the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism. Moreover, that transition now occurs when the balance of world forces has shifted in favor of socialism and national liberation.

These are at least some of the new features to be considered in estimating the student revolt. We look at several of them in more detail.

Changes in Student Composition

In the 1930's and the 1940's there was a national total of several hundred thousand college and university students in the United States. Today there are 2,200 institutions of higher learning with a total student population of 6.7 million. This enormous leap has altered the class composition of the students. While percentage-wise the children of professional and middle class families represent a decisive majority of the student population, there has been a sig-

nificant increase in *absolute* numbers of the students from working-class homes. This increase has *not* been significantly reflected in the black community. As of 1965 there were only 200,000 black youth in college, half of them in black or predominantly black institutions in the South.

Here is an illustration of the student population increase which is illustrative of the boom *and the contradiction* within it. The California State College system represents the largest system of public higher education in the Western Hemisphere. Current enrollment exceeds 188,000 full and part-time students. The faculty and administrative staffs number approximately 10,000. Prior to 1945 there were only 13,000 state college students on seven campuses. Since 1947, eleven new campuses have been created. Enrollment on all 18 campuses is expected to reach 225,000 by 1970. The University of California comprises nine campuses, two of which were created in the last ten years. All nine campuses have 90,000 students and a yearly budget of \$1 billion.

Eligibility for enrollment at the state colleges and the university in California is constructed to limit the numbers of black, Mexican-American and white working-class youth who can fulfill requirements. This is done by ranking all graduating high school students according to their grade-point average in high school plus their scores on the College Entrance Examination Board tests. Given the higher standards of education available to white, middle-class youth, plus the bias of the educational system to relate to experiences of white middle-class youth rather than working-class and ghetto youth, the system is rigged in favor of the white middle class. The top one-sixth of these high school graduates are eligible to attend the University of California. The top one-third are eligible to attend the State Colleges. Anybody with a high school diploma from an *accredited* high school (there are a number of ghetto schools which are not accredited or have only recently been given accreditation) is eligible for enrollment at any of the junior colleges in the state. If you maintain a good grade-point average at a Junior College you become eligible to transfer into a State College. This makes clear the advantage middle-class youth have in obtaining a college degree. However, it also shows that working-class youth have a new basis for going to college.

The figures available for 1966 show that 42.2 per cent of the students in California Junior Colleges came from families with parental incomes of less than \$8,000 a year (the majority of these with

family incomes of between \$4,000 and \$8,000 a year) that 30.6 per cent of the students in the State Colleges came from families of parental income yearly under \$8,000 (the majority of them in the area of between \$4,000 and \$8,000 yearly); that 23.3 per cent of the students at the University of California came from families with a yearly income of less than \$8,000 (also with the majority of them from family incomes between \$4,000 and \$8,000 a year).*

Some sociologists have argued that there is a so-called "equality of opportunity" and "upward mobility" through the college system. We do not suggest this. But we do insist that there is a new quality of mass higher education, and that the trend is toward greater expansion of college facilities and vast increases in the numbers of students. Moreover, the student rebellion is not limited to campuses with only white, middle-class students, but on the contrary is spreading to the State, City and Junior colleges and into the high schools, each containing respectively a greater and greater proportion of working-class youth. And in recent months, black and Mexican-American students have assumed major leadership roles. These two features—mass education, and the spreading rebellion—are decisive historically because they are laying the objective class basis for the rejection of petty-bourgeois radicalism as a major ideological current in the student Left.

Role of the State and Big Business

Another fundamental area of change since World War II is in the character of the universities and colleges themselves. While the ruling class—i.e. big business—has always insured that its representatives sit on the governing boards of the universities, there has now been a massive flood of federal and state money into the colleges and universities and a consequent new role of the state in higher education. Moreover, because there is intense monopolization of industry within the country, the actual power over decisions of higher educational policy is limited to fewer and fewer men within those governing boards. Increasingly, too, educational policy and planning is made regionally—e.g., the New England Regional Council on Higher Education or the Western Regional Council on Higher Education. Thus we are no longer dealing with single institutions,

*The source for these figures is the California State Scholarship Commission.

but state and regional *systems* of higher education.

Look at the spiraling increase in federal financing of higher education. In 1950 the expenditure of higher education for research activities amounted to \$222 million. The government supplied 70 per cent of these funds. The *total institutional expenses* for higher education in 1968 is \$17.2 billion. The Federal government contributed one-fifth of that total or more than \$3 billion. It is estimated that total yearly expenditures for higher education will be \$41 billion by 1976. A recent commission set up by the Carnegie Foundation, and headed by former University of California President Clark Kerr, suggests that the federal government should assume one-third of that total expenditure or more than \$13 billion.

The fact is that the federal government, through its funds to the universities and colleges, is financing the research and development programs for the major industries in the country.

Another new aspect of this higher educational system is that the universities and colleges are big business industries themselves, and also hold stock in leading corporations. In the latest annual report of the Boston Fund Inc. on college and university funds we find that: 47 colleges and universities hold more than \$213 million worth of stock in International Business Machines; 45 universities and colleges hold stock worth \$106 million in General Motors; 42 institutions hold nearly \$97 million worth of stock in Standard Oil of New Jersey. Millions of dollars worth of stock are owned by universities and colleges in Eastman Kodak, Texaco, Gulf Oil, Coca Cola, Xerox, A. T. & T. and Ford Motor Company.

What is the historical import of these facts about higher education? Big business and the federal and state governments—i.e., those who control the system of state monopoly capitalism—are utilizing colleges and universities in a *new* way to accomplish *new* things.

In the first place, they use higher education to train workers technically. The institutions are of extreme value in allowing monopoly to amass greater profits because they relieve the industries of the necessity to train their own workers *within* the industry. Instead, this training is done in the colleges primarily at state expense.

Second, it relieves industry of the major proportion of its research expenses since the research can be done in the universities, primarily financed by the federal government. It is simply a fact that big business could not maintain its same rate of profit without federal financing of its research and development.

In the third place, big business uses its control over higher educa-

tion to indoctrinate the students ideologically — the curriculum is geared to perpetuate bourgeois ideology, anti-working-class ideas, racism, anti-Communism and the system of world imperialism.

Fourth, big business utilizes higher education to divide the working class along racial lines, not only by insisting upon racist ideology in the class room, but by a systematic policy of excluding large numbers of black people from the colleges to insure that the highly technical sections of the working class remain overwhelmingly white. Then it inculcates these skilled youth with the idea that they are not workers but “professionals” who should have no part of trade-union organization. Thus, they break the highly skilled workers off from the production workers in two ways—utilizing racism and professionalism, preventing or making difficult union organization.

Fifth, big business, through its control of the financial structure of higher education, uses the university as a sort of giant holding company. It uses the money for investments (often in the companies owned by members of the Board of Trustees) and for contractual arrangements between the university and corporations (often also the ones they own) for the expansion of university facilities, and for supplying the universities with paper, food, text books, etc. They also use the universities as purchasers of important real estate for new industrial uses, or, as in the instance of Columbia, to obliterate black communities. (This is also a good deal for the corporations which may eventually lease the land because universities are public trusts with tax exemptions. What a racket!)

Sixth, big business utilizes the universities to establish educational centers in foreign countries (e.g. the University of California in Chile) in which they have major investments—Latin America, Africa, Europe. These educational institutions then become prime centers to train foreign students to service American big business abroad and to indoctrinate foreign students politically and ideologically. Likewise, big business in this country uses the university to research techniques in counter-revolution, counter-insurgency and psychological warfare, etc., for use in foreign countries, not least of which are the socialist countries.

Lastly, universities are the ideological centers for the defense of this system, not only for students, but for the entire population, especially through the use of the mass media. Scarcely a week goes by but that some professorial big shot, from the sociology or political science departments of Yale or Harvard, is not on this or that television program (like “Face the Nation” or “Meet the Press”) lectur-

ing to the American public. Moreover, these “specialists” are either going to or coming from the State Department or the Pentagon as an “advisor” on policy.

These are the central functions of the higher educational system. They are new functions. They represent a new strategic role for higher education. Understanding this is absolutely essential to a correct estimate of the student revolt. Students, through their demands for the democratization of higher education, are striking at a vital organ of the body politic.

Unless these new features are grasped, it is impossible to understand the intransigence of the governing boards of trustees in the face of student demands. If we only see the student movement in terms of petty-bourgeois radicalism, we cannot explain the use of 500 police daily for 3 weeks on the San Francisco State College campus to break a student strike. We must understand the new strategic role of higher education.

Challenge to What is Taught

Another new feature of the rebellion, is that students are challenging the authority of the governing boards which rule the universities, and they are expressing increasing dissatisfaction with the content of their education. This is new, and the two areas of protest are interrelated. Past student rebels did not in significant mass movements challenge these aspects of the higher educational system.

The big business domination of education produces one aspect of the contradiction within the university. The universities exist to service a dying, degenerate social order. But the basic commitment of inquiry and scholarship is to use science (social and physical) in order to create a more humane and rational organization of society. Thus, there is the cry from the students that the education they receive is irrelevant to life. What they mean by that is that education has nothing to do with the realities of life they perceive all around them. And, the fact is, that in order for education to be relevant today it *must* be radical — i.e. it must swing with the revolutionary epoch in which we live. Not only does education not do that; it does the opposite. It is the center of counter-revolution! This contradiction is especially sharp for black students. The implications of this contradiction, especially as they are manifested in student demands for new and different courses which *they* control, are enormous. Imagine what it means to this ruling class when you challenge the ideological and political content of the education re-

ceived by 6.7 million students, 30 per cent of whom are from the working class!

We spoke earlier of the contradictions which operate within the context of expanding the educational system, namely, that eligibility for college admission was structured to limit working class and ethnic minority enrollment. This reflects the other side of the contradiction of the mass higher educational system. On the one hand, life necessitates such a mass system. That is, the socialization and specialization of industry requires the socialization and specialization of education. But the class bias interferes—or more precisely the class consciousness of the ruling class interferes. It can be a very dangerous thing to have a highly educated, literate working class. Thus, the ruling class does two things. It tries to limit the enrollment, and it intensifies the training aspects of education as opposed to the liberal arts. Thus, on the one hand it must expand the system, and on the other hand it must tighten its control over the system. This in turn results in an intensification of the first contradiction over the content of education—i.e. we have the interpenetration of the two contradictions.

Moreover, the objective need of all young people to obtain higher education (because of the socialization-specialization process in industry), leads to a greater and greater demand inside and outside the colleges for an increase in the number of students, and for a radical change in admissions' requirements. Inside the colleges the pressure comes from radical students, especially black radicals. Outside the colleges the pressures come from the trade-union movement and the communities, especially black and working-class communities. And from these pressures, and life's necessities for the ruling class, there is a change in the composition of the student body—especially the entrance recently of students from the ethnic minorities. The change in composition leads to ever-more massive student demands to change the curriculum—again the interpenetration of the two contradictions. I believe that these two contradictions arising from the corporate control of higher education and the socialization-specialization of industry, as they operate *independently*, and as they *interrelate*, are the central cause of the student rebellion.

The nature of the contradictions in the university leads to what must be the strategic goal of the academic revolt: the overthrow of the boards of trustees as they are presently constituted, and their replacement with boards representative of and responsive to students, faculty and the black, brown and working-class communities. Given

the nature of the monopoly power represented on these boards and the uses to which they put the university, it is abundantly clear that they will not be overthrown by the students fighting alone. Nor will students and faculty be sufficient. They can be overthrown, by an anti-monopoly coalition of the academic community, the trade union movement, and the black, brown and working-class communities. And we suggest that the objective contradictions within the system of higher education itself makes *possible* the formation of such a coalition. The formation of such a coalition, around such demands, will necessarily *transform* the political outlook and direction of its participants.

Students Challenge the System

Finally, in this discussion of the new features of the student rebellion, we come to this reality: the revolt takes place in the new epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism when there has been a shift in the balance of world forces in favor of socialism and national liberation. One-third of the world is socialist. One-third of the world is in the throes of revolution to achieve national liberation. Unlike previous times, the sharpest point of the international struggle at this moment is the movement for national liberation against imperialism. This is not to deny our Marxist-Leninist outlook which holds that the *primary* conflict in the international arena is the *class* conflict between capitalism and socialism; but it is to suggest that whereas the Soviet revolution was the revolution for the generation of the thirties, the Cuban revolution is the revolution of this generation. And that especially the African revolution effects the black movement. These realities deeply influence the ideological and political outlook, and the *tactics*, of the student radicals. We will deal with this at greater length in Part II.

Moreover, the era of revolution has brought masses of young people in the movement to the realization that radical change is not only desirable, it is *possible*. Look at the number of articles in the press of the New Left, on Cuba. This, too, is exceedingly consequential in effecting the militancy, determination and uncompromising posture of the rebels.

Lenin suggested forty years ago that this was the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. But there is now a new estimate. That is, that the balance of world forces has shifted in favor of socialism and national liberation. This is not just a rhetorical gimmick to make us feel good. While the *will* of imperialism to crush revolu-

tion has not altered, its *power* to execute counter-revolution is not unlimited. It no longer enjoys hegemony in the world. The two poignant examples of this internationally are: the Vietnamese struggle, where a popular national front is defeating US imperialism militarily and politically; and Cuba—ninety miles from the shores of babylon and she flourishes and grows.

If we can see this shift in the power of imperialism internationally we must likewise see it nationally. New tactics can be employed in the movement, and *successfully*. Tactics which thirty years ago would have been correctly labelled as adventurism, are no longer adventurist. Adventurism is not an abstract conception, it is a *relative* thing—relative to the *changing power* of the ruling class. Look at the movements which have fired the student rebellion and the movement for black liberation—sit-ins, barricading of buildings, the seizing of police cars, strikes, massive confrontations with the armed power of the state. And it was done without a lot of fancy footwork beforehand building the “proper” broad coalitions to pull it off. If the issues were clear, if the leadership was militant but not sectarian (and there is a difference), the coalitions were forged out of the struggle. We have often predicted the defeat of these movements. We were wrong. These movements were not drowned and killed in blood; on the contrary, they have raised the political and ideological level of the movement, and they have transformed the American political scene. We must grasp the full meaning of this new epoch. Imperialism is on the defensive internationally and nationally. New tactics, new militancy, new revolutionary fervor, commitment and determination are desirable, possible and necessary.

In conclusion then, we argue that the qualitatively new features of the higher educational system, of the composition of the student bodies, and of this epoch, add a new dimension to the US revolutionary movement. Students are not peripheral to the revolutionary movement. Objectively they are an increasingly important part of it. They are not at the point of production—the workers are. The working class is thus the decisive instrument of the revolution. But students confront the same individual monopolists that workers confront. And this quite apart from all the changes in the role of the educational system. We must see the student rebellion as a *new* dimension in the fight for the revolutionary transformation of society. This is the starting point for a correct estimate of the student rebellion.

ON SELF-DETERMINATION

JAMES E. JACKSON

Separatism — A Bourgeois-Nationalist Trap

The article of Claude Lightfoot in the November, 1968, issue of *Political Affairs* has evoked considerable interest. In my opinion the article adds no clarity to the discussion of the question under review but reflects a serious disorientation itself.

The very title of the article contains a basic confusion of concept. The title is “The Right of Black America to Create a Nation,” but the often cited and generally accepted definition of a nation which Comrade Lightfoot himself refers to, clearly implies that a nation is an *objective* phenomenon. It is a material community of people with very definite features. The classical definition, which Comrade Lightfoot cited, states:

“A nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.” (J. Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question* p. 16.)

A nation is in being only when a community of people have evolved a combination of such characteristic features. One feature or another may be stronger

than others—this gives each nation its peculiar national identity—but every one of the above stated characteristics must be present or the community cannot be a nation. A nation being a historic phenomenon arises, develops and declines, undergoing constant change. A community of people may evolve into a nation by acquiring precisely those characteristic features listed in the given definition.

But it is not something that can be willed or chosen. A nation exists as an objective fact, or it doesn't exist, because of certain mitigating historical circumstances which left it deprived of the requisite attributes. For instance, both Lenin and Stalin, in their respective works on the national question, made favorable references to the illustration given by Otto Bauer in his book *The National Question and Social Democracy*, that the concept nation is not an ethnographic or racial category, but a historical category that conforms to definite objective criterion. Bauer wrote, “in general, capitalist society makes it impossible for them (the Jews) to continue as a nation,” because they had no close territory of settlement causing them

to assimilate with other nations and "because no nation is possible without a common language." (*Ibid.*)

The Jews in Czarist Russia were certainly oppressed—experiencing the kind of savage discrimination, persecution, and the horrors of lynching pogroms, which is so descriptive of the worst features of Negro oppression in the United States—still they were not a nation. The character of their conditions defined to an important extent the route they could take in the struggle for freedom. Were they a nation oppressed, they could take the route of struggle for *self-determination, for political secession* from the Great Russian oppressor nation. But since *they were not constituted* as a nation but, to use Lenin's phrase, "*a persecuted and oppressed minority caste*," they had to struggle under other slogans—against discrimination, segregation, the pale separatism—in alliance with the working class and others for equality, for democracy, for the overthrow of the system that bred anti-Semitism, for socialism.

Basically, in its scientific usage, the slogan of self-determination of nations means that the nations, large or small, developed or underdeveloped, have the right to sovereign existence, to complete secession and the establishment of an independent state. Lenin gives us a precise definition of self-determination which holds true for the whole sphere of political science. He wrote:

"Self-determination of nations means the political separation of these nations from alien national bodies, and the formation of an independent national state. . . . It would be wrong to interpret the right of self-determination as meaning anything but the right to existence as a separate state." (*Collected Works*, Vol. XX, p. 397.)

The right of self-determination means that only the nation itself will decide how it will arrange its internal affairs and its external relations with other nations. But these are slogans for the orientation of the fighters against national oppression, when the oppressed are constituted into a specific socio-historic formation—a nation. These slogans are not necessarily apt or correct, or useful guides to action, for the communities and groups of oppressed people who do not constitute nations. National and racial oppression fall often most heavily upon peoples who are not oppressed as whole nations, but as fragmented communities, minorities, etc. The slogans appropriate for oppressed nations often ill-fit the demands, and prove contrary to the requirements and the circumstances of the struggle and its goals, confronting the *oppressed nationalities*, such as black Americans.

There can be nothing wrong with "tying into" a certain popularity that the term self-determination has currently among circles of radicals of various hues, providing one makes clear that it

is not intended to convey the Marxist meaning in political science. When we give a term from political science a *special* meaning, we must accompany it with *our* definition and explanation. For example, I made use of the term self-determination in its popular, broad, non-scientific sense in writing on this question in the following way:

"It seems to me that such relevance as the general principle of self-determination has to the reality of the status and outlook for the Negro people's struggle in the U. S. can be expressed as: The right of a people—irrespective of their level of, or direction of, development as a national entity—to act in concert, or in alliance with fraternal classes and peoples, under the direction of their own leadership, after the fashion they may choose, in pursuance of their own goal of freedom as they so conceive and construe it to be at any given moment, is an inalienable democratic right of that people which can neither be ceded or withdrawn by any other power. In this sense, the right to self-determination is to the national community what the right to freedom of conscience and freedom of political choice is to the individual." (*Theoretical Aspects of the Negro Question in the United States*, 1959.)

What Comrade Lightfoot esays in his article is not to arrive at a popular usage for the now fashionable term of self-determination; rather it is to demand the

revision of the Marxist-Leninist definition of both nation and self-determination. And he wants to qualify these scientific definitions and concepts to make it easier to replace the Party's main line with a confused accommodation to the revolutionariness of the petty-bourgeois, revolutionary Black nationalists.

Comrade Lightfoot enjoins his readers to be mindful of the fact that, "Ye live in an advanced age of science, both natural and social," and calls for approaching this question "scientifically." But it is precisely this, a scientific approach to the problem, that is lacking in Comrade Lightfoot's presentation of the question of national oppression and how to solve it in the diverse forms in which it occurs—in the form of an oppressed nation, an oppressed nationality within a nation, an oppressed national minority, an oppressed caste, an oppressed group, etc., etc. Comrade Lightfoot's presentation of the question of self-determination, as well as his conception of the nation, do not accord with Marxist-Leninist science. Rather they reveal what he derides later on as "An approach which is based only on subjective desires . . . [and] will lead exactly nowhere."

Self-determination, says Lightfoot, "must be applied to the people as a whole and not to a territorial unit . . . the right of self-determination applies to black Americans independently of whether there is territorial unity

in the black belt or elsewhere. In my view it is wrong from the beginning to have restricted the use of this slogan on the basis of territorial approach."

This assertion, on page 8 of the article, is not only in glaring contradiction to the definition of a *nation* given by Comrade Lightfoot, but is the exact opposite of what he said on page 5: "Of course, the concept of common territory is one of the fundamental features of a nation and without it there is no nation." (!) From which page shall we take our guidance on this point?

People suffering common oppression — racial, ethnological, caste, religious, language, cultural—who, nevertheless, do not occupy a common territory, do not add up to a nation. This, of course, is not to say that the victims of oppression are any less relieved by the circumstance that they are not oppressed in the category of *nation*, but it does say something about how the struggle can be waged for freedom from oppression. And it demands a correct appraisal of the facts of the case, of the particular type of national oppression, that one is dealing with. Only in the most general sense, can the slogans and strategy of struggle of the nation for liberation illuminate the tasks, the ways and means by which oppressed people, in other or lesser social political formations, can advance along the correct path to freedom.

The mistake of the "nation

builders," wrote Lenin, is not their concern for objective conditions but "their incorrect appraisal of facts—they grab hold of trivialities and do not see the main thing." He followed with the affirmation that, "We Marxists have always been proud that we determined the expediency of any form of struggle by a precise calculation of the mass forces and class relationships." (*Against Dogmatism and Sectarianism*, p. 92.)

In *The Theoretical Aspects of the Negro Question in the United States*, the major conclusions of which were embodied in the Resolution on the Negro Question adopted by the 17th National Convention, we demonstrated why *the representation of the question as that of an oppressed nation seeking sovereignty*, was not a correct orientation for the development of the necessary forms of struggle for the solution of the particular national question of black Americans.

But Comrade Lightfoot insists that, "The slogan of self-determination today means the struggle for the right of black America to form a nation if it elects to do so." Still, we must ask: Where will this nation be living—in what area of the country will it be located?

Comrade Lightfoot simply took out of the Leninist definition of a nation the essential characteristic, the most important attribute—that of a common territory—the base upon which the other

features could take shape! To eliminate common territory from the characteristics of a nation is like taking the main spring out of a watch. It may then still look like a watch, have a watch's face and hands, but will it truly be a watch?

The consequences of such an approach can become a strategic disservice to the cause itself. In his article entitled "The Latest Word In Bundist Nationalism," V. I. Lenin sounded a warning on this question that has a timely pertinence:

"He who says A must say B: one who has adopted the standpoint of nationalism naturally arrives at *the desire to erect a Chinese wall around his nationality, his national working-class movement; he is unembarrassed even by the fact that it would mean building separate walls in each city, in each little town and village, unembarrassed even by the fact that by his tactics of division and dismemberment he is reducing to nil the great call for the rallying and unity of the proletarians of all nations, all races and all languages.*" (*On the Unity of the International Movement*, p. 9. Emphasis mine—J.J.)

The nation that Lightfoot proclaims for Negro Americans would have the geographical profile of several strings of Love Beads. It would be a *conglomerate* black nation which could view "the ghettos across the land" as a part of itself.

Lightfoot is much taken with

some fine lines of distinction which G. Starushenko makes, in *The Principles of National Self-Determination in Soviet Foreign Policy*, between foreign policy, national groups, peoples and nations in respect to relating their cause to the slogan of self-determination. Still, he constantly uses the term "nation," when it is evident from the context that he is speaking of a "state." For instance on page 10, he writes: "... the possibility of black America to establish a black nation [state—J.J.] within continental United States." Again, on page 11, he looks forward to a "new system which would permit a reorganization of our entire society, a condition basic to carving out a black nation [i.e. black state—J.J.] in continental United States." When he describes the Marcus Garvey nationalist fantasy, at some points "nation" is used for "state" and vice versa.

But should the reader get lost in some fast semantical footwork here, Comrade Lightfoot leaves no doubt where he stands on the strategic concept for the black people's liberation movement. He comes out as an advocate of a separatist national solution. He declares: "The slogan of self-determination today means the struggle for the right of black Americans to form a nation [a state—J.J.] if it elects to do so." And he urges that "We should call for a plebiscite of all black Americans on whether they want to remain in the general commonwealth or to establish another na-

tion [state—J.J.] within continental United States.”

As to this latter point, Communists cannot determine policies and make political decisions on the basis of the outcome of a plebiscite or a Gallup poll, but by the careful assembly of all relevant facts and submitting them to a thorough analysis, as illuminated by the guiding principles of Marxism-Leninism.

As for Comrade Lightfoot's case for exhuming the corpse of a variant of the hapless old slogan of *self-determination for the oppressed black nation in America*, we think life has affirmed the correctness of our Party having retired that slogan a decade ago.

The theoretical foundation for our Party's ever vital and growing policy and programs on the Negro question in the United States, and its basic approach to the problems of the black liberation movement, were set forth in the documents of the National Committee and the 17th Convention. They have proven their Marxist mettle and strategic and tactical value over the span of a decade. They will continue to cast light on the road ahead in this field. This is so because our Party's position flows from a continuous and profound study of the ever-changing reality, and is deeply grounded in the scientific works of Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin's work in this area is full of illuminating insights into the complexity of the variegated patterns of the national question and,

at the same time, is a dependable compass in executing a proper dialectical pattern of movement and struggle for its resolution.

Here, then, are propositions, ideas, concussions from some of the works of Lenin, which are of a special pertinency now in the light of the sharply critical appraisal made of Comrade Lightfoot's article.

Lenin said:

“. . . As far as autonomy is concerned, Marxists defend, not the 'right' to autonomy, but autonomy *itself*, as a general, universal principle of a democratic state with a mixed national composition, and a great variety of geographical and other conditions. . . ." (*Selected Works*, Vol. IV, p. 279.) Autonomy meaning here not merely "community control," but real political power in areas of their majority, and maximum representation everywhere.

The above formulation of Lenin is deserving of the most careful contemplation. I consider it the key idea in Leninism in respect to a general strategic concept and direction of development for the solution of the national question in the United States.

While defending various forms of territorial political autonomy, as a necessary aspect in the solution of the national question where there is "a mixed national composition," Lenin pointedly opposed notions of "extra-territorial or cultural-national autonomy." He called such schemes "segre-

gation" and declared they were incompatible with Marxism but "spread ideas of bourgeois nationalism among the working class in a refined form."

Pointing out that the theory and program of "cultural-national autonomy" is petty-bourgeois, Lenin shows that, "Under the slogan of 'national culture' the bourgeoisie of all nations . . . are in fact pursuing the policy of splitting the workers, emasculating democracy and haggling . . . over the sale of the people's rights and the people's liberty.

"The slogan of working-class democracy is not 'national culture' but the international culture of democracy and the world-wide working class movement. . . ." (*Collected Works*, Vol. XX, pp. 21-22.)

Leninism teaches:

"Marxism cannot be reconciled with nationalism, be it even of the 'most just,' 'purest,' most refined and civilized brand. In place of all forms of nationalism Marxism advances internationalism, the amalgamation of all nations in the higher unity, a unity that is growing before our eyes with every mile of railway line that is built, with every international trust, and every workers' association that is formed (an association that is international in its economic activities as well as in its ideas and aims).

"The principle of nationality is historically inevitable in bourgeois society and, taking this so-

ciety into due account, the Marxist fully recognizes the historical legitimacy of national movements. *But to prevent this recognition from becoming an apologia of nationalism, it must be strictly limited to what is progressive in such movements, in order that this recognition may not lead to bourgeois ideology obscuring proletarian consciousness.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 34. Emphasis mine—J.J.)

". . . It is the Marxists *bounden* duty to stand for the most resolute and consistent democratism on all aspects of the national question. This task is largely a negative one. But this is the limit the proletariat can go in supporting nationalism, for beyond that begins the 'positive' activity of the *bourgeoisie* striving to *fortify* nationalism.

"To throw off . . . all national oppression, and all privileges enjoyed by any particular nation or language, is the imperative duty of the proletariat as a democratic force, and is certainly in the interests of the proletarian class struggle, which is obscured and retarded by bickering on the national question. But to go beyond these strictly limited and definite historical limits in helping bourgeois nationalism means betraying the proletariat and siding with the bourgeoisie. There is a border-line which is often very slight and which . . . nationalist-socialists completely lose sight of.

"Combat all national oppression? Yes, of course! Fight for any kind of national development,

for 'national culture' in general? Of course not. . . ." (*Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.)

". . . The development of nationality in general is the principle of bourgeois nationalism—hence the exclusiveness of bourgeois nationalism, hence the endless national bickering. The proletariat, however, far from undertaking to uphold the national development of every nation, on the contrary warns the masses against such illusions . . . and welcomes every kind of assimilation of nations, except that which is founded on force or privilege." (*Ibid.*, p. 35. Emphasis mine—J.J.)

". . . The proletariat cannot support any consecration of nationalism; on the contrary, it supports everything that helps to obliterate national distinctions and remove national barriers; it supports everything that makes the ties between nationalities closer and closer, or tends to merge nations. To act differently means siding with reactionary nationalist philistinism." (*Ibid.*, pp. 35-36. Emphasis mine—J.J.)

* * *

The Soviet Academician T. Stepanyan, writing on the subject, in an article entitled "Socialist Internationalism and Nationalist Ideology" (*Pravda*, January 15, 1969), underscored the fact that "The ignoring of the tendency of internationalization, of the uniting of nations, gives rise to diverse forms of nationalism."

The tendency toward the unit-

ing of peoples and nations, toward the formation of conglomerates of nationalities and peoples into large single states, is one of two objective trends in respect to the national question under capitalism. The other objective trend being the further development of national features of the respective peoples and of nation-type attributes in the sphere of economy as well as culture. Not to take note of this companion tendency becomes a deviation toward national nihilism.

The two objective trends are: one toward uniting the diverse parts of the multi-nationality state into a firmer whole; the other, being the impulse given to separate peoples to develop toward nationhood and to seek national independence and the state sovereignty.

"The Leninist principle of achieving a proper blend of class and national interest is as topical as ever," the Soviet scholar writes, "because part of the strategic plan of the ideological struggle of international reaction is the promotion of nationalism against proletarian internationalism."

"Nationalism under present-day conditions is above all expressed in ignoring the main contradiction of our epoch," Stepanyan continues, "the contradiction between socialism and capitalism, in giving up class positions when analyzing social phenomena, in giving up the ideas of the unity of all detachments of the world

revolutionary movement and above all of the socialist countries in the struggle against the common enemy—against imperialism."

Lenin said:

". . . On the national question, opportunism will naturally express itself differently among the oppressed nations from the way it will express itself among the oppressing nations.

"The bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations will call upon the proletariat to support its aspirations unconditionally for the sake of the 'practicalness' of its demands. It would be more practical to say a plain 'yes' in favor of the separation of *this or that* nation, rather than in favor of the *right* of separation for all and sundry nations!" (*Selected Works*, Vol. IV, p. 265.)

"The proletariat is opposed to such practicalness, recognizing equality of rights and an equal right to a national state, it values most the alliance of the proletarians of all nations, and evaluates every national demand, every national separation *from the angle* of the class struggle of the workers. The slogan of practicalness is in fact only a slogan of non-critically adopting bourgeois aspirations." (*Ibid.*, pp. 265-266.)

". . . To the extent that the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation struggles against the oppressing one, to that extent, we are always, in every case, and more resolutely than anyone else, for it,

because we are the staunchest and most consistent enemies of oppression. Insofar as the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations stands for its own bourgeois nationalism we are against it. A struggle against the privileges and violence of the oppressing nation and no toleration of the strivings for privileges on the part of the oppressed nation." (*Ibid.*, p. 266.)

". . . The bourgeois nationalism of every oppressed nation has a general democratic content which is directed *against* oppression, and it is this content that we *absolutely* support, strictly distinguishing it from the tendency towards one's own national exclusiveness, fighting against the tendency of the Polish bourgeoisie to oppress the Jews, etc., etc." (*Ibid.*, p. 267.)

"From the point of view of the theory of Marxism in general, the question of the right of self-determination presents no difficulties.

. . . The difficulty is created to a certain extent by the fact that in Russia the proletariat of both the oppressed and oppressing nations are fighting and must fight side by side. The task is to preserve the unity of the class struggle of the proletariat for socialism, to offer resistance to all the bourgeois and Black Hundred [KKK-like—J.J.] influences of nationalism. Among the oppressed nations the separation of the proletariat as an independent party sometimes leads to such a bitter struggle against nationalism of the re-

spective nation that the perspective becomes distorted and nationalism of the oppressing nation is forgotten." (*Ibid.*, pp. 289-290.)

"... The more slowly the democratization of Russia proceeds, the more persistent, brutal and bitter will national persecution and quareling among the bourgeoisie of the various nations be. The particular reactionary spirit of the Russian Purishkeviches will at the same time generate (and strengthen) 'separatist' tendencies among the various oppressed nationalities which sometimes enjoy far greater freedom in the neighboring states." (*Ibid.*, p. 292.)

"... in the interests of the successful struggle against the nationalism of all nations, in all forms, [the proletariat] sets the task of preserving the unity of the proletarian struggle and of the proletarian organizations, of amalgamating these organizations into an international community in spite of the bourgeois strivings for national segregation.

"Complete equality of rights for all nationalities; the right of nations to self-determination; the amalgamation of the workers of all nations—this is the national program that Marxism, the experience of the whole world, and the experience of Russia, teaches the workers." (*Ibid.*, p. 293.)

* * *

Pointing up the continuing importance of the struggle against all varieties of nationalism, V.

Afanasyev, in his book *Scientific Communism*, writes:

"In order to disunite the peoples, shake the unity of the forces of democracy and progress and thus safeguard their domination, the imperialists use a tested weapon of the reactionaries like *nationalism*. Marxism-Leninism is intolerant of all manifestations of bourgeois nationalism and requires that a distinction should be made between the nationalism of the ruling nations (dominant-nation chauvinism and racism) and the nationalism of oppressed nations. The unquestionably reactionary ideology of dominant-nation chauvinism and racism, which justifies the domination of one nation by another, is flatly rejected by scientific communism. On the other hand, the nationalism of oppressed nations is directed against imperialism and contains elements of struggle for independence and is, therefore, progressive and supported by the proletariat. . . .

"At the same time, nationalism always harbors the threat of being stripped of its democratic content and turned into dominant-nation chauvinism and racism. For that reason, while supporting the liberation trend in the nationalism of oppressed peoples, Communists consistently champion proletarian internationalism, which consolidates the international solidarity and friendship of the working people of all races and nationalities. By demonstrating that the class struggle plays the decisive

role in any social movement, including the national movement, and calling for unity among the working people of all countries, Marxists-Leninists combat the ideology of bourgeois nationalism and win the masses over to proletarian internationalism." (Pp. 117-118.)

* * *

What Lenin taught in respect to the Russian and Ukrainian proletariat holds deep meaning and rich lessons for black and white workers in the U.S. today.

Lenin said:

"... Naturally, every democrat, not to mention Marxists, will strongly oppose the incredible humiliation of Ukrainians, and demand complete equality for them. But it would be a downright betrayal of socialism and a silly policy even from the standpoint of the bourgeois 'national aims' of the Ukrainians to weaken the ties and the alliance between the Ukrainian and Great-Russian proletariat that now exists within the confines of a single state." (*Collected Works*, Vol. XX, p. 30.)

"... The national cause comes first and the proletarian cause second, the bourgeois nationalists say, with . . . would-be Marxists repeating it after them. *The proletarian cause must come first, we say, because it not only protects the lasting and fundamental interests of labor and of humanity, but also those of democracy; and without democracy neither an autonomous nor an independent*

Ukraine is conceivable." (*Ibid.*, p. 32. Emphasis mine—J.J.)

"There are two nations in every modern nation—we say to all nationalist-socialists. There are two national cultures in every national culture [that of the bourgeoisie and that of the proletariat] . . . There are *the same two* cultures in the Ukraine as there are in Germany, in France, in England, among the Jews and so forth. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 32.)

"The Great-Russian and Ukrainian workers must work together, and, as long as they live in a single state, act in the closest organizational unity and concert, towards a common or international culture of the proletarian movement, displaying absolute tolerance in the question of the . . . purely local or purely national *details* of that propaganda. This is the imperative demand of Marxism. All advocacy of the segregation of the workers of one nation from those of another, all attacks upon Marxist assimilation, or attempts, where the proletariat is concerned, to contrapose one national culture as a whole to another . . . is *bourgeois* nationalism, against which it is essential to wage a ruthless struggle." (*Ibid.*, p. 33.)

"... The Marxists' national program . . . advocates, firstly, the equality of nations and languages and the impermissibility of all *privileges* in this respect . . . secondly, the principle of internationalism and uncompromising struggle against contamination of

the proletariat with bourgeois nationalism, even of the most refined kind." (*Ibid.*, p. 27.)

"Whoever does not recognize and champion the equality of nations and languages, and does not fight against all national oppression or inequality, is not a Marxist; he is not even a democrat. That is beyond doubt. But it is also beyond doubt that the pseudo-Marxist who heaps abuse upon a Marxist of another nation for being an 'assimilator' is simply a nationalist philistine. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 28.)

Lenin pointed out:

"That 'the right to advance separate demands to supplement a single general Social-Democratic program and to satisfy local needs and requirements arising out of the special features of Jewish life,' is, of course, to be assured. However, in everything else there must be complete fusion with the Russian proletariat, in the interests of the struggle waged by the entire proletariat of Russia.

"Autonomy in matters pertaining specifically to the Jewish movement, while in matters pertaining to the struggle against the bourgeoisie of Russia as a whole, *we must act as a single and centralized militant organization, having behind us the whole of the proletariat, without distinction of language or nationality, a proletariat whose unity is cemented by the continual joint solution of problems of theory and practice, of tactics and organizations; and*

we must not set up organizations that would march separately, each along its own track; we must not weaken the force of our offensive by breaking up into numerous independent political parties; we must not introduce estrangement and isolation and then have to heal an artificially implanted disease with the aid of these notorious 'federation' plasters." (*On the Unity of the International Movement*, p. 8. Emphasis mine—J. J.)

"The policy of oppressing nationalities is one of dividing nations. At the same time it is a policy of systematic corruption of the people's minds . . . to poison the minds of the ignorant and downtrodden masses. . . .

"But the working class needs *unity, not division*. It has no more bitter enemy than the savage prejudices and superstitions which its enemies sow among the ignorant masses. The oppression of 'subject peoples' is a double-edged weapon. . . . That is why the working class must protest most strongly against national oppression in any shape and form. . . . Millions and thousands of millions . . . are spent on poisoning the minds of the people." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 237-238.)

". . . the interests of labor demand the fullest confidence and the closest alliance among the working people of different countries and nations. The supporters of the landowners and capitalists, of the bourgeoisie, strive to disunite the workers, to intensify national discord and enmity, in

A BOURGEOIS-NATIONALIST TRAP

order to weaken the workers and strengthen the power of capital.

"Capital is an international force. To vanquish it, an international workers' alliance, an international workers' brotherhood is needed.

"We are opposed to national enmity and discord, to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists. We stand for the close union and the complete amalgamation of the workers and peasants of all nations in a single world Soviet republic." (*On the Unity of the International Movement*, p. 8. Emphasis mine—J. J.)

* * *

Almost 100 years ago, Karl Marx, in a letter to Meyer and Vogt in New York (April 9, 1870), spoke on the question of the consequences of national oppression to the proletariat of the oppressor. He wrote:

". . . every industrial and commercial center in England now possesses a working-class population *divided* into two hostile camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he feels himself a member of the *ruling* nation and so turns himself into a tool of the aristocrats and capitalists *against Ireland*, thus strengthening their domination *over himself*. He cherishes religious, social and national prejudices against the Irish worker. His attitude towards him is much the same as that of

the "poor whites" to the "niggers" in the former slave states of the U.S.A. The Irishman pays him back with interest in his own coin. He regards the English worker as both sharing in the guilt for the English domination in Ireland and at the same time serving as its stupid tool.

"This antagonism is artificially kept alive and intensified by the press, the pulpit, the comic papers, in short by all means at the disposal of the ruling classes. It is the secret of the impotence of the English working class, despite their organization. It is the secret by which the capitalist class maintains its power. And of this that class is well aware.

". . . The special task of the Central Council is to awaken a consciousness in the English workers that for them the *national emancipation of Ireland* is no question of abstract justice or human sympathy but the first condition of *their own emancipation*." (Marx-Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, pp. 289-290.)

* * *

Claude Lightfoot has given us a fine book on the Negro in the United States, *From Ghetto Rebellion to Black Liberation* (International Publishers, New York), but the lead article in the November *Political Affairs* is altogether of a different genre.

It makes no difference that the separatist outlook is presented in terms of the Black Panther Party's demand for a plebiscite; it is still a boost for a separatist

way out. Such a thrust in emphasis is disorienting to the Negro freedom movement and is confusing to the non-black labor and liberal anti-monopoly associates and allies in the struggle. When the progressive movement is confused, only the reactionary circles benefit.

We Communists who are members of the oppressed black people's nationality, have the special responsibility to be vigilant against the impact of bourgeois nationalist influences just as white Communists must stand tallest against great power chauvinism and white supremacist racist corruption.

* * *

Lenin's guide-line in this regard holds true for us today. He said:

"Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism — these are the two irreconcilably hostile slogans that correspond to the two great class camps throughout the capitalist world and express the two policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the

national question." (*Complete Works*, Vol. 24, p. 23.)

"... We fight on the basis of the given state, unite the workers of all nations in the given state, we cannot vouch for this or that path of national development, we advance to our goal by *all* possible paths.

"But we cannot advance to that goal without fighting all nationalism, without maintaining the equality of the workers of all nations. . . ." (*Selected Works*, Vol. IV, pp. 267-268.)

We think the approach toward accommodation with nationalism and separatism, which Comrade Lightfoot has surfaced in his article, must be rejected in favor of the line of the Draft Resolution for the 19th Convention of the CPUSA. The policy in respect to the solution of the national question in the Draft Resolution, builds upon the correct foundations laid down in the 16th, 17th and 18th Convention resolutions on the Negro question, and was prepared with the participation of Comrade Lightfoot.

Slogan of Self-Determination Unwarranted

Claude Lightfoot has given us quite a thought-provoking article in opening up the discussion on the question of self-determination. The collective response this article is bound to evoke will certainly greatly help to chart a correct path on this complex question.

Lightfoot's formulation on the question of full economic, political and social equality for the Negro people, insofar as it calls for "guarantees that will make the black minority equals in a majority white society," adds to the formulation of the draft program, although he makes no attempt to spell out the guarantees.

However, it seems to me that his call for the restoration of the slogan of self-determination and the holding of a plebiscite are unwarranted. For one thing, what he has advanced in asserting that "self-determination must be applied to the people and not to a territorial unit" in reality represents the policy of national autonomy, which was rejected long ago as a Marxist-Leninist approach.

Lenin characterized the concept of national autonomy, which ignores territory in the solution of the national question, as petty-bourgeois nationalism. Polemizing against it as a form of self-determination, Lenin wrote that "self-determination of nations'

in the Marxist Program cannot, from a historic-economic point of view have any other meaning than political self-determination, state independence and the formation of a national state." (*National Liberation, Socialism and Imperialism*, International Publishers, p. 50.)

In actuality, what Lightfoot has done, is to confuse the Marxist-Leninist concept of self-determination with the popular connotation of the black nationalists.

The slogan of self-determination, in the Marxist-Leninist sense, has substantive meaning only in relation to realizing self-government, i.e., statehood for an oppressed nation. In this regard, it should be noted, that objective development within the country—industrialization, consequent urbanization and mass migrations—has been steadily reducing and breaking up the vast area of Negro majority, which once embraced not only the overwhelming majority of the black people in the South, but in the entire country.

Dwindling Black Belt

According to the U.S. census, there were 286 black majority counties in 1900, containing 4,057,619, or 45.9 per cent of the total Negro population; in 1910, there were 264 black majority counties

containing 3,932,484, or 40 per cent; in 1920 there were 221 black majority counties containing 3,251,440, or 31.1 per cent; in 1930, 191 such counties containing 2,738,432, or 23 per cent of the country's Negro population, and in 1940, 2,642,808 or 20.5 per cent. By 1950, the number of black majority counties had dropped to 169 and by 1960 to 145. Thus, the territory where national statehood could be exercised is becoming smaller and smaller.

As yet, there has been no definite halt to this long-range accelerated development spurred by the collapse of the plantation system in the Deep South and the consequent migration of hundreds of thousands of displaced sharecroppers to the urban centers of the North and West, aggravating the urban and ghetto crises.

Lightfoot attempts to justify the restoration of the slogan of self-determination on the grounds that the black people constitute a "national group" and that the USSR, after the October Revolution, created the material conditions for national groups, in the process of becoming nations, to become full-blown nations. He quotes G. Starushenko, Soviet author of *The Principle of National Self-Determination in Soviet Foreign Policy*, as saying: "It would be quite proper to speak of the self-determination not only of nations but also of the national groups which have not yet succeeded in developing into nations."

However, the situation is not analogous. There are similarities but also differences. Starushenko is referring to colonial and semi-colonial peoples. Although the historically evolved black people of the United States constitute a distinct people, with strong national characteristics, they co-evolved with and are part of the American people. Moreover, Starushenko is describing a program for the working class in power, whereas the draft program of the Communist Party of the United States outlines the strategic road to working-class power.

Current Trends

As Lightfoot himself observes, the moves toward the establishment of a black nation represents not only a minor trend today, but was a minority trend even in the heyday of the Garvey movement following World War I.

Black residents, imprisoned in the huge ghettos of the North and West, are seeking more control over their communities. They are demanding community control over their schools to halt the deterioration of education; for a say over policing to halt rampant police brutality and insure a measure of protection; for control over local anti-poverty boards and similar local agencies.

The black people are seeking an end to discriminatory gerrymandering, increased representation in political bodies—executive, legislative and judicial — at all

levels. They seek to elect more city councilmen, black mayors, sheriffs and other county officials, members of state legislatures and the Congress. They seek more members on boards of education, city commissions and all policy-making bodies.

In the South, in the recent November elections, the black people added 107 elected officials, reaching a total of 289 in the 11 states of the old confederacy. Black voters sent three new members to Congress, including Mrs. Shirley Chisholm, making a total of nine black members in the House of Representatives—an advance, but far short of 45 representatives for proportional black share of power in that body.

Black people are also seeking self-administration through incorporation of towns. An example is Roosevelt City, Alabama, a town of 5,000 near Birmingham, where the black people elected a mayor, a five-man council which took over the government from the county. The council elected a judge who now holds court every fortnight and has appointed police and other city workers. Similar action has been taken in Lawnside, New Jersey, a town of 2,500.

The concept of black power, which arose out of the freedom struggles of the sixties, expresses in general the content of the aforementioned goals.

On the cultural front, the long fight waged by Communists, Left-progressives and democratic-

minded people against the white-supremacist distortion of the role of black Americans in the historical development of their country, has become a mass movement as black college and high school students, frequently joined by whites, are storming campus after campus in a demand for more black teachers, courses in black history and for black studies departments.

On Self-Determination

These developments are not to be equated with self-determination, as Lightfoot correctly points out. Nevertheless, with the growth of the people's democratic movement to curb monopoly, the strengthening of all-black unity under the increasing hegemony of the black workers—the only really revolutionary sector of the black people—and the building of the historic alliance of labor and the black liberation movement, the present trends can lead to meaningful acquisitions of power. They could lead to black-majority county governments in substantial areas of the Deep South and more representative government at municipal and state levels.

With the advent of revolutionary working-class power and the socialist reconstruction of society, assuring a high degree of democracy and respect for the will of the Negro people—or even prior to that under favorable conditions—these trends could lead, dependent upon the desire of the black

people, to a redrawing of political-administrative boundaries, even of the present state frontiers, to enable a wider region of autonomy and self-government in areas of the remaining Black Belt in the South.

Given the unlikely desire of the black people, or a sector of them, to form a national state as a separate entity, either before or after the overthrow of capitalism, Communists would be bound to uphold such a right, but would agitate for or against secession, dependent upon the merits of the situation existing at the moment.

The right to separate, and the act of separation, are not identical. Should reaction be riding high, the agitation would be of separation. In the advent of a people's anti-monopoly or socialist government, the agitation would certainly be against secession.

However, grounds for such a possibility are so unsubstantial, they do not warrant placing self-determination in the program today, or calling for a plebiscite.

Objectively, the process of the breakup of the Black Belt is irreversible. Historical experience discloses that subjectively the demand for the formation of a national state is unlikely. The black people have expressed a two-fold desire: as citizens to integrate and, at the same time, as a people to retain cohesiveness, to retain their own institutions, cultural and socio-political. This unity of opposites appears to be the domi-

nant trend. The trend toward nationhood, expressed in such utopias as advanced by the Garvey movement at its peak, the 49th staters in the thirties, or the present Nation of Islam and the Republic of Africa, remain minority trends.

These interrelated trends have arisen and declined in proportion to the degree of working-class and democratic support of the liberation movement, and in reaction to the degree of white supremacist backlash.

Two-Fold Development

A deeper insight into the basic character of the Negro people reveals that the two trends reflect the dual aspect of their development: at once as part of the American people and as a distinct people.

The American people in the course of two bourgeois-democratic revolutions—the War for Independence and the Civil War—developed historically as a stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological makeup, manifested in a community of culture—in brief, they developed into a nation.

At the same time, the peoples of African descent, composed of different tribes, different cultures, different levels of social development and speaking different languages, developed historically as a new people, a distinct people bearing strong national characteristics and subjected to the most

barbarous oppression. The decisive question for black Americans, as a historically developed people, as an oppressed national minority in a particularly distressing situation, because of the remnants of slavery, is the realization of power—political, social and economic.

Given proportional black representation at all levels of government, the question is posed: What more is demanded to provide equal rights for black Americans? What institutions can be established to express the special interests of black Americans, of the Mexican-Americans in the Southwest, of the American Indians and the Puerto Rican minority in the United States?

In this regard, the experience of the Soviet Union bears study. In the USSR, in addition to the Soviet of the Union which represents the common interests of all citizens, irrespective of territory, there is also a special body—a Soviet on Nationalities — which represents the specific interests of each nation and people in the USSR. All legislation must pass

both bodies to become law.

In discussing self-determination, it should not be overlooked that U.S. capitalism counts on the continued oppression of the Negro people, with the concomitant white-supremacist ideology as a powerful economic, political and social reserve for the maintenance of its historically outdated system.

Thus, the black freedom movement constitutes the most powerful ally of the working class, in the struggle for peace and democracy, and for the fulfillment of its historic mission as gravedigger of capitalist society.

* * *

It is in view of these factors, the dispersal of the black population rendering unrealistic a definite territorial area for the realization of statehood, the lack of national consciousness moving in that direction, that it seems to me the restoration of the slogan of self-determination and the calling of a plebiscite, as proposed by Lightfoot, is strategically not justified.

HERBERT APTHEKER

Irrationalism and Reaction

The very air is foul with more than smog and tear-gas. These are only the more apparent effluvia emanating from the stench of a rotting social order. Were Gibbon working now on the decline and fall of the U.S. empire, his notebooks would be overflowing.

Sadism—which, in one sense, may be considered a generic term encompassing such phenomena as racism and pornography—dominates the scene. Last week I was in Mississippi; random notes on a brief visit: the Dean's home in a Negro college had recently been bombed; a 14-year old youngster had been castrated—by a sheriff—for speaking “disrespectfully” to a white girl; wholesale slaughter had been narrowly averted when armed KKK elements discovered to their chagrin that the intended victims were also armed and ready.

This is the point concerning pornography. It is not sexuality; in a way, it is its denial, for pornography is contemptuous of sexuality as it is of human dignity. It is unfeeling, spiteful, brutal; in a fine essay, William Robert Miller describes it as “prehuman brutishness” (*Christian Century*, January 29, 1969). It is, of course, an especially crass manifestation of male supremacy—perhaps the oldest and in many ways the most vile mode of oppression.

Debasement is decay's product as well as its intention; I have no doubt that the debasement is not only systematic but is deliberate. And—glory be!—it is clearly very profitable. At its heart is irrationalism; the eclipse of reason, the denial of science, the repudiation of causation. The normal result is cynicism; the abnormal is sadism. The finale is fascism.

The levels vary; from the over-priced rot usurping more and more of the shelf-space in U.S. bookstores: *Ringside Tarts*, *Illicit Bed*, *Hot Young Lust*, *Nude Ranch Nymphs*—the list is endless. No motivation, no real feeling, no difficulties, no doubt, no warmth, no love, no pity, no compassion, no thought; no human beings. Less pretentious but otherwise little different from the best-selling Spillane “books.” The same increasingly for the movies—not only at American Legion

stag parties, and 42nd Street “art” houses, but more and more in what neighborhood movies manage to survive. Again, the central feature is mindlessness mixed with brutality.*

Increasingly, major publishing houses are turning out this poison: E. P. Dutton with Claman's *The Malediction* is an example. More often, indeed characteristically, from such houses, the fiction mirrors the decay but does not quite wallow in it. The naturalism gives it some sense of art; that is, a reader feels actual effort on the part of the author and does take away insights. Fred Chappell's *Dagon* (Harcourt, Brace) focuses on a young girl who is both nymphomaniac and sadist; Cormac McCarthy's *Outer Dark* (Random House) on incest and murder; Jonathan Maumbach's *What Comes Next* (Harper & Row) on a psychopathic college student; David Wagoner's *Baby, Come On Inside* (Farrar, Strauss, Giroux) on an alcoholic, rich roué; Thomas Berger's *Killing Time* (Dial) on a paranoid who calmly murders three people; Benjamin De Mott's *A Married Man* (Harcourt, Brace & World) describes in clinical (or is the word, tempestuous?) detail the final fling of a boor. Etc.

On Broadway—less so, off-Broadway, and even less so, off-off-Broadway—as Walter Kerr wrote in a recent *Times* (January 26):

Nowadays, it's not good form to ask what a play is about. Aboutness is out, content is irrelevant, conscious design is suspect. A play is simply a series of impressions that happen to happen in a certain unordained sequence. . . . We're supposed to sit quietly, keep our responses open, and never, never strain for coherence.

What we have referred to in the above paragraphs is a steeper decline than the literary reflections of alienation;** these continue but do not represent as full a repudiation of reason as most recent productions.

* Here is the theme of a new film, entitled “Twisted Nerve” as indicated in a major advertising campaign:

“Cleaver, Cleaver
Chop. Chop
First the Mom and then the Pop
Then we'll get the pretty girl
We'll Get Her Right Between the Curl.”

** See in particular: S. Finkelstein, *Existentialism and Alienation in American Literature* (New York, 1965, International); his “The Artistic Expression of Alienation,” and H. Langford's “The Imagery of Alienation,” both in H. Aptheker, ed., *Marxism and Alienation* (New York, 1965, published for AIMS by Humanities Press); G. LeRoy, *Marxism and Modern Literature* (New York, 1967, AIMS); *Man and the Arts: A Marxist Approach* by Arnold Kettle and V. G. Hanes (New York, 1968, AIMS).

Another particular and infinitely important source of irrationalism in the United States is white chauvinism. A useful examination of this connection has been produced very recently by Reese Cleghorn, an Editor of the *Atlanta (Georgia) Journal*; it is a 31-page pamphlet badly entitled *Radicalism—Southern Style: A Commentary on Regional Extremism* and jointly issued by the Southern Regional Council in Atlanta and the American Jewish Committee in New York. I say badly entitled because this is a study not of radicalism but of reaction and especially of the George Wallace movement.

The point at this moment is that Mr. Cleghorn emphasizes that the Wallace movement reflects the irrationalism so characteristic of dominant Southern politics; he says this irrationalism reflects the racism that afflicts the South in particular—an ideology in direct conflict with democratic principles. The thinking, writes Mr. Cleghorn, is paranoid and stems from feelings “of guilt, obsessive defensiveness, close mindedness”; the feelings themselves, of course, stem from enslavement and oppression and super-exploitation of others, though Mr. Cleghorn is not quite so clear on the latter point. But he is clear as to the irrationalism fostered by racism; here is another and a striking example of racism’s cost to all Americans of all colors.

Reason’s eclipse takes many other and sometimes rather elusive or highly sophisticated forms. The entire tendency towards a technocratic, arithmetic, *counting* methodology in the social sciences is part of this: it is illustrated in the writing of Herman Kahn and the philosophic efforts of Z. K. Brzezinski; in the apocalyptic visions of Norman O. Brown, with his insistence that it is only the subjective and the so-called unconscious which matter rather than the objective and the conscious; in A. H. Maslow’s rejection of social renovation as central to making possible the better life and replacing this (basic to the concept of Utopia as well as to the concept of revolution) with efforts at the release of psychic impulses so that one would have not Utopia but rather “Eupsychia”; in the most recent writings of Herbert Marcuse with their reflections of near despair and their emphasis again upon the subjective and psychological.

In addition to the well-known attacks upon values and ethics—either as unknowable or as irrelevant to “science”—there are growing signs of a repudiation of the Enlightenment as a whole. There certainly is value in calling attention to areas of neglect in the entire Enlightenment tradition, including its highest, or Marxian aspect; I mean, for example, such questions as the nature of power, of evil, of psychology

as a whole. But this is something else than, for example. Ronald V. Sampson’s essay, “The Bramble of Power,” (*The Nation*, December 16, 1968) where one reads: “*Only* (my emphasis) by appealing to the private individual can we give meaning to the legitimate ideals of Progress, Democracy and Socialism.” Mr. Sampson concludes—quite logically, given his “only”—

Long-term action needs to be undertaken at the level of psychotherapy, family mores, child nurture and an education, cooperative and not competitive, that is devoted to rearing the whole creative potential of man through the work of his hands and his brain in a life that is not divorced from nature.

It does not reflect any denial of the consequence of Mr. Sampson’s essay to remark that such writing is not only pre-Marxian; it is pre-Owen, and we will not go forward by retreating. Clearly, a competitive society will have a competitive education; one struggles on all levels—including the educational—but one never forgets the *strategy*, namely the transforming of society.

Perhaps the most dramatic reflection—as of this moment, at any rate—of the flight from reason is the fantastic fad of McLuhan, or of McLuhancy. Significantly, it is the United States—including its academic community—which has embraced this shoddiness and made of it a veritable cult of the “in.” The English scholar, D. W. Harding, in a penetrating analysis of this phenomenon (*New York Review of Books*, January 2), observes:

McLuhan’s glaring incoherences of thought and disregard of everyday observation are not confined to peripheral “probes”; they occur at nodal points of the system. And yet the cult sprang up. Something in our education abets the willing suspension of common sense which a belief in McLuhan requires.

Sidney Finkelstein in his *Sense and Nonsense of McLuhan* (New York, 1968, International) presents a Marxian and therefore devastating critique; alas, for every ten who read Finkelstein there are ten thousand who read McLuhan—itsself sufficient commentary on the eclipse of reason in the United States!

In a very important—and therefore neglected!—book (to which this writer made reference in *Political Affairs*) Pamela Hansford Johnson suggests that all “must know the basic reason for the deluge of sado-

masochistic, 'hard-core' pornography." Here is her basic reason":

This is not published by good, altruistic persons who believe they are helping to make a sweeter and more educated society. These may exist: but I have referred earlier to another force in a commercial society, which is an infinitely powerful one. People are publishing the stuff because there is money in it. The motive is, quite simply, profit, and this is the way they can make a quick, sure turnover.

This is, I think, the immediate reason; but it is not the basic reason. For consider: profit-making has existed for some time, but the reason Mrs. Johnson wrote her book now is that in the present time there is, as she says, "the deluge." Such a deluge appears only in a society which is dying; it reflects the disintegration and it intensifies that disintegration. At the same time, for those who rule that society, the motive is not only making profit in the selling of such commodities but also inculcating inhumanity.

An imperialist society in an advanced stage of senility—such as that afflicting the United States—is one whose rulers feel increasingly challenged by the human qualities of human beings; among these are the sense of the social, of the collective, of love, of compassion, of courage, of solidarity, of discontent, and—in many ways, most distinctive and most consequential—of reason. Negating all these is fascism; fascism may indeed be defined as the organized assault (by, as Dimitrov said, "the most reactionary, most aggressive, and most chauvinist elements among the bourgeoisie") upon all that is distinctively human in the history of Man.

Increasingly, significant sections of the U.S. ruling class are opting for fascism. Every struggle against every manifestation of that ultimate foe is a contribution towards resisting that choice; it is, simultaneously, a contribution towards revolutionizing the American social order. Resisting the brutalization of culture is an important sector in the struggle, and one capable of winning infinitely broad support.

February 17, 1969

* *On Iniquity* (New York, 1968, Scribner's), p. 113.

ON LABOR OPPORTUNISM

JAMES WEST

Approach to Work in the Trade Unions

The trade union movement is one of the chief accomplishments of the American working class. Despite all its weaknesses and shortcomings, the capitalist class views it as an obstacle in the drive for maximum profits and as a potential threat to the continued sway of its system.

Why else did the ruling class cause the enactment of Taft-Hartley, Landrum-Griffin and other federal and state anti-labor laws? Why else does it now seek new anti-labor measures under the Nixon administration, such as imposed contract settlements without membership ratification (thereby nullifying the right to strike); extension of Taft-Hartley restrictions, including possibly new ones, to agricultural workers (under the guise of extending its "benefits" to them); preventive detention legislation (in the name of "law and order," a leaf taken right out of Hitler's book, and now used extensively throughout Africa against unionists and strikers), etc.?

Without organization, the working class is as nothing, wrote Marx, more than a century ago.

With organization, the possibility of realizing its historical potential begins to emerge as a reality. The significance of trade unions lies just exactly in this, that they are the elementary form of working-class organization having the capacity to unite, on the basis of elementary, economic class interests, workers of the most diverse views, including the majority who still support capitalism.

Elementary Organizations

They are the first step on the road to working-class emancipation. Even this first step must be constantly solidified, extended and defended, to bar any retreat from it under the attacks of the class enemy. Defense of the trade unions (whatever their shortcomings) is a sacred duty of Communists and class-conscious workers.

Defense of the trade unions in no way implies abandonment of criticism of their weaknesses and shortcomings. To the contrary, it vitally requires criticism to further strengthen them, to enhance their revolutionary potential, to bring them up to, and maintain them at, a high level of fighting

spirit. This calls for constructive criticism accompanied by a discussion of ways and means to overcome shortcomings, which helps the class and the labor movement solve their problems; a criticism which does not become, objectively, an attack from the Left serving to dishearten and discourage efforts to strengthen and improve unions as an utterly hopeless task.

Such, I believe, is the total effect of the critique rendered by A. J. Lima, in his article "Opportunism in the Trade Unions and the Struggle for Peace" (*Political Affairs*, January, 1969). It is not only that his evaluation is at once incomplete and overdrawn; it also sets some tasks—not all—which are out of kilter with the present level of struggle and consciousness in the labor movement, thereby objectively setting the stage for future "disappointments" when the labor movement fails to measure up to those tasks.

To say that American trade unions are "firmly based on support of the system of capitalism" is an incomplete revelation. For that matter, one would be hard-put to name the very many unions in any capitalist country of which this could not be said. True, many unions are Left- and Communist-led; but it does not follow that this automatically makes these unions revolutionary. What does count on this score, among other things, is the degree of class and socialist consciousness, the level

of fighting spirit, of the membership of these unions.

To make this the sole starting point for work in the trade unions, is to start from the wrong foot, and to end up with a predominantly negative attitude. A better, and more correct, starting point is the concept that trade unions are the elementary class organizations which, whether reactionary- or reformist-led, have the *potential* for revolutionary class struggle. Historically, this question was settled by V. I. Lenin's struggle against West European Communists who opposed work in reactionary-led unions. (See "*Left-Wing*" *Communism—An Infantile Disorder*.)

Opportunism in Labor

The discussion of opportunism in the working class by Comrade Lima is likewise one which can only lead to loss of confidence in the working class; to an attitude of "why work in the trade unions, isn't there an easier way?"; to the idea that work in the trade unions must be conducted on the basis of coming into conflict with the "opportunist working class."

In rejecting the idea that Communists must evaluate opportunism in the labor movement as containing a conscious element of sell-out and betrayal, Lima underscores his insistence on approaching the *whole class* as either opportunist, or under the influence of opportunism, as distinct from the general influence of op-

portunism endemic to capitalism which seeks to poison all.

This raises the question: What does Lima consider opportunism in the working class to be? In concrete terms, he acknowledges that opposition to the war in Vietnam (and hence, to Meany's policy) was at least no less among the workers than among the population generally. Actually, as the Dearborn and other Vietnam referendums have shown, it was higher. It cannot, therefore, be said that most workers were "selling out" to support that foreign policy.

Polemizing against Gus Hall, Hy Lumer and Victor Perlo, Lima rejects the conscious element of betrayal as a feature of opportunism in the labor movement. Is one to conclude that he wants the attack on opportunism to be extended to "unconscious" opportunism? In this category, one might place the struggle for wage increases and other self-interest economic reforms. Among some on the Left, in fact, it is fashionable to adopt a "high, moralistic" attitude to the struggle for such reforms as "opportunist."

Approached from the purely moral viewpoint, one could make out a case for viewing such reforms as "opportunist." One could conclude that all struggles of self-interest are opportunist and lead to strengthening the capitalist system. But, is that correct?

Starting Point of Struggle

What is meant by Lima's call on the labor movement "to tran-

scend the present burdensome economic issues of speed-up, destruction of jobs and job security, and all the new methods of wage cuts presently at the disposal of the state monopoly system in the form of taxes, inflation, interest rates, etc.?" (My emphasis—J.W.) Why—and how—is this to be done?

The foregoing issues are manifestations of the daily class struggle as waged by the exploiters. How can the worker *transcend, rise above, or bypass* this struggle that confronts him every day? His problem is how to meet it, how effectively to wage the struggle against these burdens.

To be sure, the capitalist class never makes concessions (and it has never given anything without a struggle), without trying to nullify them by other measures, while at the same time trying to deny any credit to the unions for such gains won by struggle. Often, the daily class struggle appears as a burdensome treadmill. But this is no argument to a worker to bypass or transcend this struggle, nor can it be an argument by revolutionaries not to take part in such struggles full-heartedly, if they have a correct appreciation of why these struggles are the starting point from which to raise the level of understanding of the workers.

So long as workers' self-interest struggles provide the starting point, and open the potential, for revolutionary class struggle, it is incorrect to characterize them as

either "opportunist" or "burdensome." It would be getting closer to the bull's eye to consider the failure of revolutionaries to identify with such struggles as opportunistic.

The truth is that self-interest struggles contain far more potential for revolutionary struggle today than at any time in the past, in view of the present-day worldwide and national context of these struggles. Whether that potential is realized depends on the conscious, vanguard forces. Where capitalism has been able to turn such struggles to account for itself, this has been due mainly to the default, in one way or another, of the revolutionary sector of the working class.

The self-interest of the working class cannot be equated to self-interest of the capitalist class or other strata whose livelihood depends on exploitation or oppression. The working class is the *only* class which has no stake in exploitation or oppression; which cannot—as a class—become exploiters or oppressors; and whose fundamental interests are diametrically opposed to exploitation and oppression. That is why the abstract, moralistic approach to demands of self-interest is false.

The self-interest of the working class, by its very nature, impels the working class to struggle against the capitalist class, even in cases where individual members of the class have visions of becoming "independent" business-

men or farmers.

The *consistent*, upward-progressing, self-interest struggle of the working class must, to win a complete victory, move to anti-capitalism, to the overthrow of the exploitative system. It may be diverted or slowed down, by misleadership or lack of sufficient class and socialist consciousness, but it rises again and again, asserting and re-asserting itself, pressing on irresistably.

For the working class, it is a matter of sheer necessity to fight in its own interests, for the failure to do so would reduce it to pauperism—something far more burdensome than its daily struggle to live.

In order for the self-interest struggle on the most elementary level to become consistent and upward-progressing, to become a revolutionary struggle, it is necessary indissolubly to merge self-interest with *class interest*, to expand the class-conscious sector of the class, which can help to extend the arena of struggle to encompass the political and social struggle along with the economic. In other words, as Gus Hall said, the important thing is what is done with the struggle for reforms, how and where it is led.

It never was a tenet of Marxism-Leninism that the struggle for reforms automatically leads to the overthrow of capitalism. But Marxism-Leninism has always highly appreciated the importance of these struggles as the

starting point for more advanced, revolutionary struggles.

Racism and Anti-Imperialism

Lima correctly places the struggle against racism as a key task today. It has generally come to be recognized that white workers can be won against racism on the basis of self-interest. In fact, the Communists were the first to point this out over thirty-years ago, and proved it in the course of many struggles.

But something more must be said. It is possible for a white worker to see his self-interest hurt by racism on the job, yet return home and be swayed by a George Wallace into believing that his self-interest in maintaining the property value of his home is dependent on racism. Thus, the struggle against racism is not won for good on the basis of personal, self-interest alone; it is not really won until the worker identifies his self-interest with his *class* interest, becomes aware of the interests of the working class *as a whole*, understanding racism to be the divisive, exploitative tool of his class enemy.

In the special conditions obtaining in our country, there can be no development of class consciousness without the consistent struggle against racism, nor can there be a winning, complete struggle against racism without developing and raising the class consciousness of white workers.

Lima sets as the second issue, around which a Left-Center coalition can be established in the labor movement (along with the struggle against racism), that of the "issue of imperialism." The draft program sees the "vital strategic objective" as "the creation of a popular alliance against monopoly by all who are oppressed and exploited by it, an alliance whose firm foundation and backbone is the working class and the Negro people."

In the context of his article, which does not discuss problems of such an alliance, one must conclude that Lima is suggesting that an anti-imperialist alliance should be the strategic objective, rather than an anti-monopoly alliance. This is no small difference, especially when he proposes that this be part of the basis of a new Left-Center coalition in the labor movement.

The question is not only on what a Left and a Center can unite. There are, undoubtedly, a whole number of questions of foreign policy on which such unity can be built. The not-to-be minimized National Labor Leadership Assembly for Peace, bringing together 500 Center and Left labor leaders, is indicative of the possibilities. But that assemblage would have smashed to smithereens, had the Left insisted that it take a stand against imperialism in general, and U.S. imperialism in particular. Many in the conference opposed the war in Vietnam because they had concluded it was

bad for the system itself.

On the other hand, there are many in labor, including supporters of capitalism and imperialism, including some supporters of U.S. foreign policies in general, who are prepared to fight against various monopoly evils, whether on the tax structure, conglomerates, or the myriad of problems arising out of the urban crisis, and *specific* aspects of foreign policy.

More important still is what the rank and file in their millions are most likely to respond to and act upon. Experience has already shown that the fight for peace can be approached meaningfully among workers in the struggle against pro-monopoly, anti-peoples' tax policies. Few issues agitate workers today as much as the tax bite; few demands get as much response as the demand to shift the tax burden to the monopoly corporations.

To insist that the rank and file become united on the basis of anti-imperialism, or that the Left-Center coalition be re-established on that basis, is to set a task not on the order of the day, and doomed to fail.

We leave to others, or to another time, the refutation of such unfounded, even startling, assertions in Lima's article as "The economic theory necessary to determine the laws of motion of this [the state monopoly capitalist] phase of imperialism has not yet been discovered." (Is not Marxist-Leninist political economy such a

theory?) Or the statement, "this phase of imperialism and these expenditures [by the state] have led to the revolutionizing . . . of production relations." (How? What is a revolution in production relations if not socialism?)

Unity of Rank and File

We wish to limit ourselves to some questions of tactics and of work in the trade unions. Tactics depend in good part on how one approaches the labor movement; how one assesses opportunism within it; how one regards the strategic tasks confronting it.

Any review of the labor movement over the last 30 years or more (and Lima's article is mainly this), must also discuss what happened to the Left in the Right-led and Center-led unions (and not just what happened to the Left-led unions, their expulsion, etc.), what happened to rank-and-file movements, to the fight for democratically-run unions, especially at the plant and local level, and what happened to the Party in relation to the labor movement.

The break-up of the Left-Center coalition in the late 40s was not inevitable. Had there been a powerful Left and strong rank-and-file movements in all the unions, the outcome of the struggles around the Marshall Plan and other issues could have been otherwise. The break-up of the coalition, which had built the CIO, became inevitable only when, un-

der Browderite revisionist policies, the Left began, years before, to surrender leadership positions in unions led by the Right and Center in the name of "unity," and abandoned the building of rank-and-file strength in various forms in all unions, Left, Right and Center. This includes the liquidation of Party shop and industrial clubs in most areas.

Now that the possibility of rebuilding a strong Left and of establishing a new Left-Center coalition has vastly improved, it is useful to draw some lessons from the past. One such lesson might be expressed in a kind of formula which is not new, and which, if anything, has improved with age:

—The united front from below (unity of action of workers on specific issues; rank-and-file movements in various forms, including black caucus movements; democratically-controlled local unions, including strengthened steward systems, etc.)—*Always*.

—The united front at the top and at the bottom (Left-Center coalition with a Left powerfully based in the rank-and-file; unity-in-action on one or more specific issues, involving the rank-and-file and various top leaders irrespective of ideological difference)—*whenever possible*.

—The united front at the top alone (in whatever combination or form)—*never*.

At all times, and under all circumstances, the Communists place their main emphasis on building the strength, unity and power of the rank and file. The key to this

is unity-in-action of the workers on the job (and in the community) on the vital, burning issues that bring them into conflict with the class enemy.

The Center and the Left

It is this which is a major factor in opening up differences among labor leaders, dispelling the notion that they are all one, undifferentiated, reactionary mass. A Center force begins to emerge in higher echelons of leadership in response, among other things, to the pressures of powerful rank-and-file movements and the rise of a growing Left.

In the absence of rank-and-file and Left existence and action, the Center capitulates to pressures from the Right and becomes all but indistinguishable from it.

In this respect, while bureaucracy in the labor movement is a major problem, to make this the central issue or determinant of whether or not to have a Left-Center coalition policy, is to doom any such possibility in advance. Who can deny that John L. Lewis, surely not the smallest of labor bureaucrats, became—under conditions of technological advance in coal, and mass pressures from his own and other unions' ranks—the catalyst around which a Left-Center coalition arose and carried the labor movement to a new, higher stage!

It is necessary to learn how to wage the struggle against bureaucratic practices, for greater

rank-and-file control over union affairs, without shutting the door to the possibility of some labor leaders, including beaurocratic ones, joining a coalition for a new forward march by organized labor.

It is one thing to speak of a Left which, among other things, wages the fight against imperialism and against beaurocracy (including beaurocracy in some Left-led unions); it is another thing to insist that the struggle against beaurocracy and imperialism be made a principled condition for the existence of a Left-Center coalition.

In approaching the question of a Left-Center coalition, it is necessary to understand the Center as it is, without illusions. The firmness and degree of progressiveness of positions taken by the Center are largely determined by the strength and influence of the Left, by the strength, unity and fighting spirit of the rank and file. The stronger, the more influential the Left and rank-and-file movements, the more progressive and energetic are the positions of the Center likely to be.

In general, the Center can more readily be moved to pro-peace, anti-fascist positions. It is far more likely to move to positions of political independence than the out-and-out Right-wing leaders. In the main, Center leaders are supporters of capitalism, leaning to concepts of "enlightened" capitalism and can more readily be

moved to anti-monopoly directions.

Anti-Communism is prevalent among many Center leaders, but they are also more prepared to scrap cold-war positions and to disregard or negate anti-Communism as the *chief* issue facing the people. Many Center leaders are more pliable to pressures to support black-liberation demands, especially under strong Left and rank-and-file pressures. Far from being revolutionaries, they are reformists, seeking to make such changes in the system as they think will make it work better.

It is at such points, as the foregoing, that they come into conflict with the reactionary, blind anti-Communist policies of George Meany and Company. It is at such points, that they have need for and find themselves, even if temporarily, of having more in common with the rank and file and the Left than they have with the Meanys. It is at such points, and on issues giving expression to them, that coalition between them and a strong, rank-and-file-based Left becomes possible.

The attainment of a Left-Center coalition does not put an end to differences—in ideology and policy—between the two components. These differences, and the struggle between them, will go on. Essentially, it becomes a competition over which policies in the coalition, those of the Center or the Left, gains predominant influence with the rank and file. The Left,

for its part, wages this struggle in a way aimed at strengthening the unity of the whole working class in struggle on issues, including as part of this, the strengthening of the coalition of Left and Center forces.

For these reasons, too, the Left places its chief reliance, its main attention and effort, to building the strength, unity and fighting spirit of the rank-and-file movements, for their control over the affairs of the union, from local on up, beginning with the role of the shop steward. This is the ongoing, permanent feature of the work of Communists and the Left.

Many Possibilities for Struggle

The pump-primers, the generating forces of the rank-and-file movements, are the conditions on the job and in the community: speed-up, hazardous working conditions, labor's right to a determining voice in the organization of production and the uses to which new technology is employed, as it effects job security, work loads, pay rates, health and safety, etc., the demands of black workers for full and complete equality on the job and in the union, the compelling need to organize the unorganized, the fight around taxes, housing, prices, etc.

For this, no sanction from higher echelons is needed. The problems of contract restrictions and beaurocracy did not prevent steel workers, for example, from engaging in over 7,000 unauthorized

strikes over the last decade. To be sure, lack of obstruction from above in the union structure, or a green light from the top to go ahead on such issues, would facilitate and hasten the whole movement forward. This is still another benefit that can result from conditions created by a coalition of the Left and Center.

It is therefore wrong to conclude, as some comrades have, that "nothing can be done" until the "beaurocrats are *first* removed." The few instances in which this is absolutely the case must not be overdrawn into an incorrect general conclusion. Experience has shown that it was the accumulation of hundreds and thousands of rank-and-file struggles against the companies, which created conditions for the ouster of class-collaborationist, reactionary labor leaders. Such was the case with McDonald in steel, and others. Nor does rank-and-file control and the establishment of democracy in a union come about by the election of a new leader, *in and of itself*. It comes about as the result of united struggle of the rank and file under the direction of rank-and-file and Left leadership.

* * *

If the revitalization of the labor movement, and the attainment of the historic goal set by the Draft Resolution for the 19th Convention for the emergence of the American working class as an *independent* force — especially, politically independent — are to

become reality, then the building of the rank-and-file movements and a powerful Left must be seen as urgent, immediate tasks of the greatest magnitude. It is inconceivable that this can be done without scores, yes, hundreds, of Party shop and industrial clubs.

This means that the remnants, still to be found in some districts, of the liquidation of shop and industrial clubs, must be liquidated in the shortest time.

The Draft Resolution, in setting the goal of helping our class emerge, at long last, as a politically independent force, in effect calls on *this* generation of Communists to accomplish an historic task no previous generation could.

The 70s can and must become that decade in which this historic problem is largely, if not fully, solved.

But to do this requires a change—a drastic change—in the style and method of leadership. What is needed is *concentration* on the decisive sectors of the industrial working class, which can become the vanguard of all who work, in making the momentous break to class independence. It is not enough to ideologically win the Party membership for the concept and policy of concentration; for that concept to become reality, leadership must set an example and lead in the work of concentration. When this is done, then we can speak of making the turn.

It appears strange that we should have to point out to a section of the International the usefulness and extraordinary importance of the trade union movement. . . . The trade union is the cradle of the labor movement, for working people naturally turn first to that which affects their daily life, and they consequently combine first with their fellows by trades. It therefore becomes the duty of the International not merely to assist the existing trade unions, and, before all, to lead them to the right path, i.e., to internationalize them, but also to establish new ones where possible. The economic conditions are driving the trade unions with irresistible force from the economic to the political struggle, against the propertied classes—a truth which is known to all those who observe the labor movement with open eyes.

General Council of the First International to
Section 3 in Chicago, June 3, 1874.

Trade Unions — Schools of Socialism

A. J. Lima begins his article on "Opportunism in the Trade Unions and the Fight for Peace," by referring to research he did in preparation. But doing research on labor opportunism at this late date is pretty much like shooting fish in a barrel.

It doesn't take any deep knowledge of Marxism to note what is obvious to the newest union member—that opportunism exists in the trade union movement.

So what else is new? Opportunism has existed and will exist in the labor movement, and outside of it, as long as capitalism exists—and for some time afterwards. No serious student of the labor movement will deny the existence of opportunism; the question is how it is viewed, in what context, and in relation to what other factors.

What no Marxist can ignore, is that the operations of the class struggle, as an inherent feature of capitalist society, constantly works to counteract and offset the inroads of opportunism on the working class as a whole.

This point was sharply detailed by Lenin in an article written in 1916 dealing with the opportunism evident in that period:

The trusts, the financial oligarchy, high prices, etc. while permitting the bribery of a handful of peo-

ple in the upper layers, are increasingly oppressing, crushing, ruining and torturing the mass of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat.

Unfortunately, it is this basic feature of the class struggle as it manifests itself in the U.S.A., that Lima has either ignored or minimized, so that what emerges from his one-sided view of the American scene is a picture of an all-powerful, invincible American ruling class standing astride an impotent, corrupted and demoralized, working class.

This is then compounded by the suggestion that even among the world's Communist leaders there are no real answers. Referring to the analysis of state monopoly capitalism by the 81 Party Conference of 1960, Lima says, "The economic theory necessary to determine the laws of motion of this phase of imperialism has not yet been discovered." "This," he continues, "is a very serious weakness of the world movement."

Well, indeed. The leading Marxists of 81 parties of the world deliberated for several weeks and unanimously adopted a statement analyzing the world situation, within which the organizing of struggle against the profiteering war schemes of imperialism was central, but to A. J. Lima, this is unimportant, nor does he come forward with any suggestion of a more profound or effective

"theory" of his own. The reader is thus left to assume that the working class, being without any "magic formula," to "determine the laws of motion of this phase of imperialism," is forced to sit on its hands and await the coming of some new "Messiah."

This negative view is further developed later in the article (p. 52) when the profound comment is made that, "The labor movement in the U.S. is firmly based on support of capitalism," to which the author adds that "support to capitalism means also, of necessity, to support state monopoly capitalism and an imperialist foreign policy. The bulk of the people in this country do exactly that, and this includes the bulk of the leadership and membership of the labor movement."

At this point, an uninitiated reader might well begin to ponder various forms of suicide in the light of the dismal outlook charted.

If this assessment is correct, then it would have been true to have said that the farmers and artisans of the 13 colonies were committed to the maintenance of feudalism 200 years ago. And a lot of good that did for King George III!

It is not exactly an original observation to note that American workers are not socialist-minded — but then, if they were, this would be an entirely different kind of a ball game and there would be different scores, different rules,

etc. The fact is, however, that the mass of the American working class and its leaders were never supporters of any other system of society than the present one, but this fact never prevented American workers and some of their leaders from engaging in some of the most militant and earth-shaking class battles that this world has ever seen—and, in the process of such great battles, those workers, time and again, changed the course of history. After all, weren't American workers "supporters of capitalism" when they stopped the shipments of arms to suppress the Russian Revolution in 1919? Or, when their militant sit-ins and general strikes turned the Roosevelt Administration to a more democratic course?

That there are regressions, setbacks, retreats, is neither unusual nor should it be unexpected. The road to socialism was never charted as a smooth, straight, onward and upward promenade (to paraphrase an earlier Marxist of some distinction, who is quoted earlier in this piece).

Again, what is really disturbing in the article as a whole, is its consistent negativism, which is made sharper by the author's ignoring or downgrading of various new and significant developments.

How, for instance is it possible to write a "serious" analysis dealing with the labor movement and the fight for peace in recent times,

and make no mention, even in passing, of the emergence of the American Labor Alliance representing the pooling of the forces of the two largest unions in the nation around a program of organizing the unorganized, mutual assistance against anti-labor attacks, etc.?

Why is no recognition given to the Labor Assembly for Peace which provided an important channel for giving voice to the sentiments of millions of workers who oppose the Vietnam war and U.S. foreign policy generally? The activities of trade unionists for peace, operating in many forms and in virtually all unions, played a most vital part in the movement that brought about the dumping of Johnson and the emergence of Kennedy as an anti-war candidate.

Can the substantial increase in the number of strike struggles, in each succeeding year of the Vietnam war be said to have no relationship to the attitude of workers towards that war? During the 40-month period beginning January, 1965, through April, 1968, there were an average of 574 strikes in progress each month, involving an average of 325,000 workers. In April, 1968, 4,910,000 man-days were lost due to strikes—the highest for any single month since the 1960s.*

* Figures from September, 1968 P. A. article "The Rise in Strike Struggles," by George Meyers and James West.

Additional indicators of the growing vigor and vitality of the labor movement are evident in the steady ousting of conservative union officials at the top as well as in lower levels of leadership; the emergence and effectiveness of black caucuses in many unions, such as auto steel, transit, etc.; the growth of rank-and-file movements; the steady organizing victories of U.E. and the beginnings of talks with IUE, looking towards joint bargaining with the electrical monopolies, etc.

It is plain, however, that one of the central questions posed by the Lima article is the question of an estimate of the role of the trade unions in a capitalist society. Did the unions originate as organizations to change the system, or did they arise basically to provide the workers with some defense against the onslaughts of the more powerfully positioned employers?

Unless one is prepared to assign to the unions that role which should properly be that of the vanguard party of the working class, then the limitations of trade unions as organs of struggle of the workers under capitalism must be noted.

At the same time, it is a truism, that the trade unions, as Marx pointed out, are schools of socialism, since it is in and through the unions that the workers gain an appreciation of their strength and power when united, of their ability to produce leaders from their ranks capable

of defeating and outwitting the class enemy, and of the necessity to struggle constantly in order to survive and to go forward.

In speaking of the tasks ahead (p. 57), Lima refers to the 30s as a time when the Left-Center coalition was built around the issue of "organize the unorganized." "Today," he continues, "the two key issues are racism and imperialism."

None can question that racism and imperialism are issues of great magnitude and vitally affect the welfare of the labor movement in the coming period. Clearly, the labor movement cannot move ahead on any major front, unless it develops positive answers and policies in these two key fields.

At the same time, the basic underlying economic issues form the solid rock-foundation for moving the broadest masses of workers into struggle, and this is as true today as it was in the 30s and must never be lost sight of.

Finally, when Communists, and especially Communist leaders, appraise the question of opportunism in the labor movement, this can hardly be done properly without relating it to the role and responsibilities of the Communist Party itself.

From the days of its birth, the CPUSA has always had a certain basic estimate of the key and

decisive role of the working class in bringing about social change in American life. The history of the CP is replete with the contributions made to and with the labor movement. In carrying out this approach, the CP was always conscious of the fact that the development of socialist consciousness within the working class did not come as a result of any spontaneous development arising from trade union struggles in themselves, but must be brought in from without.

In this regard, especially in relating the struggle against racism and imperialism to the fight for decent living conditions, democracy and socialism, the CPUSA must play a much more creative, energetic and clarifying role. To be really effective, however, requires a Communist Party many times the size and more deeply rooted and oriented towards the working class, than is presently the case.

To a greater extent than is often realized, rank-and-file workers sense the close relationship between Communists in leadership and their own ability to curb opportunism and corruption in their unions. In this respect, the restitution of the full right of membership in the Painters Union (where the hourly wage averages \$7.00 an hour) to Louis Weinstock, is an interesting commentary on the whole question of "labor opportunism."

BOOK REVIEWS

A. W. FONT

A History of HUAC

Once again, in January of last year, the Supreme Court rejected a challenge of the constitutionality of the mandate of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. So HUAC is likely to be with us for a while longer. It has been with us—or, rather, against us—for over thirty years, ever since 1938 when it came into being under the chairmanship of Martin Dies. In its initial year it received an appropriation of only \$25,000. I say "only" because by the time of the 89th Congress it was costing us taxpayers over \$1,000,000.

In January, too, some members of the Committee proposed to change its name to House Committee on Internal Security. This bit of cosmetic surgery would remove the blemish of the word "un-American." "Un-American" is considered to be a dirty word. Nevertheless, it is a word which defies definition. Walter Goodman states in his new book* that "When the resolution [establishing the first HUAC] came to the floor of the House . . . Representative Johnson of Minnesota asked a question

—'What is meant by un-American activities?' — which was to echo down the decades without ever receiving a much better answer than it received that day, when it was ignored."

Will a change of name produce a change of function? It is not likely. It would seem wise to be prepared to change those "Abolish HUAC" posters to read "Abolish HISC."

Goodman's book, *The Committee*, surveys HUAC from its prehistory in the Fish and Dickstein committees to the end of 1966 when the Committee received smart rebuffs from the ladies of Women Strike for Peace and from youths of the New Left, who were no gentlemen. Since then the Committee (in 1968) has again demonstrated its single-minded malice by conducting hearings on the August police riot in Chicago. Characteristically it did this by conducting an inquisition against the victims of the cops.

Down the years since 1938, HUAC could always be counted on to inject itself into any situation which promised headlines for its chairman. (So far eight Congressmen have had the dubious

* Walter Goodman: *The Committee*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, \$10.

honor of bearing that title.) Communism in the United States has supposedly been its main preoccupation. In pursuit of this vaguely defined subject it has ranged widely, taking on the trade unions, peace organizations, teachers, lawyers, churches, Hollywood, youth movements, civil rights and civil liberties groups—in short, poking into any area where democracy and humanism appeared to reside. Nominally, its purpose was to determine the need for new legislation and to propose such measures as it found to be needed. In this it has been an almost total failure. But in its real purpose of destroying progressive movements and the people associated with them, it has had major success. This has been especially true in regard to individuals, hundreds of whom have been deprived of life, liberty or livelihood through the exposure power of the Committee.

Those subpoenaed by the Committee had their choice of a number of undesirable alternatives. They might answer Committee questions and find themselves refuted by a “friendly” witness and thereby exposed to a perjury frameup; they could refuse to answer and be found in contempt; they could “cooperate” with the Committee and become, essentially, stool pigeons; or they could claim the protection of the Fifth Amendment, a course which had its own undesirable implications and consequences.

Walter Goodman devotes an entire chapter to a discussion of the

moral, philosophical, tactical and legal propriety of “taking the Fifth” before the Committee. Here he poses the position of Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School, supporting the use of the Fifth, against that of Professor Sidney Hook, who sought to refute the Dean’s arguments. It is typical of Goodman, whose book suffers from the insufferable smugness of one who is above the battle, that he sides with Hook. The harsh fact is that every hostile witness compelled to take the stand was obliged to play a game with a deck stacked against him by his opponents, and according to rules which the latter had devised. In this predicament the choice of tactics certainly belonged to the one who was in process of being “taken” by the congressional hustlers.

But Goodman assumes throughout the book the aloof position of a liberal critic of liberals. While he proclaims himself a partisan opposed to the Committee, he makes it clear that, in most instances, he has at least as much contempt for the victims as for their persecutors. He reviews cases much like a referee deciding a round on points. He uses his considerable wit, and undeniable gift for the language, to ridicule those witnesses whose choice of invective may be more gross than his own. He pillories those who saw a fascist tendency in the Committee’s actions.

Goodman’s judicial calm sometimes leaves him, as when he can say: “. . . some of the union chiefs

and federal officials whom Dies attacked aspired to nothing grander than to function as bureaucrats in a Sovietized America.” (That’s not Dies talking, that’s Goodman!) He kindly suggests that “What Dies represented was an aching nostalgia for pre-World War I America.” He bemoans that “. . . an opportunity to show the extent of the American Communists’ servitude to Moscow was lost . . .” He calls it demagoguery when Vito Marcantonio, a lone dissenter in the House, tells his colleagues: “You fear the people and their will for peace and freedom.” He speaks of “. . . ladies involved in the synthetic peace movement which the Communists had put together to oppose the U.S. role in Korea . . .” For him the rambunctiousness of some of the Committee’s youthful targets, and the fact that there really *are* Communists in the peace and civil rights movements, “add to the liberal burden” in opposing the Committee. And he shows a truly liberal gift for the pejorative distinction when he states in a footnote:

In writing of the opponents of the Committee in this chapter, I mean those who sometimes act as defenders of individual Communists but are not the Party’s collaborators or apologists—that is, persons more likely to contribute to the American Civil Liberties Union than to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and more responsive to the pronouncements of Americans for Democratic Action than to those of the National Lawyers Guild.

The fact is that you can find

embedded in the text of *The Committee* a full indictment of the destructive, anti-democratic, reactionary role of HUAC. But this is delivered with such Olympian aloofness, such “objectivity,” such “even-handedness” that its value as an anti-HUAC document is seriously undermined.

Mr. Goodman’s own role as an active civil libertarian has largely escaped me. It is probably my own fault, however, that the only action I have known him to take is to sign a petition for civil liberties—in the Soviet Union.

But it cannot be said that we were not put on notice as to the fatal flaw in Mr. Goodman’s approach to the Committee. In a foreword written by his friend Richard H. Rovers we read: “Though individual Communists may have been men of rather simple-minded integrity, the Party was a totalitarian wrecker. Mr. Goodman has a solid appreciation of this basic truth, and this lends added force to his indictment of the Committee.”

However, the contrary is true: by totally misjudging the role of the Party, Goodman has accepted the Committee’s own basic premise and thereby seriously marred his attack on it.

That the author intended better than this is shown by these words from his final paragraph: “Between the Committee and the liberal spirit no reconciliation is possible, for the Committee embodies the drive to ban, censor, forbid, jail that has cursed the land for 200 years.” True enough, and so we say: Abolish HUAC!

NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

COMMUNIST COUNCILMAN FROM HARLEM AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL NOTES WRITTEN IN A FEDERAL PENITENTIARY

by Benjamin J. Davis

The first Black Communist to hold public office in the United States, the author, who served a 5-year prison sentence under the Smith Act, tells of his successful legal defense of Angelo Herndon, his decision to join the Communist Party, his election to the New York City Council, and his Smith Act trial. He gives first-hand insights into the struggles of black people in Georgia in the 1930s, municipal politics in New York in the 1940s, and the life of a political prisoner.

218 pages, paperback \$2.85

THE DOLLAR CRISIS

What It Means To You

by Victor Perlo

Popular explanation of the instability which threatens capitalist currencies, the danger to living standards, and how to solve the crisis in the interests of working people.

32 pages—40c

CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION

Why Socialist Countries Intervened

by Herbert Aptheker

Detailed examination of internal and external dangers to socialism in Czechoslovakia which developed in 1968, and how counter-revolution was prevented.

32 pages—35c

THE CIVIL WAR AND BLACK LIBERATION TODAY

by Claude M. Lightfoot

Discusses the nineteenth-century class conflicts which overcame racism and abolished slavery, the development of black-white unity in the struggle, and relevance of this history to today's freedom movement.

16 pages—25c

THE PATH TO REVOLUTION

The Communist Program

by Gus Hall

Report to Special Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., July, 1968 on major questions regarding the Party's Draft Program and the American path to socialist revolution.

40 pages—25c

CZECHOSLOVAKIA AT THE CROSSROADS

by Gus Hall

Full assessment of the crisis in Czechoslovakia, covering historical background, circumstances which necessitated the entry of the Warsaw Pact troops, and its relation to the struggle for peace and socialism.

36 pages—25c

At local progressive bookstores, or order from:

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

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

Orders must be prepaid (no stamps). Add 20c postage on orders under \$2.00; orders for \$2.00 or more postpaid. New York residents include sales tax: 5% N. Y. City or 2% N. Y. State.

WRITE FOR COMPLETE LIST