

MAY, 1975

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

30 YEARS AFTER HITLER'S DEFEAT

Gus Hall

MARTIAL LAW AND THE
NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC STRUGGLE
IN THE PHILIPPINES

William Pomeroy

THE CIA: INSTRUMENT OF
U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Arnold Lockshin

THE WORLD SCENE
THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

Draft Resolution, Communist Party, U.S.A.

THE REAL LIFE OF A
TRUE REVOLUTIONARY:
A REVIEW OF REVIEWS

Louise Patterson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Gus Hall</i> | |
| 30 Years After Hitler's Defeat | 1 |
| <i>William Pomeroy</i> | |
| Martial Law and the National Democratic Struggle in the Philippines | 12 |
| <i>Arnold Lockshin</i> | |
| The CIA: Instrument of U.S. Foreign Policy | 30 |
| <i>Communist Party, U.S.A.</i> | |
| The World Scene | 44 |
| The Economic Crisis | 51 |
| BOOK REVIEWS | |
| <i>Louise Patterson</i> | |
| The Real Life of a True Revolutionary: A Review of Reviews | 59 |

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: \$7.50 a year; \$3.75 for six months; for foreign, including Canada, \$8.50 a year. Single copies 75 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N.Y.

30 Years After Hitler's Defeat

The annual observance on May 8th in the Soviet Union is a deeply moving experience. In the streets and parks of Moscow hundreds of thousands of veterans and their families meet in reunion under handmade signs tacked to trees indicating the military units they fought in during the war. They come from all corners of the Soviet Union to keep a solemn pledge, made when the guns were silenced: "We will meet in Moscow one minute after 6 on the 8th of May every year to observe the victory over fascism." Without any campaigns or resolutions, when the clock strikes 6 on that day there is a nationwide moment of absolute silence.

After thirty years the annual memorial observance is still as fresh, as moving and as meaningful as was the reunion on the first anniversary of the victory over fascism. It reflects the deep feelings of the people of the Soviet Union and the people throughout the world. It symbolizes the attitude of the working class the world over.

In striking contrast, the representatives of the capitalist class of the countries that were part of the alliance that defeated fascism are *not* observing this 30th anniversary. They have never observed the anniversary of this historic event in which they participated. It is as if they are hoping that their silence will help to erase the memory of this great victory from the consciousness of the people.

Behind these two contrasting reactions to the anniversary of the victory over fascism lies the real story of the nature of the alliance that defeated Hitler. An important element of our observance and tribute must be to gain a deeper, fuller understanding of the nature of the forces involved in this unprecedented victory over fascism.

Hindsight not only provides a more objective viewpoint. It also blends the details, the subjective factors, the phenomena that contained only momentary significance into the general landscape of history. It is now easier after a span of thirty years to grasp the more fundamental factors of the whole historic period of the battle against fascism. From a distance in time only the upheavals related to qualitative turning points in history stand out like mountain peaks. Only they provide the perspective, the basic points of reference, and serve as guides to an objective study of history.

Looking back after thirty years, the crushing defeat of fascism looms as one of the loftiest pinnacles, as a monument to the forces

of progress the world over.

The fascist-axis aggression was the most serious assault against social progress in all of history. It was world capitalism's effort to destroy the first land of socialism.

The crushing military defeat of Hitler-fascism was, above all, a people's victory without precedent. The great majority of the world's population contributed to this victorious turning point in history. Even the casualties testify to the magnitude of this heroic struggle. More than 50 million people lost their lives.

The perspective after thirty years makes it crystal clear that the main contribution and the main sacrifices, in human lives and suffering, as well as in material resources, were made by the first land of socialism—by the people of the Soviet Union.

The victory over fascism is reason enough to celebrate, to make toasts, to lower the flags in memory of the millions who gave their lives *in order that social progress could be made irreversible*.

If, in today's world, the conditions and the causes that gave rise to the fascist holocaust were not still in existence the toasts and the pause of silence would be enough. But unfortunately that is not the case. Therefore, we must add to the toasts and the pause the need to use this occasion, this anniversary, to draw lessons, to deepen our understanding in order to guarantee that it will never happen again.

The Basic Class Contradiction

The same factors that guided and determined the thinking and actions of the capitalist class during the Second World War dictate their attitude toward the anniversaries. In a basic sense, imperialism does not celebrate victories over fascism because they are victories over members of their own class. Imperialism does not salute anti-imperialist victories.

The United States, British and French imperialists took part in an anti-fascist war, but they were not conscious anti-fascists. They were a part of the alliance against an aggressive imperialist force, but they were not anti-imperialist. They contributed to the conquest of a brutal, racist force, but this did not make them anti-racist. They fought against a reactionary force that was hell-bent on destroying socialism, but this did not make them pro-socialist. The fact that they joined with the progressive forces in the fierce battle to defeat the most reactionary sector of their class does not make them a progressive force.

The war did not and could not basically change the inner nature of the forces that fought it. The war did not and could not change the nature of the basic contradiction of this era in world history.

Therefore, it is important to understand the nature of the forces and the contradictions between them. It is also necessary to see how these forces operated in the context of a unique war.

From the beginning, for the Soviet Union and for most of the world's people, the war against the fascist monster was an anti-fascist, anti-imperialist, just war in the broad interests of social progress. And within that scope it was a war in defense of socialism, national liberation and in the interest of the working class in general.

The forces of the capitalist class were motivated by different factors. They were influenced by national class interests. The resolution of their inter-imperialist contradictions coincided with the struggle against a fascist imperialist power. The ranks of the capitalist class within each of the capitalist countries were also divided. Their ranks were split over whether their class interests would be best served by putting aside their inter-imperialist rivalries or by temporarily joining the forces of anti-fascism against their capitalist competitors. This inner struggle continued throughout the whole period. These factors become clearer and stand out in sharper focus if we trace the actions of these forces within the context of the basic contradiction of the Second World War era.

First, we must begin from the fundamental premise that the basic contradiction in a capitalist society arises from the social character of production and the private appropriation of the products of that production. This gives rise to the struggle between the two main classes—the capitalist class and the working class. Engels said, concerning this contradiction between the social character of production and the private appropriation of its products: "This contradiction . . . contains the germ of the whole of the social antagonisms of today. The greater the mastery obtained by this new mode of production over all important fields of production and in all manufacturing countries . . . the more clearly [is] brought out the incompatibility of socialized production with capitalistic appropriation." (*Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, International Publishers, New York, 1935, p. 58.)

The birth of the first socialist state, the Soviet Union, gave the basic contradiction and the class struggle an added dimension. The very act of doing away with the contradiction between "socialized production and private appropriation" in the socialist sector raised the basic contradiction and the struggle between the classes to a new level—to a struggle between the two social systems reflecting their respective basic interests.

This basic contradiction creates the dividing line between the forces of progress and the forces of reaction. It is the framework

within which all other contradictions operate. To one extent or another, all secondary contradictions are influenced and affected by the basic contradiction.

The basic contradiction operates within each capitalist country and it is expressed on a world scale by the contradiction between the socialist and capitalist systems.

Since the October Revolution the basic policies pursued by world imperialism have been policies of aggression against the Soviet Union. The policies of economic blockade, of military and non-military interventions, as well as the ideology of anti-Sovietism are all instruments formulated and carried out in pursuance of the basic contradiction.

This was the basic factor that motivated all the imperialist powers in the period leading to the Second World War. This remained so during the war, and when the war was over it continued in the form of the cold war.

There are periods when other contradictions cross the path of the basic class contradiction. But these only momentarily and partially short-circuit the basic contradiction. They cross its path, but they *never* replace it.

The other contradiction that interfered with the exclusive pursuit of policies along the path of the main contradiction was that between the imperialist powers. It interfered with, but it *never* replaced the basic class contradiction.

Hitler Germany's rapid rise to a world power was made possible solely because monopoly capital in the U.S., Britain and France fed the fascist monster directly and intravenously. Hitler-fascism was designed to be the spearhead against the Soviet Union—the shock troops for a resolution of the basic contradiction.

After a buildup of a number of years, German fascism began to conquer new lands. Because of the basic contradiction the other capitalist powers did absolutely nothing to stop it. In fact they participated in this conspiracy of aggression.

Years after the war President Johnson admitted: "France could have stopped Hitler when he started into the Saar. France and England combined could have prevented the occupation of Austria or even later stopped the Nazis at Czechoslovakia. The United States, England and France could have prevented the rape of Poland." Although Johnson made a correct assessment, he did not explain *why* France and England did not stop Hitler, and he should have included the United States.

At the very height of Hitler's aggression against a number of countries, Prime Minister Chamberlain declared to the House of

Commons: "We must not try to delude ourselves. And still more we must not try to delude small, weak nations into thinking that they will be protected by the League [of Nations] against aggression." British imperialism was ready to make all kinds of concessions as long as it appeared that Hitler-fascism was moving against the Soviet Union along the path of the main class contradiction.

In 1938, representatives of Hitler Germany, Britain, France and Italy gathered in Munich, Germany. In pursuance of their interests along the path of the basic contradiction, they secretly parcelled out to fascist Germany, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Memel, etc. These were secret agreements uncovered only after the war. After Munich the Nazis were free to attack Poland.

The governments of the United States, Britain and France turned a deaf ear to the urgent proposals of the Soviet Union for an alliance against fascism. The Soviet Union proposed treaties in defense of Poland and Czechoslovakia. But the basic aim of the United States, Britain and France was to strengthen and to maneuver fascist Germany into a war *against* the Soviet Union.

And to make things even worse at this critical point, on the secret advice of the British and the French governments, the capitalist government of Poland refused a direct Soviet offer of aid in its defense. In fact, when the German forces struck Poland most of Poland's armed forces were on the borders of the Soviet Union.

After years of futile efforts to establish a collective security system, and in the face of the continued double-dealing and maneuvering by the United States, Britain and France, the Soviet Union signed a non-aggression treaty with Germany. This threw a monkey wrench into the maneuvers of the capitalist powers to form a united world capitalist front against the Soviet Union in pursuance of their policies along the path of the basic contradiction.

In 1939 Britain and France were forced to formally declare war against Germany. But this did not mean that they had given up the struggle for their basic class goals. In fact, Hitler was fully aware of this. At one point Hitler declared: "That they have declared war on us does not mean they are going to fight." He was absolutely correct. This was the setting for what became known as the "phony war." It was phony because the capitalist countries were still planning and maneuvering for the "real war"—a war against socialism.

Based on secret documents uncovered since the war, G. Deborin writes:

The anti-Soviet and anti-democratic campaign in France, Britain and the United States reached its peak during the Soviet-Finnish

war. It seemed then that international reaction was close to achieving its aim: the launching of an anti-Soviet crusade. The general staffs in France and Britain were fitting out an expeditionary corps to help Finnish reaction and preparing an attack against the Soviet Union in the South. Neither did they scrap their war planning [against the Soviet Union] after the conclusion of the Soviet-Finnish peace treaty.

The French General Staff had completed a plan for Operation Baku, envisaging a sudden air assault on the Soviet Union's key economic potential, to be followed by a ground invasion. The plan was submitted to the government on April 4, 1940, and soon thereafter the final date for the attack was set for the end of June or early July, 1941.

Britain's Chiefs of Staff Committee took part in drawing up the plan. It continued work on it even after France lay crushed, and even when the prospect of a German invasion loomed large for Britain herself. On June 12, 1941, the Committee decided on steps setting the stage for a swift air strike from Mosul against the oil refining plants in Baku.

At the height of the danger to the survival of the peoples of Eastern and Western Europe, instead of repulsing the enemy, the rulers of Britain and France dreamt of an alliance with it and plotted an attack on the Soviet Union—the only country capable of delivering the world from the plague of fascism. (G. Deborin, *Secrets of the Second World War*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1972.)

It is obvious that the basic class contradiction was very much the principal, continuing, underlying factor motivating the capitalist powers.

Inter-Imperialist Rivalries

However, the contradiction between the imperialist powers kept interfering and increasingly shortcircuiting the policies based on the basic class contradiction.

All during the period of Hitler's conquest of Europe, the United States and other capitalist countries continued to work on turning the war into a united imperialist war against the Soviet Union. There are volumes of evidence and facts to sustain this conclusion. For example, in 1941 the FBI and British intelligence outfits planted such false reports as: "From highly reliable sources it is learned that the USSR intends further military aggression the instant Germany is embroiled in major operations." So the dirty tricks are as old as the FBI.

On June 22, 1941, German armies moved against the Soviet Union

in full force. Now it was a war waged along the lines of the basic contradiction. Hitler Germany's war against the Soviet Union was reactionary, imperialist, aggressive and totally unjust. German imperialism set out to destroy the Soviet Union and thus to clear the way for its own world supremacy. But in doing so it also fought for the continued domination of the world by capitalism.

In December 1941, the Japanese forces attacked Pearl Harbor. This added a new dimension to the struggle and to the contradictions. By then the contradiction among the imperialist powers, or more accurately, between the groups of imperialist powers, had become much sharper. It began to interfere with the policies that were based on the basic contradiction. It was only after the attack on Pearl Harbor that the United States ruling class realized that its interest would be best served by an alliance with the Soviet Union.

The United States, Britain and France began to see their long-range interest in an alliance with the Soviet Union. But from their viewpoint this alliance was momentary and partial. It was an alliance to last only until the interference of the shortcircuit could be overcome. And what is most important—even while historic factors forced them to move towards an alliance with the socialist forces, they did not give up their goals, their policies based on their class interests. The basic contradiction *did not* become inoperative.

Through united action the war could have been cut short. Tens of millions of lives could have been saved. The Red Army was fighting heroically against the bulk of the Hitler-fascist forces. If the United States, Britain and France had opened up a second front in Europe, Hitler would have been forced to fight on two fronts. It is now known that Hitler had absolute assurances that there would be no second front. For a long period, therefore, he was able to concentrate all his forces in the war against the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's forces continued to fight without aid and no second front opened in 1941, nor in 1943, nor in the beginning of 1944.

Instead of a second front against Hitler-Germany, the capitalist powers pursued their basic colonial interests by sending their armed forces into Africa. In addition to not opening up a second front, documents now reveal that all during this period the capitalist powers were in continuous secret negotiations with fascist Germany. These double-dealing, secret negotiations took place in Spain, Sweden, Portugal, Switzerland and at the Vatican. During this period the chief negotiator for the capitalist powers was Allen Dulles of the CIA.

Only after the fascist forces had suffered decisive and historic defeats on the Eastern Front, after Hitler's main forces were destroyed,

and only after the anti-fascist forces in Europe were challenging the Nazis on every block, was the second front opened in 1944.

Thus, the capitalist countries entered the war on European soil only when the outcome of the war had become a foregone conclusion. It is a fact, therefore, that the capitalist powers fully entered the war only when they were absolutely convinced it would be the only way they could continue to pursue their policies along the path of the basic contradiction.

This becomes clear when we look at some statistics. The armed forces of the Soviet Union destroyed 507 of Hitler's best divisions and an additional 100 divisions of Hitler's fascist allies. By comparison with this the Hitler forces lost 176 divisions on all other fronts of the war combined. Three out of four Luftwaffe planes were destroyed on the Soviet-German front. This is also true of the bulk of Hitler's artillery and Panzers. And, out of a total of 13,600,000 killed, wounded or captured German soldiers and officers, Germany lost over 10 million on the Eastern Front.

The policies and actions that the United States, Britain and France pursued during most of the war period were clearly expressed by Harry S. Truman, who became Vice President of the United States, said: "If we see that Germany is winning we ought to help Russia. And if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany. And that way let them kill as many as possible." (Deborin, op. cit.) This expressed both the basic contradiction and the interfering, short-circuiting contradiction between the imperialist powers. The aim of this policy was to win the struggle and to resolve both contradictions in favor of capitalism, and specifically in favor of United States, British and French capitalism.

Now that more of the facts are in the open it is clear that while the contradiction between the imperialist countries at times became an obstacle on the path of pursuing their main class aims, imperialism never gave up its goal of destroying the first land of socialism.

These are important facts. But they do not in any way change the historic significance or the basic nature of the coalition of forces that finally defeated Hitler Germany. The character of the coalition was not determined by the aims or desires of the ruling class circles or the bourgeois governments of the U.S., Britain and France. The character of the coalition was determined by its objective nature—by the fact that it was a coalition with the legitimate, anti-fascist forces—in the first place the Soviet Union—and the masses that were in motion both politically and militarily throughout the world. The coalition was an important factor in the defeat of fascism,

and it became a major factor in the developments that took place after the war.

In spite of the reactionary policies of the bourgeois governments, the victory over fascism and the coalition of forces that brought this about were crucial to the rise of national liberation movements and the emergence of a number of new socialist states.

The experiences of the Second World War added tremendous substance to the Leninist policies of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. These experiences were an example of how to fight for such policies under very difficult circumstances. But they also demonstrate that policies of peaceful coexistence do not eliminate the class struggle or the basic contradiction. This should not surprise anyone, because the goals of those who pursue policies of detente or coexistence are not the elimination of the class struggle or the basic contradiction.

The imperialist powers never gave up their basic class outlook. This became crystal clear immediately after the defeat of German fascism. Even before the final peace conference, before the birth of the United Nations, the imperialist powers, under the leadership of U.S. imperialism, vigorously pursued their basic aims. They became even more arrogant and aggressive, believing they had the monopoly on the atom bomb. This new emphasis was given life through all kinds of provocations, military and otherwise. The new emphasis gave birth to the cold war. The new policies of aggression against the forces of national liberation the world over were parallel with and a part of the anti-Soviet policies. The imperialist powers moved to safeguard their old colonial empires. But in most cases it was too late. They suffered one defeat after another and most of the old colonial empires collapsed.

The Anti-Fascist Character of the War

The defeat of Hitler-fascism was an historic blow against reaction. We must not allow the basic nature of the struggle to be obscured because different forces were motivated by different interests—interests which momentarily coincided with the struggle against fascism. The historic impact on world developments was not lessened because the anti-fascist coalition was composed of diverse forces.

Spokesmen for the imperialist powers do not observe or celebrate the anniversaries of the triumph over fascism because it was a defeat for imperialism. Celebrating the defeat of fascism does not advance their struggle along the path of the basic contradiction. Celebrating

the defeat of fascism does not correspond to capitalism's place in world history.

It is only the forces of human progress, the working-class forces—only the forces propelling the world revolutionary process, the forces on the right side of the main contradiction, which celebrate and hail the victory over fascism.

On this 30th anniversary the magnificent, heroic contributions and sacrifices of the people of the Soviet Union stand out in full glory.

We must also remember and understand that the war against fascism in Germany and other countries had a profound effect on the mass patterns of thought in the United States.

The danger of fascism became an urgent concern of millions of people from the very beginning of the war. When the war began, the Communist Party took the initiative in organizing broad united front movements against fascism. The anti-fascist movement, in breadth and depth, matched the mass movements around the War of Independence and the Civil War.

This mass pressure became a primary factor in moving the Roosevelt Administration and the ruling class toward joining the Soviet Union, Britain and France in the struggle against Hitler-fascism. Because of the anti-fascist sentiment there were no insuperable problems in mobilizing the people of the U.S. for this great battle. This phenomenon is in complete contrast to the sentiment of the people during the First World War. And, of course, it is completely at variance with the tremendous movement of resistance by the people of the U.S. against the war of aggression in Indochina. Both were historic mass expressions—one in support of a policy that expressed a just cause, the other an unprecedented struggle against an unjust war of imperialist aggression.

While the ruling class and the Roosevelt Administration joined in the national effort, they did not give up their basic class aims. They were for the policies of an alliance in the struggle against Hitler-Germany. But they also continued their policies of striving for maximum profits during the war. Even in domestic affairs the capitalist class did not and could not give up its policies of pursuing the basic class contradiction.

Because of their anti-fascist sentiments and their understanding of the nature of the war, U.S. soldiers fought bravely and hard. Under the circumstances they made great contributions to the joint effort against fascism. Anti-fascist sentiment was the basis of the great efforts of the working class for maximum production of all the materials needed to fight the war. U.S. seamen wrote a heroic page in history and made great sacrifices in the process of delivering the

weapons and other necessary material to the front.

While the working class was turning out this maximum production the capitalist class (General Motors, Ford and Esso) were making maximum profits. They had manufacturing facilities on both sides, and they were making huge profits from both sides. After the war they had no compunctions about going into U.S. courts to sue for damages to their plants in Germany, caused by the bombing carried on by planes and bombs they had sold to the U.S. government at home.

U.S. monopoly capitalists not only made no sacrifices during the war, they made huge profits from all sides.

Before the war was over the anti-labor bills were already in the Congressional hoppers.

Black soldiers fought heroically on all fronts during the war. But on the home front big business was pushing racism and pursuing discriminatory policies.

Not for one moment did monopoly capital forget, relax, or make any concessions in the struggle on the front of the main basic contradiction.

It is important to take note of the different class forces that took part in the struggle to defeat Hitler fascism. But this is not enough. It is even more important to have a clear understanding of what motivated each class, what their goals and policies were. Without such an understanding, surface observations can lead to illusions, and illusions can lead to defeats.

While the spokesmen for imperialism do not want to perpetuate the memory of the monumental historic victory over fascism, there is very good reason for the people of the United States to celebrate together with the people of the Soviet Union and people throughout the world.

The observance, the moment of silence, the pause in the activities of everyday life to remember and honor the millions who gave their lives so that social progress could become irreversible should be celebrated by all the progressive forces of the world.

In friendship and solidarity with the peoples of the Soviet Union, the international community of progressive forces will memorialize those who sacrificed so much in order that the rest of us could be saved from the fascist holocaust. In observing this 30th anniversary we must also study the lessons of this victory so that the progressive forces of the world, and especially the people of the U.S., remain always alert to the danger of fascism wherever and whenever it rears its ugly head.

Martial Law and the National Democratic Struggle in The Philippines

On October 11, 1974, the Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas (PKP) and Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos announced a national unity agreement, as part of which the PKP declared its support for certain reforms which are being implemented by the Marcos regime. For his part, President Marcos welcomed PKP participation in nation-building, pledged amnesty for all PKP leaders and members, including the release of political prisoners who are PKP members, and paved the way for legal activity for the PKP for the first time in 33 years.

This development in the Philippines may have seemed surprising in view of the martial law, semi-dictatorial character of the government under President Marcos, who assumed authoritarian emergency powers in September 1972, and in view of the initial critical assessment by the PKP of the "New Society" then proclaimed.

At its outset, the "New Society" had many aspects of the repressive regimes that had marked the course of U.S. imperialist policy in Asia, from South Korea to Thailand, aimed at preserving the status quo against growing popular movements for change. The martial law decrees of President Marcos included the suspension of most civil liberties, elections, the national legislature and political party activity; they included also the banning of the right to strike and demonstrate, the introduction of government control over the press, the purging from universities of progressive and militant students and teachers, and the arrest and detention of thousands of opponents of the Marcos regime of all shades of the political spectrum, including many PKP members.

Coupled with the repression was the granting of very favorable concessions to foreign investors and businessmen, with the unabashed claim of having created "stability" for foreign investment. This feature of the "New Society" made it plain that neo-colonial conditions that had distorted and frustrated Philippine development since independence in 1946 were to continue and that one of the motivations

for martial law was to cater to U.S. imperialism and other foreign interests.

The PKP, Martial Law, and Reforms

As the martial law government has evolved, however, and as the policies and decrees of President Marcos have emerged, a number of positive features have had to be set beside the negative.

1) A nation-wide land reform program has been set in motion that in scope and implementation goes far beyond any previous steps to eliminate semi-feudal agrarian relations that have oppressed the Filipino peasantry. Pre-cooperative organizations called *samahang nayon* were immediately set up, to be succeeded by full-fledged cooperatives (*kilusang bayan*), the cooperative principle to be extended to other parts of the economy.

2) A new constitution has been instituted, in which the old presidential two-chamber legislative system, patterned after that of the U.S., is replaced by a parliamentary single assembly more suitable to Philippine democratic needs. In the meantime, a grass-roots system of *barangays* or "citizens' assemblies" has been introduced with some local government functions; though at present only periodically "consulted" by the President, they have a mass-base democratic potential.

3) An emphasis has been placed on intensified industrialization, especially the industrial processing of agricultural and mineral products formerly exported in raw form.

4) A much more diversified foreign policy and trade have been pursued, including stress on the development of diplomatic and economic relations for the first time with socialist countries.

5) A moderation of political and governmental corruption has been effected, as part of an effort to make the administrative system more efficient and less wasteful.

These are all steps that serve the developmental interests of the Philippine national bourgeoisie and the creation of a more thorough-going capitalist society in the Philippines. As such, however, they are in opposition to feudal landlord interests and have a tendency toward contradiction with neo-colonial relationships. Although still relying heavily on imperialist investment and loan capital, an effort is made to augment independent development means. For example, part of the efficiency drive has been the perfection of tax collection, especially from well-to-do evaders, which caused a boost in tax revenues from P4,554 million in 1970 to P15,680 million in

1974, with a parallel rise in government expenditure on infrastructure construction.

In a policy document issued by the central committee of the PKP during negotiations on the national unity agreement with President Marcos, entitled "Attitude of the PKP Toward the Martial Law Government Concerning Basic Issues," the PKP made known its position on these features of the Marcos program. As far as martial law itself is concerned, the PKP said:

The central point in the struggle of the PKP and that of the working-class movement in the Philippines is the establishment of a truly democratic political, economic and social order in the country. Thus, the PKP vehemently objects to the proclamation of martial law throughout the country and to its continuance. The PKP calls for the immediate termination of the martial law "emergency" situation; the restoration of the liberties of the people suspended or abolished by the imposition of martial law, particularly freedom of speech, of assembly and of the press, and of the right to strike; and the release of all political prisoners. . . .

The PKP maintains that the right of the people to elect their leaders is a basic democratic right, the denial of which is despotism.

In regard to the new constitution and new system of government, the PKP document declared:

The PKP views the institution of the parliamentary form of government as a forward step toward broader mass participation in the political processes of the country. It is to be desired that this new political form will do away with the two-party system and encourage open access on the part of the citizens to organized involvement in their political affairs through their own political parties.

It is the position of the PKP, however, that this broadened political framework cannot be realistic and cannot constitute a genuine departure from the old system of government unless it recognizes the right of the PKP to function openly and legally as a political party among the Filipino working masses.

The PKP therefore called for its recognition as a legal political party, entitled to all democratic rights, for the release of all of its cadres held as political prisoners, and for an unconditional amnesty for all of its leaders, in response to which the PKP would dissolve its armed forces and turn over their arms. These demands were acceded to by President Marcos, who immediately began their implementation after agreement had been reached, the PKP living up to its own pledges.

On the question of industrialization the PKP said:

The PKP welcomes industrialization as the only course to national development. However, the PKP strongly opposes and will actively struggle through parliamentary and extraparliamentary means against imperialist-controlled industrialization of the country. The PKP views the heavy inflow of multinational and monopoly capital as detrimental to the Philippines. Thus, the PKP as ever advocates the intermediate stages of nationalist industrialization and a non-capitalist development as discussed in detail in its Program.

Land reform is one of the principal areas in which the PKP has found grounds to support policies of the Marcos government, and around which the Marcos government has sought PKP support. However, the Party seeks to extend and broaden the agrarian program that, as promulgated, is weighted in advantage of the landlords and the well-to-do peasants:

The PKP accepts the basic principle of the present land reform program of giving lands to the tillers and of liquidating the historic evil of landlordism. But the PKP will continue to fight for the interests of the peasants in cutting down the price for which the family-sized farms are being sold to them.

The PKP supports the formation of *samahang nayon* and will campaign for wider membership of the *samahang nayon* among the peasantry. It will, however, struggle to remove the onerous conditions for such membership and will wage a vigorous fight to make *samahang nayon* a class organization rather than a collection agency for the amortization price of landholdings and a means of enrichment for insurance magnates. The PKP advocates more substantial political power for these organizations, rather than their being a mere rubber stamp of the central government.

A further salient policy of the Marcos regime that is given wholehearted endorsement by the PKP is the development of relations with socialist countries:

The initiative of the martial law government in pursuing a realistic policy toward the socialist countries has the full support of the PKP. The establishment to date of diplomatic ties with Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania and Mongolia is definitely along a progressive course of foreign policy. But the PKP thinks that there is no reason at all for holding in abeyance or long delay the country's diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The essential position put forward by the PKP, which was adhered to in the national unity agreement, was thus a conditional support of specific reforms and policies of the government of President Marcos, with the PKP reserving the right to conduct its struggle for advancing the interests of the Filipino working classes.

U.S. Imperialism and PKP Illegalization

In its historical context, the national unity agreement is an important step toward overcoming distorted conditions forced upon the Philippines by U.S. imperialism.

Philippine independence in 1946 was a neo-colonial arrangement in which U.S. imperialism remained dominant in virtually every phase of Philippine life, an arrangement worked out with reactionary Filipino landlord-comprador groups that had always had relative benefits from U.S. colonial rule. Colonial-style trade relations, perpetuating the subservient Philippine role as semi-feudal agrarian supplier of raw materials to the U.S. and as protected market for U.S. manufactured goods, were embodied in the 1946 28-year U.S.-Philippine Trade Act, subsequently modified (but not basically changed) by the 1956 Laurel-Langley Agreement. It contained the notorious "parity" agreement that gave U.S. businessmen preferential and equal rights with Filipinos in all sectors of the economy, a concession that warped and impeded the growth of a native national bourgeoisie and of any balanced economic development.

Corollary to economic control, huge U.S. air, naval and communication bases were imposed on the Philippines, and the republic's armed forces and intelligence services were put under control of a Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group and made wholly dependent on U.S. equipment and training. Foreign policy was dictated by the U.S. and shaped into the narrowest of cold-war patterns, cutting the Philippines totally away from any relations with socialist countries or with anti-colonial developing countries. Philippine domestic politics were vulnerable to U.S. interference and manipulation.

At U.S. insistence, anti-Communism was made central in both internal and foreign Philippine policies. Suppression of the PKP, which had emerged from World War II as a strong force due to its leadership of the Hukbalahap guerrilla resistance movement against Japanese occupation, but which had sought after the war with significant success to pursue peaceful, parliamentary struggles, was begun in 1946 on U.S. demand in order to remove opposition that could have caused rejection of the economic and military agreements desired by the United States. Anti-Communism divided the Filipino

people to U.S. advantage, and its military suppression program led to a costly arms budget that has curtailed Philippine development.

Illegalization of the PKP during independence was thus a U.S.-devised policy to suit U.S. imperialist needs, and helped to keep in power the most reactionary and retrogressive of Filipino ruling groups. It was U.S. imperialist policy that forced the PKP and the mass organizations led by it out of the legal political arena and into defensive armed struggle in 1946, and that determined the PKP's underground strategy and tactics featured by the leadership of the Huk armed national liberation struggle of 1946-1956 and by the maintenance of forms of armed struggle combined with peaceful struggle until 1974.

The situation of armed struggle forced on the PKP in the post-independence period tended to magnify the role of this form of struggle in national liberation. A tendency to equate national liberation with armed struggle, such as developed in some "Left" and pseudo-revolutionary circles internationally, has had to be subjected to rigid critical scrutiny by the PKP as part of continual re-examination of developing conditions and forces in the Philippines. In the period leading up to negotiations with President Marcos, the new program of the PKP adopted at its Sixth Congress in February 1973 declared: "It is to the interests of the masses that the road to revolution is without bloodshed, and they desire that the transfer of power from the forces of imperialism, feudalism and monopoly capital to the political parties of all exploited classes be peaceful." It called for "express recognition of the right of the PKP to function as a legal organization" and for its right "to work openly and legally among the Filipino masses."

Neo-Colonialism and the Philippine National Bourgeoisie

From the standpoint of progressive forces, the best course of development for the Philippines after independence should have been along a national democratic path, similar to that adopted by other newly-independent nations in Asia and Africa. This would have been featured by the termination of colonial and neo-colonial relationships, the carrying out of serious agrarian reforms, nationalization of major foreign enterprises, pursuance of an industrialization program with forms of non-capitalist state control and participation, and adherence to a non-aligned foreign policy including close relations with socialist countries.

Such a program was advocated at the time only by the PKP and a small minority of national democrats. Under U.S.-dominated neo-

colonialism, national democracy, industrialization, land reform, non-capitalist forms, and balanced foreign policy were all ruled out. At the most, a free-enterprise neo-colonial capitalism was bred.

The Filipino national bourgeoisie that developed out of this set of circumstances tended to be a warped and subservient group of interests. Oligarchic landlords, semi-feudal in domestic production and semi-capitalist in export production, and bitterly opposed to land reform, were dominant in the economy and in the two main bourgeois political parties, Liberal and Nacionalista. Tentative industrial and manufacturing groups, lacking protection, encouragement, credits or development capital, were kept weak, dependent on foreign loans, and forced into pseudo-industrial ventures like so-called "import substituting" packaging and assembly enterprises linked with U.S. trade patterns. A bureaucratic capitalist sector grew out of rampant political corruption, one of the few avenues of wealth-getting that thrived in neo-colonial national politics.

Distorted as these sectors of the national bourgeoisie tended to be, numerous factors and pressures for change have developed inexorably in Philippine society. A steady and accelerating accumulation of capital has occurred, flowing to entrepreneurial hands, strengthening desires among many Filipino businessmen, including bureaucratic capitalists, for independent development, for protection from imperialist competition, for government incentives and priorities, and for majority participation in foreign companies and subsidiaries. From within the Philippine national bourgeoisie arose the movement in the latter 1950s led by Senator Claro M. Recto that put forward a substantial national-democratic program. The Nacionalista President Carlos Garcia in 1959-1961 swung to a moderately nationalist position around the significant slogan "Filipino First."

In such direct confrontations with U.S. imperialism, nationalist-inclined sectors of the national bourgeoisie did not fare well. U.S. economic pressure, exerted especially through U.S. and international lending agencies on which nascent Filipino industrialists depended for financing importation of capital goods in particular, compelled the abandonment of modest Philippine protectionist and control policies. Most Filipino entrepreneurial capital in the 1960s was forced into joint-venture arrangements with foreign companies, and large quantities of Filipino accumulated capital and savings were drawn into foreign hands by the practice of U.S. firms of borrowing capital abroad for investment and expansion instead of exporting it as the U.S. balance of payments position has gone into deficit.

Nevertheless, a nationalist impulse from within the Philippine national bourgeoisie has continued to express itself, albeit frequently in

an indirect manner. The strength and potentiality of such a trend has had to be heeded by U.S. interests, which, although agitating as early as the 1950s for extension of "parity" beyond its 1974 termination date, finally had to agree to relinquish such privileges.

Pressure against U.S. privileges came also from other quarters: from Japanese and West European interests desiring to invest in the Philippines but inhibited by the unfair U.S. competitive position, and from a growing Filipino national-democratic mass movement that brought anti-imperialist issues into the streets. Behind the PKP-influenced popular upsurge was a worsening of mass poverty, a widening of the extreme gap between the few rich and the vast majority of the poor, and a growth of unemployment and semi-unemployment affecting between two and three million workers and agricultural laborers or 10 to 20 per cent of the labor force. National frustration and education without opportunity caused a radicalization of student and other petty-bourgeois strata.

Some Filipino national bourgeois policy-makers, disturbed by stagnating conditions of low production and low purchasing power, inadequate exports and foreign exchange earnings, vast wastage of resources through corruption and inefficiency, and immobilizing of capital in backward semi-feudal agriculture, and alarmed by the growth of mass agrarian and urban unrest, began to think in terms of drastic measures to augment development and to meet a situation of crisis and turmoil.

A crisis of the Philippine national bourgeoisie has coincided with the crisis of world imperialism, and especially of U.S. imperialism. As the balance of world forces has swung toward socialism, with an accompanying feature of this trend being the shrinking of imperialist investment and market advantages in the developing countries, the attempts to tie existing areas of dominance to the capitalist sphere have intensified. These have come up against the strong pressures for development from expanding national bourgeoisies and popular movements.

An alteration in the neo-colonial system has been occurring out of this contradiction. In part to prevent the growth of non-capitalist forms of development, imperialist interests have encouraged a more thoroughgoing capitalism in countries like the Philippines, with the national bourgeoisies conceded a greater share at all levels, while the commanding economic heights are controlled as much as possible by imperialist multinational firms and banks. At the same time imperialism seeks to ease its home crisis by transferring labor-intensive industries to such countries where abundant cheap labor is assured, with whole branches of industry from production to marketing set

up on a regional basis (such as the Asian car manufacturing programs of Ford, Chrysler and General Motors).

The Aims of Philippine Martial Law

The martial law rule introduced by President Marcos on September 21, 1972, was designed to carry out the drastic measures felt necessary both to serve the interests of the Filipino national bourgeoisie and to satisfy the investment demands for "stability" made by imperialist interests. These two sets of interests, while intertwining in many ways, do not always coincide: sectors of the Filipino national bourgeoisie have been increasingly led to consider solutions to their problems outside the neo-colonial context.

Ferdinand Marcos, elected president first in 1965 and re-elected in 1969, has turned out to be the most decisive of Philippine presidents, representing in the main the newer sectors of industrial and bureaucratic capital, as contrasted with the old landlord-comprador sectors that were the base of neo-colonialism at the outset.

It is inaccurate, however, to depict the martial law situation in sharply-drawn class terms. The emerging Filipino economic power groupings have tended to be conglomerate in character, to interpenetrate each other and to sprawl across new industry, landowning, banking and commercial fields, to involve both new and old patterns of production for export, and to have both joint-venture and wholly-owned interests. The holdings of President Marcos himself are of this widespread type. A more precise delineation of the issues involved would have to do with recognition of the need for reforms to meet the crisis, and with decisiveness in carrying them out.

As previously pointed out, the Marcos decrees and policies under martial law have introduced a variety of significant reforms and changes of emphasis, including land reform, increased industrialization, a flexible foreign policy including relations with socialist countries, a moderation of corruption, greater efficiency, dispersal of new industry about the country, more highly centralized financial and other economic agencies.

Regardless of the fact that imperialist interests hope to benefit from a number of these steps, they are undertaken to an increasing degree in the independent interests of the newer, developing sections of the Philippine national bourgeoisie. Furthermore, although not guided or carried out by national-democratic forces, these steps include a number of the program demands or lean toward demands of those forces, and, whatever their intention, contribute to a loosening of and a beginning of a transformation of the neo-colonial system.

As a dictatorship of the decisive bourgeois groups represented by

President Marcos, his regime contains all the undemocratic, reactionary and vacillating tendencies of these class forces, which attempt to maintain their associations with U.S. and other imperialist interests while undertaking ventures of their own. The reforms are ordered by presidential decree and not by democratic processes or free popular expression of will. It is a regime, furthermore, that has its Right, Center and Left groupings, which has to take account of pressures from imperialist, oligarchic and other reactionary interests, and in which internal struggles over direction are constant. Nevertheless, the reforms are in motion, they are significant, and they must inevitably bring about changes in Philippine society, class composition and attitudes, changes that can be positive rather than negative.

Reforms Supported by the PKP

1) *Land reform.* Land reform steps are primarily victories of peasant struggles led by the PKP. For the past 40 years superficial gestures toward land reform have been made in the Philippines due to such struggles for the elimination of semi-feudal agrarian relations. However, all land reform legislation in the past was heavily riddled with loophole provisions inserted by the powerful, virtually dominant landlord bloc in the Philippine Congress.

By decreeing land reform under martial law conditions, President Marcos avoided legislative sabotage by landlords. Declaring land reform to be the cornerstone of his "New Society," he proclaimed as one of his first martial law steps the emancipation of tenants in semi-feudal rice and corn growing regions. Involving the transfer of 1.3 million hectares (nearly 3 million acres) to over 1 million tenants within five years, the Marcos land reform has been given serious emphasis. By the end of October 1974 a total of 196,675 tenants had received "land transfer certificates" embracing 335,000 hectares, and 16,000 *samahang nayon* had been created, with 1975 set as the "thrust" year for their transformation into cooperatives.

While supporting the basic aims of the Marcos land reform, the PKP has pointed out that it is a bourgeois land reform with many shortcomings. Land prices, as appeasement to landlords, are set far too high (the PKP program calls for transfer without compensation, along with cancellation of debts). Cooperatives are dominated by well-to-do peasants, lack democracy, and tend to function merely as agencies for collecting land payment installments (spread over 15 years at 6 per cent interest). By October 1974 less than 40 per cent of cooperative members were poor peasants, who avoided membership out of justified distrust, and loans from rural banks went mainly to middle or rich peasants. Furthermore, landlords of all sizes re-

sisted land reform, with over half of those approached by tenants desiring to acquire land refusing to sell, a situation aggravated by martial law measures of suppressing militant peasant organizations.

By 1974 land reform was running into serious problems due to landlord sabotage, inattention to poor peasant interests, and lack of the foreign financial aid that had been hoped for especially from U.S. sources. President Marcos was compelled to take a number of steps to reinforce his program. On October 15, after the PKP unity agreement, he called the situation of only a small proportion of poor peasants in the cooperatives an "unhealthy one" and ordered the redirection of the cooperative movement to give maximum benefit to poor peasants. The rural bank system was altered to improve loans to them and a PKP program demand for *samahang nayon* shares in land banks was adopted.

Undoubtedly the acceleration of land reform was a main objective of President Marcos in reaching agreement with the PKP, a step radically different from policies of all previous presidents since independence who had heeded landlord demands for suppressing the PKP and the peasant unions it has led. An indicative statement by Marcos, made at a mass rally of 50,000 peasants organized by the PKP at Aliaga, Nueva Ecija on November 15, 1974, asserted that his program would succeed with the support of the PKP in overcoming landlord resistance.

Even with the full implementation of the Marcos land reform as it stands, the agrarian problem in the Philippines would be a long way from being fully solved. It does not embrace tenancy in other fields, for example, such as the coconut and hemp industry, nor does it deal with the abusive *sacada* contract labor system in the sugar industry. However, it will help destroy the political and economic power of the feudal landlords, and will accentuate the wage-laboring rural proletariat and the poor small-holding peasants as allies of the industrial working class.

2) *Foreign policy reform.* The most important effect of the new Philippine foreign policy and its diversification of trade and investment has been the beginning of a dilution of U.S. imperialist dominance in the Philippines. Spokesmen of the Marcos government have called this the replacement of "alliance diplomacy" by "development diplomacy." Termination of the U.S. privileged "parity" position has seen the influx of Japanese and West European capital at a rate now far in excess of new U.S. capital. For example, of all new investment projects registered under the Philippine Board of Investments since 1969, 42 per cent had been Japanese-financed as of March 1974 (\$312.1 million out of the \$737.2 million total), the U.S. share

being only 27 per cent (\$203.7 million), and a see-saw battle between the U.S. and Japan as the Philippines' leading trade partner has been occurring, Japan leading in 1973.

To bring all aspects of foreign policy in line, the Marcos government has pressed for re-negotiation of all military and economic agreements with the U.S. On some major issues internationally, the once-subservient Philippines has parted company with the U.S., particularly in support for the Arab countries against Israel and in opposition to apartheid in South Africa.

Also, the Philippines has moved to align itself with the developing countries that are demanding better terms of trade and fair prices for raw materials from imperialist countries. It has increasingly moved toward regional development ties with fellow members of the Association of South East Asian Nations, and has endorsed in principle the important ASEAN resolution for "peace, security and neutrality" for South East Asia.

Most important in significance, however, has been the formation of diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with socialist countries. This began as early as 1965, preceding U.S. steps toward detente. In 1972 formal relations were reached with Rumania and Yugoslavia, and in 1973 with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the GDR, Bulgaria and Mongolia. Some trade has occurred with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The most important ties, with the Soviet Union and China, have been slower with regard to full diplomatic relations, but trade and cultural exchanges have gone ahead: in 1974 this trade totalled over \$60 million, and projections of an 8- to 10-fold increase in less than a decade have been made by Philippine officials. President Marcos has indicated that full relations with both the Soviet Union and China are likely in 1975.

Today, rejecting its cold-war alliances of the past, the Philippines looks increasingly to trade with and economic assistance from socialist countries as major factors in its economic development and in cushioning it from effects of the capitalist crisis felt especially in relations with the U.S. and Japan. Both international detente and its own internal motive forces have contributed to this, and the Philippine reaction to detente and to the changing relations of forces between socialist and capitalist countries is one of the factors in the PKP attitude toward the Marcos martial law government.

3) *Industrialization and labor reforms.* Although still largely subordinate to imperialist investment and trade patterns (the development of new stages of Philippine industry in raw material processing and in labor-intensive manufacturing is still tied up with U.S. and

other market needs and multinational operations) a growth of industry is occurring and is emphasized by the Marcos government.

A growth of the Filipino industrial working class is taking place as a consequence. In 1971 there were 1,443,000 Filipinos employed in manufacturing, about 11 per cent of the labor force. The greater number of these were in "unorganized" manufacturing units employing 5 or less workers, but a growing number, 167,000, were in establishments of 500 or more workers and a further 67,600 were in plants of 200-499 workers. Under the current program, large-plant industry is increasing. Two cases may be cited. The industrial estate at Mariveles, Bataan, centered on car manufacturing, employs 40,000 or more workers, and a new industrial estate at Villaneuva, Mindanao will employ 60,000 workers in heavy and steel-based industry.

As the PKP pointed out, "the increase of the country's proletariat is providing the necessary objective and subjective conditions for sharper class struggle." A reform step by the Marcos government in its new 1974 Labor Code has the objective consequence of improving the opportunities for worker organization and unity. One of its provisions restructures trade union organization, creating about 16 industrial unions in place of the 4,000 unions and 30 major rival conglomerate labor federations that had fragmented the labor movement and kept it divided. The PKP had fought for decades for industrial unionism and labor unity, and this provision of the Labor Code is one of the Marcos reforms that it supports (although with the awareness that one of the Labor Code's aims is to give the government more centralized control over trade unions).

The Philippines and the World Capitalist Crisis

The contradictions, inherent or incipient, between the aims of imperialist interests and those of the Philippine national bourgeoisie in establishment of a martial law regime have tended to enlarge under the impact of the world capitalist economic crisis that matured rapidly after President Marcos assumed authoritarian powers.

The "energy crisis" and world capitalist inflation have gravely damaged the prospects of the "New Society." For the year 1973 the Philippines, a perpetual sufferer of trade deficits, registered a substantial trade surplus of \$241 million, boosting its international reserves to a peak of \$1.2 billion. In 1974, however, despite a record export achievement of \$2.4 billion, 48 per cent above 1973, a staggering foreign exchange deficit of \$418 million occurred, due to external capitalist trade factors. Because of falling raw material prices in capitalist world markets due to the worsening crisis, the Marcos gov-

ernment in January 1975 was anticipating a drop of at least \$900 million, or 30 per cent, in its export earnings for the coming year.

Together with this blow, the Philippines has been plunged into a more serious debt position because of the need for heavy foreign borrowings, both public and private, to finance oil imports and other trade affected by accelerating inflation. In the first three quarters of 1974 \$1.3 billion was borrowed, increasing foreign debt by 27 per cent to a total of over \$3 billion. Debt repayment in the same period amounted to \$808 million, twice the inflow of new foreign capital. Financing of development in all fields, from land reform to industry, came under severe strain, loans going to meet increased prices instead of new investment.

In this situation, the Marcos government has begun to undertake a serious re-examination of its policies and priorities. A Philippine National Oil Company was set up which bought out U.S. Gulf Oil properties and launched its own state-run purchase of oil refining, distribution and exploration, including oil importation from China and technical assistance from other socialist countries. Articles deploring the heavy reliance on the crisis-hit markets in the U.S. and Japan began to appear in the government-controlled press. The head of the key policymaking Board of Investments, under which the U.S.-influenced export-oriented investments had been stressed, called for an abandonment of the export strategy and for the main stress to be put on self-reliant industries to serve Philippine domestic needs.

One of the most important new factors in the changing situation has been the abandonment by the U.S. in 1974, as a result of its own trade problems, of the long-standing policy of preferential sugar quotas extended to producing countries, including the Philippines. President Marcos announced on February 10, 1975, that because of "the loss of the American market" that yielded the Philippines about \$250 million annually for sugar exports, he was throwing over one million tons of Philippine sugar on the world market in hope of taking advantage of present high sugar prices. The long-term effect of this development can be considerable, the "sugar bloc" in the Philippines having been one of the strongest pro-U.S. and therefore most reactionary forces in the country.

It is in this context that relations with socialist countries and an increased emphasis on relations and coordination with developing countries demanding equal terms of trade with capitalist countries need to be assessed. With its possession of authoritarian powers, the Marcos government is in a position, in conditions of crisis, to take independent steps in such directions in the interest of the Philippine

national bourgeoisie that would be difficult under other circumstances.

The "Anti-Marcos" Forces

An insight into the trends under martial law and a fuller grasp of the PKP position may be gained from a survey of the forces that have shown opposition to the Marcos government in one way or another:

1) Rival economic and political groupings within the national bourgeoisie. Although some national democrats have opposed martial law for its suppressive aspects and disruption of bourgeois democracy, the rivalry is over profitable office-holding, trade advantages, infrastructure contracts, bidding for joint-venture ties with foreign capital, and similar plums. Representative figures among these groups are Senator Benigno Aquino, leader of the Liberal Party arrested and detained, Senator Sergio Osmena, Jr., who fled into exile to the U.S., and the big monopolist Lopez family whose interests have been broken up.

2) Semi-feudal landlord groups, especially in the Central Luzon provinces where PKP influence is strong among the peasants.

3) The Roman Catholic Church. An economic and political power, the Church seeks to protect its large landholdings and its untaxed properties (including an extensive school system), although it also has banking, financial and industrial stakes in economic development. Historically, the Church has been very reactionary, anti-nationalist, anti-Communist, and an ally of U.S. imperialism, its hierarchy and its religious orders having strong foreign composition and influence.

Some Church bishops and other leaders have qualifiedly endorsed martial law as a means of suppressing the Left, but as time has gone on it has become the most publicized opposition to Marcos' rule, ostensibly from a moral standpoint of defending "democratic rights" and "the people's will." This stand from behind a moral screen is obviously connected with the Marcos decrees on land reform that affect Church landholdings, with proposals to tax Church properties, and with curtailment of "social action" and other political activities.

While the reactionary, ultra-Right forces in the Church are involved in this stance, there is also a radical Catholic grouping of young Filipino priests and nuns, calling for social reform and critical of the hidebound hierarchy. Some of these tend to extremist actions, including a romantic attraction to guerrilla warfare, and a number have been arrested for underground activity against the regime.

4) The Moslem separatist movement. Occurring in western Mindanao, Basilan and the Sulu archipelago, where Filipino Moslems are the main part of the population, although being a 5 per cent minority in the Philippines as a whole, the Moslem uprising has not stemmed

from the "New Society" and martial law as such but arises from historical problems of discrimination, neglect and exploitative abuse that have come to a head in recent years. The general capitalist expansion in this area, by both foreign and Filipino interests, has been featured by dispossession of Moslem lands and a destruction of a traditional way of life.

The serious armed struggle that has developed is the biggest single internal problem for the Marcos government. A Moro National Liberation Front, one of the Moslem groupings, demands a separate Moslem state embracing Mindanao, Basilan, Tawi-Tawi, Sulu and Palawan. Solution of the Moslem problem is complicated by a Philippine foreign policy of forming close ties with Middle Eastern Arab states, which can be endangered by charges of persecution of a Moslem minority, although the Islamic Conference has provided intercessionary offices and urges a mediated settlement based on preservation of Philippine sovereignty and territorial integrity.

5) A Filipino Maoist movement, calling itself a "Communist Party of the Philippines," has sought to promote an armed struggle through a "New People's Army" to overthrow the Marcos government. Originating in 1968 as a student-based group, it has gone little beyond being an ultra-radical petty-bourgeois phenomenon. Concentrating on malicious, lying slander against the PKP and on wrecking the broad movement under PKP influence, it has been unable to win a significant peasant or worker base, and its "New People's Army," unable to establish itself in the Huk mass base provinces as an alleged lineal successor of the PKP-led Huk movement, has roved about in remote areas where peasants have not had organizational experience or maturity in struggle.

The dogmatic ultra-revolutionary sloganizing of the Maoists has confused national-democratic issues, especially among petty-bourgeois sectors, but their "Mao Tse-tung thought" endorsement has been embarrassed by the friendly relations formed by Peking with the Marcos government. To Marcos, the Maoists and their violent line have been useful as an excuse for proclaiming and maintaining martial law. Without a real mass base, the Maoists have increasingly turned to alliances with Catholic Church elements, with landlords opposing Marcos and the PKP, and with other Right-wing forces.

6) Criticism of, if not opposition to, the Marcos regime has come from some U.S. interests. There were many signs prior to martial law of support for political rivals of Marcos by at least some U.S. businessmen and agencies (including the CIA), out of distrust of the Marcos decisiveness and "unpredictability" especially if joined to the ambitions of the newer sectors of the national bourgeoisie.

Among U.S. interests, a cautious attitude has tended to prevail toward the martial law regime. Despite encouragement and concessions, U.S. investments have not poured into the Philippines to the extent expected and hoped for. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce in Manila bitterly fought the Marcos rejection of its demands for an extension of "parity" privileges. The U.S. has dragged its feet over the Marcos-desired renegotiation of all military and economic agreements. In the U.S. Congress, opposition has been voiced to continued military and economic aid to the Marcos government. Threat of an ouster of Marcos by the U.S.-reared Philippine army has persisted, and the periodic claims by Marcos that the army is loyal to him merely lends credence to the reports.

It is evident from this listing that the organized forces opposing the Marcos government are mainly Rightist or ultra-Left in character. The main national-democratic forces, the workers, peasants and patriotic elements of other classes, have either adopted a willingness to wait and see in regard to martial law or are supporting reforms and working to extend them.

Progressive forces in the U.S. need to take note of the fact that many anti-Marcos Filipinos have taken refuge in the U.S., where they are tolerated by the U.S. government and where they have built or helped to build movements for the overthrow of the Marcos government. These include reactionary bourgeois rivals of Marcos, Catholic leaders from the political Christian Social Movement, and a number of Maoist student or other petty-bourgeois individuals. Behind a screen of calls for "restoration of democracy," these groups all seek U.S. support as alternatives to the present Philippine government, denounce all Marcos reforms, and have slanderously attacked the PKP both before and since its national unity agreement with President Marcos. The PKP welcomes all struggle in the U.S. against imperialist control and influence in the Philippines, but condemns all actions that tend to split the national-democratic forces or to strengthen the hand of reaction from whatever quarter.

The PKP does not see the bourgeois rivals of President Marcos as democratic alternatives, fights the landlords who oppose agrarian reform, condemns the interference of the reactionary Roman Catholic hierarchy and of foreign religious orders in Philippine political affairs while seeking unity with patriotic young members of the Filipino clergy. It supports Moslem autonomous self-government within Philippine national unity and large-scale development aid that will help the growth of a Moslem working class to offset conservative Moslem nationalism. It rejects Maoist pseudo-revolutionary adventurism and dogmatism and wages an ideological fight against it,

and, above all, struggles against U.S. imperialism as still the main enemy of the Filipino people.

Within the Marcos regime itself, which is not a monolithic dictatorship, a struggle goes on over the direction and extent of reforms, the extent and form of popular expression, and the question of independent lines of development, between new industrial and financial elements, bureaucratic capitalists, imperialist partners or spokesmen, national democrats, traditional export and landowning groups, and the entrenched sectors of reaction that resist economic, political or social changes. Each of these sectors has its own reasons for supporting martial law, either for developmental or suppressive purposes.

The PKP and National Democratic Struggle

For the PKP and the masses that it leads, the struggle to bring into existence in the Philippines a full-fledged national-democratic government committed to a program of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-monopoly aims will undoubtedly be long, difficult and complex. The class forces that can bring this about are still in the process of formation and development. Whatever its restrictive and still neo-colonial features, the "New Society" itself, however, is generating these forces, such as a growing industrial working class, a semi-proletarianized peasantry, and patriotic bourgeois and petty-bourgeois groupings. Furthermore, this is occurring in a favorable international situation of detente and of growing strength and influence of the socialist countries.

In entering its national unity agreement with President Marcos, the PKP seeks to strengthen the national-democratic and patriotic forces in and around the government and in the nation as a whole. Rejecting "Left" dogmatism and "revolutionary" extremism that leads to isolation from the masses and a narrowing down of the struggle, and opposing the Rightist forces that try to block reforms and to perpetuate the neo-colonial situation, the PKP has determinedly taken the course of maintaining and developing the broadest and most varied ties with the masses of the people and of playing an active, participatory role in the shaping of an emancipated Philippines. Basing itself on a Marxist-Leninist realistic assessment of conditions and forces as they exist in the Philippines, the PKP is applying itself to organizing and educating the working class as the basis and best guarantor of advance toward national-democratic development.

The CIA: Instrument of U.S. Foreign Policy

The Central Intelligence Agency is well known throughout the world as a devious, brutal and hated instrument of United States foreign policy. Formed in 1947 under the Truman Administration, ostensibly to coordinate the intelligence-collection programs of various governmental agencies, the CIA has become a huge apparatus whose principal role is to foment counterrevolution and to disrupt progressive and revolutionary movements throughout the world.

U.S. imperialism emerged from World War II as the kingpin of world imperialism. The "American Century" had begun, in the dollar-sign vision of U.S. monopoly capital. However, there were powerful world forces opposed to U.S. imperialism's grand designs. First and foremost was the world system of socialist states, led by the Soviet Union. Second were the growing national liberation movements and the many newly established independent states. Third, all the major imperialist powers except the United States were in a weakened state, and Communist prestige and Left influence were growing rapidly, especially within the working class.

These developments presented serious problems for the U.S. rulers, and old forms of aggression proved inadequate to cope with the new level of the anti-imperialist forces. As for armed military aggression, U.S. policy makers at one time considered pre-emptive nuclear war against the Soviet Union and the "roll-back of Communism," but this option was shelved (although never fully rejected, as the continuing nuclear arms build-up demonstrates), especially after the Soviet Union broke the U.S. atomic bomb monopoly.

With respect to the nations fighting for independence, U.S. imperialism had a complicated task. It wanted to supplant the former colonial powers, but under a "democratic" mantle. Classical armed intervention was not always suitable because it exposed the United States' neocolonial policies. Open, direct armed intervention in the Western European countries was even more out of the question.

The shift in the correlation of world forces and the development of nuclear weaponry by the Soviet Union compelled U.S. imperialism to elevate covert (hidden, secret) forms of aggression to a new level of importance, alongside of other forms of imperialist aggression—economic, diplomatic, conventional military and the continuing threat

of all-out nuclear war. The CIA thus became the increasingly important "underground" arm of U.S. foreign policy.

Lifting the Lid

In the present period of rapid political change and growing political consciousness, U.S. foreign policy has become increasingly exposed and with it the activities of the CIA. It is now generally known, for instance, that the CIA was behind the 1953 coup that overthrew Iran's Premier Mohammed Mossadegh, so that Iranian oil wealth would remain under foreign monopoly control. The CIA likewise engineered the 1954 coup against the progressive Arbenz government in Guatemala. When Soviet missilemen downed Francis Gary Powers' U-2 spy plane in 1960, the dangerous, potentially war-provoking activities of the CIA came into sharper focus. The rout of the CIA-sponsored counterrevolutionary invasion at the Bay of Pigs in Cuba in 1961 further exposed this "invisible organization."

With the upsurge of the democratic movements in the United States in the 1960s, the CIA's covers were lifted even further. In 1966, it was disclosed that Michigan State University had collaborated with the CIA to run a covert police training program in South Vietnam. In the same year Victor Reuther, then international affairs director of the United Automobile Workers, publicly charged that the CIA was working through the AFL-CIO's department on international affairs to subvert the trade union movements in foreign countries (see George Morris, *CIA and American Labor*, International Publishers, New York, 1967). In 1967, the CIA's clandestine connections with the National Student Association and with certain foundations, publishing houses and other bodies were disclosed.

The pace of CIA disclosures has quickened in the last few years. Its murderous activities in Vietnam and Laos have become widely known, and even President Ford has had to admit that the CIA helped mastermind the bloody coup in Chile in 1973. The aftermath of Watergate has provided additional information.

These exposures of the CIA, as well as the FBI and other "intelligence" agencies, have provoked popular reaction against these agencies and their anti-democratic rationales, brutal policies, extreme chauvinism, and fascist implications. Even former CIA agents have come forward to disclose some of the facts.

Victor Marchetti, a veteran of 14 years with the CIA, collaborated with John D. Marks to write a best-selling book, *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence* (Knopf, New York, 1974), which was published only after a prolonged court battle with the CIA. By federal court order, the authors were required to submit the manuscript to the

CIA for review prior to publication. The CIA ordered 339 passages deleted, but after court challenges the number of deletions was reduced to 168 by the time the book was published. Some of the deletions are sizable, up to 2 full printed pages or more.

Another former CIA agent, Philip Agee, has also written a book on the CIA, *Inside the Company: A CIA Diary*, which was recently published in England in order to avoid censorship.

These former agents do not tell the whole story, and some caution is necessary because their books may contain deliberate or unwitting distortions. By and large, however, the material in Marchetti and Marks' book, as well as the printed interviews with Agee (his book is not available in the United States as of this writing), are consonant with the known facts of U.S. imperialism's covert operations.

Marchetti & Marks describe the CIA in these terms:

[The CIA] engages in espionage and counter-espionage, in propaganda and disinformation (the deliberate circulation of false information), in psychological warfare and paramilitary activities. It penetrates and manipulates private institutions, and creates its own organizations (called "proprietarys") when necessary. It recruits agents and mercenaries, it bribes and blackmails foreign officials to carry out its most unsavory tasks. It does whatever is required to achieve its goals, without any considerations of the ethics involved or the moral consequences of its actions. As the secret-action arm of American foreign policy, the CIA's most potent weapon is its covert intervention in the internal affairs of countries the U.S. government wishes to control or influence. (P. 5)*

Such is the "free world" in operation! Major CIA decisions are made at the top levels of government:

Every major CIA proposal for covert action—including subsidies for foreign political leaders, political parties, or publications, interference in elections, major propaganda activities and paramilitary operations must be approved by the President or the 40 Committee. (P. 326.)

The 40 Committee, part of the National Security Council, is headed by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger—described as the most powerful man in U.S. intelligence (p. 103)—and includes the CIA director, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other top officials.

The Soviet Union has always been the main target of CIA activities, but operations against it have met with little success. Among the

* All quotations and page numbers are from *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*, unless otherwise indicated.

CIA's failures were attempts to establish counterrevolutionary guerrilla movements in Albania and in the Ukraine in the late 1940s. Similar attempts were made against Poland in the early 1950s, but these too were total failures (p. 23).

The importance of the Berlin wall in stifling U.S. espionage and disruptive activities was indicated in a secret report by former CIA director Richard Bissell, which is printed in Marchetti and Marks' book:

Classical espionage, in the early postwar years, was conducted with special intensity in West Germany, and before the Berlin wall, in that city, which was ideal for the moving of agents in both directions, providing a sizable flow of political and economic intelligence (especially from East Germany). (P. 384.)

The CIA claims a share of the credit for the attempted counterrevolutions in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968. It "has always been interested in reaching and encouraging dissidents in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union" (p. 171).

The CIA helped to track down and murder Che Guevara in Bolivia. But the agency apparently didn't stop there. Three Bolivians working with the CIA including the Bolivian President, Rene Barrientos, were subsequently killed under mysterious circumstances (pp. 131-132). The CIA director is supposed to decide whether or not someone should be murdered (p. 269), but Marchetti, in a magazine interview (*Penthouse*, December 1974), doubted that prior approval was always obtained.

U.S. Senator Alan Cranston has called for an investigation into CIA murder of its own agents, citing "considerable substantiating evidence" that the CIA murdered its own agents whom "it wanted out of the way." (*Los Angeles Times*, January 26, 1975.)

CIA operations have spanned the globe, with the peoples of the world paying the price in blood, oppression and misery: Brazil, Chile, the Congo, Greece, Indonesia, Iran, Korea, Peru, the Philippines, Laos, Vietnam, etc.

To carry on such global operations with highly trained personnel and sophisticated equipment, the U.S. intelligence apparatus must be enormous. Marchetti and Marks estimate that the ten separate agencies which comprise the U.S. "intelligence community"* comprise

* The CIA, National Security Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, Army Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, Air Force Intelligence, the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, the FBI, the Atomic Energy Commission Division of Intelligence and the Treasury Department.

153,250 people and spend an estimated \$6.228 billion annually. The CIA itself has 16,500 people and spends \$750 million each year. These figures are obvious underestimates. They do not include hundreds of thousands of contract agents, mercenaries, consultants, functionaries of proprietary organizations.

The CIA always has more money than it needs. (P. 62.) It owns one of the biggest fleets of commercial airplanes in the world (including Air America, Air Asia, Civil Air Transport, Inter-Mountain Aviation, Southern Air Transport and others). (P. 137.)

The CIA is divided into five parts, the largest being "Clandestine Services," which is the major "dirty work" section and is divided geographically into 15 separate components. It includes a Domestic Operations Division—that is, the *CIA at work within the United States*.

How the CIA Works

In his secret report, Bissell listed eight ways in which the CIA intervenes in other countries:

. . . (1) political advice and counsel; (2) subsidies to an individual; (3) financial support and "technical assistance" to political parties; (4) support of private organizations, including labor unions, business firms, cooperatives, etc.; (5) covert propaganda; (6) "private" training of individuals and exchange of persons; (7) economic operations; and (8) paramilitary or political action operations designed to overthrow or to support a regime (like the Bay of Pigs and the program in Laos).

These operations can be classified in various ways: by the degree and type of secrecy required, by their legality, and perhaps, by their benign or hostile character. (P. 41.)

On the CIA's Covert Action staff (part of Clandestine Services) are "sociologists, psychologists, historians, and media specialists—all skilled at selecting 'reachable' targets such as the youth or intellectuals of a particular country, and at getting a message through to them" (p. 162).

Marchetti and Marks estimate that the CIA has spent over \$1 billion for propaganda activities (mainly foreign but also domestic). The propaganda is divided into three categories: "white," which is true information; "gray," which is a mixture of truths, half-truths and slight distortions to slant the audience's view; and "black," which consists of outright lies, although usually accompanied by some truths and half-truths to make the lies more credible. The propaganda

campaign is far-flung and includes radio broadcasts, publication of books and periodicals and forgeries.

The CIA is very active in the field of ideology. It entered the cultural arena in the 1950s, subsidizing anti-Communist "progressive" groups, because the U.S. could not continue being identified with only Right-wing forces. (See Tad Szulc, *Compulsive Spy, The Biography of E. Howard Hunt*, Viking Press, New York, 1974, pp. 39-40.)

The CIA in operation is a picture of sordidness, amorality and inhuman conduct. The CIA agent

. . . is quite often on the brink of the underworld, or even immersed in it, and he frequently turns to the least savory types to achieve his goals. Criminals are useful to him, and are often called upon by him, when he does not want to perform personally some particularly distasteful task. . . . (P. 253.)

CIA agents traffic in dope and prostitution, engage in currency manipulation, extortion, torture and murder, including mass murder. This last was a specialty of the current CIA director, William Colby, who headed the brutal "Phoenix program" in South Vietnam which murdered 40,000 Vietnamese.

The CIA is constantly on the look-out for "assets"—indigenous forces who can be convinced or coerced into doing the CIA's dirty work. The aim is to build a network of agents in the target country's government, military forces, press, labor unions and other groups. These agents feed intelligence to the CIA and are prepared to act decisively when a coup or other major action is planned. (P. 37.)

When a potential agent is located, all available information is collected about the prospect and is checked through the CIA's massive computerized files. The agency searches for a motivating factor (ideological, monetary or psychological) to induce the prospect to become an agent. Personal weaknesses (sex, drugs) are played upon as well as political differences. If nothing else works, blackmail and threats may be used. The prospect may find himself entrapped by damaging evidence. CIA censors deleted the section of Marchetti and Marks' book which describes what happens when the recruiting pitch doesn't work.

The CIA has its own armed forces, called the Special Operations Division (SOD), which carries out paramilitary and military actions with contract agents and mercenaries:

The paramilitary operator . . . is a gangster who deals in force, in terror, in violence. . . . [He] wages war . . . but none of the rules of warfare apply. His is a breed apart; in the CIA, special ops

types are sometimes referred to as the "animals" of the agency. (P. 109.)

The CIA has three permanent training facilities for its army. For large-scale operations, the agency sets up special training bases, as it did for the 1954 Guatemalan invasion and the 1961 attack on the Bay of Pigs. The CIA led large-scale military operations in Laos, involving 35,000 Meo and other Lao mountain tribesmen, 17,000 Thai mercenaries, and CIA-hired pilots who flew bombing missions.

For its covert operations, the CIA searches for points of difference, weaknesses—"motivation" for local allies to do the dirty work. According to Bissell,

. . . implied in the requirement for a pre-existing motivation is the corollary that an attempt to induce the local ally to follow a course he does not believe in will at least reduce his effectiveness and may destroy the whole operation. It is notably true of the subsidies to student, labor and cultural groups . . . that the Agency's objective was never to control their activities, only occasionally to point them in a particular direction, but *primarily to enlarge them and render them more effective.* (P. 389. Emphasis added.)

Covert operations are carefully planned and coordinated—"orchestrated" to yield the maximum possible effect. As Bissell states:

Covert intervention is probably most effective in situations where a comprehensive effort is undertaken with a number of separate operations designed to support and complement one another and to have a cumulatively significant effect. (P. 38.)

Chile was a case in point. The CIA operated in league with the Pentagon, the State Department, the World Bank and multinational corporations such as IIT, Anaconda and Kennecott and with the Right-wing forces of the Chilean oligarchy, to overthrow the Popular Unity government, to murder some 30,000 Chileans, and to establish a fascist regime. This monstrous plot included massive propaganda; buying off opposition political parties and personalities; creating economic dislocation, provocations and assassinations; collaborating with fascist generals; and organizing anti-Popular Unity demonstrations and "strikes." All of this was planned and coordinated up to the point of the coup and armed take-over. (See Barry Cohen, "U.S. Imperialism and Chilean Fascism," *Political Affairs*, February 1974.)

On the Home Front

Since Watergate, it has become apparent that CIA methodology and practices have been brought home and are used directly against

the people of the United States. These include: disinformation; infiltration, provocation and disruption of peoples' movements; illegal break-ins and wire-taps; the compilation of hundreds of thousands—if not millions—of names on computerized lists, including information on political activities and views as well as personal life (sex, drinking, money problems, etc.); the use of this information for purposes of intimidation; establishment of bogus groups. All of this is now part of the arsenal of monopoly capital's repressive apparatus against the U.S. working people. The CIA has also been charged with participation in assassinations in this country. The targets of these activities go far beyond the Left, and include senators, representatives and other prominent personalities.

The Watergate exposure disclosed CIA involvement in the break-in itself and in other features of the "dirty tricks" campaign undertaken during the Nixon re-election drive. L. Fletcher Prouty, an Air Force officer in charge of CIA support for eight years, wrote:

What makes the Watergate case different from other scandals is that the system and methods used, the means by which it was all planned, staffed with experts, financed clandestinely and carried out was all taken from the operating method of the CIA. ("Watergate and the World of the CIA," *Ramparts*, October 1973.)

On CBS national television news (February 5, 1975), Charles Colson, former special counsel to President Nixon, affirmed that "the CIA organization from [former Director Richard] Helms on down" was deeply involved in the Watergate break-in and the break-in at the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

Two *Washington Post* reporters covering the Watergate story were warned by an inside government source that they were under CIA surveillance and that their lives were in danger. The source reported:

The covert activities involve the whole U.S. intelligence community and are incredible. . . .

The cover-up had little to do with Watergate, but was mainly to protect the covert operations. (Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward, *All the President's Men*, Warner Paperback Library, New York, 1974, pp. 347-348.)

Nixon's aide, Tom Huston, the former national chairman of the ultra-Right Young Americans for Freedom, devised a domestic operations plan for a massive, coordinated "dirty tricks" and repressive complex, involving the CIA, the FBI and other governmental agencies. Evidence indicates that many governmental agencies are involved

in coordinated repression, including the FBI, military intelligence, the Internal Revenue Service and the CIA. Dossiers with damaging information have been collected and passed among several agencies.

Many corporations have developed their own dossier systems, as have many city governments. The CIA even secretly read the mail of George Meany and two of his top aides to determine if CIA money allocated to undermine foreign labor movements was being properly spent.

The *New York Times* revealed last December that the CIA had sent agents into the peace and student movements in order to disrupt their activities and compile lists of "dissidents." These operations were conducted by the CIA's Domestic Operations Division, whose activities have expanded greatly in recent years. The DOD has a separate headquarters and "bases" in the major cities. According to Marchetti and Marks: "The DOD is surrounded by extreme secrecy, even by CIA standards, and its actual functions are shrouded in mystery" (p. 238).

FBI Operations

The FBI has long engaged in undercover and disruptive activities. Last November, the FBI was forced to reveal some limited information on its COINTELPRO (counter-intelligence program), which included such activities as: "sending anonymous or fictitious materials to members or groups; dissemination of public record information to media sources; leaking information based on non-public information to media sources; use of informants to disrupt a group's activities; establishing sham organizations for disruptive purposes; informing family or others of radical or immoral activity;" and undisclosed "special operations." (Department of Justice Release, November 18, 1974.)

The COINTELPRO against the Communist Party, USA "was the predecessor—and in some respects the model—of subsequent FBI COINTELPRO activities." (*Ibid.*)

An FBI memo on its COINTELPRO activities against the Black Panther Party demonstrates the drive of the government to undermine the Black liberation movement:

The Bureau would like to offer for your consideration a proposal for a *disruptive-information operation* targeted against the national office of the Black Panther Party (BPP).

The purpose of this new counterintelligence endeavor is to *expose, disrupt, misdirect, or otherwise neutralize* the activities of black nationalist, hate-type (sic) organizations and groupings,

their leadership, spokesmen, membership and supporters. . . . (Emphasis added.)

The similarity in method and even terminology to CIA activities abroad is unmistakable.

A former FBI agent, Joseph A. Burton, disclosed (*New York Times*, February 24, 1975) his participation in disruptive COINTELPRO operations against trade unions and other organizations. Burton was active in such operations through June 1974, in spite of the FBI's statement that COINTELPRO actions were ended in 1971.

Burton and other FBI agents set up a Maoist "collective" in Tampa, Florida, whose function was to gain information on genuine radicals and to disorient them ideologically. The FBI set Burton up in business, printed leaflets and placards, and took steps to print a newspaper for his "Red Star Cadre."

Even though Burton had a reputation as a "revolutionary" and there was a long waiting list for employment, he got a job with the Westinghouse plant in Tampa *through FBI intervention with the company*. He joined the United Electrical Workers (UE) local in the shop in order to keep special watch on the chief UE Tampa organizer who had played a crucial role in organizing the plant and to file reports on the workers' attitudes to the national contract.

Burton and other FBI agents succeeded in disrupting the Tampa chapter of the Vietnam Veterans against the War (VVAW), causing a dispute which resulted in the local chapter's expulsion from the national organization. Burton was even instructed to infiltrate a Canadian "Leftist" sect.

Beginning with the Johnson administration, a massive program was launched to mesh the CIA with local police departments. Under cover of "reforming" the police departments and "fighting organized crime," dozens of former CIA officials have become integrated in leading positions in major city police forces. (See Andrew Kopkind, "The Politics of Police Reform," *Ramparts*, October 1973.) The CIA has been training city policemen for a number of years.

The Fascist Danger

The full extent of the role of the CIA, the FBI and other intelligence agencies is not easily determined, but it is certainly enormous.

A former CIA agent, Stuart H. Loory, now a professor at Ohio State University, disclosed that the agency has massively infiltrated the US news media, including United Press International, Associated Press, *Newsweek*, *U.S. News & World Report*, CBS, NBC, the Hearst newspaper chain, the *New Republic*, the *Christian Science Monitor*

and the Reuters News Agency. (*Daily World*, January 24, 1975.)

There are strong suspicions of a CIA role in the assassinations of such figures as President John F. Kennedy, the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert Kennedy. The implausibility of the "lone assassin" stories in these murders and the obvious cover-ups have lent credence to the theories of CIA, Cuban emigré and organized ultra-Right involvement.

The Ford Administration's "probe" of the CIA, headed by Vice President Nelson Rockefeller and including such notables as former Governor of California Ronald Reagan, will be a cover-up. No one has benefitted more from CIA-ism than the multi-billionaire Rockefeller family. Rockefeller is a strong advocate of strengthening pro-repressive, pro-imperialist dictatorships abroad. (See *The Rockefeller Report on the Americas*, Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1969.)

The CIA has been the instrumentality, in one country after another, for overthrowing governments and installing military and fascist dictatorships. This reveals the increased tendency of U.S. imperialism to prefer extreme Right-wing governments. Today, says Soviet writer Sh. Sanakoyev,

... the ruling circles in capitalist countries in their struggle against the peoples are resorting again (so to say, as a preventive measure) to the methods and forms applied by Nazi Germany and fascist Italy . . . local reactionaries and imperialist circles, even under the conditions of a detente, are quite prepared to use the most extreme measures in order to preserve and consolidate their positions, to give a helping hand to reactionary regimes, and to suppress liberation movements. ("Foreign Policy and the Ideological Struggle," *International Affairs*, May 1974.)

The use of the CIA and CIA methods on a large scale within the United States is a danger sign that powerful sections of the monopoly ruling class are moving to erode and undermine bourgeois democracy in this country. The intelligence agencies which carry out the dirty work are staffed by gestapo-minded ultra-Rightists, as exemplified by the gang that planned and carried through the Watergate break-in.* This new thrust coincides with the unprecedented cen-

* E. Howard Hunt, a long-time CIA agent who played a central role in the 1954 counter-revolutionary coup in Guatemala and the Bay of Pigs invasion, shares the ultra-Right views of his long-time friend William Buckley (who also saw service with the CIA—see Tad Szulc, *Compulsive Spy*, Viking Press, New York, 1974, p. 66). Marchetti, in a magazine interview (*Penthouse*, December 1974) described Hunt and Buckley as "the kind of guys who were really great in Spain during the Inquisition, who roasted people at the stake."

Marchetti described CIA director Colby as "a very dangerous man. I

tralization of power in the executive branch of government and the placement of the hand-picked representatives of the top monopolies in the most important positions.

As James E. Jackson has pointed out, Watergate uncovered a plot for:

... an underground route to the institutionalization of a particular Americanized modern version of fascism. . . . This Trojan-horse route to fascism was to be accomplished without fascists and without a fascist party. . . .

These operatives in the plot worked from safe havens of appointed posts in the executive controlled governmental bureaucracy. These technicians of the fascist coup were drawn from the CIA, FBI, metropolitan police departments, the Army, Marine Corps, Naval and Air Force intelligence agencies. (*Revolutionary Tracings*, International Publishers, New York, 1974, pp. 6-7.)

It is now obvious that Watergate is only an *example* of widespread CIA, FBI and other subversion within the United States. It would be inexcusable naivete to assume that the danger is over. Almost any organization with even the semblance of a democratic program is a potential target for attack.

Mass Fight-Back and Vigilance Necessary

There are powerful forces within the United States which can block steps towards neo-fascism and can lay the basis for greater democracy. The disclosures of Watergate, the CIA, FBI, etc. are themselves reflections of a growing mass awareness of the threat to democracy and indicate readiness to combat this danger.

The growing struggles against monopoly provide major avenues for defeating the threat to democracy. Of major importance are the struggles against unemployment and inflation; for detente and against imperialist aggression; for drastic cuts in the military budget; against racism and racist incitements. Broadening and uniting these struggles, strengthening them organizationally and deepening them ideologically is the firm basis for victory.

think he's got the mentality of a Heinrich Himmler."

G. Gordon Liddy, a former FBI agent, who proudly displays swastikas and Hitler's *Mein Kampf* in his living room has, as one Watergate prosecutor placed it, "the mentality and nature of a man who sends people into the gas ovens." (*Daily World*, October 25, 1974.)

Bernard Barker, who led the five-man team that actually made the Watergate break-in, was a former member of the hated Batista secret police that tortured and murdered thousands in prerevolutionary Cuba. (Michael Meyerson, *Watergate: Crime in the Suites*, International Publishers, New York, 1973, p. 108.)

The current economic crisis has brought forth a mass fight-back mood, with the working class and its allies moving into a more advanced stage of struggle against monopoly. Major sections of the trade union movement, sparked by the rank and file, are calling mass actions against monopoly-caused unemployment and inflation. These economic struggles come on the heels of the Watergate exposures of the mass movements of the 1960s and 1970s. The result is a growing mass consciousness of the nature of the class enemy and the need for unity. There is greater receptivity to developing organized forms of struggle.

Communists and progressives need to build on these positive trends, which include a new degree of rejection of anti-Communism.

The crisis has likewise intensified contradictions within the monopoly ruling class, with powerful forces moving in the direction of neo-fascism and others seeking a way out through concessions.

The struggles to defend and extend democracy must be intensified. The CIA, FBI and all similar agencies and practices *must be abolished*. All those guilty of "dirty tricks" sabotage of the peoples movements at home and subversion of governments abroad must be tried and punished for their crimes.

The national emergency powers granted to presidents under conditions of anti-Communist hysteria should be ended. Legislation needs to be enacted to curb the tremendous power of the executive branch and to give the people a voice in its operations.

Repressive legislation such as the "Criminal Justice Reform Act of 1975" (Senate Bill 1) must be defeated. In the words of John Abt, this bill is

... a 700 page chamber of horrors, the legislative embodiment of all the evils of Watergate. It would immunize federal officials from criminal liability for their official misconduct. It would authorize cover-ups of official wrongdoings by shielding them from public disclosure. It would penalize participation in political movements and demonstrative actions of a militant or Left character. Finally, the bill would implement Nixon's call for "the punishment of crime without pity" (except, of course, for his crimes and those of his cronies). ("Senate Bill 1: A Legislative Chamber of Horrors," *Political Affairs*, February 1975.)

In building the people's movements and organizations, care must be given to selecting leadership and cadre. These must be chosen on the basis of their ability to give direction and concrete leadership and to *consistently build* the movements.

The warning must be out against disruptive countermovements

that "spring up" alongside of legitimate mass organizations.

The Communist Party, as the most reliable and far-seeing core of the working class and people's fight-back, must be built into a mass party. Its ideological and organizational integrity must be guarded vigilantly in full accordance with the Leninist principles of democratic centralism and accountability. The class enemy strives to exploit every error and every political or personal weakness.

The exposure of the CIA, FBI and other such agencies, limited as they are, provide a partial picture of how these agencies work. These operations must be further studied, exposed and combatted by every Communist and democratically minded fighter against monopoly as an integral part of the struggles of our class and our people for a better life and for socialism. Vigilance can avoid serious set-backs in the path towards socialism and will speed the final victory over capitalism.

\$1.25 (\$1.50 outside USA)

special
enlarged issue

**NEW
WORLD
REVIEW**

A BI-MONTHLY
May-June 1975 Vol. 43, No. 3.

30TH ANNIVERSARY Of The Allied Victory Over Fascism

*The World War II Victory: Its Meaning for
today's struggle for Detente and World Peace*

ATTENTION ORGANIZATIONS: Copies 50¢ each in bundle orders of 50 or more.
Yearly subscription \$4.00.

Write to: NEW WORLD REVIEW, 156 Fifth Ave., N.Y.C. 10010

The World Scene

We present in this issue two excerpts from the Draft Main Political Resolution for the 21st National Convention of the Communist Party USA. The Convention will take place in Chicago on June 26-29 of this year. The Draft Resolution provides the main basis for the pre-Convention discussion now in progress and will be acted on at the Convention.

We have selected what we regard as two key sections of the Draft Resolution. The first, which deals with the general crisis of world capitalism in its present stage, forms the cornerstone of the resolution as a whole. It defines the relationship of world forces within the framework of which all current mass struggles and movements take place. It is on a correct understanding of this balance of forces, and of both the dangers and opportunities which flow from it, that questions of policy and program must be decided.

The second section deals with the economic crisis in the United States. This crisis, the worst since the thirties, occurs within the context of a world economic crisis of capitalism which has emerged as a central feature of the general crisis. It is the focus of mass struggle today and the key factor in the advancement of the anti-monopoly coalition. Readers are invited to comment on the sections published here.

—The Editors

The picture of the world scene that is coming into ever sharper focus reveals that this is an epoch of the deepening general crisis of capitalism, the last days of colonialism and the emergence of socialism as the advanced and leading force in the world arena—an epoch of the world-shaking transition from capitalism to socialism. The last of the systems of exploitation of the many for the enrichment of a few is on its way out.

For capitalism, the general crisis is a crisis of decay, of decline. Internally it is driven by the basic contradiction between the increasingly social nature of production—to which the scientific and technological revolution is adding a new dimension—and the increasing private monopolization and appropriation of the fruits of social labor.

In the world arena the general crisis of capitalism is intensified because capitalism is being challenged by the coming together of all the contemporary revolutionary forces into a united anti-imperial-

ist alliance of the socialist states, the forces of national liberation and the democratic movements of the capitalist countries, led by the working class. In the words of V. I. Lenin:

We cannot know how rapidly and how successfully the various historical movements in a given epoch will develop, but we can and do know *which class* stands at the hub of one epoch or another, determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in that epoch, etc. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 145.)

On the scales that measure which force “determines the main content” of this epoch, the balance has tipped against world imperialism. One of the factors in the new stage of the general crisis is the fact that this qualitative shift has reached a point where it has for some time been irreversible.

The most basic and most decisive factor of this new reality is the existence of the two world social systems, socialism and capitalism, each embodying the state power of one of the two basic antagonistic classes. The contest between the two systems embodies the main contradiction of modern society in circumstances in which *both* of these classes have state power. This has been the main contradiction and the cardinal feature of the world scene since the birth of the Soviet Union. The explosive emergence of the first socialist state marked the beginning of the end of world capitalism, the beginning of its decay, of its general crisis.

The general crisis of capitalism has passed through a number of stages. The stages are related to the continuing shift in the balance of world forces. This shift has now brought about a new qualitative and irreversible change. The general crisis has entered a new stage.

The new stage is characterized by the breakup of the U.S.-dominated world imperialist pyramid. It is characterized by the crumbling of the Portuguese colonial empire, the oldest and the last of the capitalist slave empires, by the liberation of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola, which sets the stage for the end of colonialism in Africa. It is characterized by the defeat and forced retreat of imperialism on a number of fronts—the defeat of U.S. imperialism in Indochina; the retreat of West German imperialism from its positions of aggression on its borders with Poland, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic; the retreat of U.S. imperialism from its cold-war bunkers of economic blockade and boycott. The first preliminary steps in the process of retreat in the Middle East have also been taken by Israel and U.S. imperialism.

Previously it was other imperialist powers, in particular Britain and France, which were compelled to retreat, while the more powerful U.S. imperialism could pose as their rescuer—at a price. But in the present stage of the general crisis U.S. imperialism finds itself in the same boat as the others, and now there are no rescuers.

The new stage in the general crisis of capitalism is also characterized by the new relationship between the countries which possess raw materials and the leading imperialist countries. The ability of the raw material-producing countries to refuse to sell their output at imperialist-dictated prices, and the inability of the imperialist countries to impose their will on them, is a reflection of the new balance of world forces.

The new stage is evident in the changed relationship of forces in the United Nations. The advancing tide of national liberation and the decline of U.S. domination in Latin America, manifested among other things in the growing trend toward disintegration of the Organization of American States, has vastly changed the makeup of the United Nations. U.S. imperialism has for some time lost its power to dominate that body and now finds itself in a small minority on many key questions.

The new stage is reflected in the economic sphere—in the accelerating and devastating rise of inflation, in the crisis of the capitalist monetary system, in the new economic crisis of simultaneous overproduction and inflation.

The new stage reflects a qualitative shift in world relationships. The shift is a many-sided, cumulative, dialectical process.

There is a shift in the balance of military forces. This acts as a deterrent against imperialist aggression. There is in particular a shift in the balance of nuclear forces. The Soviet nuclear arsenal acts as a deterrent against imperialist nuclear aggression.

There is a shift in the balance of economic production. Between 1913 and 1973 production in the Soviet Union increased 113 times. In the same period production in the United States increased 9 times.

There is a shift in the balance of the overall quality of life between the two systems. Socialism has now surpassed capitalism in providing a higher, a more satisfying quality of life. It has surpassed capitalism in providing social and economic security, high standards of education, medical care, culture and the overall conditions for a more meaningful, happy and secure life, making possible the flowering of the full human potential. This has raised the status of socialism and the competition of the two systems to a new level.

In striking contrast to the example of socialism is the sharp decline in the overall quality of life under capitalism. For the masses, there

is less and less accessible. Millions become more alienated and frustrated. All this adds a new dimension to the shift in the balance of forces and the new deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

There is, in short, a shift in the balance of forces because of the continuing rise in the prestige and influence of world socialism and the continuing decline in the ability of world imperialism to influence or determine the course of human events.

The new stage is reflected in the new level of class struggle and the growing influence of working-class revolutionary parties in the industrialized countries. We may note, for example, the new level of the demands of the French working class, calling for greater inroads on the power of the monopolies, and opening the way to the victory of the anti-monopoly forces.

There is a new level of the contradictions and the centrifugal forces that tend to keep the forces of world imperialism scattered.

There is a new shift in the balance of forces in the field of ideology. Bourgeois ideology is less and less believable and more and more on the defensive. The influence of socialism on the ideology of masses and the continuing growth of the influence of Marxism-Leninism constitute a new factor in the crisis of capitalism. Bourgeois culture decays and declines, and the bourgeois assault on science, culture and reason grows, while working-class culture is making tremendous gains throughout the world.

The rise of the struggle for detente has its roots in the shift in the balance of world forces and the new stage in the general crisis of capitalism. World imperialism is forced to deal from a position of waning influence and growing weakness, while world socialism, the main power base for the forces of the world revolutionary process, increasingly deals from a position of greater influence and strength.

The struggle for detente arises from this new relationship. The achievements of that struggle are becoming as irreversible as the changes in the balance of world forces. It represents a new level of the struggle for peaceful coexistence, of the class struggle on a world scale.

The shift in the balance of world forces dictating the changes in imperialism's policies and tactics does not change the nature of imperialism itself. Imperialism does not give up its aggressive character and its efforts at penetration of other countries. Threats of war, preparations for war and war itself continue. But because of rising opposition at home and abroad, U.S. imperialism has turned to greater use of internal forces in these countries through corruption and subversion. The undermining of the Allende government in Chile was a classic example of the combined efforts of the U.S. government and U.S.

corporations—of a state-monopoly operation. Wherever it can, U.S. imperialism is following the same policies—in the Middle East, Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands, Vietnam, Cambodia, South and Central America, and Africa.

*

In the context of the present stage of capitalist development the unprecedented leap in science and technology has become a double-edged sword. On the one hand, the new technology serves to expand production and leads to new lines of products and the retooling of the older lines of production. On the other hand, it creates new contradictions and more swiftly sharpens all of the old contradictions. Under capitalism the new technology is an instrument of speedup. It serves to increase the rate of exploitation. It also serves to increase the size of the industrial reserve army and to swell the numbers of the permanently unemployed. It sharpens the problems of overproduction while millions go hungry.

Because the research and application of the new technology requires huge amounts of capital, it follows that only the biggest corporations and the capitalist countries with the greatest hoards of capital are in a position to take full advantage of the revolution in science. It is therefore a new factor in the process of monopolization. It adds to the inequality and the contradictions between the larger and smaller capitalist countries and to the contradictions between the industrialized and the developing countries. The new technology in the hands of the biggest corporations is a powerful instrument for the growth of multinationals and the extension of production on a world scale.

Because of the large amounts of capital required for both the development and application of the new technology, new pressures arise for the greater use of the resources of the state for the benefit of monopoly capital. As a result, the state has become a bigger factor in scientific research, in the manufacturing of the new automated equipment and in the construction of factory buildings. The state has increasingly aided the monopolies through "capital investment grants," accelerated tax write-offs and gifts of all kinds. In industries like space technology and atomic energy, where initial investments are extremely high, "partnerships" are set up in which the state makes the investments while the big monopolies reap the benefits. Thus, the leap in technology has pushed the state-monopoly relationships to a new level.

At the same time, these relationships have grown also because of the deepening of the general crisis in the economic sphere, compelling the monopolies to rely to an increasing extent on government

economic resources to bolster their profits.

These contradictions and the technological gap that exists between capitalist countries do not appear in the relationships between socialist countries. Joint research and sharing of technological breakthroughs are new dimensions which socialism adds to human and national relationships. Under socialism the new technology serves to erase remaining class patterns; under capitalism it serves to further delineate and sharpen them.

In a sense the past period has been a "honeymoon" between the technological revolution and capitalist production. The fact that the rise of the new technology contributed to expanding production has served to cover up the contradictory factors in these relationships. Now we are entering a period in which the contradictions will come into ever sharper focus. The leap in technology thus serves to sharpen all contradictions and to emphasize the basic fact that capitalism in this stage of its general crisis is in growing contradiction to the new level of science and technology.

*

On the world scene one of the most helpful auxiliary forces that imperialism has is Maoism. Opportunism has always been a tool of imperialism, whether in the form of social democracy or of "Leftism." Maoism is opportunism on the level of betrayal. It is a form of petty-bourgeois radicalism, of "Left" revisionism which, in the name of "revolution," betrays the interests of the working class.

Imperialism has always used misdirected nationalism. Maoism is rampant nationalism turned into great power chauvinism. In Maoism opportunism and nationalism have combined to become the central auxiliary force for world imperialism. It is small wonder that the U.S. ruling class goes to such lengths to picture China under Maoism as a "model" of socialism, in contrast to its unrelenting anti-Sovietism.

In the world struggle between the two systems, Maoism is an accommodation, a capitulation to the wishes of imperialism. Imperialism hopes to divide the ranks of world socialism. In this effort Maoism is doing its very best. Imperialism hopes to divide the non-socialist anti-imperialist forces from the socialist community. Maoism does its very best to create such a division. U.S. imperialism did not want the world to support or recognize the independence of Bangladesh. Maoism accommodated itself to that imperialist wish.

In Chile U.S. imperialism wanted as many states as possible to support and recognize the government of the military butchers. Maoism rushed to comply with this wish.

U.S. imperialism wants to bolster the NATO forces in Europe. Maoism is its main propaganda mouthpiece in this effort.

U.S. imperialism wants to keep its troops in Southeast Asia. Maoism is the chief advocate of this policy.

The ultra-Right and fascist forces in the U.S. are against the policies of U.S.-Soviet detente. Maoism is completely with them.

U.S. imperialism is for keeping the Arab countries divided in order to be able to dictate the prices of oil. Maoism is the most active force in attempting to create such division.

The most reactionary forces headed by the Pentagon military brass are against mutual arms reductions. Maoism is the most vocal and vociferous opponent of any such reductions.

World imperialism wants to split the world Communist movement. Maoism is its most effective instrument.

Strategically, U.S. imperialism sees the Soviet Union as its most formidable opponent, as the roadblock to its policies of aggression. Hence anti-Sovietism is the heart of its ideological and propaganda campaign. But it cannot keep up with the anti-Sovietism of Maoism.

*

The nature of the epoch and its place in history are unmistakable. It is the epoch of history's greatest turning point. It is the epoch of the end of socio-economic systems based on exploitation, of the transition to a socialist system motivated solely by the well-being of all the people. This transition resolves the main contradiction of capitalist society—the contradiction between the exploited and the exploiters, between the working class and the capitalist class as it is expressed in the class struggle. The main revolutionary force is also clearly defined. That force is the working class.

The total force propelling the whole world revolutionary process is likewise sharply defined. It consists of the three currents: the socialist countries, the working class and the democratic movements which it leads in the capitalist countries, and the movements of national liberation. These act as a unified force in the struggle against world imperialism.

Thus, a powerful, healthy force is emerging from a sick and dying social order. History has assigned this force a unique task. As Frederick Engels puts it, "this struggle . . . has now reached a stage where the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) can no longer emancipate itself from the class which exploits and oppresses it (the bourgeoisie) without at the same time forever freeing the whole of society from exploitation, oppression and class struggle." (*Communist Manifesto*, Preface to German Edition of 1883, Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1950, Vol. I, p. 24.)

The Economic Crisis

The new features of the general crisis of capitalism have emerged with particular sharpness in the economic sphere. The growing instability of capitalist economy, covered over for a time by accelerated rates of growth and surface manifestations of "prosperity," has now erupted into a chronic state of economic crisis affecting the entire capitalist world, and not least the United States.

The crisis is especially evident in the monetary and financial spheres and is marked above all by a pronounced upsurge of inflation afflicting all capitalist countries. And within this framework there has developed in the United States and a number of other countries a cyclical crisis of overproduction. This crisis is not just "another recession." We are in a depression which is not only much more severe than any previous postwar downturn, but possesses certain unique features. It is simultaneously a crisis of overproduction and of pronounced inflation. And it occurs within the context of a deepening overall economic crisis affecting the entire capitalist world. The crisis of inflation and overproduction is a new phenomenon, one which poses new problems and new kinds of struggle for the people of our country.

Within capitalist circles the crisis has given rise to consternation and to mounting uncertainty, pessimism and fear of the future. On all sides, predictions of a world depression of disastrous proportions are heard, accompanied by expressions of despair of preventing it. In this country, government spokesmen openly express their inability to cope with the economic problems currently besetting the U.S. economy. And economists who only a decade ago declared that they had discovered the secret of crisis-free capitalism are today admitting that their economic theories are incapable of providing answers to the problems of inflation and overproduction. All this testifies to the progressive crumbling of the edifice of U.S. monopoly capital and the failure of increasing state monopoly capitalist measures to avert it.

The international monetary system constructed at Bretton Woods in 1944, based on the dominance of the dollar in world capitalist finance, is now a shambles. The very idea of a stable system of currencies with fixed relations to one another has been abandoned and "floating" rates of exchange, with currencies fluctuating in value from day to day, have become the rule. The dollar has progressively lost its former privileged status. It is no longer redeemable in gold and, thanks to chronic and increasing balance of payments deficits, two devaluations

and mounting inflation, it occupies a deteriorating position in the world economic arena. Recent years have witnessed repeated monetary crises and there are well-founded fears of even worse crises to come, with growing threats of the erection of monetary and trade barriers between countries like those which wrought such havoc during the thirties.

Tied in with the growing monetary problems of world capitalism is the alarming surge of inflation throughout the capitalist world. Inflation is, of course, no newcomer; in the United States it has long been a built-in feature of the economy. With two minor exceptions, consumer prices have risen every year since World War II, in bad times as in good. But since the mid-sixties the rate of increase has steadily accelerated. By 1970, according to the official figures, consumer prices were rising at a rate of 6 per cent a year and during the past year at a rate of well over 12 per cent. Inflation has reached "double-digit" proportions, and with no visible prospects of reduction.

The source of the mounting inflation lies first of all in the growing power of the big monopolies to create artificial shortages and to raise prices incessantly. This is facilitated by the rise of state monopoly capitalism and the efforts of the government to "regulate" the economy in the interests of big business through the inflationary practices of deficit spending and the creation of fictitious money. It is further augmented by the inflationary impact of the \$100-billion-a-year military budget.

It is the working class which pays the price of inflation. For the workers, soaring prices mean falling real wages and deteriorating living standards. They lead to growing economic hardships and suffering. They are a source of mounting unemployment.

Inflation bears especially hard on the poor and the elderly. Thus, the Department of Agriculture's low-cost food budget rose 17 per cent between mid-1973 and mid-1974, while its higher-priced budget rose only 12 per cent. Those compelled to live on the miserly fixed social security payments have already been reduced to desperation.

Inflation has its most devastating impact on the masses of Black and other oppressed peoples. Already the victims of price and rent gouging, the residents of ghetto communities are today the special victims of inflation. The already excessive prices rise more rapidly than in white communities and in the absence of housing construction rents become more and more extortionate.

On the other hand, for the oil companies, the food trusts, the steel corporations and other key sectors of monopoly capital, rising prices have meant soaring profits. For the capitalist class inflation is a device for multiplying profits and holding real wages down. It benefits from

inflation—indeed, it needs it—and therefore does not conduct any serious struggle to end it.

The crisis is marked also by the persistent recurrence of financial difficulties—of soaring interest rates, of credit crunches and near-crises of liquidity, and of a rising number of bankruptcies of big firms and banks. And hanging overhead like a sword of Damocles is a mountainous volume of debt, private and public, totaling some \$2½ trillion or twice the gross national product, which threatens in the present state of the economy to disrupt the entire system of payments. But meanwhile, astronomical interest rates provide the giant banks with a huge profit bonanza.

Further compounding the contradictions of monopoly capital are the sharply rising prices of raw materials. This grows out of the movements of developing countries to take control of their raw materials and to put an end to the price scissors by means of which the U.S. and other monopolies have been plundering them. To this the monopoly corporations have reacted in characteristic fashion. They have compensated themselves many times over by retaining control of distribution and processing, and by exorbitant increases in prices to the consumers. Thus, the oil monopolies have tripled their profits in the past two years while prices of oil products have skyrocketed. At the same time they have tried to cover up by blaming the oil producing countries, though the increased prices of crude oil are but a minute fraction of the total price rise. Their aim is to dissuade workers from fighting against high prices, also to mobilize public opinion against the Arab states and in support of U.S.-Israeli aggressive policies in the Middle East.

The energy crisis has come to the fore as a key aspect of the deepening general crisis of capitalism. It is not a consequence of the depletion of resources but of the vastly sharpened contradictions of capitalism in this stage. As Gus Hall notes in his book *The Energy Rip-off: Cause and Cure*, "the world is not running out of sources of energy tomorrow." He charges that "the monopolies have created the so-called energy crisis" and have used cooked-up shortages and the resulting panic "to put over the most expensive price squeeze on the consumer in all history." (International Publishers, New York, 1974, pp. 29, 41.)

But there is also a real energy crisis. Hall states:

. . . the real energy crisis is the product of a number of historic processes coming together, creating a number of contradictions that demand fundamental resolutions. There is, first, the conflict between the energy needs of the people and the monopoly cor-

porate control of the sources, production and distribution of energy for the sole purpose of maximizing private profits. . . . There is also the contradiction between the growth of energy production with its more sophisticated and complicated energy technology, requiring centralized planning and control, and the inherent incompetence, the anarchistic, dog-eat-dog nature of monopoly capitalism. . . . Lastly, there is the conflict between the greater need for science and scientists and the decline in government and corporate money for science and the declining number of students in science. . . .

(The) sharpening conflict between the countries providing the raw material and the international monopolies is another, major element of the real energy crisis and requires new and more basic solutions. (pp. 41-42.)

The extortions of the monopolies in this situation have greatly added to inflation and have aggravated the current crisis.

•

Within the framework of this protracted state of crisis, the cyclical pattern of economic development—the pattern of booms and busts inherent in capitalist production—continues to unfold. The economy undergoes repeated cyclical crises of overproduction. But these now exhibit new features, arising from the new level of the general crisis. In this period we witness the occurrences of such crises in the face of rising military expenditures and even during large-scale warfare as in the 1969-71 downturn. We witness crises in which mounting unemployment and falling production are accompanied by marked inflation—something which bourgeois economists had only recently declared to be impossible. Cyclical crises in this period tend also to be more aggravated and protracted than before. That of 1969-71 was the longest since World War II.

The present crisis of inflation and overproduction exhibits these features in much more pronounced form. It has been swift in its development. Unemployment is rapidly rising and the gross national product is falling. A depression of marked proportions has developed. But these facts only begin to tell the story. The disruptive effects of inflation are far greater than ever before. Because of skyrocketing prices coupled with astronomical interest rates, housing construction has fallen by 50 per cent. Auto production has declined by one-fourth. Unemployment in these and other industries has risen to levels far above the national average and is becoming chronic. Yet the prices of building materials and of cars continue to rise apace. Farmers slaughter calves to protest against the impossibly low prices they

receive while retail food prices climb more than 2½ per cent in a single month. Real wages have fallen 10 per cent in the past two years and consumer buying has declined, yet inflation continues unabated. The indications are that the crisis will be severe and drawn out, with unemployment reaching high levels and prices continuing to rise, and that recovery will be slow and difficult.

Along with the rising cost of living, spreading unemployment is increasingly taking its toll among the workers. And here, too, the impact on the Black and other oppressed minority peoples is by far the most severe. Unemployment among Black workers, according to even the inadequate official figures, is more than double that among white workers. In the ghetto areas it is actually 3 to 4 times as high and in some cases even higher. Among Black teen-age youth in the ghettos, in some instances as many as 80 per cent are unemployed. Chronic mass unemployment is already a severe problem of some duration in the Black communities. Because of the lower seniority of Black workers, a consequence of the long-standing discrimination in hiring and upgrading they have suffered, the gap between Black and white unemployment grows.

Also among the special victims of unemployment are women workers, who already suffer gross discrimination in hiring and upgrading and who, in many industries, have very low seniority. In addition, unemployment hits hard at the younger generation, and particularly against Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican and other minority group youth. Many of these are shut out of employment altogether and growing numbers who have come out of school have never had a job.

Finally, the crisis of inflation and overproduction is not confined to this country. In other leading capitalist countries, consumer prices since 1970 have risen by anywhere from 28 to 55 per cent. And a number of them, most notably Britain and Japan, are also experiencing marked cyclical downturns. In addition, unemployment is rising in all major capitalist countries. Indeed, President Giscard d'Estaing of France has declared that the capitalist world is already in the grip of a general economic crisis and that "all the curves are leading us to a catastrophe." And in its annual report the International Monetary Fund states that as of mid-1974 the situation of the world capitalist economy "constitutes perhaps the most complex and serious set of economic problems to confront national governments and the international community since World War II." All this imposes limitations on the speed and extent of recovery from the current cyclical crises in the United States. In general, the outlook is one of deepening overall crisis which may reach very serious proportions. In the

economic sphere, the general crisis of capitalism has truly entered a new stage.

In this situation, as at all times, the ruling class seeks to resolve its difficulties and to bolster its profits at the expense of the working people. But in today's conditions of simultaneously rising inflation and unemployment it is confronted by new contradictions. Since it views inflation as caused by "excessive" wage levels, the cure it proposes is to curtail mass purchasing power, to raise taxes and limit government spending (except for military purposes), to restrict economic growth and "cool off" the economy. But this means accelerating the rise in joblessness and deepening the crisis of overproduction. On the other hand, to resort to deficit spending and tax cuts to stimulate the declining economy also stimulates the process of inflation. In view of this contradiction, it is small wonder that there is such confusion in the ranks of monopoly capital, its political representatives and its economic theoreticians, and that such a profusion of conflicting views were expressed in the recent "summit conferences."

But whatever the differences, it is clear that monopoly capital will not of its own accord undertake to combat inflation by freezing or rolling back its swollen prices and profits. Nor will it do so by cutting military spending. On the contrary, unless it is prevented from doing so by mass popular struggle, it will continue its assault on living standards and jobs of the workers. This was evident in the conferences and it was made even more evident in President Ford's 1974 economic message. To the big corporations he offered new tax concessions in the name of "stimulating investment"; to the working people he offered chiefly advice to "drive less, waste less, heat less, and eat less." He called for reducing the federal budget, not at the expense of the huge military outlays but of social welfare and public service expenditures. He professed to reject wage and price controls but established a "watchdog" Council on Wage and Price Stability whose real function is to press for *de facto* wage controls.

Ford's latest economic message, in the face of the deepening cyclical crisis, calls for a record deficit in the federal budget, proposes an insignificant cut in the taxes of working people and an equally insignificant jobs program, while he projects increased taxes on oil products which will send fuel prices skyrocketing.

Nor do the Democrats, despite their partisan attacks on Ford, offer any real alternative. They, too, seek to hold down the purchasing power and living standards of the working people. In opposition to Ford, they call for wage and price controls which, as all experience shows, will mean solely wage controls. They, too, are for "fighting

inflation and recession" by helping big business at the people's expense.

In fact, in recent years there has developed through the instrumentality of both parties of monopoly capitalism a longer-range shell game which might be termed "up the downstairs economic ladder." A wave of price increases occurs, while workers remain tied to wage contracts. Just before the contracts come up for renewal, wage-price controls are imposed which permit only limited wage increases in the new contracts. Then the controls are removed and the process is repeated. This is the pattern which lies ahead for the working class, with the connivance of both parties and the top trade union leadership. Unless this is checked, the outlook is one of continuing decline of real wages and rising profits.

But if the ruling class strives to meet the new stage of economic crisis by intensifying its offensive against the living standards of the working people as a whole in order to bolster its profits, it also strives no less to do so by intensifying its racial oppression and superexploitation of the Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican and other oppressed minorities in order to maintain and enlarge the superprofits it derives from these sources. It greatly steps up its instigation of racism and the fomenting of racial strife and violence, as the means of splitting the working class, of pitting white against Black, in order to intensify the exploitation of both.

In the Black and other ghetto communities, as has been noted, rising prices and rents and mounting unemployment strike hardest. Here the deterioration of living standards is swiftest and deepest, the growth of poverty, hunger and degradation the greatest, so that living standards fall increasingly behind those of white workers. And this special oppression and exploitation, in turn, becomes the means by which monopoly capital, relying on disunity between Black and white, attacks also the working conditions and living standards of the white workers.

But a growing mass movement against rising inflation and unemployment is now taking shape. Tremendous economic struggles are in the making as the working class and its allies move into their counter-offensive against the monopolies. The class struggle in the United States is entering a new, more advanced stage. It is taking on a new content and urgency.

It is these mass struggles and the advancement of class consciousness stemming from them which will be decisive for the future. At their heart lies the struggle for Black-white unity as the foundation of working-class unity, a struggle which demands and must lead to a vastly increased fight against the poison of racism, against the striving for racist privilege at the expense of working-class solidarity and

the best interests of the white workers themselves.

In the forefront of the people's struggle against inflation and unemployment is the fight for price and rent controls and rollbacks and against any form of wage controls. This must be accompanied by a fight for a sharp cut in military expenditures and an equally sharp increase in spending for social welfare and public services. Other key demands include tax reforms to make the wealthy and the big corporations foot the bill, vastly increased social security payments and drastic improvements in unemployment compensation, large-scale federal and municipal housing programs, a multi-billion-dollar federal jobs program sufficient to employ all who are jobless at union wage levels. Of special importance in the struggle against unemployment is the demand for a six-hour day with no reduction of pay. A special program of jobs for youth is needed. And woven throughout all these struggles is the battle against all forms of discrimination on the basis of race, nationality or sex. Also important is the fight to open the doors to large-scale trade and other economic relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, including Cuba. This is not only essential to the struggle for detente; it is also a potential source of large numbers of new jobs for workers in this country.

Such a program of struggle will help greatly to defend the economic interests of the working people, to mitigate the effects of the crisis. It will help to build the people's coalition against the monopolies and to curb monopoly power. It will not, however, bring about the abolition of inflation or unemployment. This is not feasible within the framework of capitalism. It can be achieved only through the elimination of capitalism and the victory of socialism. Of this the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are living proof, for in these countries there is no inflation, no joblessness, no crisis. Prices are stable and living standards are constantly rising. This is the direction in which the struggle must be directed in our country, and herein lies the special role and responsibility of the Communist Party.

(Continued from p. 64)

from one written by a Communist and for a paper that speaks for the Communist Party, U.S.A., in which Angela Davis avows membership. It is no accident that I found it the most discerning of all the reviews I have read to date. The reviewer is Ted Bassett and the paper is the *Daily World* of November 2, 1974: "The life

and struggles of Angela Davis will have a tremendous impact on millions now seeking a way out of the mounting crises in this country. Ms. Davis embodies profound lessons not only for the Afro-American people and other non-white oppressed minorities but for the entire U.S. working class and people."

BOOK REVIEWS

LOUISE PATTERSON

The Real Life of a True Revolutionary: A Review of Reviews

In the dedication of her autobiography,* Angela Davis makes clear for whom the book was written:

For my family, my strength.
For my comrades, my light.
For the sisters and brothers whose fighting spirit was my liberator.
For those whose humanity is too rare to be destroyed by walls, bars and death houses.
And especially for those who are going to struggle until racism and class injustice are forever banished from our history.

There are several possible approaches to writing a review, several months after its publication, of this brilliant and human story of the life of a young woman Communist who has come to symbolize for millions of progressive mankind the triumph of truth over injustice through the unity in struggle of peoples of all colors, in all countries and from all walks of life. I choose this opportunity to look at how it has been received to date.

Angela Davis in her Preface says: "I was not anxious to write

*Angela Davis, *Angela Davis: An Autobiography*, Random House, New York, 1974, 400 pp., \$8.95.

this book. . . . When I decided to write the book after all, it was because I had come to envision it as a *political* autobiography that emphasized the people, the events and the forces in my life that propelled me to my present commitment. Such a book might serve a very important and practical purpose. There was the possibility that more people—Black, Brown, Red, Yellow and white—might be inspired to join our growing community of struggle. Only if this happens will I consider this project to have been worthwhile."

Six months is a short time in which to give a comprehensive evaluation of the reception of what, in my opinion, is destined to become a classic in revolutionary literature. But the developments so far are already an affirmation of its being "worthwhile."

First of all, let us look at its distribution. The hard cover edition of Random House is already in its second printing and the paperback to be put out by Bantam in the fall is eagerly awaited by tens of thousands whose shrunken budgets in this economic crisis can't stretch to in-

clude \$8.95 books. The Book of the Month Club made it one of the Alternate Selections in the "Spring News" sent out to all its members. *Book Digest*, with a circulation of 400,000, which prints "Condensations from the Best Non-Fiction Books," in its March 1975 issue prints twenty pages from the *Autobiography* under the title: "The Personal Struggle of a Radical Activist Fighting Extradition Dramatically Depicts the Failure of the New York Prison System." The pages are copiously illustrated with pictures of the infamous FBI poster signed by J. Edgar Hoover naming Angela Davis one of the ten most wanted "criminals"; of her capture by FBI agents; of the now-demolished Womens' House of Detention in Manhattan (described in these pages), "where Angela Davis was held in a psychiatric ward." It also has pictures of her family, of the trial in California, of the Madison Square Garden victory rally; and a recent shot of "activist Angela Davis protesting the death penalty and conditions in a southern jail." The front cover of this issue of *Book Digest* carries the jacket of the Davis book along with those of books by Edwin Newman, J. F. terHorst, William Manchester and E. Howard Hunt!

"The Librarian's Choice: A Milwaukee Reader" for February 3, 1975, selects the Angela Davis *Autobiography* as its book of the month, with her picture on the cover, and a review which ends thus: "This is an important work about a woman who is sure to

remain in the public eye for some time to come."

The *Black Scholar* purchased 3,000 copies to be used in its own subscription drive. Her appearances all over the country in major book stores and colleges, and on TV talk shows are too numerous to describe in this review.

Translations and/or republications of the book are already proceeding in England, Japan, France, Italy, Denmark, Holland, Finland, the German Federal Republic and Norway. The Spanish copyrights will cover both Spain and Latin America. Negotiations are pending with the socialist countries as the arrangements under new copyright agreements are being worked out. England holds all copyrights to publication of books from the United States in English-speaking African countries (one of the subtleties of neo-colonialism), and I could get no information on African distribution as yet. I was told, however, by someone in the publishing field that lawsuits are pending to break through this "book curtain" imposed by British imperialism for so long on the African peoples.

Turning from distribution, which at this writing is still spreading widely, it is interesting, as well as revealing, to look at another angle of its reception—by the bourgeois critics who try to shape the book-reading habits and thoughts of the American people. The "august" *New York Times* treats books written by avowed Communists by pretending they have not been pub-

lished—by silence. This book, however, neither the *Times* nor any of the major, and minor, newspapers and periodicals dare ignore lest their virulent anti-Communism show up the hypocrisy of their "concern" for the Solzhenitzyns and freedom of the arts. I have on my desk press reviews from East to West, North to South, and all points in between. It is impossible to quote from all of them, but certain threads run through most of them. Anti-Communism, racism and male chauvinism are present, of course, and disbelief that the autobiography reveals the real Angela Davis because it does not deal with what they deem her "private life," which has nothing to do with dedication to struggle. They cannot understand an Angela Davis who says: "Revolution is a serious thing, the most serious thing about a revolutionary's life. When one commits oneself to the struggle it must be for a lifetime." I shall give a few examples.

Christopher Lehmann-Haupt, a dean of the *New York Times* daily book page, in the October 23, 1974, issue, says in part: "It is hard to resist feeling curious about her as an individual. For she appears so unusually intelligent, articulate, and well grounded in her beliefs that one almost instinctively looks to her for explanations one wouldn't expect from others of the same militancy and political persuasion."

On the other hand, Elinor Langer in the *Sunday Times Book Section* of October 27, 1974, devoting an entire page to her re-

view, comments: "To the personal narrative she brings such precision and individuality, that she reminds us out of what universal, bitter, private experiences the black movement coalesced in the first place. Her account of her involvement with the party is so plausible and fresh it turns back the burden of explanation to those who feel that the Communist Party is so irrelevant, drenched with the blood of history or populated by Government agents, that anyone who would willingly join it is stupid, unserious and against him/her self or fond of losing."

Robert Kirsch, book critic of the *Los Angeles Times*, in the November 6, 1974 issue, froths at Angela's statement "that my political involvement ultimately as a member of the Communist Party has been a logical way to defend our embattled humanity," by stating that "only a handful of people have chosen the CP as the vehicle." One wonders if he really read the book, for throughout its pages Angela Davis describes the broad scope of the struggle which encompassed millions in this country and abroad. Or is he asleep when he quotes Angela's descriptions—"more people than I had ever seen assembled in one place—hundreds of thousands in the GDR and close to three-fourths of a million in Cuba."

The very elitist voice of the *New York Review of Books*, which devoted dozens of columns to defending the racist William Styron's *Confessions of Nat Turner*, handles the Davis book

very tersely along with two others on George Jackson, and, says Francis Carney in the November 28, 1974, issue: "Angela Davis' autobiography has been attacked as 'Stalinist' which seems to me unfair. But other phrases from the vocabulary of the Thirties seem appropriate; the work might fairly be characterized as 'agit-prop' or one might say it was written 'under discipline.' It is not an autobiography and it would be wrong to consider the bare facts we are given as the basis for considering her life. She has relentlessly insisted that her life has nothing of interest in it apart from her continuous commitment to struggle against capitalist imperialism, racism and sexism."

Ivan Webster, in that "sanctuary of liberalism," the *New Republic* for November 1, 1974, unconsciously, I think, offers us an excellent example of the anti-Communism among some Black intellectuals and nationalists to which Angela Davis ascribes in vivid detail the break-up of SNCC and the split in the Black Coalition in Los Angeles. Mr. Webster, a Black man on the staff of *Time*, in a male chauvinist, flippant manner asks why she didn't mention Harold Cruse's *Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* (a virulent, spiteful, anti-Communist attack on not only the Communists but practically every Black artist Cruse dislikes). "Indeed," says Webster of this Black scholar, whose honors include Phi Beta Kappa and Magna Cum Laude, "she has very little to say about

her reading in any case . . . she contents herself with romantic posturing—in effect with challenging the capitalist monolith to put up its dukes, avowing that her Marxist dad can lick anybody on the ideological block."

A Black woman writer, on the other hand, in the *Chicago Daily News* of November 2-3, 1974, Maya Angelou, says: "Davis explains her belief and membership in the Communist Party so rationally that this reader is impelled to see it as logically following her experience. There is no hysteria or ranting in this book—rather, the telling of events."

But for Karen Durbin in *Ms.* magazine for February 25, 1975, Angela Davis is schizophrenic. "There are really three Angela Davises," she says. "One is a black woman, one is a middle-class intellectual, and one is a revolutionary activist." And she finds it "extraordinary" that "in the end, Davis resisted the certain comforts and satisfactions of the distinguished academic career that lay before her and to which she was powerfully drawn, and turned instead to the almost equally certain discomforts and dangers of a life of political activism."

Julius Lester, a Black folklorist and writer, in the *Progressive* for February 1974, doesn't share Ms. Durbin's schizophrenia theory, asserting "the state of California attacked Angela Davis because of who she was—a black, female Communist." He concludes that "when one considers that the choice of most Americans is

an intense indifference to injustice and the suffering of others, one must respect and admire Davis's basic and unshakable instinct toward caring. Whatever else her biography does, it communicates the risks and sacrifices she has endured in her efforts to right inhuman wrongs. Amid a variety of responses to her, one must be a re-examination of how one is living his or her own life."

The *New Yorker* of November 11, 1974, the magazine of "sophisticated humor," loses its cool when it says the autobiography is "a grim book and more hostile perhaps than its author realizes, for she reveals a spirit more rebellious, and one might say more racist, than her intellect admits." Yet it concludes: "The author, who is a Communist, was practically and emotionally supported by Communists, black and white, here and abroad, and perhaps the soberest thought for non-Communist Americans is that the struggle for equal justice, state and federal, should have been left to the Communists."

Marc Karson of Mankato State College in the *Minneapolis Tribune* of November 17, 1974, seeks a psychological explanation by stating, "She internalized, too, the positive image of a strong mother whose behavior illustrated that racism 'was not written into the nature of things.' . . . She could displace her anger at racism onto capitalism. The party could become the authoritative father substitute for the reticent father of her childhood. . . . As Freud put it, 'All revolutionists are born

in the cradle.'" He concludes, however, "Or will posterity judge her as a brilliant woman who spurned the personal success that could be hers in a capitalist society and instead chose to use her talents to liberate blacks and white workers with whom she identified? Probably both her supporters and detractors could agree that her life has been a testimonial to the classic statement of Eugene Debs: 'Where there's a lower class, I am in it, where there's a criminal element, I am of it, where there's a soul in prison, I am not free.'"

Faith Berry, editor of *Good Morning Revolution: Uncollected Social Protest Writings of Langston Hughes*, in the *Washington Star-News* of October 20, 1974, comes closest, in my opinion, to a real understanding of what Angela Davis and her autobiography are all about of any of the reviewers in the capitalist newspapers of the many I have read. She writes: "Anyone interested in the most intimate details of her life will not find them in this book. It is not the prose of a woman telling us about her intimate personal habits, her love life, or sexual activities. Only in relating to political ideas and events does she actually reveal anything about herself, her feelings, her family, or her experiences. It is the reason that some of the most forceful, cogent passages of the book are about the experiences in jail: she is able to project the pain of her incarceration by fully exposing all the inhuman conditions of our penal

institutions. What the book unveils most of all is a series of events in the making of a revolutionary, told with a clarity that highlights all the circumstances which made her one."

*

Angela Davis' *Autobiography* comes on the literary scene at a most opportune time. It is like a breath of fresh air midst the plethora of books flooding the market by Watergate conspirators and others seeking to make millions of dollars titillating the reader with salacious gossip about "people in the news" and "dirty tricks" exposures.

The people will not have the difficulty in understanding nor make such contradictory evaluations.

Black people in our country living in sub-standard housing, underemployed even before the present depression, and whose sons and husbands by the thousands clog the prisons, will admire and hail the Angela Davis who has chosen the path of one of our most revered ancestors, Harriet Tubman, the great anti-slavery leader. After her escape from slavery, standing for the first time in her life on "free" soil, Harriet Tubman said: "I looked at my hands to see if I was the same person now I was free. There was such a glory over everything, the sun came out like gold through the trees and over the fields, and I felt like I was in heaven. . . . I had crossed the line of which I had so long been dreaming. I was free. . . . But my home after all was down in the

old cabin quarter with the old folks and my brothers and sisters, and I made this solemn resolution: I was free and they should be free also. I would make a home for them in the North—and I would bring them all there." And so, with the price of \$40,000 on her head, dead or alive, Harriet Tubman made nineteen or more trips back and forth and brought over 300 "pieces of living and breathing 'property'" to freedom!

All people, in every land and clime, have their heroes and heroines who fought for freedom. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, in beginning the *Communist Manifesto*, wrote in 1848: "The history of all hitherto existing society is a history of class struggles." Angela Davis in her autobiography says "The *Communist Manifesto* hit me like a bolt of lightning." She was only fifteen at the time. But her story, told in the 400 pages of the autobiography, will help people everywhere oppressed by capitalist injustice to understand the universality of their struggle and to identify the real enemy—world imperialism, with U.S. capitalists at the helm.

The Davis story is profound, but written with a simplicity which makes it understandable to a school child. It contains lessons for the most advanced radicals. It is a weapon with which to fight racism and anti-Communism, the basic ideological weapons used by monopoly capitalism.

I would like to end this "Review of Reviews" with an excerpt

(Continued on p. 58)

ANNIVERSARY TOURS

ALL YOUR TRAVEL NEEDS

- * Youth Bargain Travel
—on your own and in groups
- * Special Tours For Workers
- * Many Other Tours For Groups & Individuals
- * Air Tickets, Domestic & Foreign
- * Cruises, Auto Rentals, etc.

SPECIAL SERVICES

Sanitoriums & Spas Everywhere

Bringing Relatives to the U.S.A.

Visiting Relatives in USSR & Other Countries

SEND FOR OUR 1975 BROCHURES

ANNIVERSARY TOURS

250 West 57th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019
(212) 245-7501

1741 Ivar Avenue
Hollywood, Calif. 90028
(213) 465-6141

THE MORNING BREAKS



THE TRIAL OF ANGELA DAVIS



by Bettina Aptheker

"This book, written so beautifully, is on the face of it Bettina Aptheker's story of the movement to free Angela Davis. That is the fact. The truth is deeper. Painful. Beautiful. Cry-making.

Maya Angelou

"I found this book totally absorbing, a slice of recent history told by a participant, that should be come a classic the day it is published.

Jessica Mitford

Cloth \$9.50 Paperback \$3.75

ECONOMICS OF RACISM U.S.A.

Roots of Black Inequality

Victor Perlo

Using current data of the Census Bureau on jobs, income, unemployment and living conditions, the author demolishes the phony arguments of big business, union bureaucrats and government for their racist policies. Showing how racism hurts white workers as well as Blacks, he presents a people's program to advance the interests of all working people.

Cloth \$10.50; Paperback \$4.25



INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
381 Park Ave. South, New York, N.Y. 10016