

JUNE, 1975

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE ECONOMIC CRISIS DEEPENS

Victor Perlo

PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION

**NEW TRENDS IN THE TRADE
UNION MOVEMENT**

George Meyers

MAOISM AND THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

James Steele

THE STRUGGLE FOR DETENTE

Frances Bordos

THE NEED FOR A CULTURAL PROGRAM

Ellen Perlo

ON SECTARIANISM

Michael Myerson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Victor Perlo</i>	
The Economic Crisis Deepens	1
<i>Subcommittee of the Education Commission CPUSA</i>	
Mental Development and Learning Disability: A Marxist Approach	14
<i>George Meyers</i>	
New Trends in the Trade Union Movement	21
<i>James Steele</i>	
Maoism and the Youth Movement	26
<i>Frances Bordos</i>	
The Struggle for Detente	33
<i>Ellen Perlo</i>	
The Need for a Cultural Program	40
<i>Michael Myerson</i>	
On Sectarianism	44
<i>Betty Smith</i>	
The Need for the Communist Party	50
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>Robert Lumer</i>	
On Shakespeare	55
<i>Leon Baya</i>	
A Reply	57
<i>Beatrice Lumpkin</i>	
Reply to Hank Starr	60
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>Simon Gerson</i>	
Bob Moses—Wall Street's Talented Tool	61

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.

The Economic Crisis Deepens

The majority of the American people are being increasingly hurt by the capitalist world's most serious economic crisis since the 1930s. Key data, through March 1975, are shown in the table.

The 14 per cent decline in industrial production registered by March already exceeds the previous maximum decline since World War II. The underreported 8 million people and 8.7 per cent of the labor force unemployed in March are record highs for the postwar period. And one must especially note the Black unemployment rate, officially reported at 14.2 per cent, but estimated by the National Urban League at a terrible 28 per cent.

The 11 per cent decline in real spendable earnings of employed workers by March 1975 is not only several times more severe than any earlier postwar decline; it was *equalled* but not exceeded only once before in U.S. history, between 1929 and 1933, the peak and trough of the Great Crisis of the 1930s.

The counterpart of the current decline in real wages was the un-

Data on the Economic Crisis

	<i>November 1973 Peak</i>	<i>March 1975</i>	<i>Percent Change</i>
Industrial production (1967=100)	127.5	109.6	-14
Unemployment (in thousands)	4,254	7,980	+88
Real spendable weekly earnings, (1967 dollars)*	97.50 (10/72)	86.76	-11
Ratio of price to unit labor costs in manufacturing (1967=100)	107.5	116.8	+9
Consumer price index (1967=100)	137.6	157.8	+15
New housing starts, private, annual rate (in thousands)	2,540 (2/72)	980	-62
Sales of new domestic autos, annual rate (in millions)	11.0	6.2	-44

All data, from standard government sources, are seasonally adjusted.

*Employed non-farm worker with 3 dependents.

precedented rapid rise in corporate profits during the first three quarters of crisis downturn, from an after tax annual rate of \$73.2 billion in the fourth quarter of 1973 to \$94.3 billion in the third quarter of 1974, an increase of 29 per cent. This means an increase of about 17 per cent in real terms. This is in especially marked contrast to the normal cyclical order, when profits start downward before production and decline faster than production.

The combination of falling real wages and rapidly rising profits signifies an extreme increase in the rate of exploitation of labor.

This is measured in another way by the Commerce Department's index of the ratio of price to unit labor cost in manufacturing, even though that index is constructed so as to minimize the increase in the rate of exploitation. During the 20 years from 1953 to 1972 it showed only a slight upward trend, from above 90 to under 100 early in 1972. But then it jumped to a peak of 121.6 in November 1974, one year after the start of the crisis downturn.

One consequence of this superexploitation is the obscene spectacle of the boom of luxury consumption by the rich in the midst of the crisis. The wealthy are buying a thousand Cadillacs a day, up 44 per cent to an all-time April record, while hundreds of thousands of auto workers are jobless because of the prolonged decline in the mass car market. "One of the hottest items on the real estate market these days is the \$100,000 house (while) hundreds of thousands of homes in the \$35,000 to \$60,000 price range are standing empty . . . because there are no buyers" (*New York Times*, April 5, 1975).

But another and more lasting consequence is that this complicates and tends to prolong the process of overcoming the crisis of overproduction and the ensuing depression period.

To understand this, we must refer to the basic theme of Marx: "The ultimate reason for all real crises always remains the poverty and restricted consumption of the masses as opposed to the drive of capitalist production to develop the productive forces as though only the absolute consuming power of society constituted their limit." (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, International Publishers, New York, 1967, p. 484.)

At a certain stage this contradiction makes it impossible for the capitalists to sell the goods produced at the previous rate of profit, and a crisis follows which acts as a violent cathartic, temporarily resolving the accumulated contradictions and preparing the way for a new upturn.

This cathartic acts *essentially* by destroying capital values, and

preparing the conditions for a restoration of the rate of profit on the reduced capital. At the same time the sustained purchasing power of some segments of the population, the appearance of new markets and areas of investment, the need to replace worn out machinery with new models provide a fresh stimulus to production.

Because profits went so high, capital investment and capacity *increased* for almost a full year after the mass consumer market turned down owing to the restricted purchasing power of the workers. Huge excesses of capacity, huge excess stockpiles of goods were accumulated. It will take a long time to work off enough of this excess to provide the basis for a revival. Inventories started to decline only in the first quarter of 1975. In the first three postwar crises, inventory reduction continued twice for four quarters, and once for three quarters. This would seem to set a minimum time requirement. Indeed, the First National City Bank suggests that inventory liquidation may "slow the recovery" throughout 1975 and 1976. (*Monthly Economic Letter*, March 1975.)

An important part of the destruction of capital values in a crisis of overproduction consists of the reduction of prices of stocks of commodities. However, owing to the extreme degree of monopolization in the United States, and the support of monopoly price structures by the government, the reduction in prices of commodities is occurring very slowly and unevenly. Financial journals are stressing the "success" of metals corporations, for example, in cutting production rather than prices. And worker-consumers are hard hit by the seemingly inexhaustible ability of the food monopolies to continue ratcheting up the prices of their products in the face of declining farm prices.

Thus the corrective effect of the crisis decline is relatively weak, tending to prolong the agony of adjustment. Similarly, the braking effect of maintained purchasing power of part of the working people is weaker than usual.

In past crises employment and purchasing power of workers in non-commodity producing sectors, and of white collar and supervisory personnel generally, were relatively well sustained. This is less the case now. Since last fall, employment in the private non-commodity producing sectors and factory employment of white collar and supervisory personnel have been declining. This has been nearly balanced by continued increases in state and local government employment, but financial crises of many of these governments may end that. *More important, the real wages and salaries of these workers have been cut at least as much as those of production work-*

ers. On the whole, then, this is less of a prop than in previous post-war crises. Increases in unemployment insurance, old age pensions, and other "transfer payments" are providing measurable support to mass purchasing power. Whether this becomes enough to meet the urgent needs of workers depends on the success of popular struggles against the Ford Administration's attempts to slash all benefits of this type, for extension and improvement of unemployment payments, a halt to layoffs, etc.

Distorted Timing of the Crisis

The timing of the decline was greatly distorted by the "energy crisis" and its aftermath. The artificial shortage of oil created by the monopolies in the winter of 1973-74, the spur of new investment in oil and other energy industries and the accelerated pace of price increases created a scare psychology in which artificial shortages appeared across the board for basic industrial materials, together with long waiting periods for delivery of machinery and equipment.

Users engaged in multiple ordering beyond their actual needs, for fear of not getting delivery from all suppliers. The *appearance* of boom continued in steel, metals, chemicals, machinery, for a year after final consumption passed its peak. New orders for capital equipment did not reach a peak until September 1974, and steel production remained strong almost to the end of that year.

All the sharper was the subsequent plunge in orders for equipment, as buyers cancelled their duplicate orders and tried to cut down on the suddenly surplus stocks on hand. Machine tool orders in February 1975 were down 72 per cent from a year earlier, while new freight car orders fell 69 per cent. McGraw Hill estimates that the real volume of orders for non-electrical equipment is down 40 per cent from the August 1974 peak. It reported industrial operations at "an abysmal 65.5 per cent of capacity in February" and predicted it would fall to 60 per cent by mid-year.

Under those conditions, the roughly 10 per cent decline in raw steel production by March 1975 could only be the first symptom of the inevitable sharp production decline in that bellweather industry. Sharp declines in other basic materials were also just getting under way in the late winter of 1974-75.

Contrary to official rosy predictions, McGraw Hill predicts that capital spending will fall all year, and the Conference Board predicts a further drop in 1976.

Financial Contradictions

The rate of return for manufacturing corporations rose to 15.7 per cent of net worth in 1974 according to the First National City Bank. That was the highest rate since 1950, when Korean War boom conditions prevailed. Following the acute phase of crisis downturn, the pressure on the rate of profit is exceptionally severe, exactly because of the unusually high rate of profit reached in 1974. Moreover, this profit boom encouraged overexpansion of corporate borrowing at superhigh rates of interest, and created conditions for the insolvency of thousands of firms. The Chemical Bank, one of the leading New York banks, has more than a half billion dollars of debts outstanding according to analysis of data supplied by a bank prospectus, and "Analysts stated that many major banks are experiencing similar difficulties." (*Wall Street Journal*, March 25.)

The "liquidity ratio" of cash and other "quick assets" to current liabilities fell to a new low of 17 per cent in the second quarter of 1974, as compared with a "normal" ratio of 35-40 per cent a decade earlier.

In order to improve their liquidity, corporations are issuing bonds at a record rate, replacing debts due now for debts due 20-30 years from now. Simultaneously, the federal government is borrowing huge sums and will borrow still more as the deficit in fiscal 1976 moves up to the \$70-100 billion range—an all-time peacetime high as a percentage of gross national product.

This combination of pressures points to some combination of still higher interest rates and a return to peak rates of price inflation, as soon as there is any significant upturn in production. It means that there is no end in sight to the whipsawing of working people between bouts of prolonged unemployment and accelerating inflation. And it means that the very process of recovery, when it comes, will rapidly reproduce in highly aggravated form the contradictions which erupted in the present crisis.

The Chase Manhattan and other leading banks have involved thousands of investors in real estate investment trusts, based on high-interest mortgages on high-rise office buildings, shopping centers, etc., a large percentage of which have defaulted, reducing the value of the investments to a fraction of their original cost.

Acute crises have hit a number of giant corporations and semi-governmental corporations, as well as state and municipal governments. The financial establishment strives strenuously to preserve the operations of all really large corporations, either as such or

through merger, in order to avoid the panic effect of a series of shutdowns owing to bankruptcy. But bankruptcies leading to the loss of work of hundreds or even several thousand workers have been frequent. And the danger of a financial panic remains serious, which could lead to a new wave of liquidation and further extend in time and depth the crisis decline.

Worsening International Economic Outlook

Imperialism strives to overcome its crises partly by expansion of foreign trade and investments, especially intensification of exploitation of labor and materials of developing countries. U.S. imperialism has expanded abroad since World War II with an intensity never before known. And again in the crisis year 1974, the giant U.S. owned transnational corporations gave priority to foreign over domestic investment. But the possibilities for U.S. imperialist expansion abroad have narrowed dramatically, and it is being forced to contract in key sectors. The nationalization of oil—from which half the remitted profits of corporations came—by the OPEC countries is the most profound blow to the economic structure of imperialism since the postwar socialist revolutions. Moreover, it is “catching.” It has emboldened many of the developing countries to break in manifold ways with neocolonialist relations, to reduce the plunder by the U.S. and other imperialist monopolies.

The increase in the price of oil has interfered with the traditional means by which imperialist countries get out of their crises partly at the expense of developing countries, through forcing down the prices of raw materials and improving their own terms of trade at the expense of the deeper impoverishment of the developing countries. Instead, the terms of trade have turned against U.S. imperialism, rendering more difficult its exit from the economic crisis.

The political and military defeats of U.S. imperialism, the special hostility it has evoked by its aggression in Indochina, by its support of Israeli expansionism in the Middle East, by its CIA involvement in the fascist coup in Chile—have hastened the breakaway of many countries from the financial tutelage of U.S. imperialism.

The dollar has been forcibly devalued. It is losing its position as the main currency of account in international transactions. The U.S. balance of payments, still weighed down by bloated military expenditures abroad, is more in deficit than ever, further weakening the possibilities of U.S. capital abroad.

The crisis of overproduction, for the first time since the 1930s, is synchronized throughout the developed capitalist countries. More-

over, it reached its acute stage of rapid decline simultaneously in every one of the main countries, with a degree of uniformity never before seen. The extreme internationalization of capital, the great expansion of international trade, the rapid flow of tens of billions of “Eurocurrencies” from country to country, of investments from stock market to stock market, has finally reached a climax in the simultaneous culmination of accumulated contradictions in a world crisis. This marks an important difference from earlier postwar crises. Then a crisis in one or two countries could be relieved by increased sales to countries where booms continued. Now the opposite is the case. The decline in markets in each country reacts on and tends to deepen the crisis in all the other countries.

Moreover, within this global capitalist crisis, the pattern of uneven development which has emerged in the past two decades has continued, and perhaps even become stronger. That is, Britain and the United States, which have been losing ground to rivals, are losing ground more rapidly. This is particularly apparent, for example, in the critical markets for steel and automobiles, where imports have reached a record share of U.S. consumption in this crisis. Japan and West Germany, on the other hand, continue to improve their *relative* position, even while they also are afflicted by declining production and rising unemployment.

Under these conditions, the most promising avenues for growth of trade lie in the socialist countries, which know no crisis and are rapidly expanding, and in the OPEC countries, which are using their increased oil revenues to finance huge economic development programs, providing big markets for capital goods and other commodities and services. As Acting Secretary of Commerce John K. Tabor put it: “The most promising prospects for increased foreign sales at the moment are no longer in the markets of our traditional trading partners—Japan and the nations of Western Europe. Their economies are in recession like our own.

“The more lucrative opportunities lie elsewhere: in the growing markets of the oil-rich countries of the Middle East and the centrally planned economies of the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and the People’s Republic of China.” (*Commerce Today*, April 14, 1975.)

But U.S. capitalists are getting less of the OPEC markets than their rivals because of their hostile policies, and are especially losing out on the expansion of peaceful trade with socialist countries. All of the other major capitalist countries are now giving priority to this trade, and expanding it at an exceptionally fast rate. U.S. imperialism, however, continues to discriminate against trade with socialist coun-

tries in many ways, continues to embargo Cuba and most Asian socialist countries. The brink-of-war mentality men of the Pentagon, the enraged Zionists, the more stupid variety of anti-Communist theoreticians and financiers, the "bridge-builders" who speculate on dealing with just one "favorite" socialist country, the troglodytes of the Meany type and the bourgeois politicians whose prejudices and fears lead them to adjust to any serious pressure from the Right have so far combined to frustrate the increasingly vocal attempts of manufacturers to get a piece of the alluring \$75 billion East-West trade market (that's its estimated scale for 1975)!

After several months delay, the Administration has finally (April) shown some movement on this question, releasing some long delayed export licenses, and promising to take fresh initiatives to overcome the Congressional barriers this summer. Past experience indicates that the Administration cannot be expected to stick to its guns on this issue unless there develops pressure from unions and other groups representative of the millions of working people with a vital interest in this trade to overbalance the still strong opposing forces. Moreover, at the present pace of government action it cannot be expected to bring about a major improvement in the low level of U.S. trade with socialist countries during 1975.

Is Recovery Around the Corner?

There is much official optimism of the "recovery is just around the corner" variety, and even assertions that it has actually begun. This optimism counts partly on the tax rebates and tax cuts enacted this year. The tax rebates and an average increase of \$5 in take-home pay owing to the lower withholding taxes are likely to result in a modest increase in consumer spending. But the gains are being eroded by rapidly rising state and local taxes, probable increases in federal energy taxes, and continued increase in consumer prices.

Optimism is also based on the fact that reduction of inventories has begun. That is so, but the pileup is so great that this process is likely to continue all year.

Thus, it is quite possible that a slight summer increase in consumer spending will be followed by a new period of decline. In any case, this crisis is likely to differ from earlier postwar crises in the duration of the following depression period. Since World War II these depression phases have been relatively brief. This time, there is apt to be a long period during which production fluctuates around a low point, possibly interrupted by false starts at recovery.

But while there remains considerable uncertainty about the tim-

ing of the next recovery-period, we can project with considerable confidence the long-term trend of development of the U.S. economy and draw the necessary implications therefrom.

The Problem of Slow Growth Rate

The perspective is that over the course of this entire cycle, and perhaps for additional cycles thereafter, the United States faces a period of slow economic growth.

As early as 1969, this writer wrote that the United States was entering a period of slower economic growth, and, indeed, that proved to be the case during the last cycle, ending in 1973. All of the accumulating contradictions which led to that conclusion several years ago have become more serious, and are increasingly tending to strangle the economy. And an important new factor has entered, which affects the entire capitalist world.

This is the partial victory of the developing countries in the struggle to obtain control of their own raw materials and to obtain reasonable prices for these materials. The ability to plunder these materials without limit, and at bargain prices, was an essential ingredient in the specific pattern of economic growth followed by the imperialist powers during recent decades. Now that we have to pay for oil and other raw materials, and pay several times more than formerly, they are striving to gear their scale of production to the quantity of materials they can afford to buy.

True, U.S. imperialism is striving strenuously to reverse this situation by breaking up OPEC and forcing down the price of oil, by regaining unrestricted control over raw materials in developing countries. But regardless of any partial and temporary successes, the general trend towards the destruction of the entire system of neo-colonialist exploitation and plunder is irreversible.

For the present, relatively rapid growth in the non-socialist world is concentrated in the developing countries. According to preliminary figures, industrial production in the developed capitalist countries declined 0.5 per cent in 1974, while it increased 7 per cent in the developing countries. The decline in the developed capitalist countries for 1975 will be several percent, while production is booming as never before in the oil producing countries, and in certain other developing countries, such as Brazil.

Presumably, in due course capitalism will adapt to the new relationship of forces, and resume economic growth on this basis. But this will take time.

Meanwhile, other factors are tending to inhibit economic growth

in the capitalist countries, most notably the now seemingly permanent rapid inflation of world capitalism and the sharpening labor/capital struggle in the developed capitalist countries.

Bourgeois economic policy knows no route for checking inflation but curtailment of production and consumption, and seeks an ever larger reserve army of unemployed in order to weaken the bargaining power of the working class.

Japanese Prime Minister Miki told the Diet (parliament): "The conditions that once prevailed both at home and abroad . . . supporting the nation's high rate of economic growth have crumbled, bringing the era marked by the ability to buy inexpensive raw materials, fuel, food and animal feed to an end. . . . It is imperative . . . that the Japanese economy should alter course . . . from the previous high rate of growth policy to one geared to a stable growth and improvement of social welfare." The final phrase may be taken with a grain of salt, as Miki combined it with urging the Japanese people to accept lower living standards. (*Journal of Commerce*, January 27, 1975.)

Various projections place the prospective long-term growth rate of Japan in the 4-5 per cent per year range, instead of the 10-15 per cent range prevailing over the past fifteen years.

At the other extreme, Britain, which has had the lowest growth rate of any major capitalist country, now faces a long-term complete stagnation or even decline in economic activity under the severe deflationary measures imposed by the government to deal with the worsening situation of the British currency and the country's continued loss of ground in foreign markets.

As for the United States, even the President's Budget projects a slow rate of growth for the rest of this decade. Official and semi-official agencies project average annual growth rates of 2½-3 per cent, linked to conservation of energy. Paul Samuelson, one of the most prominent bourgeois economists, a year ago wrote an article entitled "Worldwide Stagflation" in which he said: "Compounding the economic problem of inflation is the fact that, often and in many countries, there persists a simultaneous problem of unemployment and stagnant growth. 'Stagflation' is a new name for a new disease: stagflation involves inflationary rises in prices and wages at the same time that people are unable to find jobs and firms are unable to find customers for what their plants can produce."

He dismisses as "academic" adoption of a "Draconian" policy of so increasing unemployment and reducing production as to achieve absolute price stability, but concludes: "What is not academic is the

more relevant debate going on behind the scenes of official life: Would it not be desirable, in the interests of keeping inflation from accelerating, to countenance and even contrive slow U.S. growth for two or three years, so that unemployment will remain above the 5½ per cent level? Even if desirable, is such austerity feasible in the present American political environment?" (*Morgan Guaranty Survey*, June 1974.)

But with unemployment already approaching 10 per cent, the capitalists have raised their sights. It has become clear that the dominant sections of the capitalist class would be happy with permanent unemployment of 6 per cent, or even 8-10 per cent, so long as they can get away with it. A headline over a front page *New York Times* article reads "High Joblessness Expected to Persist as a Condition of U.S. Through Decade" (April 21). The writer, Soma Golden, reports that the "goal" of keeping unemployment above 6 per cent indefinitely is now accepted by the whole establishment of bourgeois economists.

The switch to a lower growth perspective has significant international as well as domestic implications. Fifteen years ago leading circles of U.S. big business, led by the Rockefellers, moved to consciously accelerate economic growth with the primary purpose of staving off the strengthening economic competition of the Soviet Union and world socialism. The imperialists now see a more immediate need to combat the developing countries, especially the oil producers, and "their own" working classes. This has led to a shift in emphasis. To try to break the price of oil, curtail its use, and hence reduce overall energy consumption, a slower economic growth rate is desired. And it also is designed to maintain a high level of unemployment, to help in efforts to defeat labor struggles against inflation and speedup.

Regardless of how long the growth rate of capitalism remains slow, the present crisis marks an important stage in the economic and social competition between socialism and capitalism. In the 1930s the Soviet Union achieved very rapid economic growth, while the capitalist world wallowed in crisis and depression. But starting from a very low level, the USSR had a long way to go, and posed no immediate threat to capitalist economic supremacy.

Now, the already powerful cooperative grouping of socialist countries is enjoying annual increases of 7-8 per cent in national income while the advanced capitalist countries are registering two consecutive years of decline. This is rapidly changing the world balance of economic power to the advantage of socialism at the same time

as the relations between the socialist countries and the developing countries intensify and the imperialist centers lose their monopoly of economic relations with the developing countries.

For the American people, this shows more clearly than ever the advantages of socialism as a system. It dramatizes the need for a socialist society, ruled by the working class and its allies, rather than the pseudo-socialism of capitalist countries, such as Britain, which performs just as miserably as the other capitalist lands.

But it also poses immediate and urgent problems.

The American working class faces a perspective of chronic mass unemployment for the indefinite future on a scale approaching that of the terrible thirties. It means that Black workers face an indefinite continuation of 20-30 per cent unemployment (realistically speaking), and youth, especially minority youth, a dubious prospect of *ever* finding lasting employment.

What must the American working class do to prevent such suffering, to change this perspective?

Approaches to Struggle

As Gus Hall put it, because of the new aspects of this crisis, the old remedies do not work. It's necessary to raise more advanced demands.

New demands, offering a perspective of seriously relieving the situation of millions, must come to the fore. These new principles are getting increasing recognition from the working class and oppressed peoples:

- An *effective* government commitment to *directly* provide employment to *all people needing jobs* producing required goods and services, from a vast housing program to health services, education and mass transit.
- The absolute need to radically slash the military budget to provide funds for needed programs, to relieve inflationary pressures and to reduce the war danger.
- Nationalization of key industries under democratic control, takeover and operation of closed down plants.
- The 30 hour week for 40 hours pay, a demand already being adopted by tens of thousands of workers.
- The demand to reach at least the standard of other capitalist countries in job security and unemployment compensation.
- Priority in all respects for the special needs of the Black and other oppressed peoples, a concrete commitment to achieve genuine economic and social equality within a relatively brief time span.

But whatever the level of struggle, it is above all necessary not to be side-tracked by debates about "what is best for the economy." For monopoly capital, that is invariably a code phrase for "what is best for our profits." The aim of struggle is to win concessions, improvements, relief from suffering, for the working people.

The growing impact of the crisis of inflation and overproduction on the masses of working people has catapulted economic issues into the forefront of struggles. . . .

Joblessness is a much more serious problem than is indicated by the overall government figures, which considerably underestimate its rate to begin with. In certain industries, particularly auto, the rate is far above the national average. A city like Detroit suffers not only from double-digit inflation but from double-digit unemployment. In growing measure this unemployment is chronic, outrunning the duration of both unemployment compensation and supplementary unemployment benefits. In the Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican ghettos, mass chronic joblessness has already reached very serious levels. Women are experiencing high rates of unemployment, as are young people, many of whom are being shut out of employment altogether.

The increasing hardships imposed by this combination of soaring prices and vanishing jobs are impelling growing numbers of people into action. An unprecedented growth of mass actions and movements is taking shape, both locally and nationally. These are responses to the growing urgency created by the crisis and reflects its new features. The fight against inflation takes place side by side with the fight against unemployment and the two are becoming increasingly intertwined.

The anti-inflation struggle takes place on a number of fronts. A key aspect is the fight for higher wages, which are vital if the workers are not to fall farther and farther behind the rising prices. While workers and trade union organizations at lower levels are displaying rising militancy in this struggle, it is obstructed by the policies of the Meanys and Abels, who support employer demands for higher productivity, willingly serve on government boards to curb wages and devote themselves to supporting the demand of a section of the big corporations for easier credit to "stimulate business." Abel's no-strike agreement creates a special road-block for the steelworkers. It is necessary to wage a determined struggle against all limitations on wage increases and all "productivity" speedup schemes, and for the unfettered right to strike for higher wages.—*Draft Resolution, 21st Convention, CPUSA.*

Mental Development and Learning Disability: A Marxist Approach

Mental development is a crucial subject for both politics and psychology. In politics, the struggle for economic, political and social equality of Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Native Americans, Asians and women requires a basic grasp of the nature and dynamics of mental development in order to defeat the ideology of inequity so prevalent in our monopoly capitalist society. In psychology, a scientific understanding of mental development is essential for advancing our knowledge of human thinking, feeling, and personality, and to prevent the corruption of science by capitalist ideology.

Above all, and most important, Marxist-Leninists need scientific psychology to refute all racist theories of mental development, *i.e.*, theories which arrive at conclusions of Black mental or personality inferiority. Such theories have proliferated in the recent period, and have even penetrated the Left in guises such as "learning disability." Such theories have not only been applied to Blacks; they have been used to stigmatize working people of all colors.

The basic principles of the Marxist-Leninist approach to mental development must be restated to provide a sound basis for a refutation of such theories.

Fundamental to a scientific understanding of mental development is the theory of reflection, developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin as a major feature of dialectical materialism, specifically in the area of epistemology, the theory of knowledge. This theory states that the human mind is a reflection of reality produced by the brain and nervous system. This reflection of reality is *non-material*—a mental image, as Lenin put it—and is produced by the *material* brain and nervous system. Such a distinction between the material brain and the non-material mind is crucial in avoiding the crude mechanical materialist position that thoughts are material or the idealist position that the mind is something independent of the brain.

To produce a reflection of reality, complex neurological processes take place in the human organism in the course of its activity in the surrounding world. These processes were called "higher nervous activity" by Pavlov, who discovered many of the laws of such activity.

Basic to the reflection of reality is sensory cognition: the receiving of sensations and their processing by the brain to produce percep-

tions of the surrounding world. Also vital for reflection is memory—the storing of such sensations and perceptions so that they can assist in present and future adaptations to reality.

With the development of language—what Pavlov termed "the second signalling system"—a new and qualitatively higher form of reflecting reality emerged. Arising out of the human labor process, language enables humans to reflect reality not only in sensation, perception and memory representation, but also in words and ideas. Language is the basis for human thinking, for reasoning, and for making judgments as a basis for human activity. It permits non-automatic activity, conscious activity, by human beings.

Language is also a means of communication, permitting the exchange of ideas and knowledge and their transmission to future generations. Language, which was developed by human beings, is an acquired tool—it must be learned by every individual. It is essential for human functioning, for problem-solving, for social relations, for work activity in a collective manner, and for human freedom.

The human mind is thus a non-material reflection of reality in the form of sensations, perceptions, memory representations, ideas and knowledge. Further, human emotions and personality are part of and express human reflection, the human mind.

But the human mind is not a passive reflection, a *tabula rasa* (blank tablet) for the environment to write upon, as the philosopher John Locke maintained. The human mind, the reflection of reality, is formed in the course of individual and group labor activity, collective living, social relations, scientific activity, education, etc. To understand the human mind, it is necessary to understand the human activity which produces it.

Human activity takes place in both a natural and social environment. Mental development is, hence, a reflection and a result of the individual's activity in natural and social reality. For human beings, social reality is the *determining* reality in their mental development. And social reality means the specific social structures of capitalism, socialism, colonialism, etc., with their class and national struggles, their oppression or freedom from exploitation, their specific contradictions, their racism or equality, etc. A scientific understanding of mental development cannot be achieved without a scientific understanding of such social reality.

We can now put forth an expanded and more complex definition of mental development and the human mind: The human mind is a non-material, language-based reflection of natural and especially social reality produced by the material brain and nervous system in the

course of an individual's life activity in a specific society.

The above principles are fundamental in the political-scientific refutation of theories of inferiority and inequality. Racism has two main ideological rationales for the continued oppression and superexploitation of the Black people in our country: that they have inferior mental development or that their personalities are deformed or inadequate. These alleged inferiorities of intellect and/or personality are claimed to be either inherited or caused by the environment. Whichever road they take—birth or environment—these racist theories all conclude that Blacks are *now* inferior mentally or emotionally.

The theories of Arthur Jensen, Christopher Jencks, James Coleman, Daniel Moynihan and Albert Shanker are recent racist theories which are completely contrary to scientific principles of mental development and personality—as are all racist theories. They have been developed and given wide currency in the professional journals, the teacher training institutes, and in the capitalist press in an effort to stem the rising tide of Black freedom struggle.

Arthur Jensen's theory of Black genetic intellectual inferiority takes the racist hereditary road. It has received massive scientific disproof. It also completely violates the scientific principle that the intellectual functioning of all human beings is an acquired, not an inherited, capability, and that it is based upon language, which is also acquired after birth. Jensen's theory, so stridently championed by the openly genocidal Shockley, is a prescription for intensified oppression of the Black people. It was embraced by the Nixon Administration as a sufficient basis for wrecking the Headstart pre-school program.

Christopher Jencks plays both sides of the racist street—he claims that both by birth and by living conditions, Black people cannot benefit from education, regardless of how high its quality is. Therefore, Blacks cannot really be educated today because of their deficient intelligence and defective personalities, he alleges.

James Coleman espouses the racist theory of "economic and cultural disadvantage" of Black children due to their environmental conditions. Daniel Moynihan, archideologist of monopoly capital, put forth the theory of the "Black matriarchy" which supposedly causes pathology and deformed personalities in the Black family.

Albert Shanker, who reeks of racism, has developed or embraced two theories of Black inferiority: that large numbers of Black children have "incurable behavior" and should be segregated into special classes, and that equally large numbers of Black children are guilty of "criminal behavior" and should be ousted from the regular schools. Such "incurable" and "criminal" behavior, he says, is caused by

ghetto life. One need scarcely stoop to answer such open racism. It is, indeed, Shanker who is incorrigible in his criminally racist behavior.

All the above theories are scientifically false and ignore the social reality of Black life, with its liberation thrust, its active struggle against oppression, its consequent psychological strength and intellectual development, and its collective life activity in an exploitative society. The purpose of such theories is to maintain racist oppression, not to contribute to scientific psychology or sociology.

It is regrettable that well-intentioned professionals, even on the Left, have developed theories which also conclude that Black and other nationally oppressed children have poor mental development, learning disabilities or deformed personalities. Such theories have appeared in the *Daily World* and require refutation; these theories deal with learning disabilities and with mental and personality development of Black children, as well as with children of working and poor people of all colors.

One theory put forth is that learning disability is so widespread among poor children, especially Black, Puerto Rican and other oppressed minority children, that one-third of them are outside the pale of normalcy and cannot learn except under special conditions. This theory is scientifically false.

There is no adequate scientific evidence of such extensive neurological damage among these children. The most accurate estimate—and only an estimate can be made at this point in scientific testing—is that about 3 per cent of all children, including Black children, have learning disabilities which impede their normal education.

Further, this theory is objectively racist. It falsely stigmatizes as educationally and mentally inferior hundreds of thousands of children of working class families, especially if they are poor and/or Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican or Native American on the false basis of "learning disability." It both condones continued racist educational treatment of these children and seduces white people into the acceptance of racism, since what can be done if "they" (Blacks, poor, etc.) are "learning disabled"?

It is not surprising that the New York City Board of Education has claimed that there are 250,000—yes, one-quarter of a million!—children in New York City who have "learning disabilities." The label "shadow children" has been savagely foisted on these children. "Learning disability" is, indeed, a racist excuse to continue providing inferior education while blaming the victim.

Another theory that objectively has racist implications is the "inter-

actionist" theory. This theory claims that mental abilities are formed throughout life as a result of the constant interaction of environmental influences with the child's developing nervous system. It states that the central nervous system (the material base for intelligence) is harmed by a noxious environment (rotten education) and so Black children's central nervous system is harmed by rotten education.

This simplistic theory of an environment "interacting" with the nervous system omits three other crucial features of mental development (described above). First, there is not just a material central nervous system and an environment. There is also the non-material reflection (the human mind) which is produced by the nervous system as it "interacts" with the environment. The material central nervous system can be harmed by disease, injuries, poisons, or other physical or chemical elements, with resultant neurological impairment. But there is no acceptable scientific evidence to show that school education, which takes place by words, sight, demonstration, etc., can cause neurological damage of the kind claimed by the "interactionist" theory. School education can and does affect the mind (the reflection) of children, with little or no effect on the physical organism. That is, the central nervous system will almost invariably remain healthy and intact, with the child capable of learning in normal fashion.

Second, it is not the environment which "interacts" with the human organism. It is the individual child, with his nervous system and mind (reflection) who is *active* in the environment. Such activity includes family and community relationships, collective activity (sports, play), problem-solving in daily life, many-sided communication and exchange with others, assumption of responsibilities, intellectual and emotional experiences at home and with friends—plus school life. It is the totality of such activities—not just education in school—which determines the mental development of the Black child (and of all children). It is unscientific to limit the environment of the child to education alone and to see only "interaction" rather than varied and complex activities of children in their environments.

Third, the "environment" is no one-dimensional, uniform entity, which interacts with the child. For Blacks and other oppressed minorities, it is the specifically monopoly capitalist conditions of racism, ghettos, unemployment, poor housing and health care, and rotten education. But the "environment" for Black people also includes their activity for survival, their mutual assistance and companionship, their human goals, their family strength, their daily fight against oppression, and their development of pride, dignity,

and intellectual skills in these struggles. Of such is their mental development constituted.

Another harmful theory that has been set forth is that education determines a child's mental development. It is claimed that a child just acquires spontaneous and concrete ideas in everyday life, while school provides the abstract ideas and formal reasoning so essential for mental development. Mental development, of course, can be advanced by good education, and under socialism education assumes even greater significance.

But we must also recognize that the educational system in our monopoly-dominated society also seeks to prevent real understanding of reality, particularly of social reality. It teaches lies about capitalism and socialism. It ignores or demeans the role of working people in U.S. history and development. It is racist in its books, its curriculum, its attitudes and its practices. It fails to develop adequately the potentiality, the creativity, the talents and the skills of children. It withholds the social understanding that can expand the consciousness and ability to cope of working people.

Working people have always fought for decent education for their children—and they continue to fight for it today. We need to struggle to improve education in all ways so that it contributes far more to mental development instead of placing obstacles in the way of such development.

However, it is not education as such, nor education alone which leads to adequate mental development. It is the entire range of the individual's activity and experiences—family, friends, job, union, marriage, sports, community and education—which determines whether a person's mental development is adequate or not. It is in the course of all these activities—not just in school—that a child develops reasoning skills and abstract ideas. To say that poor education leads to poor mental development is to pronounce an intellectual death sentence on all Black children who are receiving an inadequate education. It leads into the racist swamp created by Jensen, Moynihan, Coleman, Jencks, Shanker and others of their ilk.

Here, it is not a question of the central nervous system. If that is intact and healthy at birth and is undamaged by disease or noxious elements, it is capable of producing the most advanced mental development. In fact, Communists base themselves upon the fact that the overwhelming number of working and Black people have the physiological and mental capability of developing the most advanced working class consciousness—and what higher mental development can there be than that?

Finally, we must repudiate the theory that poverty and unem-

ployment destroy Black children's minds and personalities and that poor teaching must inevitably result in poor and often disorganized mental ability formation in Black children. Poverty, unemployment and oppression can break down and degrade a small number of working people, as Lenin pointed out, but it develops discipline, unity, strength and organization among the mass of workers. Class struggle could never be effectively carried out nor socialism achieved if capitalist poverty and exploitation crippled the minds and personalities of working people. The downtrodden and superexploited Russian and Cuban masses bear shining historical witness to this.

This, too, applies to Black people. Certainly, racism harms Black people. It robs them of decent health care, causing illness and early death. It subjects them to low wages and greater unemployment, with the resultant terrible living conditions, frustration and unhappiness. It makes them pay higher rents for worse housing. It gives their children poor education so that they can not achieve the skills and attain the educational levels necessary for decent jobs at decent pay.

But it is precisely these oppressive conditions that are the basis for Black freedom struggles. True, Black people are victims of racism and are harmed by it. But Marxist-Leninists do not stop there. In the words of Dr. Herbert Aptheker (*Political Affairs*, June 1974), describing Black history: "The fire did not consume the victims, it tempered them. With oppression there is victimization, but if one believes that nothing but a victim is produced he does not understand the dialectics of oppression. Further, oppression debases the oppressor, not the oppressed. The latter resist in ten thousand ways and forge their own culture, psyche and spirit while doing so—their own morality, religion, folklore, literature and heroes."

The poor, the overwhelming majority of working people, Blacks, Spanish-speaking people, Native Americans and women have adequate brains and nervous systems. They have the potential for the fullest mental development. Their children have the physiological equipment needed to learn if they are given a decent education. Apart from a small percentage, they do not have learning disabilities. Despite poor teaching and poverty and exploitation, their "mental ability formation" and their minds and personalities are perfectly adequate for the tasks that confront them. These include uniting in struggle against monopoly oppression, heightening class consciousness, and fighting through to socialist victory. Ninety miles from our country the Cuban working people, Black and white, used their perfectly adequate mental development to achieve socialism. Our working people of all colors will do no less.

PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION

GEORGE MEYERS

New Trends in the Trade Union Movement

I propose to deal with several questions relating to the section of the *Draft Main Political Resolution* concerning the trade union movement.

The first paragraph of that section reads as follows:

The new stage of the general crisis of capitalism has brought unprecedented attacks by monopoly capitalism on the living standards of the people of the United States. The answer of the working class has been an intensification of the class struggle and a measurable growth of radicalization in its ranks. These developments are having a decisive effect on the trade union movement. Expressions of a new trend in labor are already emerging. In particular, a new, militant Left trend is clearly emerging.

Developments in just three short months since this *Draft* came off the press are dramatically confirming the correctness of these estimates.

The year 1974 saw the biggest strike wave in the nation's history, giving the lie to the slander that workers won't fight in times of depression. The U.S. Labor Department listed some 6,000 official strikes for the year, and this does not include the countless rank-and-file stoppages, lasting from several hours to several weeks.

These struggles are continuing into 1975. For the first three months, in which relatively few contracts were up for negotiation, 1,190 official strikes have already been recorded. While this is less than the 1,300 strikes recorded in the same period last year, the length of the strikes has nearly doubled, from an average of 8.7 days in 1974 to nearly 15 days this year. Here is a clear indication of the intensification of the class struggle. Everywhere workers are being forced to "hit the bricks" for wage increases adequate to meet the spiraling cost of living and to fight off the attempts of the corpora-

tions to slash hard-won work standards.

A powerful manifestation of these new trends was the historic April 26 demonstration for jobs organized by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO in Washington, D.C. This notable event brought an important section of the trade unions into direct leadership of the fight for the needs of all workers. Nearly 75,000 took part, including tens of thousands from basic industries like steel, rubber, communications, electrical, textiles and chemical, from the unaffiliated UAW, from the AFSCME and the AFT. In New York and a number of other cities these unions worked closely with the progressive-led National Coalition against Inflation and Unemployment, a primarily community-based organization.

The New Rank-and-File Upsurge

The *Draft Resolution* further notes "the emergence of healthier, class-struggle trends in trade union leadership as a result of intensification of the class struggle and the positive impact of rank-and-file pressures on trade union elections."

A Left is again emerging in union leadership which gains strength from the rank-and-file upsurge, welcomes it and is beginning to give it direction. The election of Arnold Miller as president of the United Mine Workers and of Edward Sadlowski as director of the USW's Chicago-Gary District 31 has severely shaken the ruling class and the opportunist union officials who had been content to coast along on a policy of no-struggle collaboration until retirement.

Now they see militant leaders springing up all about them. They face a militant body of Black workers organized into the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists and a Coalition of Labor Union Women dedicated to ending discrimination against women in industry and in the unions.

The economic crisis has spotlighted the total bankruptcy of class collaboration in the trade unions. True, this has not prevented the Meany leadership from clinging to its disastrous policies. But it has put a growing number of union officials who had supported these policies "between the devil and the deep blue sea." These officials now find themselves caught between the reactionary pressures of the top bureaucracy and the militant grass-roots pressure of a rank-and-file demanding action on the urgent problems it faces.

Some are frantically trying to block the rank-and-file upsurge at all costs. Others are giving ground here and there, trying to slow down the movement and divert it into harmless backwaters. But more and more, union officials who had previously supported class-

collaborationist policies are finding it difficult to escape the wrath of their own memberships and are being forced to break with the policies of the AFL-CIO leadership. This is particularly true at lower leadership levels and in local central labor councils. But the powerful impact of the rank-and-file is beginning to penetrate even the AFL-CIO Executive Council itself. This explains why George Meany was bowled over when he tried to prevent the April 26 demonstration.

Meany's phony "neutrality" in the 1972 presidential elections has created a widening breach. Important trade union leaders are now speaking out for real political independence. There is now not only much talk about the need to break with the two-party system but also about how to bring this about.

Meany is now looking toward the racist, anti-labor George Wallace, who he finds has "mellowed." Wallace has recently indicated his "mellowness" by indicating that the U.S. should have cottoned up to Nazi Germany and Japan in World War II, rather than allying with the Soviet Union. In fact, Wallace received his first AFL-CIO endorsement in Alabama's recent gubernatorial elections. Yet, following a sharp rebuff at the Democratic Party's "mini-convention" in St. Louis, Meany banned AFL-CIO involvement in pre-convention presidential politics, where labor has consistently fought Wallace.

Only a few days after Meany's pronouncement, however, leaders of the IAM, Communications Workers, UAW and a number of other unions met in Washington to plan for a maximum joint political impact at the next Democratic Convention. They announced their intentions to set up a separate headquarters and staff for this purpose. Interestingly enough, it was this same group that played a prominent role in the April 26 demonstration.

The internal struggle in the AFL-CIO over this demonstration reveals some of the forces at work. First, the success of the November 16 demonstrations organized by the National Coalition against Inflation and Unemployment led a number of the more progressive trade unionists in the New York-New Jersey area to plan a march of their own on Washington. Two major demands emerged in their discussions: a shorter work week and a reduction in military spending. Meany, who had given lip service to the first of these but was in bitter opposition to the second, came out against mass union demonstrations in Washington or anywhere else.

But instead of capitulating the sponsors took the proposal into the IUD Council where it won a majority after a heated debate. But so widespread was the positive response which followed that within a

week the IUD Council met again to make the support of the action unanimous.

However, those previously in opposition were able to impose certain conditions as the price of their support. Demands for a shorter work week and a cut in the military budget were dropped as official slogans. The program at the rally was watered down to include such demagogues as Senator Hubert Humphrey. Fortunately, efforts to eliminate the march from the Capitol to the stadium were forestalled. This march proved to be the most stimulating part of the entire proceedings.

Several things stand out in the April 26 rally. First, a number of leaders launched a mass demonstration in the face of Meany's open disapproval. Second, while certain conservative IUD elements were able to extract concessions as the price of their support, the fact that they were forced to participate was an important contribution. The success of the rally in turn created conditions for even more advanced initiatives in the struggle for jobs.

Such are the dialectics of the struggle. In some ways it reaffirms the lessons of the thirties. The rank-and-file movement for industrial unionism which the Party then helped initiate began to take on a powerful head of steam. It began to develop its own leadership as well as to attract some honest elements in the AFL. At the same time vicious Right-wing social democrats like David Dubinsky of the ILGWU entered the scene with the avowed purpose of curbing the movement and keeping it within safe class-collaborationist bounds. But Dubinsky overstepped his mark and slunk back into the AFL in defeat.

John L. Lewis and Sidney Hillman showed similar though less obvious inclinations even while they helped assure the success of building the CIO. The present undemocratic structure of the United Steelworkers was established under Lewis's personal direction, patterned after the UMW which was only recently returned to rank-and-file control after many bloody struggles by the membership. Hillman, for the purpose of controlling the rank-and-file, constantly pushed such incompetent class collaborators as Emil Rieve of the Textile Workers into positions of leadership.

The newly developing Left and militant trends in labor have opened up important opportunities for Communists and other progressives in the struggle to replace class-collaborationist control of the trade union movement with class-struggle policies so urgently needed in this crisis. It would be a disastrous mistake to underestimate the important part Communists have to play in this process. The work

of the Communist Party made significant contributions to developments leading up to the successful April 26th rally.

A most careful examination of our work is required. Two tendencies have emerged which can severely set us back if not corrected. One is the sectarian error of underestimating the meaning of what is happening. It expresses itself in an anarchistic, anti-leadership tendency—a tendency to scoff at the value of electing rank-and-file candidates (to minimize the importance of the victories of Miller and Sadlowski, for example). It is a tendency to dwell on the weaknesses, real or imagined, of such candidates but to miss the point of their victories. Another manifestation of such "Leftism" is found in such expressions as "I would never accept a position of trade union leadership. I will not let myself be corrupted." In fact, some comrades want to make a virtue of never seeking union office at any level.

There is also a tendency to downgrade such actions as the recent UAW rally of 10,000 in Washington and even the April 26 demonstration by exaggerating mistakes and weaknesses to the point of obliterating the basic impact of these actions. The *Guardian* of May 7 dismisses the whole April 26 demonstration by saying that it "was intended from the beginning not to articulate the genuine anger and strength of the working class, but to divert the outrage and inherent power of the working masses into a politely orchestrated pep rally on behalf of the Democratic Party." But what the *Guardian* overlooks—and what some of our comrades also may tend to overlook—is the fact that these labor leaders were compelled to assume sponsorship of a demonstration involving masses of workers, a type of action which they have diligently avoided for many a year. Such "Leftism" on our part will not only isolate us from the healthy trends maturing in the union leadership but will undermine any efforts to build grass-roots RANK-AND-FILE MOVEMENTS OF STRUGGLE.

The second tendency is one which swings to the Right. With the favorable turn of events our efforts to build united Left-Center relations at all levels of trade union leadership are being interpreted by some as an excuse for abandoning the building of rank-and-file movements. But to succumb to this would not only be a blow to our Party's work in the trade unions; it would also do serious damage to the emergent Left trend. For it is the unrelenting pressure of militant rank-and-file movements that has been the key to the new situation in the labor movement, and it will continue to play that role.

The *Draft Resolution* is correct in reaffirming our basic position of working to build rank-and-file movements starting with the problems of workers at the point of production and with major emphasis

on production workers in basic industry. What the new situation requires—and makes feasible—is the redoubling of efforts to build united front relations at all levels of union leadership around the militant demands coming from the rank-and-file movements. New initiatives going beyond April 26 are now needed in the fight for jobs. And conditions are ripening for a victorious campaign for a shorter work week with no reduction in pay.

In the struggle against unemployment new possibilities are developing to put an end to discriminatory hiring practices against Black and other minority group workers as well as against women, with the correction of past injustices in the process. This will mean a powerful blow against racism and a lasting contribution to working-class unity against the monopolies.

New opportunities exist in many areas. The movement for labor's political independence can now move from the probing to the planning stage. The paranoid anti-Communism of Meany and his Right-wing social-democratic supporters need no longer be a roadblock to U.S.-Soviet detente. The drive to curb the monopolies through nationalization of enterprises can move forward.

A new Left-Center coalition around such issues can be consolidated and become a dominant factor. Labor's rank and file is looking for bold, militant leadership. There is no place for sideline spectators in this struggle. We Communists in the trade unions have a special unifying role to play.

JAMES STEELE

Maoism and The Youth Movement*

In his greetings to this meeting, Comrade Gus Hall calls our attention to a very important thing. "As Marxists," he says, "we are all aware of the many sides of each development. The crisis gives rise to struggles and movements. It propels the process of radicalization. It also frees the popular mind from old, accepted concepts." Then he makes this crucial point: "People who are the victims of and feel the effects of the crisis are forced to think about the causes of the crisis. It is therefore a moment when we can initiate and lead mass struggles, as well as give to millions a deeper understanding of the nature of capitalism. *The crisis has placed the discussion and advo-*

*The following is an excerpt of a report given at a meeting of the Central Committee of the YWLL on March 15.

know that at a certain stage of the general crisis the masses cannot *cacy of socialism on the order of the day in a new way.*" (Emphasis added.)

This is fundamental. It is the question Lenin posed in 1917 in *The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It*. Aware that millions were in search of fundamental answers to the capitalist crisis, Lenin asked: "Can we go forward if we fear to advance towards socialism?" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 356.) Of course, the Russian proletariat and oppressed masses could not. And under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party they began rapidly to draw fundamental conclusions about the capitalist system. Only the opportunists and the ruling class feared to advance toward socialism.

The situation in this country today is in some ways similar. Millions of working people—among them the youth, especially the Black youth—offer fertile soil for the idea of socialism. This ideological development is influenced by the deepening of capitalism's general crisis and, in contrast, by the profoundly revolutionary role of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the struggles for detente and peaceful coexistence, for national liberation and social progress. And it is influenced especially by the example of life under socialism.

However, to say this is also to say that the people in their search for basic answers are increasingly influenced by and in fact are moving toward the Communist Party. This, too, is fundamental in relation to today's ideological struggles.

The ruling class and its ideologues, as in the pre-October 1917 days, move forward if they fear to advance toward socialism. And today the working masses are on the move. Monopoly capital cannot abort or divert this movement by means of traditional forms of Right-wing anti-Communist slogans and propaganda but must seek more and more to confuse the people with "left" hooks. Comrade Henry Winston, national chairman of the Party, points out that a "corollary to the crisis of capitalism is the crisis of anti-Communism. This crisis is evident, for example, in monopoly's desperate and escalating attempts to counter scientific socialism, the Marxist-Leninist analysis of class and national liberation, with other, more 'revolutionary' theories. Unlike Marxism-Leninism, such theories are so versatile that they can be adapted for use by ruling-class as well as radical circles." (*Strategy for a People's Alternative*, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1975, p. 27.)

This is a key aspect of the struggle for clarity in fighting against the current racist offensive and the economic crisis. It accounts for the "new combatants" recently alleged to be leading the battle against racism, for the new-found "liberators" of Black people and self-pro-

claimed "vanguards" of the working class.

Aware of the implications of the ideological development of tens of millions, who are objectively aligning themselves more and more with the line of the Party, the ruling class is making frantic efforts to destroy this new basis for Black-white working-class and democratic unity and prevent the development of class and socialist consciousness. Monopoly capital spares no expense in attempting to prevent Black workers and Black youth from embracing the Party. Because white workers and white youth, who now show a new level of willingness to reject racism and unite with Black and other oppressed peoples, are increasingly attracted to the line of the Party, monopoly now has to work overtime to win working-class whites back to racist positions. For these reasons, together with the crisis of bourgeois ideology in general and anti-Communism in particular, monopoly is driven to "counter scientific socialism . . . with other more 'revolutionary' theories . . . so versatile that they can be adapted for use by ruling class as well as radical circles."

Maoism, Ultra-Left Echo of the Right

We are well aware of the intensified drive of the Maoist "party of the new-new typers" against the growing influence of Marxism-Leninism among the people. This, too, is the ruling class at work, trying to turn back the rising influence of the Communist Party and the Young Workers Liberation League. Monopoly has fielded and given concerted support and opportunity (media exposure, etc.) to forces which pose serious problems for the people's movement. Their common characteristics are anti-Communism in the name of "Communism," disruption of unity in the name of "unity" and the use of Maoism to caricature Marxism-Leninism.

Amiri Baraka, for example, is no longer just a Pan-Africanist but is now a "revolutionary socialist," even a "Communist." He is no longer called "Imamu" but is now Chairman Baraka. Uniting with some of the most outrageous and clever chauvinists on the "Left," like Arthur Kinoy, Baraka has become a leading exponent of a new communist party.

The January-February issue of *Black Scholar* contains a revealing article by Baraka, in which he finally lets loose the full scope of his anti-Party, anti-Soviet venom. He charges that the CPUSA "toes the Moscow line." He accuses the Party of "collaborationist politics" and even maintains that the CPUSA is *more responsible* than the monopoly bourgeoisie for "scaring" Black folks away from socialism, because Black liberation, he says, "ain't at the top of their agenda."

Baraka comes up with this classic gem: "We found out that most

of those people who tried to make our liberation a minor detail were not communists at all, but revisionists, scoundrels who tried to revise Marx-Lenin-Mao, the principles of Marxism, so they could compromise in an unprincipled way with capitalism and make sell-out detente deals with the international bourgeoisie. It is these fake communists who liquidated our national struggles and called them minor details." Isn't this incredible, especially from the mouth of a so-called "revolutionary socialist"?

In the first place, the Party's record, from its founding, in the struggle for Black liberation is an outstanding one. The Communist Party, basing itself on the theoretical legacy of the great Lenin on the national question, was the first and only political party in the United States to establish the oppression of Black people as a special question, central to all movements and struggles. It is the Communist Party which elevated the fight for Black-white unity and against racism to the level of principle and which has correctly understood the centrality of Black liberation to the class struggle.

Secondly, the Party has always clearly distinguished between Marxism and Leninism on the one hand and Maoism on the other. It recognizes Maoism as an expression not of the principles of Marxism but of anti-Marxism. In direct contrast to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries led by Leninist parties, it is the Maoist grouping in China which recognized the fascist junta in Chile, which trades with apartheid South Africa, which supported the Pakistani forces of genocide against Bangladesh, which obstructed united assistance to Vietnam, and which now warns of a "Soviet peril" in Portugal and calls on NATO to take action, including intervention, to counteract it. It is Maoism which, as the *Draft Resolution* makes clear, connives in every way with imperialism.

It is the struggles of the peoples for detente and peaceful coexistence, including the peace forces of the United States, representing the majority of the population, that have checkmated U.S. imperialism and created the conditions for the historic advances currently taking place in Vietnam, Cambodia, southern Africa and the Middle East.

Baraka never says what the struggle for detente and peaceful coexistence should be replaced with. But that doesn't matter because he is simply resorting to sheer Maoist demagogy. He and other "new forces" of Maoism in the country no longer have serious international pretensions anyway. It is quite obvious that the CPSU and the other 73 Communist parties which, in addition to the CPUSA, recently elaborated the general line of the world Communist movement, based on adherence to Marxism-Leninism and not on the idle thought of

Mao Tse-tung, prefer Comrades Winston and Hall and the CPUSA, steeled in struggle and tested by time, to such elements as Amiri Baraka, Mark Smith, Owusu Sedaukai, Irwin Silber, Arthur Kinoy and company.

If one reads Baraka's article closely, one will find the key to his "second coming." He says that the struggle for Black liberation "is a struggle for socialism." What he is doing is denying the democratic content of the struggle for Black liberation and of the general working-class movement at the present moment. He is attempting to refute the anti-monopoly strategy of the Party. It is customary for Maoists to seek to skip stages. And it is helpful only to monopoly if Maoism succeeds in influencing masses with such counterrevolutionary, adventurist propositions.

In his "analysis" of the Black freedom movement, it is very significant that Baraka does not mention Martin Luther King even once. This is comparable to discussing the Abolitionist movement, the Civil War and Reconstruction without ever mentioning Frederick Douglass. But why does Baraka commit this sin of omission? Because he dare not openly attack King by name as "an old civil righter" who led "the people into compromise with capitalism." Black people would never tolerate that. So Baraka, without the slightest embarrassment, simply fails to mention the man who for twelve years led the movement which decisively changed contemporary U.S. history.

Although Baraka avoids mentioning Martin Luther King by name, he devotes himself to undermining Dr. King's great legacy, the essence of which is the struggle for peace and for the *complete equality* of Black people in every sphere of life, combined with the fight for the political power of the united multi-racial masses—in other words, the struggle for *advanced democracy*. The *objective kinship* of Dr. King's strategy with the anti-monopoly strategy of the Party is clear, as clear as the objective kinship of Frederick Douglass' anti-slavery strategy to that of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.

This is not the first time Baraka has emerged in the Black liberation movement challenging its main tasks. In the mid-sixties Martin Luther King began to pursue his poor people's campaign, a strategy which linked the struggle against racism and poverty with militant opposition to U.S. aggression in Vietnam. When the Johnson Administration escalated the war in 1967, multi-racial unity of the U.S. people was the day's cardinal task and the precondition to successful struggle against monopoly's racist offensive.

King's outspoken opposition to the Vietnam war as well as his strategy as a whole came under attack from both the Right and the "Left," inside and outside the Black community. The only position to

counter King which could acquire some mass following within the Black movement was a narrow nationalist one. And eventually all who feared moving forward, "Left" and Right, joined the bandwagon.

The long hot summer of 1967 showed that there was mass anger and resentment among Black people over the limited gains of a decade of militant mass struggle. Cultural nationalism played on this and directed that anger not against the real enemy: monopoly and its government, but against whites in general and therefore against the leading figure in the Black freedom movement who consistently fought for Black-white unity in the struggle against oppression.

The situation was made all the more opportune when the brutal assassination of Rev. King created a tremendous vacuum of leadership and ideological direction. Aided and abetted by FBI and CIA infiltration and disruption of many movement organizations, people like Baraka and Ron Karenga were able to impose their narrow cultural nationalist line on the Black liberation movement.

This did serious harm for several years. It diverted important forces, especially large numbers of Black youth and students, away from the main tasks which the new stage of the Black liberation struggles—the post-civil rights stage, as Comrade Winston called it—had placed on the order of the day. Baraka and Karenga were also the ring-leaders of the intolerant muscle tactics within the movement which sought to silence critics. (One remembers their performances at the Black Power conferences in the late 1960s.) They headed the anti-working class campaign which, in the name of Black unity, was directed against emergence of leadership of Black workers, against development of solidarity of white workers with the just demands of the Black people, and against crystallization of Black-white unity on a higher level.

Word Magic Revisited

Baraka now writes all this off by simply saying: "We were wrong." But if he was wrong all these years, why should anyone believe that he is right now? This is why he hides behind a "revolutionary socialist" facade. It is because of the mounting prestige of world socialism and the growing bankruptcy of capitalism in the eyes of the masses. It is because the one force in the world consistently able to make program and principle become reality is Marxism-Leninism. Hundreds of millions are inspired by the power and capabilities of the Communist and Workers' parties. In this country millions are inspired by what is happening in places like Portugal, France, Guinea-Bissau and Vietnam.

So they turn toward Marxism-Leninism, toward the Communist

Party, seeking to know more about its program and to hear its leaders. They know that the Party was the key to winning Angela Davis's life and freedom. With each passing day the Party's line becomes ever clearer, and the youth see also the YWLL emerging as an organization which serves their interests.

Many people marvel over the seemingly rapid conversion of Baraka to "scientific socialism." He himself attributes this to the influence of African revolutionaries such as Amilcar Cabral. But Cabral was a Marxist-Leninist, not a Maoist. We may well question this alleged "conversion" of Baraka. The thing about embracing Maoism is that one does not have to drop one's cultural nationalism, only its veneer. After all, Maoism *is* cultural nationalism dressed up in Marxist phraseology.

Baraka's "conversion" is not the result of his acceptance of Cabral's views. Indeed, who could hope to gain any respect by disagreeing with them? No, Baraka became a "Marxist-Leninist" precisely when thousands of Black readers turned the pages of Henry Winston's book *Strategy for a Black Agenda* to the chapter entitled "Contradictions in Baraka's Word Magic." Baraka was then forced to change his "Blackness" strategy to one of trying to "out-Communist" the Communist Party.

Thus, he plagiarizes the Party's analysis of various questions, only to distort the conclusions in order to turn them against the Party. He seeks to impose outlandish ideological conditions for unity on the broad Black liberation forces. And when the Party calls for unity on common issues he labels it revisionist because it does not call for socialist revolution. In doing so he seeks to make Black Marxist-Leninists appear repulsive to those mass forces who are prepared to fight for jobs but not for socialism, and so to restrict the participation of the Party and the League in united front movements.

Baraka attempts to intimidate Left-leaning Blacks with charges of collaborating with the "revisionist" Communist Party and "its 'youth arm' the YWLL." The objective is to counter the Party's role in building anti-imperialist solidarity with African liberation, in building a coalition movement capable of resisting racist and political repression, in building a Marxist-Leninist expression in the youth movement. It is to counter the Party's rapidly increasing attraction to Black masses and to try to isolate it and the League from broad Black trade union and democratic forces. In all these aspects, Baraka's activity is synonymous with the anti-Communist strategy and tactics of the ultra-Right sections of monopoly capital.

Just as his "first coming" was directed in substance against the

mass democratic line of Martin Luther King at a time when the Black people were ready to struggle for fundamental measures, so Baraka's "second coming" is directed against the advanced democratic anti-monopoly line of the Party, precisely at a time when new tasks and new possibilities for advance are before the people's movement. Perhaps those who have felt I was being too hard on Baraka will understand that what is at stake is the struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism. We must not hesitate to stand shoulder to shoulder as the militant reserve of the Party in the difficult ideological battles ahead. Every possible step should be taken to equip our membership with a clear understanding of the concrete expressions of Maoism, Trotskyism and other ultra-Left views. We must make of Baraka's "second coming" what Marx said of Hegel's statement that history repeats itself. "But what he forgot to add," Marx said, "was the first time as tragedy, the second as farce."

It is not enough that youth want to fight racism, to fight for Black liberation, for democracy, economic security, social progress and youth rights, even for socialism. What is decisive is that *young people learn to fight in the correct way*. Militant mass struggle, uniting all sections of the young people, against racism and unemployment is the best cure for the infantile disorder of "Left-wing" Communism in the youth movement.

FRANCES BORDOS

The Struggle for Detente

Gus Hall, in his report to the Central Committee in June, 1974 (*The Big Stakes of Detente*) places the question in its historic context as follows:

Each decisive moment in history has its point of focus, its decisive forces, its course of development. The essence of this moment, the balance of its forces, its direction, its currents and trends are all encompassed in the phrase "the struggle for detente."

The dynamics of detente express the processes, the historic shift in the balance of power at a time when the old system and its ruling class have lost their place of dominance to a new force representing a new social system and a new class that increasingly determines the course of human events. Detente expresses a qualitative change in international class relations.

In this period of pre-Convention discussion, it becomes necessary to take a closer look at the course of the struggle for detente in order to assess more concretely how well the essence of this moment is understood and whether the struggle for detente is indeed seen as the focal point. A number of key questions have to be dealt with and clarified in order to make this struggle more effective.

There are some who deal with detente as an abstraction and see this struggle as impractical because U.S. imperialism and its representatives such as Nixon, Ford and Kissinger are a gang of reactionary politicians and no agreements or treaties they sign are worth the paper on which they are written. While the characterization of these men and their ilk may be accurate, it is a one-sided assessment. It leads to the conclusion that we cannot win concessions from U.S. imperialism, that there is nothing that can be done to curb it short of revolution.

While U.S. imperialism is no "paper tiger" to be disposed of with the flick of a butane lighter, it is by no means invincible. Since 1961 thirteen major treaties and agreements have been signed and ratified of which eight were exclusively between the U.S. and the USSR, and the remainder were multilateral.

The struggle for detente presupposes a confidence in the policy of and the imperative for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. This policy as developed by Lenin becomes daily more effective as the basic foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist states, and strongly influences the direction which U.S. foreign policy must take. The reason for this is stated in the Draft Main Political Resolution for the 21st Convention of the C.P.U.S.A.:

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. . . .

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. . . .* (My emphasis —F.B.)

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.

But, as the Resolution continues, it points out that this new relationship does not change the nature of imperialism itself. This in no way, however, should obscure the continuing process of the weakening position and influence of world imperialism and the setbacks that the U.S. has been forced to sustain in Portugal, Greece, among the NATO forces, in Cambodia, and now the most ignominious of all, the end of the brutal, racist intervention in Vietnam.

But the wounded U.S. imperialist bull, while mustering its last spurts of ebbing strength to yet inflict untold harm and destruction, is doomed to succumb and be vanquished by the superior forces of a "united anti-imperialist alliance of the socialist states, the forces of national liberation and the democratic movements of the capitalist countries led by the working class." (Draft Resolution.)

Therefore, an evaluation of U.S. imperialism's position in the struggle for detente must be balanced with a deep appreciation for the anti-imperialist forces allied against it, and a confidence in the U.S. working class based on a Marxist-Leninist understanding of its viability in the struggle for detente.

* * *

One must also draw some pertinent lessons from the "Jobs Now" demonstration in Washington on April 26th. Of the more than 50,000 who marched from the Capitol to the stadium, most were union members, marching in defiance of the wishes of Meany. This action is an indication that the workers are no longer willing to be lulled into inaction by a Meany, Shanker, Abel or a Humphrey. And if they question the leadership of these class collaborators on their ability to lead in the struggle for jobs, they also question their Cold War adherence to anti-detente, pro-militarist positions. This was further evidenced by the many placards calling for cuts in the military budget and increased trade which means more jobs.

The many instances already of how trade with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries has guaranteed the jobs of workers and even created new ones in the U.S. are not to be decried as a means of propping up U.S. monopoly capitalism, but rather as a means of winning workers to see more clearly their own self-interest in pursuing the struggle for detente and peaceful coexistence.

The *Wall Street Journal*, an accurate mirror of the interests of U.S. finance capital, in an editorial on April 30th attacks the idea

of detente as expressed in an article—of which they reprint a condensed version—titled “A Soviet View of Detente” by A.I. Sobolev, head of the Department of History at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism. To answer the charge that peaceful coexistence is helping the imperialists to solve their own contradictions, Sobolev states:

It becomes increasingly difficult in the course of peaceful coexistence for capitalism to use various extraordinary measures (intensifying authoritarian power, speculating on the threat of war, slanderous arguments about the aggressive intentions of the Socialist countries and so forth) to solve their contradictions. That is why peaceful coexistence does not lead to the weakening of the contradictions of capitalism, but in the long run, if one can put it this way, locks capitalism's social economic relations within the framework of its natural laws, on which soil its contradictions develop most fully.

The editorial also answers the question of whether favorable action on the question of detente can be expected from U.S. monopoly capital (and aren't they the ones who determine the actions of the Fords and Kissingers?). It states:

Both events in Portugal and the Sobolev analysis underline the warnings issued a few weeks ago by *The Economist*: “The danger to the democracies of Europe no longer comes mainly from the risk of a direct Soviet invasion. . . . It comes from the possibility that the Communist parties in a number of European countries may be able to climb to power, and then be undislodgable from it. . . .

So this is detente. Even this kind of detente, so long as we do not mislead ourselves about its meaning, is preferable to bristling hostility.

It would seem that the *Wall Street Journal* is developing a more realistic assessment of the relation of world forces today and the relative weakness of the U.S. within that.

* * *

The present moment evolves out of the dialectical processes of the past decade. The counteroffensive launched by the Communist Party, USA against the Cold War and McCarthyism in 1961; the unfolding of the Black liberation movement under the leadership of Martin Luther King, Jr. and the struggle against racism; the development of solidarity with the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America; the growth of militant rank-and-file formations in large sections of the trade union movement, particu-

larly in basic industries; the tremendous groundswell in the struggle against U.S. aggression in Indochina; the popular mass indignation that developed with the Watergate revelations and the impeachment movement which forced Nixon's resignation—all attest to the massing of the democratic people's forces against the decay and corruption of U.S. monopoly capitalism and to a large degree they have swept aside the fears and restrictions imposed by the McCarthy era.

The new mood of militancy of the working people and the democratic, progressive forces is everywhere evidenced in the rapid multiplication of movements and struggles on new levels. But these new developments have also been accompanied by an intensification by the ruling class of its anti-Communist, anti-Soviet ideological campaigns which has made it most difficult for large sections of the people to part company with the Cold War mentality. While more and more workers have been able to identify their self-interests with detente on the basis of their practical experience that relates to the question of jobs, this is not so, in the main, for the liberals, for large sections of the peace movement, for many who claim to be for socialism and call themselves “anti-imperialists.”

Trotskyites, anarchists, Maoists and other extremists as well as Right-wing social democrats are blind to the dialectics of international detente as a combination of cooperation and struggle. They accuse the Soviet Union and other socialist countries of denying support to revolutionary forces, and assert that peaceful coexistence is surrender to the class enemy. The present-day “Leftist” phrasemongers refuse to understand that the prime obligation of a revolutionary today is to prevent a world thermonuclear conflict and assure the physical survival of nations. (See “The Dialectics of Detente,” *World Marxist Review*, September 1974.)

Another sector in the peace movement with blind emotional hysteria fails to recognize that they have fallen prey to the racist policies of Zionism in terms of Israeli aggression against the Arab states. The main enemy becomes the Soviet Union. This too, although it goes beyond the “defenders” of Israel, then becomes joined with the hue and cry for “intellectual freedom” in the Soviet Union. All, the ultra-“Leftists,” the racists, the liberals and Zionists, join with the most reactionary ruling forces against detente and peaceful coexistence.

This anti-Communist, anti-Soviet venom persists because of the lack of a working-class basis among these sectors of the peace movement indicated above. Therefore, it is denied that the struggle for

detente is the class struggle on a world scale and the beneficiary of such a denial is monopoly capital, U.S. imperialism. Who else benefits from a weakening of the world-wide alliance against U.S. imperialist policies and aggression?

It becomes urgent therefore for Communists in particular to mount a struggle to expose the true meaning of this anti-Soviet, anti-Communist ruling class offensive. This deterrent to the full unfolding of the class struggle by pursuing the objective of making detente irreversible can no longer be side-stepped or passed over with the idea that the movement for world peace will somehow develop in spite of such ideological roadblocks. Only the highest degree of unity of the working class, the oppressed minority peoples and the general progressive community can be successful in curbing and then defeating the forces of reaction.

One final obstacle to the struggle for detente is the influence of racism among the anti-detente forces in the peace movement. The Vietnam war was never fully recognized as being racist in character by large sectors of the peace movement. Nor was there full appreciation that among the U.S. troops the Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano and other minorities as well as their families at home were hardest hit by the draft and in actual combat. The effects of the war and the military budget, inflation and unemployment again takes its greatest toll among the oppressed minority workers. And the greatest exploitation and repression is directed against the non-white peoples both at home and abroad.

Some of the "Leftists" and progressives in the peace movement, as well as in other struggles, do not see that their avoidance of or opposition to detente is slowing the struggle for liberation. Henry Winston in *Strategy for a People's Alternative* presents this argument very sharply and in clear perspective:

Isn't the crushing armaments burden imposed by imperialism linked to the crisis of existence for the exploited and oppressed here and in all capitalist countries? Isn't the struggle to force imperialism's retreat from its cold war positions of intervention and armed confrontation central to the anti-imperialist struggle in Africa, Asia and Latin America? . . . How can one talk about stopping U.S. imperialism without forcing it to respect the right of peaceful coexistence for the Soviet Union and the socialist camp? The struggle to make peaceful coexistence irreversible is the core of the anti-imperialist struggle for liberation and social progress. . . ." (P. 45.)

One needs also to see the relevance of the struggle for the in-

dependence of Puerto Rico not only for the primary reason that the Puerto Rican people must have the right of self-determination, but because the struggle for detente is also very closely linked to this struggle for independence. In the "Appeal for Puerto Rico" issued from the Preparatory Meeting for the International Conference in Solidarity with the Independence of Puerto Rico held in Havana March 30-31, 1975, we have the following statement:

In a world in which the forces of peace, freedom and socialism are imposing an international detente, Puerto Rico is a gigantic military base from which U.S. imperialism threatened Venezuela with intervention in 1958, organized the invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965, and has plotted subversive armed attacks against Cuba as was seen in the Bay of Pigs invasion. There, in Puerto Rico, under an ill-disguised colonial slavery, the United States has atomic weapons which are endangering world peace and the security of the peoples.

* * *

The urgent need to heighten the struggle for detente, in light of the questions raised here, is not yet fully appreciated in the ranks of our Party and for that reason even less so in the mass movements. More educational material delving into the basic correctness of this policy at this moment is required so that a more vigorous fight can be waged to have detente become the very heart of the program of the peace and anti-imperialist forces, with heightened activity in the ranks of the working class.

While the struggle for detente is discussed in the Draft Resolution in the section "The World Scene" and again in "The General Crisis in the United States," the weaknesses and requirements to combat them should be dealt with in the section "The Peace Movement." For even though the struggle for detente cannot be confined to the peace movement alone, there cannot be an effective drive for peace without detente as a major focus.

It is also necessary to point out that every struggle that is directed against monopoly capitalism—whether it be on the economic, social or political front—weakens the ability of U.S. imperialism to maneuver and continue its aggression and oppression at home and abroad. If we thus plug in all struggles and movements to the fight for detente, we can and will help make it irreversible.

The Need for a Cultural Program *

Since the earliest days of recorded history, the visual arts have played a major role in projecting and preserving the multi-aspects of current life. In fact, recorded history started with the first graphic representations—primitive drawings on the walls of caves, still-undeciphered hieroglyphics, crude sculptures of fertility goddesses, decorated pottery. Much of what we know of our origins has been learned from these archeological finds.

And from these graphic remains we learn that in those earliest days there were musicians, scribes, dancers, actors, craftsmen—as well as visual artists. Artistic creation, then, is a natural and universal means of expression and communication. Throughout the ages these forms of expression have enriched lives and contributed to the understanding, education and enjoyment of all peoples.

In addition, of course, the role of the arts as a medium for propaganda must not be underestimated. Especially in the last century, since science and technology have provided the processes to facilitate the production and distribution of posters, newspapers, leaflets, pamphlets, etc., and have perfected means of mass communication—radio, TV and cinema—political concepts have reached the majority of literate people. Daumier's cartoons, Picasso's "Guernica," Rivera, Orozco, and Siqueiros' murals, Woody Guthrie's songs and Eisenstein's films are classic examples.

Where there are liberation struggles going on, we get posters of protest—as from African countries. Where liberation struggles have led to victory, we get posters of jubilation—for example, the Communist Party of Portugal, underground for 50 years, issued a whole series of splendid posters to celebrate its emergence. And there is no need to describe the distinctive political graphics, films and performing arts of the socialist countries. There is no doubt that the arts are an accepted and important vehicle in political work.

And never before has an exploiting class made such massive use of art forms as does U.S. imperialism. In its attempt to corrupt, seduce, brainwash and distract the public, crime, racism, violence and pornography dominate the mass media. Anti-Communist ads are featured as subway posters, nihilism is the theme of "pure art" pro-

moted by the Rockefellers and their peers; neuroses, frustrations, sex and witchcraft are the subject matter of current "literature."

But in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, a people's culture, a culture reflecting the needs of the oppressed minorities, a working-class culture begins to emerge via the struggles of the people for their rights. Thus, we see in the United States a renaissance of Black, Latin, Asian-American and Native American poetry, theater, literature and art. We see women fighting for the right to take their place in the cultural world. We see artists of the working class being born. And we see a turn towards the socialist world for inspiration.

However, the Communist Party of the USA has barely started to consider the potential for effective use of its cultural forces. Whereas the CP was once a leading influence in cultural work—both in organizing artists and in ideological and artistic input—the entire area of "culture" has been practically neglected since the WPA projects of the 1930s depression years, since the days when top writers and artists contributed to the *New Masses*, and since the First American Artists Congress Against War and Fascism, attended by over 400 of the leading U.S. artists and a delegation from Mexico including Orozco and Siqueiros.

After World War II, during the 1950s, when the forward drive of the Party was halted by McCarthy witchhunts, harassment and ostracism, the face of the Party practically disappeared, including its cultural image. But for some time now, the Communist Party has been recouping its forces, regaining strength lost to fear and persecution. And now that the Party is being accepted in many mass movements, now that the Party can and does play a leading vanguard role in the struggles against racism, war, unemployment, exploitation, super-profits, and all the other aspects of U.S. imperialism—now it is vital to the success of our efforts to bring the image of the Communist Party of the United States into public view and into the fight for a working-class culture. And in this aim—to build the Party and to see to it that it becomes an accepted part of the political and cultural life of the country—the participation of the Party's cultural forces as an integral and continuous component of all programs and actions is of vital importance.

Yet the CP has failed to make a basic analysis of U.S. culture, of the economic problems that face cultural workers in their professional lives, of the racism faced by Black, Latin and Native American artists. Nor has there been any attempt to encourage and develop the very real talents of working-class artists whose jobs in industry

*This article was written for the New York Artists' Club.

could lead them to portray the day to day aspects of the class struggle through the visual and performing arts. Creativity is not limited to "professionals," nor are all artists "intellectuals." In fact, working-class art, in all its forms, must come from the working class, and artists who create such art, regardless of the source of their income, must be classified as workers. Thus the Party must clarify its approach to cultural work.

Unfortunately we have fallen into the trap of reflecting bourgeois notions of cultural production as a Sunday afternoon hobby. Art has become an appendage to speeches, campaigns and fundraisers instead of an effective partner. We have been insensitive to cultural workers, regarding them as dispensable providers of services upon last-minute demand. They have been regarded as temperamental, undependable and ideologically underdeveloped. Rarely have they been involved in the initial stages of planning. The assignment of cultural tasks is haphazard, which often results in a duplication of efforts. This pattern of work causes resentment and reinforces individualistic tendencies. But only by fully integrating our artists into the Party and giving more attention to cultural work will we be able to successfully counteract the decadent use of the cultural media by the capitalist system. It is the responsibility of the organization and its members to further develop collective methods of work.

Culture is an instrument of class struggle. We must use our skills to attack the capitalists, to inspire and unite the forces of peace and progress, the workers, the oppressed. The arts, because of their direct and powerful impact on the minds and hearts of people and their potential for changing attitudes, must be enlisted in the fight against racism.

The first and most obvious step must certainly be the reconstitution of a Cultural and Mass Media Commission, with the prestige and importance given the other commissions. Members of the Commission from the various cultural fields will have to work closely with other commissions and with the national and state and regional offices, as well as with specialized groups working closely with the Party, so that activities can be planned and coordinated.

Once a Cultural Commission is operative, programs can be developed and projects can be carried out for maximum effectiveness. There are as many possibilities for using cultural forces as there are cadres to cooperate. And make no mistake—we have artists and technicians who rank with the best—writers, actors, painters, graphic artists, muralists, photographers, architects, musicians, dancers, poets, craftsmen, film makers.

It is not the purpose of this report to set out a definitive program, but even immediately there are steps that can be taken:

The Artists Club—i.e., the graphic artists—are in the process of setting up a workshop. Its immediate purpose is to provide whatever the Party or affiliated progressive groups require: a design for a pin to commemorate the Party convention; posters for May Day; a leaflet for distribution at a rally; an invitation for a fund-raising affair; Xmas cards to raise funds for the *Daily World*, etc., etc. It is hoped that eventually the workshop will attract other graphic artists, Party and non-Party, and those who want to learn. There may be classes, lectures, open houses, exhibits, etc. But even now, without equipment or adequate workspace (there are facilities but they must be cleaned up, painted and equipped), there is a group willing to and capable of taking on projects.

Another example—for about a year now we have had a new publication—the *Cultural Reporter*. This publication has with amazing competence tried to cover the cultural field and to raise questions and stir interest. A Cultural Commission could see to it that other comrades become involved, submit articles, contribute linecuts, help with technicalities. We have lots of writers and journalists, as well as graphic artists, in the Party. We own a videotape machine and a tape recorder which are not being put to use.

A comrade has offered to give classes at the Marxist Center in the production of film strips, but the curriculum has gotten lost in someone's desk drawer.

Comrade Gus Hall, in a recent talk to the staff of the *Daily World*, stressed the need for the Party to come out of hiding. For too long its members have worn the masks of the Democratic Party, mass organizations, even the Republican Party. But now, Comrade Hall says, the days of secret participation are over. The time is now to build a mass people's movement with the Communist Party as an open participant, and with Communists functioning as Communists.

And if the Communist Party is to be accepted, if the influence of the Communist Party is to grow, it is necessary to show the people of the United States, and the world, that there IS an active, growing Communist Party in this country. Certainly the capitalist press is not going to give us favorable publicity, cover our functions, give us credit for our organizational activities, interview our leaders sympathetically, praise our fight against racism. So we have to redouble our efforts to project the image of the Party. For too long the importance of cultural cadres for this task have been underestimated. This attitude must change. NOW.

On Sectarianism

On July 4 last year, nearly 10,000 persons marched on Raleigh, the state capital of North Carolina. This was the largest demonstration in the South since the death of Martin Luther King. It was perhaps the largest demonstration in the country since the signing of the Paris peace accords. And, as everybody on the march knew (and knew before coming), the Communist Party was an intrinsic part of the leadership of the march.

Our Party press hailed the march for the tremendous success that it was. Our Political Committee took pride in the leading role of our comrades. Communists were on nearly every one of the scores of buses returning home from Raleigh. And from many we heard the pledge to build the Alliance, based on the knowledge from Raleigh that we really could reach out to millions, that we could organize and win victories, that our time has come.

Our Party's 21st Convention will be held just a few days short of a year after the march on Raleigh. It will be a good gauge for the comrades in the districts and the leadership to determine what has been done to put into practice the enthusiasm of Raleigh and to check up on the Party's role in each district in building the National Alliance.

Of course, as the Draft Main Political Resolution notes, the building of a movement against racist and political repression has been only one area of our mass work, albeit one of the more successful. The general thrust of the Resolution is one to which we can fully subscribe, namely that we are in a new period, and that we must understand what is new and act with a new boldness to assert our vanguard role. Last July 4 in Raleigh showed that we are capable of doing so. But it is necessary, vital and an absolute requisite that we understand what that vanguard role is in practice. Words alone are not enough. Never has one country seen so many self-proclaimed "vanguards" as we have today in the United States.

* * *

As the Draft Resolution points out, the objective conditions have never been better for our Party to do battle: the Cold War is waning as many of the anti-Communist myths have been shattered; detente is becoming recognized as a necessity for our times; most anti-Communist laws have been declared unconstitutional; the superiority

of the socialist countries is becoming increasingly evident to growing numbers of our people; the mass illusions—about the indestructibility of the U.S. military, the lofty morality of the country's political leadership, the ability of the capitalist system to meet our daily needs—all have been seriously eroded in the last decade.

It is very significant that fully half of the Draft Resolution is devoted to mass movements. This is where we must be. Comrade Gus Hall correctly pointed out in his remarks to the Central Committee last December that the potential growth of our Party will be realized to the extent that we are bold in approaching this new period. Comrade Hall also, correctly we believe, pointed out that all too often we have outstanding actions on a national level but build no grass-roots base to support this. One obvious indication of this problem is the number of outstanding conferences we help to organize which dissipate into inactivity when the conference delegates return home. Our comrades have become quite skilled at *mobilizing* for conferences. Where we are lacking is in *organizing* when the conferences are over. The difference between mobilizing and organizing is most important. In the past 15 years, literally millions of people were mobilized in demonstrations around civil rights and peace issues. The lack of sustained, continuous organization, however, is apparent to anyone who cares to look.

Another similar manifestation of the same problem is our ability to gather names of prominent non-Party forces in support of activities we engage in, initiate and organize. This is fine and a quite proper method of work to show breadth and garner even wider support. Unfortunately, sometimes these sponsors, steering committees and executive boards remain on the letterhead and are not actively involved, consulted, worked and discussed with, in the actual dynamic of the organizations. True, the latter way of working is infinitely more difficult, time-consuming, delicate and often frustrating. But it is also absolutely necessary if we are to be serious about what we say, if we are to lend substance to our discussion of united fronts.

* * *

Which brings up to the primary question we wish to raise in this discussion—the question of sectarianism in our methods of work. The pre-Convention discussion not only considers our main line and the election of our leading bodies for the coming period, but it also reviews the work of the period since the last convention. The pre-convention discussion is a time of intense criticism and self-criticism out of which comes a Party stronger and more confident in its

ability to correct weaknesses and to grow. We believe the problem of sectarianism is one that deserves our closest attention in this discussion.

We have alluded to only a couple of ways sectarianism rears its ugly head. There are others. One of the most serious is the confusion by comrades of what is a united front. Basically a united front is the coming together of various forces who *disagree* on many questions, including fundamental ones, but who join with one another to accomplish agreed upon goals which, alone, they would be unable to accomplish. The Communist Party enters into united fronts in numerous areas with forces who may or may not agree on socialism, on the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the need for a Leninist party, on the belief of the primary contradiction between the working class and the capitalist class—in short, on the fundamental underpinnings of our Party. If there was agreement on these questions, presumably these forces would be in our Party. We have a front with them on the question of, say, peace in Indochina, however, because on that goal we can agree. Such a united front is the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression.* While our Party plays a role in the Alliance of which we can be proud, it is not “our” Alliance alone. Modesty should accompany the pride we feel and should be reflected—together with the pride—in the final Political Resolution.

Many comrades are confused about this. Some look upon the Alliance (and other united fronts of which the Party is a part) as “intermediary organizations”—groups initiated, organized and guided by the Party to attract non-Party forces to the Party. That the whole Party is not clear about the distinction between united fronts and intermediary organizations is seen in many ways. After the July 4 march in Raleigh, as we have already mentioned, there was a magnificent opportunity to build the Alliance, uniting with other forces, to create a truly mass movement. But not all the comrades understood this, including some of the comrades who have been assigned to work in the area of defense. Rather than building Alliances with the thousands of people who felt strongly enough and committed enough to travel to Raleigh, some comrades sought to turn the brothers and sisters who shared the buses into precinct workers for Party and YWLL election campaigns. (Undoubtedly some of these non-Party forces were prepared to help out. But as a whole, they

*Throughout the Draft Resolution, the word “Racism” is used instead of “Racist” in referring to the name of the Alliance. This should be changed in the adopted Political Resolution.

clearly were not. The result was that they neither worked on our election campaigns nor were Alliances built.) More often the sisters and brothers were forgotten altogether. A precious moment was lost.

Another, similar error is the use of Party bookstores and education centers as centers of Alliance (and other united front) activity. If we are in a true alliance with others, we should either be meeting in a “neutral” center—a church, community hall, union hall or whatever—or at least in each other’s headquarters on a rotating basis. The fact that it takes so much explaining and effort to get comrades to understand such a basic proposition indicates that we have a serious problem of not understanding united front work. In some cases there is simply bureaucratic inertia, and a “no-struggle” attitude of taking the “easy” route.

There are at least two Party districts where no Alliance yet exists, but in which Party representatives, when addressing non-Party bodies on questions of repression, have spoken in the name of the Alliance. Usually the problem does not reach such extremes. In some cases, comrades, understanding the need of work in the field of defense but lacking the experience or the confidence to build united fronts, will rely on other comrades and on the Party organization to be the base of the Alliance.

This reflects a weakness in Party education perhaps, because while comrades are fairly well grounded in ideological and even strategic concepts, we are lacking in organizational understanding. Perhaps the Party schools and Marxist centers should offer training courses in organizing.

In united front work, a good Communist should be equal to 10 non-Party members in dedication, sacrifice, organizational ability, political acumen. But many times, we find Party-led “mass organizations” which are predominantly Communist, indicating either a lack of ability or a lack of confidence or both. Again, this is a serious problem to overcome if we are to realize the potential of the times.

We devote so much space to this question because we believe it is the key to making the great advances we know are possible in this period. Moreover, the mastering of united front work and the elimination of sectarianism are essential to the strategic implementation of our Party’s program. It should go without saying that we cannot have an antimonopoly coalition without a coalition.

But sometimes we build coalitions in name only, “letterhead” coalitions in which we are virtually the only force. Obviously it is self-defeating to talk breadth and build narrowly. Our deeds must match our words. As a Party we are capable of this task, but we must ful-

fill our capabilities. Revolutionaries must prove themselves each day in struggle, over and over again. It is imperative to our role as the vanguard of the U.S. working class.

The masses will come to see us as a vanguard. But first they must see us. We completely subscribe to the Draft Resolution when it states that "the possibilities for the growth in size and influence of our Party are considerably greater than what has been realized in practice, and they will become greater still. Therefore we have to assess what stands in the way, and what more needs to be done in order to realize the objective possibilities." (P. 73.) The Draft Resolution goes on to give the required assessment of "what stands in the way and what more needs to be done." It concludes that "all Communist standards of work must be measured against the yardstick of leadership of masses in struggle." We absolutely agree.

The growth and influence of the Party is precisely the point of this paper. We can only recruit if we have ties with the masses. Obviously we cannot recruit new Party members from within the Party, except perhaps by producing "red-diaper babies." There are all too many comrades, including unfortunately some leading cadres, who see their political work as "internal" work or who even see their leadership role confined to leading "inside" the Party. We have to master the elimination of the separation of "Party leadership" and "mass leadership." They have to become the same thing. When we run candidates for public office we sometimes offer comrades who are known only to the Party, who have no mass base. We cannot take the working class so lightly. Election time is one of the few times that working people get to assert their political temper. We must offer to them our best comrades. The same is true for our mass work in general. If comrades are good enough to give leadership "inside" the Party, certainly they should be good enough to give leadership to masses outside the Party. And similarly, if comrades are proven leaders of masses they should become leaders of the Party as well.

It should be clear to anyone that our Party is absolutely correct when we say we are in a new period of history. After Vietnam, Watergate and the economic crisis, millions of our people have lost confidence in the capitalist system and are starting to look for alternatives. We know that socialism is the only viable answer to the crisis and masses are beginning to see that as well. Our task now is to join with the masses in fighting for that answer. The working class and the people need our Party but we need the working class and the people. As new forces begin to develop a socialist perspec-

tive we must be at their side. We can only do this if we have built ties to them in day-in and day-out working relationships. People have learned to distrust words. Deeds are what count, and rightfully so. Our Party has to be seen in action as not only having the correct analysis of the moment and the best vision of the future, but we have to be seen as the best fighters, the most dedicated of militants. These are the qualities that have won Communists the leadership of the working class in Vietnam, in Chile, in Portugal.

Not only must we work to win the working class and the people's confidence, we must also be open to them as they approach socialism. Unquestionably, tens of thousands are starting to talk about socialism. Socialism is becoming a mass issue. It is our responsibility as Communists to talk socialism with them. Of course new voices for socialism will often be mistaken on this, that or another point. Should that prevent us from talking to them and trying to win them? Of course not. Yet sometimes we fail to do so. When syndicated columnist and former McGovern supporter Pete Hamill announced in a lengthy statement that he has come to understand that socialism is the only alternative for our country to the evils of monopoly capitalism, we should have embraced him and welcomed him on board the train to socialism. But instead, because he said a few stupid things about the Soviet Union, our *Daily World* ran a series of five or six articles virtually branding Hamill as an enemy. Could we not have agreed with him where he was right, which was in 90 per cent of his statement, and shown where we disagreed? Ideological struggle should be conducted to win people, not to lose them.

Another example: Since our last Party convention, the Puerto Rican Pro-Independence Movement has become the Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP). PSP has become a mass movement for socialism in the barrios of our country (aside from its influence in Puerto Rico itself). The PSP is a young party; it has not yet made the full transition to a socialist party. It has its share of opportunists and anti-communists. Its practice is sometimes sectarian and narrow. Still, can any comrade argue that the development of a mass movement for socialism in the Puerto Rican communities is not a positive development to be welcomed? There are forces, including leading forces in PSP, who are Marxist, who are partisans of the world Communist movement, who want unity with our Party. How do we influence this development best—by working closely with it or by holding it at arm's length? If we cannot enter into coalition with such forces, with whom will we have an antimonopoly coalition? The questions are rhetorical, of course, because the answers are

obvious.

There are hundreds of Pete Hamills and PSPs (this is not meant to imply that Hamill and the PSP are at all equal) that we can win if we are willing. Of course we do *not* include in this category such outfits as Revolutionary Union, whose express purpose is to destroy our Party.

The problem of sectarianism represents an ideological and organizational fear of the masses. But we should have nothing to fear. Our Party is capable of meeting the challenge of the times. Our ideas are subscribed to by hundreds of millions of people around the world. They can be the ideas and we can be the organization of millions here in the United States. Comrades, if we unite with others we have nothing to lose but sectarianism. We have an entire class and a people to win.

BETTY SMITH

The Need for the Communist Party

The working class cannot eliminate capitalism and with it capitalist crises without its own political party, one guided by the Marxist-Leninist science of social change. Only such a party is able to organize, unite, and lead the struggle of the working class and its allies to defeat the monopolies and establish socialist power. This is the essential, Leninist party of the new type, the Communist Party.

It is not difficult to get agreement about the indispensability of our Party in the struggle against monopoly and for socialism. But it is still much too difficult to get specific explanations as to why, if we are convinced our Party is essential to advancing and winning the class struggle, we find such reluctance in our ranks to try to convince other activists—to recruit them into the Party.

The Draft Resolution for our 21st Convention lists eight major areas of mass work in which our Party already is, or can be, a major force in developing mass struggles. Within these general categories are many more—tenants' struggles, schools, taxes, ecology, energy, transit, child-care, etc.—in which comrades are active. Some of these struggles begin spontaneously, without specific Party initiatives. How well do our clubs and higher organizations respond? How often are we able to join in with such shop or neighborhood actions to try to develop them to a higher level of struggle and ideological clarity? A key measure of how effectively we do so is

whether or not we recruit new members in the course of such activity. Another gauge of our own confidence in the role of our Party is how quickly we can end the examples we still have of one Communist, one shop, or one or two Communists to a key housing development or neighborhood block.

Confidence in the role of our Party is based on our confidence in the capacity and future of the working class. Some comrades see class struggle mainly as the economic struggle carried on in the shops and trade unions. On the other hand this is sometimes even perceived as a "narrow" struggle, compared to forms of community or city-wide activity. We need to be clear and consistent that the class struggle means for all comrades the fight to place the working class at the head of mass struggles. It means developing the fight so as to advance the struggle for a political power that will curb the monopolies and move forward to building socialism. This goal is impossible to achieve without advancing the leading role of the basic working class, united and guided by its Leninist Party.

The Draft Resolution lists other obstacles to recruiting. One of these is the influence of racism among potential white recruits, and the presence of white chauvinist errors among Party members which discourages Black and other specially oppressed from joining. White chauvinism is an obstacle to recruiting from many aspects. How does a white Communist in a shop or key neighborhood coalition behave so as to convey an understanding of the need for unity against racism? Is this understanding of the fundamental self-interest of white workers and the working class in Black-white unity convincing to other white workers? Does the white comrade in the shop or on the block give effective leadership in defense of victims of racist firings, frame-ups, police brutality? Are these problems discussed in the Party collective for assistance so as to guarantee adequate follow through and the best possible solution? Seeking answers to these and similar questions indicates how serious we are about building our Party, and our level of confidence in the working class.

A willingness to take on problems and struggle for collective answers to them is the opposite of reliance on spontaneity. However, there are still too many examples of confusing the inevitability of socialism with its spontaneous arrival when the conditions are more developed than at present. Of course, it is not put so plainly, but the idea is present in many of our habits and attitudes. A few districts now have a plan of work for Party-building, but most do not, nor is there a national plan or a national recruiting leaflet or pamphlet. And while our Party is growing, we have not organized a

recruiting drive which would not only increase our membership but provide us with rich, many-sided experiences from which to improve our recruiting in the future.

It has often been said that some clubs insist on unrealistically high standards for new members, and use "standards" as a method of restricting membership. Often these are also clubs which have no specific focus for their political work, and therefore don't feel the need for new members. We must work to shift such clubs from being a group of comrades, each of whom may have a different mass or Party assignment, to a club with one main purpose and a definite concentration point.

As we do this, we can develop a fight for higher standards of Party membership in a way that will be an aid to recruiting and not an obstacle. The new draft Constitution has an added requirement for membership, which is part of the fight to raise our standards of activity and collective work. In addition to accepting the Party Constitution and program as determined by the Convention, belonging to a club and participating in its activities, and paying dues, members will be asked to *carry out club decisions*. Presumably that will include decisions to speed up recruiting and new approaches to potential members. The first approach is a plan of work, at the national as well as district and club levels. Part of such a plan must be the stepped-up use of Party literature to bring potential recruits closer to the Party and to answer those questions which are obstacles to membership. Planned and consistent circulation of our press and the fight for subscriptions is a basic aid to recruiting. These measures will help, but other forms are needed. Each district, and in some cases, each city or section organization needs a regular, structured, on-going series of classes for new members and potential members. Such classes will at the same time be a means of valuable educational training and refreshment for the present club leaders and other district cadre who will conduct the classes. While national cadre can participate in various districts from time to time, we need a system of classes so widespread and continuing that the local cadre *must* be the main core which leads them.

Our national schools and nationally-sponsored one or two week schools in major cities have produced enough experience and material so that it should be possible to provide outlines, summaries and similar teaching aids to districts. *Party Affairs* might also contain more such material and outlines on current articles or topics.

Some of the bookshops and neighborhood centers we have established are now not open during the hours that workers could most easily get to them—evenings and weekends. Along with ongoing

THE NEED FOR THE CP

classes and forums, we might examine whether in some districts a form of neighborhood "political club" (*not* Party club) would help involve activists who are beyond the age of YWLL membership. Where there is not a YWLL organization, the classes would help to build one in a short time. But the "political club" could be a means of lively educational and informal social activity, as well as a center for struggle on the issues which concern that neighborhood.

If such a "club" could develop ties with an unemployment center or union hall nearby, activities of a much wider scope would be possible, and provide the Party club in the area with an advanced mass base.

The struggle for higher standards in mass work, organizational methods, and in developing the collective life of the clubs will raise higher the Party spirit of the membership and help the clubs become the kind of units that its members are proud to introduce to recruits.

Another part of Party-building is to convey to others what the Party has contributed to the effectiveness of the individual's work in the union or the neighborhood. Too often, comrades with good mass ties act as if their effectiveness is due solely to their personal abilities. Of course, this is a factor, but most of the credit for sustained mass leadership should go to the Party collective, and doing this would bring others closer to joining the Party.

Our Party has been an important factor in many victories for the working class and people since our '72 Convention. Comrade Angela Davis won bail, and was freed. The McCarran Act was defeated. We contributed to movements of struggle such as the NAAPR, NCFIU, Chile Solidarity, Solidarity with African Liberation, the Conference Against the Military Budget, and many labor rank-and-file developments. The monopolies' claims that they had mastered control over the economy, the political system, and imperialist adventures, have suffered a series of defeats. The Watergate exposures, the energy crisis and the depression, and the rout of U.S. imperialism by the heroic Vietnamese people, have led tens of thousands to deeper questioning about the nature of capitalism and the path ahead.

We know the struggle for democracy and against imperialism will be on the agenda as long as monopoly capitalism survives. But the developments of the past few years should help us to end the errors which flow from an overestimation of the stability of the monopolies and an underestimation of the potential for mass struggles. There is still a lag in the adjustment of many comrades to this new and changing reality. We have not yet thought through the potential for

work among the unemployed; we underestimate the possibilities of the Youth United for Jobs campaign and fail to give maximum assistance to the YWLL. Nationally as well as at the district level we are very slow to commit forces and fulfill plans for building Women for Racial and Economic Equality (WREE). All of this indicates we have not yet digested the impact of the last few years on the working class and its allies, particularly Black and other specially oppressed peoples, women, and youth. We have not fully acted upon the fact that class collaboration can be defeated as the dominant trend in the labor movement in the coming period.

Persistence in this underestimation of the potential for further successes against monopoly will be a serious brake on building our Party. We will find ourselves tailing the mass movements or running to catch up instead of giving leadership and winning new active forces into our Party.

This pre-Convention discussion period and the work of the 21st National Convention must put us fully on the breakthrough course!

In all the democratic mass movements and struggles of today the Communist Party is an essential participant. The Party is not merely a relevant factor in relation to them; it is *indispensable*.

These movements and struggles are the basis of all social progress. But they cannot by themselves be the guarantee of the consistent advancement of the interests of the working class and other sections of the people, let alone of the advance to the revolutionary struggle for a socialist society. For this an additional factor is required—the conscious factor in the form of a Marxist-Leninist vanguard political party.

Mass movements and struggles can and do arise spontaneously, without the initiative or even the presence of such a vanguard. But left to themselves they lack longer-range direction or staying power. When the struggle progresses beyond the issues around which a given movement develops it often tends to become dispersed, or else it may become an obstacle to further progress. It is only the involvement of a vanguard party—a Communist party—that provides the basis for advancing the ideological level of such movements, for giving them power to endure, to grow stronger and more unified, to rise to new levels of struggle.

Fundamental to the struggles to build the people's alliance against the monopolies, to forge the movement for a socialist United States is the unrelenting endeavor to build and strengthen our Party, to develop even more closely its ties with the masses, to elevate its ideological and political level. This is fundamental.

—Draft Resolution, 21st Convention, CPUSA

COMMUNICATIONS

ROBERT LUMER

On Shakespeare

Without claiming to be any kind of an expert on Shakespeare, I would like to add my two cents worth (let's say ten cents worth, considering today's inflation) to the interesting discussion in PA on Shakespeare's role and the role of all other progressive and humanist artists of the past in creating a revolutionary culture today.

First of all, who was Shakespeare? We know little enough, but that little is enlightening. Shakespeare was an actor, playwright and *part owner of the Globe Theater* in London at the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century. His theater was under the patronage of the English national court which for a part of Shakespeare's lifetime united the nation and stood for the interests of the bourgeoisie. Shakespeare was a member of the nascent, revolutionary bourgeois class of his time. He and his 17th century followers like Webster, Beaumont and Fletcher reflected the thinking of the most advanced element of the bourgeoisie of that time. With great class partisanship, Shakespeare wrote about the class struggles taking place against feudalism. *Henry IV* and *Henry V*, to take two examples, deal with the defeat of feudal-

ism (and the feudal ethics of a Hotspur) in favor of the creation of a nation. Plays like *Macbeth* deal with representatives of a dying class who run amok in their desire to hold or gain power (like the MacArthurs and Nixons of our time).

At the same time, Shakespeare also attacked the greed and dishonesty of elements of his own class. *Timon of Athens* is quoted by Marx in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* when dealing with the money fetish and alienation present in all bourgeois society.

Like all representatives of a revolutionary class, Shakespeare didn't speak just for his own class but in the name of humanity. True, there are elements in his works which contradict this, just as the ownership of slaves stood in crass contradiction to the values contained in the Declaration of Independence. But nonetheless, Shakespeare was a profound humanist and there is much in his ethical values and human portrayals which is of the utmost value today.

On the other hand, as both Leroy and Cassidy point out, Shakespeare has no understanding of the role of the masses and can go so far as to show con-

tempt for ordinary people (although sometimes precisely these people are the ones to show great wisdom). There is much of the feudal order in his works and a tendency to treat nobility as automatically more "noble" than others. In many works, the nobility speak in verse and the commoners in prose. His works also contain much of medieval Christianity in them and expound concepts, such as chasity, which are patently absurd in our day.

So what do we do with all of this? Does it have a value for revolutionary culture in 1975? If we demand only works that reflect a correct and modern ideological position from a Marxist point of view, we can discard not only the classics but also most contemporary literature. Literature of the past cannot replace the necessity for revolutionary literature of the present. But the past can still offer us a great deal. Shakespeare deals with *social classes* in his plays and any production which emphasizes the class nature of his plays instead of masking it behind Freudianism, mysticism, etc. is making a contribution to the struggle against modern bourgeoisie ideology which would have us believe that there are no classes and no class struggle. Of course Shakespeare does not question capitalism, but his sharp attack on certain aspects of it is useful in our time for criticizing modern capitalism and helping people understand the origins of their alienation. And today, when a tremendous quantity of commercial "cul-

ture" has descended to portraying and glorifying the most asocial kinds of behavior, and all kinds of perversion, works which contain normal, human values are vitally necessary if the people are not going to become so brutalized that they can be used for the greater perversions of war and fascism.

Again it must be stated that the greatest need is for modern, revolutionary works. But Lenin has pointed out that under conditions of capitalism, the dominant ideology and culture are capitalist and that there are only elements of a democratic and socialist culture. American history has shown that just how strong these progressive elements are inseparably linked with the political mood and movements of a given time. It is no accident that the "red" thirties were the time of the greatest upsurge in progressive art in our century and that the 50s were a wasteland. It is also no accident that in the decades where the greatest political struggle in the country involving the masses was the Black liberation struggle, the progressive art of those decades was largely by Black artists and on the themes of Black liberation. What I'm trying to point out is that revolutionary art cannot be pulled out of a hat at will. Although there are signs that the 70s and 80s could again become decades of progressive and/or revolutionary culture, we need the classics and must fight to save them from the distorting hands of the bourgeoisie.

Which works and writers are valuable at a given time is a tricky question. Obviously works which deal with or parallel modern political questions are interesting. But a work which deals with historical questions in a dialectical way also has its value even though the theme may be strange. The performing arts are extremely useful because we have the opportunity to interpret, to add ideas of our own to what is on the written page, emphasize certain elements in the work, edit, etc. Paul Cassidy is quite right in considering both academically historical interpretations and modernizations of Shakespeare as traps. The only example I know where Shakespeare has been successfully rewritten and modernized is Brecht's *The Round Heads and the Peaked Heads* which transforms *Measure for Measure* into a totally new play. But the

writer must have the abilities of a Brecht to get away with it. Still, the possibilities for interpretation of both Shakespeare's work and our own are endless. I wouldn't put graffiti on the walls or garbage cans in the court of Hamlet's Denmark, but I would make his castle decayed and crumbling. I would draw parallels between the desperation and ruthlessness of the feudal lords and today's profit barons. Most especially I would try to interpret the plays in such a way as to awaken the critical spirit of the audience so that they may analyze the social processes taking place.

Many of the ideas presented here are not new. But their newness is not important. To the contrary, the fact that they have already been applied successfully in the fight for socialism and in socialist countries indicates their solidity.

LEON BAYA

A Reply to Cassidy

May I have the privilege of a reply to Paul Cassidy's strictures against Sidney Finkelstein's *Who Needs Shakespeare?* and of my review of that book (March 1974 *Political Affairs*).

First, humanism, that is, the primacy of human beings and of their elevation to a life of dignity, self-development and true political, social and economic equality on earth, is an inherent principle

of socialism. Thus, when Finkelstein extols Shakespeare for his humanism, we acknowledge that the man from Stratford-on-Avon is a supreme spokesman for one of our basic tenets. If certain popular soap operas or bourgeois productions advocate humanism, they ought to be praised for that aspect of their message. But I am certain that they are often tainted with erroneous concepts such as

man's evil, instinctive nature and his innate greediness, etc., as well as his inborn violence and brutality.

Secondly, in Shakespeare's later works, especially in *King Lear* and in *The Tempest* we find a broad concern with classes: the wealthy are callously indifferent to the plight of the poor. The main theme of *Lear*, in my opinion, is not one of ingratitude; rather it deals with a self-willed, arrogant, dominant ruler, accustomed to having his way, who has never suffered either physical pain or mental anguish. This autocrat learns, in the storm scene and later, how the poor, the neglected and the mentally unbalanced suffer in a world where the rich have an unnecessary abundance of life's comforts, while others go about the countryside naked, hungry, homeless and friendless. Lear asks that those who live in the lap of luxury "shake the superflux" to these suffering people. Anyone familiar with the social and economic conditions of Shakespeare's day is aware of the almshouses, the paupery, the crimes on the highways and the misery of large groups of people, especially those yeomen and their families who were driven from their lands so that wool could be grown for an expanding European market. In *The Tempest* Shakespeare has loyal Gonzalo speak of a world where neither riches, poverty, nor service should be known.

True, Shakespeare was not a politician. And like writers in every class-divided society, his

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

art, as he says, was "tongue-tied by Authority." He almost lost his life when Lord Essex presented *Richard II*, a play which dares to show the dethroning of a king—a personage anointed and divinely chosen to rule.

With regard to the *Merchant of Venice*, when Finkelstein speaks of *gold*, he refers to it, Mr. Cassidy should understand, not literally, but figuratively; gold or money distorts men's lives because seeking and getting it *debases* human beings. Note also in *Timon of Athens*, one of Karl Marx's favorite plays, that Timon's friends desert him when he loses his money, and return to fawn on him when he finds gold. The latter "knits and breaks religions," turns ugliness into beauty, and vice into virtue. Marx quotes this passage in *Capital*. And are not gold, money, business—are not the accumulation of these for personal gain at the expense of exploitation of others—anti-humanist?

Furthermore, Shakespeare's attitude towards women is basically a humane one. In almost all of the plays women play leading, often initiating, roles: they are loyal (Cordelia), dignified (Desdemona), passionately attached to their husbands (Lady Macbeth), and utterly delightful in their repartee and quick intelligence (Rosalind). Ophelia, alone, is non-assertive, and the reason is a matter of dramaturgy; had she been a typically perceptive Shakespearean woman, the play would not be possible, although her insanity and death are mo-

A REPLY

ments of great pathos. For his time, when women were seldom educated, and were almost never involved in careers, and more often than not were maligned as gossips and shrews, their portrayals as the equals of men represent a significant advance.

In addition, for Shakespeare to portray Shylock as having some human qualities was a relatively advanced position. Jews were reviled, wore separate clothing, and were condemned to money-lending because the professions and land ownership were denied them. If you wish to see what the common opinion of Jews was among the upper class in England, read Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*, which depicts him as a money-mad, murderous, treacherous monster with no redeeming traits.

I cannot understand why Cassidy condemns Shakespeare for not being class-conscious in the contemporary sense. Marx and Engels tell us that the proletariat as we now define that class do not appear on the stage of history until the Industrial Revolution, a term first used by Engels, incidentally. It is as unfair to take Shakespeare to task on that score as it is to criticize Darwin for not recognizing that genes,

rather than blood, carry hereditary traits.

Finally, when Finkelstein describes our best writers as being alienated, he means our best capitalist writers, some of whom have great skill, but who present a pessimistic and dreary outlook on life. He does not refer, of course, to Brecht, Gorki, Sholokov and Carl Sandburg, for example.

Lastly, Finkelstein did not "set up Shakespeare" as the "last word" in his or our changing world. Finkelstein judged him in his historical perspective which, I believe, is a fundamental Marxist principle. For his time, Shakespeare was a humanist, as was Sophocles in *Antigone*, and Rembrandt in his tranquil domestic scenes, and Leonardo in his human women rather than the disembodied angels of the pre-Renaissance. For our time, too, Shakespeare's sympathy, his full-length portraits of people, his language, his humor and his dramatic art are more than sufficient for us socialists to *need him*. So does the socialist world, which produces his plays continuously.

May I venture to say that a future Shakespeare can only come to fruition as modern socialist-humanism in all its facets.

More on the Philosophy of Science: Reply to Hank Starr

"The strong idealism which permeates the book," to quote Hank Starr, led me to join Pappademos in his critique of Kuhn's book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, which was being accepted uncritically by some of our Marxist colleagues. Our purpose in laying bare the idealist aspect of Kuhn seems to have been largely accomplished, at least in the pages of *Political Affairs*. In Hyman Cohen's letter in the February 1975 *Political Affairs*, Cohen also says that we must not let Kuhn's "idealist side muddy the waters."

I believe that Pappademos has performed a further service by opening up a discussion on the political implications of the philosophy of science in the article "The Scientific Outlook Under Attack." Pappademos is writing a detailed reply to Starr, since the major work on that article was his, but I would like to add a few words.

In this time of economic crisis, the impression is being created by bourgeois sources that there has been a breakdown of the ability of scientists to predict events, since even the "specialists" don't understand a depression accompanied by inflation. A feeling of helplessness is being deliberately spread among the people, fed by the idea that some subjects cannot be understood. For example, the March 21, 1975, *Science* printed an article titled "Limits

to the Scientific Understanding of Man." At this time, when ideological clarity is essential, it would be wrong to exaggerate Kuhn's contributions by overlooking the impact of Kuhn's idealist confusion.

In this connection, I think Starr is way off base when he suggests that "commitment to a common paradigm makes Marxism so effective in transforming the world under many widely varying conditions." This turns the whole class struggle upside down, and makes its success dependent on the agreement of its practitioners, rather than its correspondence to the needs of the people and reliance on the leading role of the working class.

Cohen makes a useful suggestion of the "need of a thoroughly Marxist-based study of Kuhn's original question: How does the body of scientific knowledge grow?" I hope that intensive work is being done in the socialist countries also on this important question. No doubt, Kuhn's specific studies in the history of science will make a positive contribution to this study.

Finally, the most common criticism of our article, from some leaders of our movement, was that they could not understand it. This is a serious criticism and I believe we should follow the model of Aptheker's "Time on the Cross," which is a readable critique of a technical book.

BOOK REVIEWS

SIMON GERSON

Bob Moses—Wall Street's Talented Tool

Robert Moses has been called a genius, an empire-builder, a Hitler, the John Bunyan of public works and "the prime minister of the permanent government." Call him what you will, Robert A. Caro's work* amply demonstrates that Bob Moses was one of finance capital's most useful 20th century tools. If the big banks didn't have a Bob Moses they would have had to invent one.

Caro, a youthful investigative reporter, tells us why in his meticulously-documented, massive (1,260 page) volume. It is something of a seminal work, notwithstanding one or another possible disagreement on an occasional fact or interpretation. That the book won a Pulitzer Prize award last month — something impossible ten years ago when Moses was at the height of his power—reflects the new feeling in wide circles to socially relevant investigative reporting.

Unquestionably, Moses was a ruthless genius with an awesome drive who was afflicted with a terminal ego. His arrogance and contempt for individuals, par-

ticularly poor people, were monumental. Snubbed at Yale because he was a Jew, Moses became a hardened snob at Oxford. A child of wealth—his parents were part of the German-Jewish "Our Crowd" set—he was mesmerized by the British upper class. His Ph.D. thesis at Oxford on Britain's civil service early on showed his life-long class bias, including as it did an attack upon civil servants daring enough to form trade unions. To solve this problem, the young Moses wrote, there would have to be "in the last analysis . . . the remorseless exercise of the executive power of suppression and dismissal. . ." In this regard, Moses didn't change much over the years, except for the worse.

Caro dwells at considerable length on the details of Moses' early life, his forbears and the development of his character. These are, of course, useful to an understanding of the man Moses but of themselves are by no means decisive. After all, there were others in public life with fanatical ambition, vast abilities and overwhelming drive—but who got nowhere. Moses, however, left his marks, some of which are ugly scars, on New York and the

**The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1974, \$17.95.

nation. These are not only in the form of the public works themselves but, what is more significant, a whole anti-democratic *class* doctrine and *class* methodology in public construction. As one of his sharpest critics, the famed architect-philosopher Lewis Mumford said of him: "In the twentieth century, the influence of Robert Moses on the cities of America was greater than that of any other person."

Mumford does not exaggerate. Engineers, architects, builders and public officials came from everywhere to visit Bob Moses and his far-flung works, the more than 800 miles of parkways, Jones Beach, the Robert Moses State Park at Massena on the Canadian border, the Robert Moses Power Dam at Niagara, the Triborough and Verrazano bridges, to name but a few of the \$27-billion worth of public works (figured in 1968 dollars) he had built. "Robert Moses," writes Caro, "was unquestionably America's most prolific creator. He was America's greatest builder."

Caro unfolds the fascinating details of Moses' rise to the pinnacle of power between 1924 and 1968 in lucid and vivid prose. Moses wheedled, cajoled, corrupted, lied and terrorized his way up under six New York State governors and five New York City mayors. Brooking no dissent, he crushed opponents and surrounded himself with a wall of sycophancy as he strove to realize his own visions. But it was not these aspects of the talented tyrant that are of the deep-

est social significance. Basic to understanding of what may be called Mosesism is that Moses introduced new elements into the period that Caro terms "the orgy of public works without precedent in history."

Moses developed, according to Caro, "a whole new doctrine on the building of urban public works in a democratic society," that is, the ruthless bulldozing of people, homes and farms out of the way of his giant projects to reap billions for great banks, insurance companies, building contractors, politicians and favored lawyers. Moses was the first to nurture to its fullest flower the new form by which the bankers could garner billions from public works while being freed from public controls, the so-called "public authority."

This was a device set up by legislation which "possessed not only the powers of a large private corporation but some of the powers of a sovereign state: the power of eminent domain that permitted the seizure of private property, for example, and the power to establish and enforce rules and regulations for the use of its facilities that was in reality nothing less than the power to govern its own domain by its own laws."

Further, these authorities could issue bonds which under the U.S. Constitution were sacred, unbreakable contracts. The detailed records of the authorities were secret; only bland meaningless reports were made public. Thus, the public authority in Moses'

hands became in fact, Caro writes, "a new fourth branch" of government virtually independent of the other three.

It was the bond-issuing power of Moses' public authorities that provided muscle and made them favorite investments of finance capital. These bonds, backed by the revenues collected on Moses' toll bridges and parkways, were rated AAA on the bond market. His tax-exempt authority bonds "had both greater safety and a higher return than corporate bonds," Caro notes. Little wonder that Dwayne Saunders, vice president of the investment division of the Chemical Bank, said: "Wall Street loved him for this."

And Wall Street loved Moses for another reason—his bonds were virtually interminable. The motorist commuting to work across a Moses-built toll bridge might wonder occasionally when the damned thing would be paid for and toll-free. The Triborough Bridge Authority, for example, piled up such an annual surplus that it could have retired its bonds and paid for itself in about six years. But that wouldn't satisfy Moses or his bankers. Moses simply thought up new projects for the Triborough Authority and issued new shiny forty-year bonds under his charter, bonds that would be privately placed with Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank, the Chemical Bank, Morgan Guaranty Trust, the Marine Midland Bank, the Manufacturers Hanover Trust and the United States Trust.

Bankers were the prime beneficiaries of the Moses empire and its real controllers. But there were lesser beneficiaries — contractors, engineering firms, insurance brokers, certain lawyers, a few old-line building trade union leaders and, most certainly, politicians of both major parties. Moses spread the "legal" graft around with a judicious hand; those helpful got on the gravy train; those who disagreed with his imperial plans were destroyed or ignored. Deep in the bowels of the Triborough Authority, Moses' principal fortress, were dossiers on the personal and political peccadillos of friends and foes.

Notwithstanding his pose as an above-politics, selfless public servant, Moses was basically a reactionary, a Red-baiter and a malignant racist. He regarded Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal reforms as "socialistic" and was, among other things, a virulent opponent of the system of proportional representation under which New York councilmanic elections were held from 1937 through 1945. Caro flatly terms him "a pioneer in McCarthyism, twenty years before McCarthy."

Caro charges that Moses helped push New Dealer Rexford Tugwell out of his New York City Planning Commission post, that he surreptitiously aided the drive to bar re-nomination of the liberal Republican Manhattan Borough President Stanley M. Isaacs, and that he poisoned the mind of Mayor La Guardia against Paul J. Kern, the brilliant president of

the Municipal Civil Service Commission — all of whom had crossed Moses at one time or another. Even this reviewer had the dubious distinction of being publicly attacked by Moses — at a nominally non-political hearing on construction of a Brooklyn-Battery crossing.*

Threaded throughout Caro's massive work is proof positive of the incredible depth of Moses' racism. Moses did not really want masses of working people at his beloved Jones Beach or using his parkways, especially Black and Puerto Rican people. Parkway bridges were deliberately designed to be too low to permit buses to pass. Buses need permits to park at Jones Beach and, Caro writes, "buses chartered by Negro groups found it very difficult to obtain permits." His "white-only" ocean-front policy was paralleled by his

*Speaking at a City Council hearing March 27, 1939, Moses, a violent proponent of a bridge rather than a tunnel connecting Battery Park to Brooklyn (which his Triborough Authority would build), lashed out at the demand that civil service engineers be used on the project. The *New York Times* reported it thus the next day: "Civil service spokesmen who argued for greater employment of civil service personnel on the bridge received a tart warning (from Moses—SWG) that 'civil service can become a racket to the point where nothing but a communistic state pleasing to Mr. Isaacs and Mr. Gerson can take care of them.'

"Borough President Stanley M. Isaac and Simon W. Gerson, his assistant, were both in the Council chamber when Mr. Moses made them targets for his remark."

attitude inside New York. "Robert Moses built 255 playgrounds in New York City during the 1930's," Caro writes. "He built one playground in Harlem."

This basic anti-workingclass, racist policy was generally maintained in all Moses projects, expressways, bridge approaches, parks and housing. He could accommodate himself gracefully to the desires of the robber barons of the North Shore of Long Island and William Randolph Hearst, but not to the desperate needs of the poor. Caro demonstrates with a map that Moses redrew a route for a Long Island parkway to avoid cutting a portion of Otto Kahn's private golf course or otherwise disturbing the lordly estates of the Four Hundred — but brutally cut through small farms. Even the 125th Street Manhattan exit of the Triborough Bridge was originally designed for another spot — but Hearst had some property that he wanted to unload, and Moses was accommodating.

But Moses rammed expressways through working-class areas in Brooklyn and the Bronx, destroying sound rent-controlled housing and compact neighborhoods. He was ruthless in his function as City Construction Coordinator—a veritable Poohbah, he headed seven different agencies at one time—when he mowed down poor areas to make way for higher-priced or even luxury housing. Caro hammers this point home, reporting that "to build his highways, Moses threw out of their homes 250,000 persons." And for

other projects, Caro estimates that Moses dispossessed "tens of thousands more . . . the figure is almost certainly close to half a million. . . . More significant even than the number of the dispossessed were their characteristics: a disproportionate share of them were black, Puerto Rican—and poor. He evicted tens of thousands of poor, non-white persons for urban renewal projects, and the housing he built to replace the housing he tore down was, to an overwhelming extent, not housing for the poor but for the rich."

In a word, says Caro at one point, Moses' "vision did not include poor people or jobs." It emphatically did not include mass transportation. (The auto and highway industries were among his strongest supporters.) Use Triborough surpluses to help build subways? Never, said Moses. Those funds "are pledged to our bondholders." A Joint Program adopted by Moses' Triborough and the Port of New

York Authority recommended spending \$1.2 billion for new highways — not a cent for subways. "The ultimate effect of Moses' transportation policies would be to help keep the city's poor trapped in their slums," Caro concludes. "They were in effect policies not only of transportation but of ghettoization, policies with immense social implications."

Moses is gone now, maneuvered out by Nelson Rockefeller in 1968 when he was governor of New York, and reduced to a \$35,000-a-year powerless consultant's post at the Triborough Authority. But the system of authorities that Moses built remains and the bankers and big bondholders still reap vast fortunes out of them, even as cities crumble and the quality of life for masses of workers decays.

Caro's book is therefore more than a brilliant political biography; it is a challenge to the people's forces.

The History Commission of the Communist Party is gathering material pertaining to activities of Communists, trade unionists and other left and progressive forces in the country. We want material relating to activities preceding the founding of the Communist Party as well as its early years, and later period. We seek to obtain information about strikes, left and progressive political movements, actions of Blacks and other minorities, demonstrations, meetings, arrests, jailings and other events. We would appreciate receipt of written information, old pamphlets, pictures, news clippings and other mementos of events.

Anyone having such information or material can contact or send it to: Phil Bart, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010. These contributions will be greatly appreciated.

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