

Political Affairs

Theoretical Journal, Communist Party USA, June 1993

\$1.75



TAKING ON CORPORATE AMERICA

- The Political Crisis of Government
– Gus Hall
- U.S. Imperialist Crisis – Perlo
- Hip Hop and Youth – Mitchell
- Marx and Shelley – Cameron
- YCL in the 1930s – Licht
- Gorbachev and Coup – Yanayev
- Communist Party Files Suit

Political Affairs

Editorial Board

Joe Sims, Editor
Tom Hopkins, Assistant Editor
Mike Bayer, Phillip Bonosky,
Norman Goldberg,
Judith Le Blanc, Carole Marks,
Prairie Miller, Anthony Monteiro,
Victor Perlo, Roy Rydell,
James West

Cover Design: Norman Goldberg

Business and Circulation:

John Urquhart, Ellen Perlo

Special Assistant: Dorothy Kahan

Political Affairs (ISSN 0032 3128) is published monthly, except for combined September/October, by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., 235 West 23rd Street, New York, NY 10011. [This address is for all correspondence.] ☎ 212 989-4994

Manuscripts are invited. If a manuscript return is requested, please enclose a postage-paid, self-addressed envelope.

Subscription rates: \$18 for one year (Individuals); \$27 for one year (Institutions); foreign subscriptions: Canada and Mexico, \$20 a year; all others, on request; single issues, \$1.75. Second class postage paid at post office in Bellmawr, NJ. *Postmaster:* Send changes of address to: Political Affairs, 235 West 23 St., New York, NY 10011.



June 1993 Vol. 72 No. 6

- 1 Editorial: Hands off Yugoslavia!**
- 2 The Political Crisis of Government**
Gus Hall
- 8 New Phase in Imperialist Crisis**
Vic Perlo
- 14 Rap, Hip Hop and the Social Consciousness of Youth**
A. Mitchell
- 20 Shelly and Marx**
Kenneth Cameron
- 25 Experiences in Building the YCL**
Mary Licht
- 29 Gorbachev and the August Coup**
Gennadi Yanayev
- 31 Manifesto of the National Salvation Front of Russia**
- 34 Labor and the Class Struggle**
Ed Nelson
- 35 Bookends**
Gerald Horne
Herb Kaye
- 38 Letters to the Editor**
- 39 Communist Party Files Suit**

Hands Off Yugoslavia!

Readers will be interested to learn that the Communist Party USA has received a letter from the newly-formed League of Communists – Movement for Yugoslavia, asking for joint cooperation between our two parties. The new organization is the legal successor to the former League of Communists and is working to achieve peace and restore a common Yugoslavia on the basis of its former borders. The Party has organizations in all of the territories of the former republic. The letter describes the tragic disintegration of Yugoslavia, spurred on by nationalist and religious hatred leading to civil war and secession.

Criticism is directed in the letter against the European Economic Community which is playing a deceitful role in the civil war in Yugoslavia, pretending to be the arbitrator in the conflict while it is really interested in reducing these lands into helpless states and sources of cheap labor and material for foreign capitalism. The League views the crisis as an internal matter for the peoples of Yugoslavia, to be resolved in a peaceful way without foreign interference. It calls upon the presidency of the state to initiate measures that would prevent moves for secession and settle all questions through dialogue.

The League of Communists – Movement for Yugoslavia stands for the reestablishment of Yugoslavia as a national state. Its program calls for the reconstruction of a unified national economy, making possible a genuine and durable community of citizens, nations and republics. The letter calls attention to the importance of the working class in this crisis. It states:

The class interests of the working class as a whole in the territory of Yugoslavia are an unavoidable and funda-

mental factor in the reunification of all parts of Yugoslavia. The experiences and economic ties shared over the past seventy years have mixed together the interests of the working class so that a single Yugoslav economic area has become the vital interest of every section of the working class. To this should be added as an important factor the Yugoslav idea and Yugoslavia as a state community which connected people by economic, cultural, political and family links. There is a large number of mixed marriages and children from mixed marriages, so that to this category of the population Yugoslavia as a whole is their true homeland.

The looming danger in this conflict comes from the Clinton Administration which seeks to establish a military base in this part of Europe, using the pretext of subduing the Bosnian-Serb aggression. This would give U.S. imperialism a vantage point from which to dominate these lands, to suppress people's struggles and secure big gains for capitalism. This war danger demands a mass response. Our Party calls on all progressive and peace forces to unite against the Clinton drift to military aggression. Emergency mass mobilization and action are necessary. Clinton's war policy must be stopped.

The Communist Party USA views the formation of a nationwide Communist organization in former Yugoslavia as a positive development in a very complex period. Our Party welcomes their call for more lasting cooperation and views it as an important step forward in the fight for world communist unity. We are in solidarity with the League of Communists – Movement for Yugoslavia in their program for national reunification, for peace and against imperialism and reaction. □

Corrections

In the May 1993 issue of *Political Affairs* (Vol. 72, No. 5), page 26 should end with the words: "... only with massive organized pressure on a scale our country hasn't seen in a long time."

Page 36 should end with: "... the wealth they produce should be owned and enjoyed by the people, not a handful of monopolists and bankers."

The Political Crisis of Government

Gus Hall

Editor's note: For a full text of the following article, write to the Communist Party USA, 235 W. 23 St., New York, NY 10011.

This is one of those moments when it is difficult to keep up with fast-changing reality. This is also a time of more than usual cross-currents, counter-currents and outright contradictions. Thus, the assessments and even the plans we make today may be out of date by the time of our coming Midterm National Party Conference. More than ever, updating has become a daily necessity.

We have two kinds of crises going on simultaneously. We have a continuation of the economic crisis and a fast-developing political and presidential crisis.

We have a record-breaking number of homeless now, and record-breaking unemployment. The big corporations are laying off new thousands every week. There are more African Americans living in ghettos now than any other time in U.S. history. And there are more poor and oppressed Puerto Rican Americans and Chicano/Mexican Americans living in the poverty-ridden barrios of our country.

There are more broken down, drug infested and crime-ridden schools, hospitals and neighborhoods. The cities are broken down. Within the crisis of the cities is the economic hardship of high rents and high prices for food. And inflation is beginning to take hold in almost every area. We are in a long-term declining stage.

This is supposed to be a moment of hope and expectations, but June college graduates this year are filled with fear and anxiety about the future.

There are no jobs. There is more racism and discrimination in jobs, housing, education and every area of life.

And with all this going on we have a political crisis of government. We have been critical of the Clinton Administration's increasing tendency to cave in to right-wing pressures, to compromise, and to renege on promises. We were careful, however,

not to allow ourselves to fall into the anti-Clinton camp of Ross Perot and company.

It seems that almost overnight there has surfaced a new coalition of reactionary Democrats and Republicans, particularly those based in the oil industry, who have come up with a full-blown right-wing program, beginning with their revolt against a proposed new energy tax.

But their opposition to energy taxes is only the bait. What they really want are big cuts in Social Security, Medicare, retiree pension funds and veteran benefits. Then, for good measure, they are demanding a cut in taxes on the rich and big corporations which are already outrageously low.

Clinton and those who support him will have to choose whether to continue making concessions to the right wing or to join in the struggle against the right wing in both parties.

We also have to add the political influence of the religious right – especially the evangelicals – which is organizing all over the country to take over politically, especially on the local level such as in school boards and city councils.

Clinton will have to choose between his campaign promises to raise taxes on the rich and the demands of this new right-wing coalition to cut taxes on the rich.

We face a new dilemma. This new oily boll weevil right-wing coalition adds a tactical wrinkle for us. Who should we fight? Should we continue fighting against Clinton's compromises or should we switch to fight this new right-wing coalition? Well, I think we have to do both, challenge Clinton's caving in to pressures from the right and mobilize against the new ultra-right coalition and their anti-people agenda.

THE ECONOMY ■ The economic crisis is very different from the Depression of the 1930s. That accounts for the difference in the people's response to it. For millions, it is just as deep as the '30s. But not all of those affected are totally at the end of their rope. There are millions of professionals as well as the petty bourgeoisie who are not directly affected, and see the remedies for relieving the suffering as not in

Gus Hall is National Chairman of the CPUSA. Abridged from a report to the Party's National Board, May 22, 1993.

their interests. And there are those who are receiving unemployment checks. It is important to understand that not all sectors of the economy are equally affected. Some have moved upward from the bottom of the crisis.

There are contradictions between the systemic crisis and the cyclical crisis of capitalism. These contradictions are reflected in the fact that the big corporations continue mass layoffs, while at the same time there is some hiring, especially by retail outfits.

The contradiction is also reflected in the fact that big steel corporations are laying off workers and closing plants while opening up mini-mills with cutting edge technology, far fewer workers and a non-union workforce. Here, I want to commend Comrades Paul Kaczocha and Scott Marshall for the fine article on the steel industry in the May issue of *Political Affairs*. Everyone should read it because it deepens our understanding of some of the things I'm generalizing about in the steel industry.

There is the seeming contradiction that corporations are downsizing while simultaneously profits are upsizing. But this is not really a contradiction. It is simply the fact that corporations are making bigger profits with fewer workers.

The crisis negatively affects the sale of cars and the competition between Japanese and U.S. auto companies. Nevertheless the big three U.S. car makers are raising their prices.

The systemic crisis is also reflected in the deepening of the economic crisis simultaneous with creeping inflation. The inflationary rise in prices is influenced by factors other than competition. Price increases during a depression or recession, which bypass the capitalist laws of supply and demand, are the result of a state-monopoly conspiracy. This is a new feature. Corporations are able to bypass the economic laws because of the global monopolization of industries like auto. This phenomenon, of price increases in a crisis-ridden economy, is the direct result of the new level of power and control that finance capital has over all economic developments.

THE MONOPOLY MONEY GAME ■ There is, in effect, a vicious cycle of money circulation taking place around the huge five trillion dollar national debt. That is, the government borrows money that is passed on to monopoly capital, especially to the military industries. The government then pays interest on the money borrowed from the big banks and financial institutions. The government then borrows

the same money again from the same financial institutions and keeps paying the interest on that money. And so it goes around and around on an ever bigger scale. This debt cycle is kept going by constant and massive injections of our tax monies into it.

The repayment of the monies borrowed and the interest has its own inner cycle. It does not serve to stimulate the economy. Therefore, the idea of canceling the national debt and the interest payments makes good sense.

To guarantee the perpetuation of this process and a constant source of funds, Clinton has proposed a new gimmick – a new “trust fund” into which new taxes will be placed. Actually, the new taxes on the people will be placed into the debt cycle as new sources of profits for the banks, financial institutions and huge monopolies. Clinton's proposed new taxes are to be the renewed source of revenues to keep this state-monopoly process replenished.

To get the people to accept the new taxes, Clinton is demagogically telling them that all the new tax monies will be placed into this “special trust fund” to be used only for reducing the national debt. It is a gimmick. It is pure demagogy.

CONTINGENT WORKFORCE ■ The systemic crisis is even reflected in the most serious setback for the working class in possibly 100 years – the process that, if not reversed, could lead to the gradual destruction of organized labor.

In my last report to the National Committee in March I said that a contingent workforce – temporary, contract and part time workers – made up 25 percent of the total workforce. The total is now closer to 50 percent. There are big corporations, like Manpower, Inc. – the largest private employer in the U.S. – who are in the business of renting out or selling hired hands in large numbers. The majority are non-union and most do not receive benefits like vacation, sick time, overtime pay, health coverage or protection from race, sex and age discrimination.

In most cases, the corporations do not pay health care coverage, Social Security and workmen's compensation, plus they have the added benefit of greatly reduced paperwork. Most of these workers are working for minimum wages, while the corporations who rent them get high hourly profits from their labor. The temporary rental agencies also get a slice of the profit pie. Many of these workers are without citizenship or documents.

This is an increasing challenge to organized labor. While workers are being laid off, the part-time contingent sector keeps growing. They are replacing full-time organized workers. This adds to the rate of exploitation of workers generally. And because it is a contingent force it is also a standby force used for strikebreaking and union-busting activities.

A POLITICAL CRISIS OF GOVERNMENT ■ Returning to the Clinton Administration, we have to unravel a real mess and set tactics for the immediate future.

It seems incredible that they were able to get into such a big mess in such a short time. Be that as it may, the Clinton Administration is in a rather serious crisis. The administration is in a gridlock of its own making. It provided the opening and the basis for the Republicans to move in and destroy all of Clinton's programs, except for the measly \$4 billion unemployment extension.

Almost daily something new is dropped into the media pipeline that goes in the wrong direction, the opposite direction from Clinton the candidate – whether on foreign policy, like on Clinton's pressure to bomb Bosnia and resume nuclear testing, or on his about-face on taxes from a tax-the-rich to a tax-the-poor plan.

From the beginning, I think we have been rather careful in our criticism of the new administration. And I think this was correct. But more and more we are in a position where we must step up our criticism and call for militant actions. The people are getting a daily dose of the "real Clinton" as he caves in and compromises in favor of the rich and the corporations.

The problem is that Clinton has been attempting to serve two classes simultaneously, though more and more the servitude is to big business. Especially because of the deepening crisis of capitalism this is not possible any longer. The class struggle and the class issues are sharpening. The Clintonites seem to be trying to resolve an unresolvable contradiction. And their compromises are mainly in favor of the corporations.

This sets the stage for the new moment. It sets up a scenario for alienating both classes. And it looks like Clinton is responding more to the pressures of his own class, the ruling capitalist class. However, one of the reasons for this is that there is not yet a powerful and potent enough people's force pushing him from the other side of the class line.

CAPITALIST TAX PLAN ■ We can see this clearly in his about-face from the campaign when he promised to tax those with incomes over \$200,000 – how it is coming down lower and lower. Now, if passed, the taxes will be on everyone, so-called "equally."

We have to look not only at the income taxes, but also at Clinton's proposed energy tax and his proposal to increase the "sin" taxes. This opens the door for Republicans to charge Clinton with "taxing the people who can't afford it." They will run with this issue as they did in blocking Clinton's economic stimulus package.

House Ways and Means Committee chair Dan Rostenkowski, with help from the *Wall Street Journal*, is rallying the biggest corporate guns – the corporate "cheerleaders" – to steer Clinton's capitalist tax plan through the House and Senate. Rostenkowski in the House and Moynihan in the Senate are making pro-business changes in the plan and mobilizing corporate forces to guarantee its passage.

Within a day of the revised plan's approval in the House Ways and Means Committee, Rostenkowski had gotten a formidable list of converts, such as General Electric, Procter & Gamble, IBM, Kellogg, General Mills, GM, Honeywell, Walt Disney and the like.

Why? As Rosenkowsky admitted, "The bill, as originally put together by the Clinton people, would have had these same corporations working against it." What kind of changes did Rostenkowski make to get the first 50 "cheerleaders" to sign on? Their support hinges on three changes that effectively turn the tax bill into its exact opposite:

- Reducing the corporate tax rate to 35 percent instead of 37 percent, which means billions "saved" for the big corporations;

- Killing Clinton's provisions for investment tax credits and for higher taxes on multinationals' overseas royalty income – more billions for the multinationals.

The Senate Finance Committee's Chair, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, is promising the same changes and maybe more.

Rostenkowski wants to guarantee the passage of a pro-corporate tax bill, just as he did in 1986 when he marshaled a 300-strong corporate coalition to guarantee the "landmark tax code overhaul" in favor of the rich and powerful.

This corporate coalition, known as TRAC (Tax

Reform Action Coalition) is still together and lobbied against the original Clinton plan to raise the corporate tax rate, until the House Committee halved it and dropped other clauses like the low investment tax credit, unfavorable to them.

The only way this conspiracy could backfire, the *Wall Street Journal* admitted, is "if the voters and some representatives recognize this bill as favoring big business interests – the same interests Clinton railed against during his campaign." Urging Clinton to accept the changes, Rostenkowski counseled, "It would be a grave mistake to view corporate America as our enemy."

The Treasury Secretary, Lloyd Bentsen, is working full-time helping to rally corporate support for the "amended" Clinton plan.

Even before the House Committee changed the bill, the National Association of Realtors was mobilizing its 750,000 members to support it, as were similar organizations. The Committee sweetened the bill even more for the real estate industry by writing a more general provision to deduct losses on rental income. And Senator Dale Bumpers is now working to sweeten Clinton's tax plan even further by giving investors higher capital gains tax breaks. Bumpers admitted that this could create "a whole new breed of tax shelters."

The Clinton tax proposal is the best example of where the Clinton Administration is going. It is Clinton's bill, but in reality the bill going to Congress is a Rostenkowski-Moynihan-Bentsen big business tax bill. In some ways it is more weighted for monopoly capital and against the people than the Bush tax overhaul was. And, of course, it is a total betrayal of Clinton's campaign promises not to increase taxes on the people.

On the overall stimulus package, instead of introducing separate bills Clinton put into this package programs that, while good for the people, looked like "pork barrel" projects for the inner cities. The Republicans used these items to attack Clinton as a "tax and spend" president. This set the stage for the filibuster. And the Republicans got away with it.

REFORM BEHIND CLOSED DOORS ■ In the health care field, it is now clear why Hillary Clinton wanted secret hearings. The *New York Times*, in an article on health care reform, says:

In the end the health care changes will come as a boon to the industry's giants: Prudential, Cigna, Aetna, Metro-

politan Life, Travelers and Blue Cross and Blue Shield. So much of the reform will be to streamline the system, drive many of the smaller companies out and concentrate health care into a few huge corporations.

On the out-of-control drug prices, even after all the hoopla against the pharmaceutical companies – all the charges of price gouging – it looks like they will not cut prices but only "slow down" the price increases. These are the kind of pro-corporate deals that are being cooked up behind closed doors.

The result of all this is that with each day's breaking news, Clinton's credibility and popularity sags among the people. There is a steady erosion of support.

What is Clinton's response? He goes on the stump to make campaign-like speeches, goes shopping with Chelsea in high-priced book shops, stops air traffic in a major airport so he can get a \$200 Hollywood hair cut and on and on. His speeches are beginning to have that hollow ring of demagoguery, rhetoric and fakery. His behavior is beginning to look like that of an "imperial presidency." The American people will not suffer such a presidency silently.

The positive side of all this is that people are losing their illusions. We are moving into a period of great struggle. The only way to push Clinton in the opposite direction is to mount big movements and struggles.

So the Clinton Administration is in a gridlock, in a crisis of its own making. It is heading for a run in with many sectors of the people that he is rubbing the wrong way. It is an unresolvable contradiction to try to serve the ruling class and respond to the needs of the working class at the same time.

Clinton will respond only to mass pressure from the unemployed, the hungry and the working class in the form of organized movements of struggle. Clinton will continue responding to the pressures and demands of the ruling class, corporate America, the Perot forces and the rest of the organized right wing until the working class, the trade union movement and its allies begin pushing from the opposite direction.

CLINTON FOREIGN POLICY ■ These counter-currents are also present in the foreign policies of the Clinton Administration. It is ironic that a president who overstated his anti-Vietnam war position to get elected is now leading a campaign to resume

nuclear testing.

Anyone who viewed the end of the Cold War as the end of imperialist aggression was sadly mistaken. The plan to resume U.S. nuclear weapons testing cannot be separated from the overall aggressive policies of "aggressive, humanitarian interventionism." This was the justification for Bush's push into Somalia which Clinton continued, as well as Clinton's plan to drop bombs in Bosnia and to aggressively support Yeltsin's road to capitalism in Russia. The policy decision to continue Star Wars advanced weapons development, even though they now go on under less warlike-sounding names.

Many countries, including Russia, said they would not resume testing unless the U.S. does first. Clinton's action sets the precedent for the resumption of nuclear testing throughout the world. We must begin taking this issue on because it creates a whole new ominous threat to world peace. Although Clinton faces a strong sentiment for peace throughout the world, it is clear that to translate this sentiment into political clout will require a revitalized, reorganized peace movement in the United States.

Clinton's push to drop bombs over Yugoslavia to "settle" that conflict was turned down by everyone – including England, France and Germany, who have their own imperialist aims – and by Congress, the military and the American people. The only one who went along with the idea was Yeltsin. One of the difficult twists in the political situation is that there are more right-wing Republicans than Democrats who are against Clinton's military solutions. It is difficult to ascertain why this is so. It is another of those bizarre twists and contradictions.

Now it looks like the people in the former Yugoslavia may find a peaceful solution and pull the rug from under Clinton's war plans. Thus peace in this region of the world may very well be achieved, no thanks to the efforts of the Clinton Administration.

Clinton's pro-imperialist policies around the world are based on the belief that the United States is the only superpower left and can impose U.S. domination in a new world order. The main problem with this is that the world, outside of Mr. Yeltsin, is not ready to accept U.S. domination. This problem was expressed recently at a United Nations meeting on world peace. The Clinton Administration is officially boycotting that meeting.

The contradictions between Clinton's policies

and the majority sentiments for peace and peaceful solutions to conflicts opens the door to a winning struggle over Clinton's imperialist foreign policy. But it will take a revitalized peace movement to accomplish this.

NEW PEOPLE'S DEVELOPMENTS ■ There are some very positive developments in the ranks of the trade union movement. Overall, developments are moving in the direction of struggle and more militancy. There is a growing sense of greater left-center unity. Rank-and-file movements are on the rise, putting pressure on the opportunistic and social democratic policies of the union leadership.

There is a growing willingness in the trade union movement to include Communists in coalitions. The historic May Day march, called by New York trade unions, including the central labor body, had an official Communist Party contingent. There is a growing willingness in the ranks of labor to include Communists in their struggles and movements. This is an example of the new trends taking shape.

There are some very important developments in the African American community as well. The six months of internal policy discussions by the leadership and membership of the NAACP and the Urban League was a reflection of the changes taking place in the African American community.

The policy changes that took place are in the direction of more militancy, more action-oriented struggles and all-people's coalitions. The election of the new leadership in both organizations is an expression of these changes.

There are similar developments in the Chicano/Mexican American and Puerto Rican American communities. They are all moving in a more militant direction. And closer relations with the working class are taking hold.

We have had and are having some breakthrough experiences in the electoral field. The campaigns themselves are big victories.

THE PARTY ■ We must not permit all the interruptions, including the work on the legal case and political defense of the Party, to sidetrack us from the positive work of our Party.

Just to mention a few:

- The Party's public meetings have been absolutely great. They have broken new ground. We have also made the first breakthroughs in holding

streetcorner meetings. They are the basis on which to make this a routine part of our work.

- The YCL convention was a great success. It was a mass event.

- We have continued to recruit new members, slowly but steadily.

- The resumption of our school, the New York Workers School for Marxist-Leninist Studies, turned out much better than expected.

- The quality of the *People's Weekly World*, *Political Affairs* and *Jewish Affairs* keeps getting better and better. We should take advantage of the special May issue of *PA* to get subs and bundles.

- We now conduct national Party and YCL schools regularly and on a very high level.

- Most of our Party commissions are functioning better.

- We have had historic breakthroughs in our Communist election campaigns.

- Most important is that our working relations with mass organizations, including trade unions are on a much higher level.

- The Party has further extended its contacts and relationships with Communist parties worldwide.

- And, finally, I think we can say that the leadership cadre of the Party has continued to mature and grow.

These are only some of the more visible and obvious positive aspects of our Party's activities. They all lay the basis for further growth of the Party in all areas.

SUMMARY ■ We tried a new structure for our National Board meetings – the managed discussion where a number of opening remarks are presented on agreed-upon points and then the discussion on all points is opened up. It is an experimental structure so it has some shortcomings. But I think it does achieve what we want – a more planned and focused agenda. Most of the comrades presented well-thought-out reports. And it is quite different from speaking “off the cuff.” This gave the whole meeting a different tone. We have to refine it but I think it is basically a good structure for these meetings of the National Board.

On the shortcomings, I think we tried to cover too much, too many opening remarks. Of course there is pressure to add another and then another point. I think we can have deeper discussions if we have fewer points.

The main weakness in the presentations was a lack of conclusions and solutions. I think this was missing in our preparations. But this is part of the fine tuning process. Although the material was mainly information, I learned a lot. The comrades who opened gave us all a lot of material. But I think we also need to project more conclusions and solutions to problems. Generally, we need to project solutions for every question, every subject in all areas.

We should put together a program of solutions. We have to be more responsive to the need in the movements, including the trade union movement, to find new solutions for the new moment. We need to respond more creatively and concretely when we hear the frustrated cry, “What can we do?”

Regarding the *People's Weekly World*, I think we need to improve the relationship between the Party and the *PWW* staff. We need better communication. I think we have to regularize meetings between the editorial staff and myself. We also need to call a *PWW* conference in which the Party and the paper's staff have an opportunity to give attention to and to discuss in detail the content and form of our paper. We have had them before and we know they can be very helpful, both for the Party and the paper.

When we do not discuss issues of chauvinism and insensitivity in the Party such manifestations grow. This is only natural. There is an unspoken feeling that the last convention settled all questions, even questions of insensitivity, and that now we do not have problems and we can go about our work without worrying about these questions in our work and relationships. Well, life is not that way. There will always be problems in a capitalist society like ours. And, unless we constantly sensitize ourselves, unless we are aware, unless we stay on top of the forms of racism, stereotypes, etc., they will seep into our work and relationships.

We have not looked at this question since the convention. I think we must do so, at all levels of the Party. We have to scrutinize, to study how we are dealing with influences of racism and chauvinism on all levels of the Party. This question was raised during the pre-convention period, but it was raised for factional reasons. However, that does not change the fact that the problems are very real. The difference is in how we handle them.

I raise this mainly because I see signs that there is a decline in sensitivity. We have this problem

Continued on page 24

New Phase in the Expanding Crisis of U.S. Imperialism

Victor Perlo

Major changes are affecting the course of U.S. and world imperialism during the last decade of the 20th Century.

The counter-revolutions in Eastern Europe and the former USSR have shifted the balance of power in favor of world capitalism, and in particular, U.S. imperialism. U.S. imperialism now has no visible capitalist military rival; it is no longer confronted by Soviet military power to hamper its aggressions. Its political leaders proclaim the United States as "Number One," "Sole Superpower," "World Policeman." And echoing previous aspirants to world supremacy, U.S. imperialism claims the "right" to intervene in the internal affairs of countries everywhere, to limit those countries' political and military options and, in many cases, to impose nominal rulers who act as puppets of Washington.

For the first time this century, monopoly corporations see vast new areas opening up for exploitation and plunder: Central and Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union and China. A new race for redividing the world is on, and the stakes are unparalleled. The scientific-technical progress that continues apace under capitalism is accelerated by putting the talents and accomplishments of scientists of the former socialist world to use.

SYSTEMIC CRISES ■ And yet at the same time, world capitalism is wallowing in the swamp of a systemic, structural crisis which has spread and deepened over the past two decades. Symptoms include:

- Chronic financial crises, in various forms, with such outlandish costs as: the U.S. Savings & Loan bailout to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars; the collapse of the high-flying Japanese stock and real estate markets, blasting the myth of the invulnerability of Japan's imperialism; the rapid slippage of power and influence of Western Europe, currently afflicted with a stubborn cyclical crisis and a menacing polarization of power in the hands of German imperialism, where the roots of fascism have not

been eradicated.

- Rapid deterioration of social conditions and mass living standards in the capitalist countries, which began in the most powerful one, the United States. This deterioration is marked by a decline in wages and worsening of working conditions; escalating long-term unemployment; and the increasing use of "temporary" and "part-time" employees with no pension rights, paid vacations, or other benefits.

- The combination of lower wages and soaring labor productivity leading to an accelerated rate of surplus value. This, along with the growing monopolization of industry and finance – the concentration of ownership – enriches the top circles of capital. The term "millionaire" is no longer the measure of great individual wealth; now the gauge is "billionaire" – a thousand times greater – which is the goal of individual capitalist greed. The resulting extreme imbalance of wealth and poverty distorts markets for consumer goods and services, weakens and destabilizes entire economies.

- Racism is the stark hallmark of capitalism everywhere. Nowhere are there more numerous victims than the 65 million minority peoples in the United States, where racism is practiced by the judicial and legal systems, by segregationist landlords and banks, by bigoted employers, and most shockingly, by police brutality – murders, torture, and imprisonment of hundreds of thousands of African American and Latino youth.

- The escalation of crime and imprisonment, in relation to population, over the past decade – with African Americans the most targeted victims of both crime and imprisonment.

- Cultural and moral decay. Its features include the wildfire spread of narcotic drug use, with foreign representatives of the U.S. military and intelligence forces prominent in the "business." This centuries-old symptom of decay is now dramatically magnified by its new offshoot, the fatal AIDS epidemic for which science has no effective treatment. Another feature of cultural and moral decay is monstrous political corruption. While this is also nothing new, it is greatly accelerating. The cost of buying elections in the United States has risen dramatically.

Victor Perlo is a member of the National Board of the CPUSA.

Political corruption is currently shattering governments in Brazil, Italy and Japan. It is a corruption that inevitably arises from the intensification of state monopoly capitalism – the merger of government and private business.

Most of these negative features are particularly intense in the United States. Most powerful economically and militarily, the U.S. has also gone furthest in corruption and decay. U.S. imperialism is not only the most militarized, and its economy most distorted by vast military budgets – it is also the developer and only user of the demonic atomic bomb. The U.S. has stockpiled so great a store of nuclear weapons, and drawn up plans for their use, that the world is threatened with utter devastation and an end to human life.

Capitalism has also created, in its greed-directed expansion, environmental menaces that can have a far-reaching, devastating, worldwide impact.

CAPITALISM'S FINAL STAGE □ The internationalization of capital has brought with it increasing economic interpenetration between countries. Yet the theoretical concept of breaking down national boundaries and instituting the free flow of capital remains a mirage. Each country's monopoly groups, with the services of their respective governments, engage in competitive rivalries – despite international financial agencies of world imperialism that do exist.

The international "free-flow" of capital is grossly distorted. An important part of the flow is between the powerful industrialized centers and the peripheral countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia – countries with several times the populations of the developed centers but whose people exist with one-tenth the wages and living standards.

The flow of capital from the imperialist centers to the periphery is not so much for the purpose of finding markets for goods so much as for exploiting sources of cheap labor power. Under the capitalist law of supply and demand, the stronger pull is exerted by the ten-times lower costs of labor power and the potential for a plentiful supply of workers in the semi-colonial world.

Labor in the industrialized capitalist centers, especially in the United States with its unions that have been under assault, swim with great difficulty against this outgoing tide – the export of capital and jobs. This threatens generations of social gains without providing benefits to the countries where super-

exploitation and plunder prevail.

These features in the evolution of capitalist society sharpen the validity of Lenin's scientific conclusion that imperialism is the highest and *final* stage of capitalism. It is, in the broad historical sweep, a transitory stage between the outmoded capitalist structure and socialism, for which all of the material and scientific-technical conditions are ripe – and overripe.

Such a transition began 75 years ago with the Russian Revolution of November 1917, followed by victorious revolutions in a number of other countries. The recent reversal of that process in most of the established socialist regimes complicates the process of transition. It causes serious mass suffering, and perhaps prolongs the life of capitalism – perhaps. But the current setbacks do not change the necessity, nor the inevitability, of socialism.

Indeed, there is now an intensified urgency for the transition to socialism, since imperialism has in fact created the physical manifestations of its decay: the mountains of nuclear bombs as well as the growing environmental danger – global warming and the progressive destruction of the ozone layer – which threaten all humanity if steps are not taken to solve the problems in time. Finally ridding the world of these dangers will require socialism – a society that, by its nature, has the potential to provide a safe and ever-improving life for all.

LENIN ON IMPERIALISM □ Lenin's description of the main economic features of the imperialist stage of capitalism remains of great value today:

1. The concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies, which play a decisive role in economic life;
2. The merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this 'finance capital,' of a financial oligarchy;
3. The export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance;
4. The formation of international monopolist capitalist associations which share the world among themselves;
5. The territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed.

Imperialism is capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established. (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 266)

Other crucial features analyzed by Lenin are:

- The development of state monopoly capitalism: the merger of government and private enterprise, and the use of government economic and financial policies to aid the most powerful sectors of finance capital.

- The crimes of the colonial system, consolidated by division of the world among the great powers.

- The uneven development of the several imperialist centers, leading to demands of the more powerful for dividing territory and loot in their favor, demands that can only be settled by war – and which, in fact, did lead to World War I and, in large part, to World War II.

Most of these features have become more pronounced since 1916, when Lenin's *Imperialism* was written. However, certain changes must be noted.

The 1917 Bolshevik Revolution brought a new feature to the international political scenario. It broke the chain of imperialism at its weakest link, although other working-class revolutions were soon defeated. Thus the class struggle emerged as the major factor in international affairs, beginning with the attempt of world imperialism to crush the Russian Revolution, and attaining its most extreme expression in Hitler Germany's war against the USSR.

The victories of the Soviet and Chinese people's armies, against tremendous material odds and at a terrible cost in lives and destruction, radically changed the balance of world forces. They set the stage for successful socialist revolutions in a number of countries, as well as for the breakup of the colonial system in Africa and Asia. Imperialism, however, retained its grip in many cases by imposing neo-colonialist régimes and using superior economic and military power.

SOCIALISM'S SUPERIORITY ■ But the *intrinsic superiority* of socialism over capitalism was proven by the rapid recovery of the USSR and Eastern European countries from wartime destruction. It was proven by the growth of the Soviet economy and living standards to rival capitalism's highest. It was proven by the astonishing pioneering achievements of Soviet science in space and other fields. It was proven by the attainment of strategic military parity with U.S. imperialism. All this was accomplished despite unremitting economic warfare conducted by Washington and its allies. And all this was done while maintaining conditions of full employment, shelter for everyone, free health care, free child care,

free education, and equality of the many nationalities – conditions inconceivable under capitalism.

In addition, national liberation struggles – that in many places went further than formal liberation from colonial rule – weakened the grip of the transnational monopolies, most conspicuously in the nationalization of oil by most of the oil-producing countries.

As the international class struggle strengthened, the imperialist powers were compelled to sublimate their conflicts and rivalries in order to unite in the counter-revolutionary cause. For at least half a century, wars among these countries became impossible, in part because of the necessity to join forces against socialism, and in part because of the overwhelming superiority of the United States over potential rivals – at first in economic power and then, even as that advantage waned, in military might.

NEW FEATURES ■ The counter-revolutions in the USSR and Eastern Europe led to the defeat of a number of progressive governments in Latin America and Africa. In addition, restrictions on imperialist plunder – achieved as a result of long struggles – were weakened in many areas. This is exemplified by the privatization of key state enterprises in Mexico, Brazil and other countries, and by the settlement of debts on terms favorable to the Wall Street bankers.

Since World War II, the transnational monopolies have acquired important new features. In addition to cartels formed by private companies, a decisive role is now played by inter-governmental financial cartels (such as the IMF), and inter-governmental economic coordination groups (such as GATT). The World Bank and International Monetary Fund are the largest of these cartels, and are set up so that the United States not only has the dominant role but also has veto power over all decisions. The European Economic Community (EEC) and the proposed North American Fair Trade Agreement (NAFTA), are important examples of inter-governmental regulatory agreements.

These inter-governmental organizations are closely coordinated with the big banks and industrial transnational monopolies, and are managed by personnel delegated by these firms. A major function of their activities is to facilitate the international flow of capital – in particular, to enable the transnational giants to engage in the most profitable export

of capital possible.

EXPORT OF CAPITAL ■ The export of capital, point three on Lenin's list of the principal features of imperialism, takes on ever-increasing importance. True – for the U.S. capitalist class as a whole, the exploitation of labor at home remains the decisive source of their profits, and is thus the focus of their attack against the U.S. working class. But the most powerful centers of finance capital, the giant transnational industrial corporations and banks, see the whole world as territory for their expansion. They see the workers and farmers of the world as the labor supply for their exploitation; control of the national resources of all countries is the object of their greed, and the U.S. military machine their ultimate tool for securing the global franchise.

Lenin said that the export of capital, as distinguished from the export of commodities, acquires exceptional importance in the imperialist stage. In 1990, the latest year for which summary data are available, the value of commodities exported from the United States came to \$393 billion, while the sales by foreign affiliates of U.S. corporations came to \$1,481 billion.

Sales by foreign affiliates of U.S. multinationals amounted to 31 percent of their total sales and 27 percent of their total employment. But profit trends tell a somewhat different story: considering only foreign companies with majority U.S. ownership (a substantial part of foreign investments are joint ventures), the non-domestic affiliates accounted for 20 percent of total profits in 1982, rising to 35 percent of total profits in 1990.

While profits from their foreign operations were the most lucrative part of their international operations, these multinationals' exports of commodities produced at home dominated the foreign trade of the United States, accounting for 63 percent of all exports. They also accounted for 43 percent of all imports. (*Survey of Current Business*, August 1992)

While these statistics are gathered from thousands of corporations with foreign holdings, capital export is even more crucial for the most powerful giants of industry and finance. In 1993, foreign interests accounted for 46 percent of the profits of the 25 largest U.S. corporations. The table below, using the latest year for which profits were reported, shows the growing significance of their foreign investments:

<u>Corporation</u>	<u>Foreign Share of Profits</u>	
	<u>1983</u>	<u>1992* or 1990**</u>
EXXON	54%	78%*
General Electric	18%	28%*
IBM	39%	76%**
Ford	19%	61%**

For the first three decades after World War II, U.S. transnationals dominated the export of capital, accounting for half or more of the total. But by the mid-1970s the rival capitalist nations, having recovered from the economic losses of the war, accelerated the scale of their foreign investments.

British imperialism expanded its investments in colonies and semi-colonies, and added considerable holdings in other countries, including the United States. Germany, through its dominant position in the EEC, was able to expand its position, especially throughout Western Europe. Perhaps most significant was the surge of Japanese industry and finance. After devoting several decades to accelerating development of production and expansion of export markets, along with establishing foreign connections and accumulating vast amounts of capital, Japanese banks and industrial combines launched a major campaign of capital export. They focused on Japan's sphere of influence in Southeast Asia, but also rapidly enlarged their holdings – including banks, auto manufacturing and real estate – in the United States.

And, of course, the avid eyes of the international financial oligarchy are fixed on the unbounded resources and labor power they hope to annex in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and also in China where there has been a partial opening of opportunities for foreign capitalist investment.

Ex-President Bush boasted, "We won the Cold War." The "we" referred to the big corporations owned by the ruling elite, including his family and Ivy League friends. In the year that ended September 30, 1992, foreign capital investment in the former USSR and Eastern Europe totaled \$28 billion. U.S. companies had effected 219 acquisitions, joint ventures, and startups valued at \$8 billion in these areas – up from \$2.2 billion the year before. Italian corporations were second with \$7.6 billion. U.S. firms concentrated on Russia. The largest contracts were the 18 oil and gas deals worth \$4.7 billion. The unmatched reserves of oil and gas in the USSR rival the Middle East as a target for the oil transnationals.

Philip Morris Corporation has invested a half

billion dollars in an attempt to take over the huge cigarette market in the former USSR. General Electric acquired, for a mere \$150 million, Hungary's world-class electric lamp complex, Tungsram.

IMPERIALIST 'SUPERVISORS' ■ These deals are mere starters. The goal of the transnationals is to grab holdings tens of times larger than those already negotiated. But for that, and to secure the investments already made, it will be necessary to consolidate capitalist rule and destroy every vestige of socialist institutions, the class-oriented trade unions, and the still-powerful Communist Party. That is why, at this stage of Russia's internal struggle, U.S. imperialism is brazenly intervening to try to insure that their stooge, the drunken bully Yeltsin, remains in power.

But Yeltsin is not their last resort, by any means. There are many Americans now in Russia acting like colonial supervisors – U.S. government officials, CIA-sponsored "advisors" and "consultants," businessmen making deals with the newly-legalized Russian capitalist class, and the like. A U.S. venture group has acquired a large area just 15 miles from Red Square and is putting \$88 million into the construction of 478 town houses. There will be a 40-acre lake, tennis courts and all luxuries. Rents will range from \$3,750 to \$6,833 a month. The U.S. State Department and the Agency for International Development have leased 50 units at an average rent of \$45,000 per year.

Then there are the oil companies, which are facing the steady exhaustion of reserves in the United States, Canada and other important areas. Deals are pending – if political conditions permit – for rights to work areas in Russia and Kazakhstan that could surpass any other new sources of oil. Chevron has the edge in Kazakhstan, where it has the tentative contract for the vast Tenghiz oilfields.

Exxon, the largest U.S. oil company, and Mobil, have a huge potential stake in Siberia. In their *Annual Report* of 1992 Exxon tells us:

Exxon and Mobil Oil Corporation have entered into an agreement to jointly identify economically attractive exploration and development opportunities in an 86 million acre region [134,000 square miles, larger than New England and New York State combined – VP] in Western Siberia. Located about 1,100 miles northeast of Moscow, the region is a part of one of the largest hydrocarbon-producing areas in the world.

Exxon has opened an office in Moscow to advance its interests in Russia. In addition: "Exxon's retail network in the former East Germany has grown to 47 all-new, high-volume service stations equipped with state-of-the-art environmental controls ... car washes, and convenience stores." The company also operates in Hungary and Poland and has been admitted – after 30 years and after partial denationalization – to Venezuela as well as Algeria. The latter breakthrough signifies the hope of the oil companies of regaining direct ownership in the oilfields of the Middle East.

The full diplomatic and military support of the U.S. government backs the expansionist aims of the oil companies and other transnationals. The invasions of Iraq and Somalia are warnings to the Arab countries and Iran to "play ball." Clinton's all-out brazen support for Yeltsin in Moscow's power struggle was underlined by the recent ramming of a Russian submarine by a U.S. submarine near Russian shores during the height of Russia's internal crisis.

A century ago, when Britain's navy dominated the seas and a major portion of the profits of its ruling class was derived from its colonial empire, some of those profits were used by the political bosses to "buy" the support of a section of the British working class and to "pay off" the trade union bureaucracy. Lenin considered the resultant opportunism the main barrier to socialist revolution in Britain and other countries where conditions were otherwise ripe, countries which had reached the imperialist stage of development.

The defeat of fascism in World War II was accompanied by victories by labor in basic industries. Strong new unions with advanced programs were created, tides of progressivism were strong and radical reforms were in the air – including government promises of full employment.

But also with the end of World War II, U.S. imperialism launched a major campaign against labor, utilizing the political weapon of anti-Sovietism, with the related assault on the U.S. Communist Party and all progressive forces. The FBI and other government intervention drove the Communists and other progressives out of leadership in the labor movement, and opportunists took control of the largest unions. The drive for radical reforms and mass movements with a socialist perspective were squelched. Wage gains and other economic concessions in the basic industries were traded in exchange

for abandoning advanced demands, such as a shorter work week and independent political action.

This red-baiting, combined with unremitting attacks on workers, so weakened the unions that beginning in the 1970s, when the structural crisis and a series of financial crises hit the United States, the capitalist class was able to wipe out earlier gains, reduce real wages, weaken the unions still further, enforce "right-to-work" laws in many states, intensify racial discrimination in employment, and, during the 1980s, obtain government intervention as scabherders against labor.

FROM PROP TO WEAPON ■ Opportunism carries influence, not least in the United States. However, in the present phase, a traditional economic prop for opportunism has been largely removed. No longer is a section of the working class getting some benefits from the superprofits out of foreign investments. Instead, foreign investments are used as a weapon to beat down the conditions of American workers.

The accelerated export of capital means that major corporations fire workers and shut down U.S. plants. This results not only in speedup and other measures to raise labor productivity in the remaining plants, but also in the transfer of plants to countries where labor costs are a small fraction of wages in the United States. The liberalization of capital flow, privatization programs put over in many countries, and the internationalization of financial activities facilitate such activity.

Bankers Trust has been one of the leaders in this process. Between 1988 and 1992, it reduced employment in its domestic offices by 15 percent while increasing employment in its foreign offices by 58 percent – and simultaneously assisting many of its corporate clients to make similar shifts. Bankers Trust's international operations in nearly 50 countries accounted for 84 percent of its net income in 1992. It also sees decisive opportunities for expansion in the former socialist countries, as it states in its *Annual Report of 1992*:

The countries of Central and Eastern Europe – particularly the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland – remain inviting to investors, who are attracted by skilled and literate labor forces, deep consumer markets, and proximity to major EC (European Community) markets. [And, of course, with wages a fraction of the U.S. level – VP]

The U.S. government makes such investments

risk-free for the big transnationals. The Export-Import Bank guaranteed a loan, organized by Bankers Trust, of \$246 million for LOT Polish Airlines to buy nine Boeing Aircraft, connected with preparations for privatization and opening up for foreign investment. And the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) guaranteed an investment by Phelps Dodge for a carbon black plant in Hungary, with Bankers Trust as the financial advisor.

The U.S.-based transnationals combine export of capital with import of labor – from Latin America, Asia, India and other countries. The workers are used to doing the most unpleasant and lowest paying service jobs, and the professionals are used to taking on scientific and technical jobs in their fields at salaries significantly below standard levels. Using nationalism as a lever, racist forces demagogically utilize this practice to try to create splits among workers. This racist splitting tactic must be actively opposed by unions and all progressive forces.

The strategic goal of U.S. imperialism is to combine a unified world capital market and communications network with a unified world labor market. According to the laws of capitalism, this unified world labor market would be set at the lowest wages and working conditions, resulting from the free market interplay of supply and demand. In fact, on a number of occasions, corporate executives have been outspoken in proclaiming that their aim is to reduce U.S. wages to the Mexican level, rather than to raise Mexican wages to the U.S. level.

The systemic crisis of capitalism makes it certain that these processes will not take place smoothly. On the contrary, the expanded flow of capital and the resulting profits create sharp contradictions, which must result in fresh cyclical and financial crises, in new dimensions to the structural crises of capitalism.

Struggles of the working class of the United States and other countries will certainly expand and intensify. In this phase of the imperialist epoch, more than ever, international solidarity is essential for labor to turn the tide, move forward in a progressive direction, and prepare the ground for a socialist transformation. Such solidarity in action can defeat the strategic political and economic goals of imperialism. It can help the workers of all countries to win great battles against capitalist reaction and exploitation. □

Rap, Hip Hop and the Social Consciousness of Youth

A. Mitchell

Where I'm from it be like run your coat Black (gimme your coat),
Jupiter has fat beats by the pack,
Where I'm from nappy hair is life,
We be reading Marx where I'm from ...

Digable Planets

Today a new rebelliousness has appeared on the music scene. And while it originates from the nation's ghettos, this music can be found everywhere from the tumultuous streets of Harlem to the quietness of the suburbs. It is rap music.

Rap music is poetry set to music, but instead of using live instruments, rappers "sample" certain beats off of vinyl records. Sampling is a method of combining or "mixing" various records on top of which a rap song is inserted, thereby creating a new and unique sound and message.

Often the terms "rap music" and "hip-hop" are confused and used interchangeably. Rap is the actual music itself, while hip-hop refers to the culture and style of rap.

However there are limitations to this definition. To describe rap music as simply a new variation in contemporary musical forms is like saying Mozart was just another classical musician. Rap, while building on and drawing from other styles of music, has added something new and qualitatively different. It is a major development in music on par with classical, jazz, blues, rock or country.

Rap is the messenger of the streets. It is the music of urban, working-class, African American youth. Significantly it has also incorporated a broader constituency and become the voice of a rising new social movement expressing the concerns and increasingly, the political demands of young people.

Rap is thus at once social commentary and social protest. As a form of social commentary Rapper Chuck D of the popular rap group Public Enemy put it best when he called rap, "The CNN of Black America."

ORAL TRADITION ■ To truly understand rap music,

A. Mitchell is a student activist living in Harlem.

one must appreciate its roots in the African American oral tradition. The oral tradition, brought to the West during the African slave trade, has remained a vital and living part of African culture in America. Black slaves were forced to rely on folk and cautionary tales as a secret means of communication by the racist viciousness and cruelty of the U.S. brand of chattel slavery, which forbade reading and writing. They relied on the oral tradition as an instrument of survival and struggle. This story-telling tradition was transposed into music, in the form of spirituals and later into the blues. The blues too became a form of advice, counseling, and clandestine communication during the hellish times that followed the betrayal of Reconstruction and the resumption of the slaveocracy to power in the South.

Thus rap's historical predecessors are jazz and the blues. Rappers today sample modern jazz tunes like those of Charlie Parker, and Thelonious Monk. It is important to note that before his death, jazz great Miles Davis was working to bridge the gap between rap and jazz. The blues influence also can be seen in the frank nature of discussing topics such as sex, drugs, and current events.

It could be argued that rap music started in the poetry clubs of the '50s and '60s. For example, in Greenwich Village, a struggling Jack Kerouac wondered how to keep audiences from falling asleep in the middle of his poetry readings. A friend – the well-known talk show host Steve Allen – suggested some light piano in the background. The rest is history.

These jazz influences compose an important underpinning of rap music and hip-hop culture. A more direct influence during the 1960s was a group of Harlemites known as the Last Poets. Some consider their style to be the direct predecessor to modern rap music. Their use of African rhythms and jazz are still found in rap today. But what most music historians consider so important about the group was their political message. Riding the crest of the African American freedom movement, they came out with albums praising Malcolm X and supporting Black equality with titles like "The Revolution Will Not Be Televised."

RAP'S ORIGINS ■ Similarly, reggae music and the poetry of Nikki Giovanni were also important pre-rap influences. Soul music during this era became a new musical inspiration and cleared the way for the emergence of rap. Funk was a by-product of soul with its deep bass lines and guitar riffs.

During this period, small Black-owned record labels began publishing their own records, thus opening the way for such trailblazers as Sly and the Family Stone, the Isley Brothers, Parliament, Funkadelic, and Kool and the Gang. Funk music and their samples will always be remembered through rap. During this time, the world-famed Motown sound was booming, and rock n' roll was one of the mainstays of American culture.

During the mid-to-late 1970s, disco music began to emerge. This fast-paced music had no social meaning, but could be danced to. Disco initially enjoyed wide popularity among Blacks, Latinos and gays. The music's culture was scorned by the mainstream public because of its weird fashions and lifestyle. But this ended with the 1975 film, "Saturday Night Fever," starring John Travolta, which brought disco to the forefront. Disco is important to the development of rap because of its party atmosphere, fast style, and use of keyboards and synthesizers instead of acoustic instruments.

Yet another significant precursor to rap was the music of Gil Scott-Heron. During the 1970s, Heron carried on the revolutionary tradition of biting social commentary in music. Various singing and rapping, Heron addressed himself to such important issues as the Watergate scandal and the dirty tricks of the Nixon administration, drug abuse and alcoholism, and the counter attack during the '70s on the gains made during the civil rights and anti-war movements. In fact, it was Heron who made the phrase, "the revolution will not be televised," famous.

In 1979, the water finally broke and rap music as we know it was finally born. A group called the Sugar Hill Gang – the name taken from the Sugar Hill section of Harlem – came out with the single "Rapper's Delight." Initially it was taken as a disco song, but many recognized its style as the dawn of a new type of music.

A consensus does not exist as to the true birthplace of rap. Many claim Washington D.C., home of "go-go," a highly syncopated driving music as the place of rap's genesis. At the very least D.C.'s

music had a major impact on this new musical current. Others claim the barrios of East Los Angeles. However, in this writer's opinion, there is no doubt the music's heart is in New York City.

In New York in the early 1980s gangs in the South Bronx, instead of ruffling used to "rhyme" against each other – rhyiming is a form of verbal non-violent competition that probably had its origins in "the dozens," an African American verbal banter in which a person's family, particularly one's mother, is the object of abuse. One of the most popular figures was Afrika Bambatta who cut the single "Planet Rock," a party song with no social significance. Nevertheless it helped widen the influence of rap.

During the early '80s rap music grew in popularity in the inner cities, but mainstream America paid no attention to it. Also adding to this was the fact that many rap groups would produce one single and never be heard from again. Also, as in other aspects of life's endeavors, Black artists did not have the capital to back up their music financially.

However rap's attraction was irresistible and with the cutting of Grand Master Flash and the Furious Five's "The Message," the new art form made an important breakthrough. This record, produced at the height of Reagan recession, spoke of the almost unbearable pain inflicted on unemployed urban youth and the attempt to cope without going over the edge. "Don't push me cause I'm close to the edge, I'm trying not to loose my head," went its alienated refrain.

CROSS-OVER ■ In 1983 the bomb dropped. A group from Hollis Queens, New York, known as Run-DMC, gained major cross-over fame ("cross-over" refers to music that is popular among different races and cultures, in this case Black music crossing over and being accepted by white audiences). The single "King of Rock" and its video broke the color barrier on MTV (Music Television, a 24-hour music cable station). Like most rap songs it didn't get major radio air play, until urban stations started having rap shows such as New York City's DJ Red Alert Show, and Mr. Magic's Rap Attack. But even Black stations refused to play rap for fear of losing their listenership because of the controversial nature of the music.

The accompanying trend of hip-hop, on the other hand, was gaining mass acceptance in the cultural arena. Movies such as "Krush Groove" –

which documents the rise and fall of Run-DMC – and “Wild Style” cashed in on the new music craze. In addition, other types of cultural expression of inner-city youth gained greater recognition, such as break dancing, a dance form dedicated to quick body mechanics once used in the Dance Theater of Harlem, and graffiti which was brought to art galleries by the late Andy Warhol. For example, Jean Baptiste was well known for this art until his tragic death from a heroin overdose in 1985.

IDEOLOGICAL INFLUENCES ■ Rap was born during the Reagan era and was not immune to the much-promoted ideological concept of “me-firstism.” As a result, in its early days the dominant trend in this new music was extremely capitalistic – most rap songs were about making money.

Needless to say, this theme was not without appeal to unemployed Black youth. Jobless, unskilled and without hope for a better future, young African Americans were looking for a means to a better life and images which reflected this search.

Tragically, negative role models were found and vigorously promoted in commercial schemes in what in all probability was a conscious reversion to the “Superfly syndrome” of the 1970s. As had occurred a decade before a “glamorous” image of drug dealers was popularized and they became the anti-heroes of rap culture. Their lavish lifestyle was copied by younger Blacks. Big gold chains, beepers, and cars with sophisticated sound systems became the desire of Black youth across the nation.

Unfortunately some rappers only perpetuated the misconception that wealth is the key to everything. Rappers such as LL Cool J, Kool Moe Dee and the infamous Slick Rick – who’s serving time in New York’s Rikers Island prison – stressed that material things were more important than anything.

But rap music can’t wholly be blamed. Rappers were basically saying that there wasn’t any hope for Black youth under Reagan, and for many dealing drugs was perceived to be the only way out of a life of poverty and despair.

Another problem that emerged as rap gained in popularity was violence at concerts. This violence closed major venues to rap music, although the cause of the violence was poor security and planning, not the music. Nevertheless, rap got a bad rap. High schools across the country banned it at recess and enforced dress codes to prevent “gang war-

fare.”

Despite these negatives, a counter-movement was incubating in the womb of hip hop and rap. This clearly political trend began to acquire a mass form in 1988 when a then relatively unknown rap group called Public Enemy released an album entitled “Yo, Bum Rush the Show.” This album was designed to raise the national and social consciousness of Black youth.

Like most acts, Public Enemy went to England and gained major success there before landing in the States and signing with Russel Simmons’ Def Jam label, which many compare to Barry Gordy’s Motown. Public Enemy’s subjects range from racist police violence, protests of Arizona’s refusal to observe Dr. King’s birthday as a national holiday, sexual relationships, and the crack epidemic. The group is still making albums, and their lead rapper, Chuck D, is considered a major influence on hip hop politics.

During the Fall of 1988, the rap group De La Soul came to life. Hailing from Amityville, Long Island, they brought out the first non-materialistic rap album. Their appeals to Black youth to replace gold chains with African medallions was widely heard. Their anti-capitalist views dubbed them the “hippies” of the hip hop generation.

The politicization of rap emerged in response to the real life problems facing African American youth, one of the most serious of which was gang violence and Black-on-Black crime. This prompted rapper and philosopher KRS-One to launch the “Stop the Violence” campaign, producing a song by the same name. A coalition of rappers – most of whom were capitalistic in the 1980s – joined the campaign. The album raised over \$600,000 for education and more importantly increased the social consciousness of Black youth.

Coinciding with and to some extent growing out of the increasingly political character of hip hop and rap was the growth of a renewed interest in Malcolm X among African American young people. Malcolm’s autobiography was widely read as many young people began to rediscover their cultural roots. Under the influence of rap and reggae and reflecting renewed national pride, Jheri-curl hairdos were abandoned and Black youth began wearing “dread locks.”

As Black youth started to become active in more organizations, political groups began to exert a greater influence on the music. For example

Farakhan's Nation of Islam enjoys a relationship with Public Enemy. Groups like X-Clan preach a narrow nationalism and are tied to well-known nationalist organizations. For example, the leader of the group is Lumumba Carson, son of Sonny Carson, leader of the Brooklyn-based December 12th movement.

Yet another factor in the emergence of rap is the response to racist police violence. The murder of Yusef Hawkins in New York several years ago had a galvanizing effect – it helped radicalize this generation of Black youth. As a result, the 1960s slogan, "Say it Loud, I'm Black and I'm Proud" was replaced by "No Justice, No Peace" and demands for social and economic justice.

WOMEN RAPPERS ■ Young African American women are having a great impact on hip hop culture. Because rap in its initial stages was largely a male-dominated scene, sexist attitudes towards women loomed large in the content of much of the music. For example, incredible as it might seem, Black women in particular were blamed for the spread of AIDS and the attack on Black men.

Initially, there were a few female pioneers of rap such as Roxanne Shanté and Sparky D but they were portrayed by the industry in a circus-like manner, existing only to have "cat-fights" with other female rappers. One group of young women in particular blazed the way for modern-day female MCs – Salt n' Pepa with their hit single "Mic Check."

When 16-year old Brooklynite MC Lyte appeared on the rap circuit, her rugged style as displayed in the song "Paper Thin" set the charts on fire and impressed many women and men. Perhaps the reason was that the raw hardcore rhythm of her music did not fit into the neo-pop category of Salt 'n Pepa.

Another major female artist is Queen Latifah who has interjected a Black nationalist trend into the ranks of women rappers. Her single "Ladies First" pays tribute to the women who fought and still fight for African American equality. Latifah currently owns a record production company (Flavor Unit Records) that signs artists that major labels ignore.

It should be noted that the problem of sexism in rap music is very prevalent. Women are frequently portrayed in songs and videos as sex objects and are often referred to as "bitches." This not infrequently leads to violence against women. Indeed in one case Dee Barnes, the host of the TV rap show "Pump it

Up" was severely beaten by Dr. Dre (Andre Young), formerly of the rap group NWA because she was "disrespectful." Some male rappers have responded to this blatant male supremacy such as Paris who has written an ode demanding respect for Black womanhood entitled "Assata." Regrettably this is only a drop in the bucket in comparison to the dominant male supremacist trend. Today there is also a new militant trend in women's rap, as many have adopted the West Coast gangster style.

LATINO TRENDS ■ Latino youth have had a heavy influence on rap. Of course they have been involved since day one as rap's origins in the South Bronx testifies. In fact Latino rap first appeared in 1981 with Mean Machine and their single "Disco Dreams" which first used spanglish (a mixture of Spanish and English). However, only lately have Latino rappers begun to establish a distinct identity in the music.

Many Latino rappers, such as Kid Frost brought out Latino and Chicano pride. Mellow Man Ace is a Cuban American rapper who is anti-socialist Cuba and blatantly sexist. East L.A. rapper Kid Frost brought major cross-over popularity to spanglish rap and dropped the single, "This is for La Raza," which spoke about great pride in Mexican American history and tradition.

Today Latinos have a major influence on hip-hop. The most popular group is Cypress Hill which has influenced an entire generation of Black and Latino youth with a mixture of West Coast gangster rap and East Coast slang and style.

GANGSTER RAP ■ The capitalists at the record companies realized the profitability of rap music and tried to destroy the art form by making a buck out of it. In 1989 an Oakland rapper by the name of M.C. Hammer came out with his single "Can't touch this." Hammer managed with his shallow, contentless music to generate major cross-over success. This combined with the appearance of Vanilla Ice, a white rapper who is to rap music what Elvis Presley and Pat Boone were to rock-and-roll, represented a new large-scale attempt to commercialize rap.

Because of the influences of commercialization, rap nearly died as an art form. Rappers were more consumed with making money than preserving and developing the art form. Money rather than the message started to become the driving force behind the music. As a result, in the major centers of rap and hip hop culture, the music began to experience a

certain stagnation.

While New York was sleeping however, Los Angeles a rap giant, and other areas of the West Coast, were beginning a new style. In California the gangs created what is known as "gangster rap." This variation of rap is extremely sexist and violent.

However behind the violent exterior of gangster rap was an underlying political message – the ghettos and barrios of this country were in desperate need of help. One of the major forces in "gangster rap" was NWA. Their single, "Straight out of Compton," takes a raw look at gang violence and police brutality. The West Coast had taken rap music over the edge, leaving the East Coast in the dust.

The sexist and violent character of this type of rap also had political consequences. In the late 1980's Tipper Gore, wife of then Senator Albert Gore, led a fight to ban many of the rappers and place an advisory notice on all rap albums they considered "unbecoming to minors." What Gore and other self-made "savior's" of youth morality did not realize was that the real violence of seeing one's brother gunned down in the street is more "unbecoming" than its musical reflection ever could be. And yet these moral crusaders are silent when it comes to grappling with the drug crisis, unemployment and other causes of street violence. Nevertheless, many of these albums were banned from record stores.

These incidents led to 2 Live Crew's banning in Daytona County Florida. In this case a record store owner was arrested and given a one-year jail sentence. Because of 2 Live's strong sexual content the store owner was accused of selling "pornography" to minors. Consequently, the group's albums were pulled off the shelves of record stores all over the country. 2 Live Crew sued the Christian Front Organization for violating their First Amendment rights and won. This case is significant because it was a defeat for the right which tried to destroy rap as a voice of the people.

Despite this small but significant victory, capitalist record corporations saw the dollar sign and milked "gangster rap" for every cent they could. As a result of gangster rap's commercialization every rap group and their mothers were coming out with so-called "gangster albums," and the style lost its rawness and appeal. Slowly, New York gained back its title as the rap capital of the world continuing the East Coast / West Coast feud.

RACISM ■ Rap is continually in battle with reaction. After the Los Angeles uprising, police officials boycotted Ice-T's song "Cop Killa." (For the record, the idiots didn't even realize it was a heavy metal song not a rap song). President Clinton even got into the act during his campaign when he blasted rapper and former Public Enemy member Sista Souljah as a racist for calling, in a song after the LA rebellion, for the killing of whites. Needless to say, Clinton's act was a clear capitulation and appeal to racism during the election campaign.

One should not be under the illusion that rap music is only a Black thing. There have been a number of Latino and white rap groups that have had success with majority Black audiences as well as whites and Spanish-speaking youth. These groups include the Beastie Boys – whose albums went platinum in just a few weeks – and 3rd Bass. Run-DMC even saved the career of the rock group Aerosmith with a remake of their 1977 hit, "Walk This Way."

One of the most amazing things about rap is that it has broad appeal among different nationalities. More and more white youth are listening to rap not just because the music industry tries to tailor it to white audiences, but because rap often deals with the problems of drugs, joblessness, school, police violence, youth alienation from society which speaks to them too.

And Black youth, while the music's creators, are generally appreciative of the efforts of others as long as the music is good. This explains why some white rappers have enjoyed a large Black audience. Groups such as 3rd Bass and House of Pain have a kind of Brooklyn street brawler style which is popular. But there are those who have gone too far. For example one white group has even gone so far as to name themselves Young Black Teenagers and have adopted a racist "black face" stereotype imitating African Americans by wearing dreads and talking in slang.

Still others, like Marky Mark, brother of Danny Wohlberg from the teen-idol group "New Kids on the Block," have been involved in racist attacks against Asian Americans and African Americans. Despite widespread criticism and a boycott launched by a group in the Asian American community, Mark remains unapologetic. Such actions show contempt for the art form on the part of some white rappers.

Rap music, unlike other musical forms is constantly on the verge of change. As indicated earlier

rap's main basis is in jazz. Rap and hip-hop are getting back to their cultural origins, but are also expanding and seeking new avenues of creative expression.

These changes are occurring within the context of a growing anti-capitalist and left trend in rap music. Groups such as the Coup, an Oakland-based group, refer to capitalism as a "spider whose web is getting tighter." Another brother from Oakland, Paris, is continuing the work of the Black Panthers preaching Black self-reliance and respect for Black women.

A group named "Digable Planets" – the name is taken from the fact that they believe every person is their own planet – are a growing force in the left trend in rap in the '90s. This group is in the vanguard of the new combinations of jazz and rap. The members of the group are named after insects. Why insects you ask? As the group's leader Butterfly puts it:

The insect theory is the son of socialist readings. Knowing where you stand in this society and knowing where you should stand. Like if you look at ants and their hill, always bringing food back and protecting it. Think of the *Communist Manifesto*, when at the end they say "Workers of the World Unite" ... it's a unity thing.

One of the most popular new rappers with a progressive message is Tupac Shakur (2PAC). A former member of the group Digital Underground 2PAC has spread his wings and has set out as a solo artist. His single "Brenda's Got a Baby" tells a macabre tale of a teenage young woman who becomes pregnant and the options she must face. His music also deals with racist police violence and other problems facing young Black people.

Another rising hip hop group, Arrested Development, deals with the need of going back to ones roots, homelessness, unity and ending sexism. Their single "Revolution" was featured in the recent Spike Lee film on Malcolm X.

The hip-hop generation is very literate and well read, especially in politics. It is important not to buy into the the negative portrayal of rap and hip hop musicians and listeners as illiterate apathetic hoodlums. As shown by the recent trends, rap is developing into a very effective medium to promote political awareness among youth. We must support the new progressive rappers, many of whom have had to start their own production companies after being

blacklisted by the industry, such as Digable Planets and Latin Empire.

Hip hop is perhaps the most powerful social and political movement among youth since the youth movements of the '60s. Not only does it have a musical expression but it also encompasses a way of dressing and talking, and it has an artistic expression in graffiti and increasingly in movies and literature. At the heart of hip hop, and its driving force, are the daily lives of working-class, nationally oppressed African American and Latino youth. In spite of the different political trends within hip hop, including even reactionary ones, and the pressure from the music industry to commercialize and milk the medium, the main underlying trend remains an anti-racist voice of the downtrodden.

The negative trends in hip hop, rather than being consciously reactionary, represent the hopelessness of many youth today, and their desire to be someone with power over their lives and surroundings, even if that means being a drug dealer or a hood. These trends are testimony to the social crisis that has been created by capitalism among young people today.

ANTI-CAPITALIST TREND ■ The growing anti-capitalist trend in rap and hip hop is a logical response. It is also a positive response to the negative trends in the music, showing that there is another way. This trend increasingly pinpoints the capitalist system as the culprit in the oppression of Black and Latino peoples and working people as a whole. And it calls on young people to "fight the power."

The attack on rap is part of a general ideological assault on youth by the ruling class, in order to destroy one of the few tools that youth have for self-expression and protest and to blunt attempts to organize youth. It is a part of the attempts by the ruling class to repress the growing frustration among youth against the daily living conditions and prevent a social explosion like the recent riots in LA and others across the country.

Rap must be recognized for what it is – the voice of the young generation. It appeals to a multi-racial audience that is discouraged by the systemic crisis and is rebelling. Rap music can and should be used as an effective political tool for social justice. To ignore its importance is to ignore the youth it represents. □

Shelley and Marx

Kenneth Neill Cameron

Percy Bysshe Shelley, one of the great revolutionary writers of the pre-Marxist era, has for decades been routinely presented as a harmless lyricist, chanting of love and nature. But some, even in the 19th Century, began to see through the mist of distortion. Among the first to do so were Marx and Engels.

Eleanor Marx remembered that her father regarded Shelley as "essentially a revolutionary," who, if he had lived "would always have been one of the advanced guard of socialism." And Frederick Engels as a young man translated part of Shelley's radical poem, *Queen Mab*, which was sold by the Chartists and the Owenite socialists at their meetings. Marx did not, of course, mean that Shelley was a practicing revolutionary but that his outlook was in essence revolutionary, as, for instance, in his preface to his poem on the Greek revolutionary war, *Hellas*, written in 1821 but in spirit anticipating the *Communist Manifesto* (1848).

This [Shelley wrote] is the age of the war of the oppressed against the oppressors, and every one of those ringleaders of the privileged gangs of murderers and swindlers, called Sovereigns, look to each other for aid against the common enemy, and suspend their mutual jealousies in the presence of a mightier fear. Of this holy alliance all the despots of the earth are virtual members. But a new race has arisen throughout Europe, nursed in the abhorrence of the opinions which are its chains, and she will continue to produce fresh generations to accomplish that destiny which tyrants foresee and dread.

The "mightier fear" was that of mass revolution:

*Rise like Lions after slumber
In unvanquishable number -
Shake your chains to earth like dew
Which in sleep had fallen on you -
Ye are many - they are few.*

It was this sense of identification with the work-

ing people of town and country and not just with bourgeois anti-feudal sentiments that caused Marx to believe that Shelley would have become a socialist - this and Shelley's understanding of the exploitation of labor:

There is no real wealth but the labour of man. Were the mountains of gold and the valleys of silver, the world would not be one grain of corn the richer.

To make a manufacturer [worker] work sixteen hours where he only worked eight; to turn children into lifeless and bloodless machines at an age when otherwise they would be at play before the cottage doors of their parents....

For fourteen hours' labor which they do perform, they receive - no matter in what nominal amount - the price of seven.

This system of exploitation was complacently regarded by reactionary and arrogant rulers - in a hymn to Famine:

*Those who consume these fruits through thee grow fat,
Those who produce these fruits through thee grow lean,
Whatever change takes place, oh, stick to that!
And let things be as they have ever been.*

One of the results of the exploitative system was the added oppression of women:

*Woman as the bond-slave dwells
Of man, a slave; and life is poisoned in its wells.*

Can man be free if woman is a slave?

Shelley, like Marx, regarded the oppression of women as an integral part of an exploitative society. He anticipated Engels in arguing that the historical roots of this oppression lay in a monogamy in which women were "considered as the property of men ... valuable to them in the same way as their flocks or herds," and he argued that at least part of this oppression would be relieved by the abolition of

Kenneth Neill Cameron is the author of *The Young Shelley: Genesis of a Radical*, and of *Marxism: The Science of Society*.

legal marriage: "I conceive that from the abolition of marriage the fit and natural arrangement of sexual connection would result."

The whole hideous system of human exploitations and oppression was supported by the ruling class and its State,

the constituted authorities of the nation, they who possess whether with or without its consent the command of a standing army and of a legion of spies and police officers and hold all the strings of that complicated mechanism with which the hopes and fears of men are moved like puppets.

"Shelley," wrote Bernard Shaw of *Queen Mab*, "shows a remarkable grasp of facts, anticipating the modern view that sociological problems are being slowly worked out independently of the conscious interference of man." So, too, in *Prometheus Unbound*, Necessity, symbolized by Demogorgon, is depicted as the directing force behind history. Jupiter, symbolizing the existing order, is helpless before this force, as his state power crumbles: "The elements obey me not." Mahmud in *Hellas* faced by the world's eyeless charioteer, Destiny, can only cry out: "Far other bark than ours were needed now/ To stem the torrent of descending time."

Necessity, as in Holbach or Godwin, is an objective, amorphous force rooted in the atoms of the universe and within the human mind, operating inexorably and without understanding:

*One comes behind,
Who aye the future to the past will bind –
Necessity, whose sightless strength for ever
Evil with evil, good with good must wind
In bands of union, which no power may sever:
They must bring forth their kind, and be divided never!*

Necessity indifferently produces good or evil. He is a "sightless" charioteer, blind or with his eyes bandaged. It is not true, however, that Necessity cannot to some degree be directed by human endeavor. Necessity works with whatever material is provided for it. If it operates in a society dominated by hatred and oppression it will produce nothing but more hatred and oppression – as in the collapse of the French Revolution. But if there is an infusion of love and comradeship, a new kind of society will emerge:

*The loathsome mask has fallen, the man remains,
Sceptreless, free, uncircumscribed, but man
Equal, unclassed, tribeless, and nationless,
Except from awe, worship, degree, the king
Over himself.*

In this new worldwide, classless, egalitarian society, "Throne, altars, judgement-seats and prisons" will be abolished, new men and women ("changed to all which once they dared not be") will remold the world with the aid of science: "Compelling the elements with adamant stress." That the forces of Necessity were driving society in this direction was, Shelley believed, demonstrated by the historically unprecedented advances made by the American revolutionary war and the French Revolution, which even though it ended in the despotism of Napoleon represented an advance over feudalism: "... there being not the remotest possibility of re-establishing the enormous system of tyranny abolished by the Revolution – France is, as it were, regenerated."

REVOLUTION & LIBERATION ■ The first step towards the future egalitarian society was, Shelley believed, a democratic republic. This, as depicted in *Laon and Cythna*, subtitled "A Vision of the Nineteenth Century," would come about on the continent of Europe by revolution: "For so dear is power that the tyrants themselves neither then, nor now, nor ever, left or leave a path to freedom but through their own blood." As part of this revolution would come struggles for national liberation, such as that in Ireland, in which Shelley had participated, and those in Mexico, Naples, and Greece that he hailed in his poetry. In these coming struggles there would be not only victories but bitter defeats:

*Our dead shall be the seed of their decay,
Our survivors be the shadow of their price,
Our adversity a dream to pass away –
Their dishonour a remembrance to abide!*

In Britain Shelley hoped that a democratic republic could be achieved by successive reforms of the parliamentary system; if not, then revolution was inevitable there also: "The last resort of resistance is undoubtedly insurrection. The right of insurrection is derived from the employment of armed force to counteract the will of the nation." For the rest of the world, for Asia and Latin America,

Shelley seems to have believed that the path to the future lay through revolution. He hailed the Black revolts in Santo Domingo and Haiti: "Two nations of free Negroes are already established; one, in pernicious mockery of the usurpation over France, an empire, the other a republic — both animating yet terrific spectacles to those who inherit around them the degradation of slavery and the peril of dominion."

Shelley, then, anticipated the outlook of Marx and Engels in various ways. He perceived the existence of classes and the class struggle, the value-producing role of labor and its exploitation, the special oppression of women, the repressive function of the state and the evolution of the world into a classless society. Some of these views are also to be found in other writers of Shelley's age: in Godwin, Robert Owen, Cobbett, Leigh Hunt, Thomas Jonathon Wooler, Richard Carlile, Ricardo, Blake and Byron. But although some of them surpassed Shelley in certain respects, none achieved the fullness of revolutionary vision that he did. Nevertheless, both their and Shelley's anticipations of Marx, insightful and brilliant though they often are, are uncoordinated and embryonic.

PERCEPTIONS OF CLASS ■ Although Shelley perceived the class struggle, he did not perceive its role in history or think consistently in its terms. For instance, in *Ode to Liberty*, he speaks of "Man" having "enthroned the oppression and the oppressor," as though Man was a classless, monolithic entity. He grasped — although not to the same degree as Ricardo — the labor theory of value, but he did not perceive the roots of exploitation in surplus value; nor did Ricardo. He perceived that the ruling class used both force and psychological manipulation, but he did not see the state as a coordinated whole that expresses the will of a ruling class.

His general revolutionary outlook was sometimes flavored with pacifist ambivalence, as in *The Masque of Anarchy* — but not in *Hellas*. While he sympathized with the working mass — as he makes clear in *Swellfoot the Tyrant* — he also feared them, though his fear of the ruling class was greater and his hatred of them intense: "I met Murder on the way / He had a mask like Castlereagh." Although he anticipated an eventual classless society he did not perceive that the basis for this society would be economic, embracing the common use of the industrial productive forces, but seems to have still thought in

Godwinian terms of an equality of private property. Although he saw historical evolution, he did not perceive that the basic factor was social and that human thinking was derivative; rather he neutrally depicted both in interaction:

The mass of capabilities remains at every period materially the same; the circumstances which awaken it to action perpetually change. If England were divided into forty republics, each equal in population and extent to Athens, there is no reason to suppose but that, under institutions not more perfect than those of Athens, each would produce philosophers and poets equal to those who (if we except Shakespeare) have never been surpassed. We owe the great writers of the golden age of our literature to that fervid awakening of the public mind which shook to dust the oldest and most oppressive form of the Christian religion. We owe Milton to the progress and development of the same spirit.

In the first part of the statement Shelley implies that ideas arise out of social structures; in the second that social change arises from ideas, perceiving the interconnections but not primary and secondary relationships. His total picture is a long way from Marx's (1859):

It is not the consciousness of human beings that determines their existence, but conversely, it is their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing production relationships, or, what is but a legal expression for the same thing, with the property relationships within which they have hitherto moved. From forms of development of the productive forces, these relationships turn into their fetters. A period of social revolution then begins. With the change in the economic foundation, the whole gigantic superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations we must always distinguish between the material changes in the economic conditions of production, changes which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic, or philosophic, in short, ideological forms in which human beings become conscious of this conflict and fight it out to an issue.

Marx's words have general application, and clearly he based his conclusions in part on changes he witnessed in his own age. The new "material productive forces" of the industrial revolution — coal,

iron, steam – had broken the old “property relationships” of feudal land owning and established new relationships based on the factory system of capitalist exploitation. As both the institutions and the ideology of the age are rooted in the economic structure, change in this structure produced change in the institutions and, through the class struggle, in the ideology also. The bourgeoisie involved in these transformations, however, perceived the ideological factors as primary and failed to see the historical role of the deeper socioeconomic ones. True, their needs created the new productive forces, but this was not consciously planned and, once created, these forces established frameworks within which change had to take place.

In the future, similar processes will take place but this time with the working class as the transforming agent and one with a basic (Marxist) understanding of the total process. “The expropriators” will be “expropriated” and “the dictatorship of the proletariat” will be established as preliminary to the “abolition of all classes.” The new communist society will go through two phases, the first in which it is “tainted economically, morally and intellectually with the hereditary diseases of the old society from whose womb it is emerging,” the second in which “the springs of cooperative wealth are gushing more freely together with the all-round development of the individual.”

Marx, then, had a coordinated, scientific theory, the essential truth of which has been demonstrated in the present century as a third of the world’s people “expropriated” the “expropriators,” and socialism, in spite of some serious setbacks, is still the central historical thrust. Shelley’s vision, on the other hand, was based on a creative sensing of historical currents, and for so early a projection, was remarkably far-sighted: a dark mirror “of the gigantic shadows which futurity casts upon the present.”

Marx’s social views were integrated with a scientific materialism that had practice as its basic criterion of truth, viewing mind as an emanation from matter, and perceiving reality as essentially developmental in response to its inherent contradictions. Shelley, beginning as a dualist with materialist tendencies, became a philosophical skeptic, leaving open the possibility of the primacy and uniqueness of mind.

A DIFFERENCE IN THEIR TIMES ■ As we read the different concepts and perspectives of Shelley and

Marx, it becomes apparent that the difference between them lay primarily not in individuals but in their times. When Shelley died in 1822 Marx was but four years old, and the difference between 1822 and 1848 was vast. What were but embryonic forces in Shelley’s day were fully born in Marx’s. An incipient capitalism had become an actual capitalism, creating new advances in science. The industrial working class, which in Shelley’s day was still being formed and was mixed with agricultural and other elements – “Men of England wherefore plough / For the lords who lay ye low?” – by 1848 had become a separate and powerful class, which in the 1830s and 1840s began to formulate its own ideology in its papers and periodicals – Chartist, Owenite and trade union.

My friends, our country may be compared to a bed full of nasty, filthy crawling Aristocratic and Shopocratic bugs. Now, in answer to our calumniators who say that we wish to destroy property, I answer, we will not destroy the bedstead, but we will annihilate the bugs.

Thus wrote, in 1839, Engels’ friend the Chartist leader George Harney, advocating a working-class socialism based on the material productive forces of capitalism – but without the capitalists. This class outlook, still fragmentary, striving to be born, constituted the core of Marxism. What Marx and Engels did was, in effect, to complete the formulation of the world outlook of the new industrial working class, a class that had not previously existed, and whose ideology, therefore, was unique, an ideology essentially materialist because the class was not blocked from reality by the narcotizing demands of rule, and essentially developmental because the class was an ascending one. Neither Godwin nor Condorcet, neither Blake nor Shelley, could have formulated this view, for the social base for its formulation did not exist in their age.

Marxism, as Engels emphasized, is not a system of thought imposed upon reality but one derived from reality. Shelley, as a young radical in a tumultuous age of change, had some extraordinary insights into socio-historical processes – “Me – who am as a nerve o’er which do creep / The else unfelt oppressions of this earth” – and some of these insights should be retained and placed in their proper perspectives. For instance, although it is true that consciousness is determined by social existence, it is not the whole truth. Consciousness reacts back upon

the social conditions that molded it and in a communist society will be the controlling element. Shelley's emphasis upon interactions in this regard, even though he fails to distinguish basic from derivative elements, is insightful and dialectical. So, too, is his emphasis upon the interactive nature of the power structures of society. Jupiter has power only as part of such a process. The structure of oppression is held together by the bonds of "Custom" and "Opinion," the phantoms and shadows of hatred, lies and prejudice emerging from the cold light of the car of Life blindly driven by Necessity. The rulers spread these opiates but they are also caught up in them.

Shelley's doctrine of love embraces love in all its aspects: "The bond and sanction which unites not only man with man but with everything which exists." He emphasizes, in *Laon and Cythna*, the power of love in inspiring a revolutionary movement, and in *Prometheus Unbound*, its cementing role in a future, egalitarian society. Both insights – and Shelley we might note, as a vegetarian, includes animals as well as humans ("everything which exists") – are profound.

Shelley had insights, however, not only into social processes but into natural and psychological ones also, and Marx was doubtless aware of some of these just as he was of those of Shakespeare, whose plays he read avidly and watched in theater, setting up what his son-in-law, Paul Lafargue, described as "a veritable Shakespeare cult" in the family. Marx

would certainly have appreciated some of Shelley's psychological insights – in *The Cenci* or *Julian and Maddalo* for instance – and he would certainly have responded to Shelley's dialectical miniature of the universe, a concept that anticipates modern science:

*World in worlds are rolling ever
From the creation to decay,
Like the bubbles on a river
Sparkling, bursting, borne away.*

Marx realized that the creative arts have their own paths to truth and that these should be seen as part of the total picture.

Art's paths to truth are not those of reason alone but insights of understanding that come from an intense blending of thought and emotion. A radical political movement cannot grow and flourish without opening these paths, which are paths not only of understanding but of action.

Today as we poise on the edge of a massive rise in such a movement, it is especially critical to reach out and recover the great progressive art of the past and create new forms for the present. We must make live again the poetry of Blake and Whitman and Langston Hughes, the fiction of Mike Gold and Josephine Herbst, the plays of Sean O'Casey, the songs of Joe Hill. The picket lines and meeting halls must ring with song and music, lending buoyancy to struggle. □

Hall, continued from page 8

nationally as well as in the districts and clubs.

A part of the same problem, the other side of the same coin, is the influence of paternalism. As a matter of fact, I think this ideological poison is a bigger problem in our ranks. And we have never really had a discussion on paternalism.

We should think about preparing some material. The African American Equality Commission is meeting next week, but I don't think the preparation for a Partywide study and discussion should be the sole responsibility of the commission. In a sense it is asking the victims to plan a Partywide discussion. The preparations should include help from the Labor Department. Perhaps such a study/discussion could be part of the coming

Midterm Special National Party Conference. Perhaps the Conference on the PWW could also be part of the conference preparation process.

The Organization Department and the National Board's Executive will discuss how to get out the openings and other material from this meeting. However, all districts should have a membership meeting, an open membership meeting. I am speaking at a New York open membership meeting soon, which will assess the political and economic crises, the new openings for and status of the Party in New York and nationally, how to ride the tide of the new possibilities, and how to come up with a new program of solutions for the crises. We will also discuss how to break out into street corner meetings. □

The Early Struggles of the Young Communist League

Mary Licht

Prior to the formation of the Young Communist League in 1921 revolutionary and socialist minded youth were engaged in a variety of struggles. For example, during the First World War young people organized against President Wilson's Declaration of War, which the people of America opposed recognizing that it was waged solely for reactionary imperialist aims. Strikes of millions haunted the administration during the two years the U.S. was involved.

World War I was the making of the United States industrially. By 1928, the total volume of U.S. production exceeded the production of the whole of Europe. From a debtor country, the U.S. became the world's richest creditor nation. During this period U.S. monopoly also strengthened its economic and political control over the countries of Latin America.

The big monopolists not only dominated the government, but began a wild attack against the workers and the trade union movement: a vicious political offensive with the Palmer Raids, deportation and the arrest of Communist Party and Industrial Workers of the World leaders. This fury was vented against African Americans who fought for democracy abroad and wanted it in America on their return after the war. The response of racist elements was seventy lynchings of African Americans during the first years of the post-war period.

FORMATIVE YEARS ■ In its formative years the struggle for peace and trade union organizing were key issues for the YCL. For example, the militarization of youth was pushed incessantly throughout the country by the ruling class with the build-up of the Marines, National Guard and the introduction of Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) into colleges. A very active YCL immediately organized students against American militarism, especially at New York's City College - free then - where many working-class youth were in attendance. Si Gerson, a leader of this struggle in CCNY, was expelled in 1927.

The U.S. arbitrarily intervened in Nicaragua in 1926, as the people there rose up against the reactionary Chamorro government. The YCL initiated a movement to withdraw the U.S. Marines from Nicaragua, despite the mass arrests at these demonstrations.

As young workers, YCLers were engaged in trade union organizing struggles and strikes in the Paper Box, Eagle Pencil, laundries and other establishments where young workers were employed. The socialist-led International Ladies Garment Workers Union was the first union where the expulsion of thousands of militant unionists took place. YCLers joined the picket lines of the Needle and Fur Workers Union who were striking against gangsterism and the destruction of their union.

The situation became critical in the Miner's Union, the oldest industrial union, where because of class collaboration policies membership dropped from a half a million to one hundred thousand. The "Save the Union Campaign" was led by left forces.

During this important campaign YCL coal miners Pat Toohey and Anthony Minerich were attacked by the monopolists. Toohey was beaten by company thugs and then charged with "inciting to riot." Clarence Darrow, the eminent attorney, defended him, and the charges were dropped.

In 1926, the Communist Party and the Trade Union Educational League (TUEL) developed a drive to organize the one million textile workers in the country, ninety-five percent of whom were unorganized. In 1926, the Passaic, New Jersey textile strike began and the entire Party and League became involved. The strike lasted 13 months, and young Communists did important relief work. YCLers Lottie Gordon, Helen Winter, and Sophie Gerson participated directly in Passaic activities. In New York City open-air meetings were held discussing the strike, and collections were made in the streets and subways. In 1928, in New Bedford, Massachusetts, the National Textile Workers Union, affiliated with TUEL, led a strike of 26,000 workers.

An important dimension in the growth of the YCL was the fight against racism and for class unity.

Mary Licht is chairperson of the History Commission CPUSA.

Bold and courageous initiative in the fight against racism and segregation were the hallmarks of YCL activity. The Communist Party and YCL decided to take the struggle where it was hardest, to the citadel of racism in the deep South.

SOUTHERN OFFENSIVE ■ In 1929 the Communist Party and TUEL led a drive to unionize the southern textile workers which resulted in the great strike of Gastonia, North Carolina. This bloody strike of 25,000 was defeated by a reign of terror which took the life of Ella May Wiggins, who was a union organizer, songwriter and singer. The Police Chief of Gastonia, Aderhold, who led a murderous raid against the strikers camp, was also killed. This strike was significant because it was the first attempt to organize textile workers in the South and greatly elevated the program of solidarity and unity between white and African American workers.

In 1929, the Party and TUEL extended their work to South Carolina where Anne Burlak went as the National Textile Workers Union (NTWU) organizer, followed by Mary Dalton to Atlanta, Georgia.

On March 6, 1930, the Communist Party, YCL and TUEL called for unemployment relief, and 1,250,000 people all over America responded. There were 110,000 in New York City, 100,000 in Detroit, 50,000 in Chicago and in Pittsburgh, 40,000 in Milwaukee, and at least 30,000 in Philadelphia, Cleveland and other major cities of the United States.

In Atlanta, the YCL also organized a meeting of African American and white workers for unemployment relief. The district organizer of the Party, and the district organizer of the YCL were arrested for distributing leaflets about the meeting. A protest meeting against this arrest was called. Mary Dalton, the Atlanta organizer and three invited speakers, Ann Burlak, Herbert Newton and I. Storey, were then arrested.

The Atlanta six were charged with insurrection under a statute enacted in 1861 during the Civil War against the newly-freed African Americans which carried the death penalty. The damning evidence in the case was a leaflet issued to announce the meeting which had an illustration showing an African American and a white man shaking hands. This display of Black-white unity was still considered insurrection in Georgia in 1930. The group was held incommunicado for up to two months when they were finally given the right to bail. Mary Dalton was forced by the stipulation of her bail to leave Georgia.

She was then transferred by the Party to Chattanooga, Tennessee.

RALLYING POINTS ■ Two years later, Angelo Herndon, an African American YCL organizer in Atlanta, led Black and white unemployed Georgians to City Hall demanding relief. He was arrested and charged with insurrection and sentenced to life on a chain gang. He remained in the miserable Fulton Towers jail for five years while the International Labor Defense, with Ben J. Davis, Jr., as his attorney, fought and won this case as "unconstitutional." The Atlanta Six case was then quashed. Herndon recruited Davis to the Party in the course of his defense.

Work in the South was stimulated by the formation at a convention in St. Louis in 1930 of the League of Struggle for Negro Rights (LSNR) – an outgrowth of the American Negro Labor Congress and the African Blood Brotherhood. A delegation of 16 representatives of different organizations and churches from Atlanta, Alabama and Tennessee, led by Mary Dalton, attended this conference, and were enthusiastically welcomed.

This organization carried out vigorous agitational work all over the country including the South. It was finally merged into the National Negro Congress in February of 1936 with Langston Hughes as president.

On March 21, 1931, nine African American youths were jailed in Scottsboro, Alabama on a charge of rape and within a couple of days were sentenced to the electric chair. The YCL immediately rallied to their defense and secured the signatures of two of the mothers so that the International Labor Defense (ILD) could enter the case. The ILD wired for a stay of execution. The Party made a national and international issue of this case, especially in the colonial world. They saw this case as a frame-up and an example of the special oppression of African Americans in the United States. It was also an expose of the system of lynching used in the South. The International Labor Defense and the Party organized demonstrations of thousands of people in cities throughout the U.S.

Demonstrations also took place in Moscow, Berlin, Paris – in all the major cities of the world. This mass pressure plus the brilliant legal defense by Joseph Brodsky saved these young men from the electric chair. The Scottsboro and Angelo Herndon cases became rallying points for the movement for full equality of African Americans during this period.

ORGANIZING SHARECROPPERS ■ In the Spring of 1931, the Birmingham district of the Communist Party decided to organize the sharecroppers in Tallapoosa and Lee Counties of Alabama. Estelle Milner, daughter of an African American Tallapoosa sharecropper, who taught school in Birmingham, and was a member of the Party, laid the groundwork for the Party's decision by secretly distributing *The Southern Worker* and placing leaflets in strategic areas.

Ralph and Tommy Gray, two brothers, contacted the Party and invited an organizer to help them build a union. These sharecroppers lived under a peonage system whereby the landowner (often their former slave master) advanced them seed, fertilizer, and food from his store. They ginned the cotton in the landlord's gin, and they sold their harvest through him. The landlord of course kept the books and the sharecropper might receive as little as \$100 for his year's work. If he protested, he was forced to leave the land, or in some cases was lynched.

Mack Coad, Secretary of the Croppers and Farmworkers Union (CFWU) arrived in Camp Hill, Tallapoosa, in April 1931, and by July the CFWU had 800 members and had won a few small victories in the continuation of food advances.

On July 15, the sharecroppers invited Coad to discuss the CFWU and the Scottsboro case. Eighty African American men and women came to the meeting. The sheriff and deputized vigilantes raided the meeting place, brutally beating men and women alike. Despite this violence, 150 sharecroppers met with Coad near Camp Hill with sentries posted all around. Ralph Gray, acting as sentry, exchanged buckshot with the sheriff who was rushed to the hospital. Gray's body was later found riddled with bullets. His brother, Ralph, the local union organizer, was also murdered. His home was burned to the ground and the body was dumped on the court house steps to serve as a warning. Mack Coad was spirited away by union members. Fifty-five African American members were arrested, many under 18 years. Estelle Milner was among those arrested. She was beaten and suffered a broken vertebra at the hands of the police.

On August 6, 55 remaining CFWU members regrouped as the Sharecroppers Union (SCU) and reconstituted themselves into five locals in Tallapoosa.

With Mack Coad gone and Estelle Milner in jail,

Harry Simms, former YCL organizer from Connecticut had recently come to Birmingham to become a liaison between Birmingham and Camp Hill. In his report-back, he informed the District Board that the sharecroppers were meeting every week in small groups, carrying on the work on their own initiative with Eula Gray as leader.

Harry Simms was then transferred to Harlan County, Kentucky to help organize the striking young miners. On February 10, 1932, at age 19, he was shot by the deputized gun thugs of the Kentucky coal operators. He died after a day and night in horrible pain because of the beating and shooting, intermingled with questioning until he died.

The train carrying his casket arrived at Grand Central Station in New York accompanied by 20 miners. 2,000 people including 50 YCL members wearing red bandannas marched with the casket through the needle trade district to the YCL headquarters. Funeral services at the Bronx Coliseum included 1200 people. William Z. Foster characterized the Kentucky miners' struggle as a guerrilla war since the entire leadership was arrested and Simms murdered.

Eula Gray, niece of Ralph and Tommy Gray, was a 19-year-old YCL leader who held the sharecroppers union together during the very critical period after the raid on Camp Hill and the murder of her uncles. She assumed Simms' role as a liaison with the Birmingham district and served as secretary until May 1932.

She continued her YCL work and by 1934 formed seven clubs. She led a delegation of sharecroppers from Tallapoosa to the Eighth Convention of the CPUSA. At the convention she gave a rousing report of the growth of the YCL and the activities of the SCU which had grown to 8,000 members, 2,000 of whom were young people.

UNEMPLOYED MOVEMENT ■ With the worsening economic crisis and the constant growth of the unemployed and homeless, the need for organizing unemployment councils became a prime task. The Party and YCL along with the TUEL helped organize the National Unemployed Council. The movement concentrated on the Workers Unemployment Insurance bill. Three times mass petitions with a million signatures and more were presented to Congress on this issue.

One of the bitterest marches took place on March 7, 1932 in Dearborn, Michigan. Five thousand

V
a-
to
y
is
th
ee
ne
in
s,
al
r-
h-
ry
'e,

in
ey
to

le
all
ut
he

ev
on.
in
im
ete
to
so
eal
he
ger
urd
ere

to
me
ive
ed,
to
the
ny

unemployed Ford workers marched to the River Rouge plant and were met with a rain of bullets from the Dearborn and Ford police. Tear gas was sprayed, hoses poured icy water in sub-zero weather. Five people were killed: Joe York, Michigan YCL organizer, Joseph Bussell, 16-year-old League member, Joe De Blasio, and Coleman Leny. An African American former Ford worker, Curtis Walker, was clubbed and gassed and died two days later. The authorities did not permit him to be interred with the four white YCL martyrs. His ashes were dropped by plane on the graves of the other four.

The funeral procession on March 12, 1932 for the murdered workers was the largest demonstration that ever took place in Detroit.

A UNITED FRONT OF YOUTH ■ It was the movement of the unemployed and its emphasis on the plight of jobless youth which resulted in establishing the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) youth relief camps. The American Youth Congress, organized in 1934, encompassed leading social and youth organizations – over 4 million people. Its program included support for the Federal Child Labor Amendment, which outlawed child labor, the right of unemployed to jobs, vocational training, and against discrimination of African Americans who were shut out of major industries.

The organization's Second Congress which met in July 1935, drafted the American Youth Act. This act was introduced in the Senate in 1936 by Senator Elmer Benson of Wisconsin. Hearings brought 1200 young people to Washington on March 13, 1936. Signatures in the hundreds of thousands were presented to Congress. President Roosevelt, while not committing himself on the act, said he sympathized with its aim. However, Eleanor Roosevelt went along with the American Youth Congress.

The organized youth became a power in the land. The AFL recognized the new youth movement, and at its 1935 Convention gave favorable consideration to a series of youth proposals. The American Student Union, formed in December 1935, led an anti-war strike of 184,000 students. The YCL played a significant leading role in these formations fighting for the unity of the young generation with the working class.

Another important youth development was the formation of the Southern Negro Youth Congress in Richmond, Virginia in February 1937, chaired by Edward Strong, who later became a Communist

leader. James Ford, Vice-presidential candidate on the CP ticket in 1932 and Harlem district organizer, James Jackson and Henry Winston were leaders in this vital movement which carried on and supported the many strikes in the South, popularized the National Youth Act, and struggled against discrimination.

When the Spanish people began their struggle for democracy in the summer of 1936, Spain was plunged into Civil War. The Fascist General Francisco Franco with the help of Hitler and Mussolini, began a rebellion against the Republic.

The only country to extend aid to the embattled Republic was the Soviet Union. The capitalist countries with their non-intervention policy helped neither side though this in essence assisted Franco who was the receiver of all needed military material.

INTERNATIONAL BRIGADES ■ The International Brigades consisting of 50,000 volunteers from around the world was a true example of solidarity. Three thousand heroes and heroines of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion were from the U.S. which included several hundred African Americans. More than half of the battalion were Communists and YCLers.

In addition to battalion fighters, medical workers did inspiring work led by Dr. E. K. Barsky. Nurses, writers and filmmakers who visited Spain went back to America to speak, write and publicize the cause of Spain's fight against fascism. Paul Robeson came and entertained the troops. The YCL wrote a glorious page in the defense of the Spanish Republic. Some of the YCL leaders who died in Spain were:

- Dave Doran, the first to volunteer in our drive to concentrate in basic industry. He went to the coal and steel regions in Pittsburgh and became known to the thousands in that area. He joined the Lincoln Battalion as a private, "the first to advance, the last to retreat" and by his bravery became an outstanding leader of the International Brigade.

- Mac Coad, who volunteered in the spring of 1931 to go South to organize the sharecroppers, joined the Lincoln Battalion to "show what role African Americans had to play on the international field against fascism – the better to fight it at home."

- Oliver Law, formerly of the U.S. segregated armed forces, commanded the first integrated military unit in Spain, which was mostly white. He was stationed at the Jarama front in Spain as a gun crew

continued on page 33

Gorbachev and the August State of Emergency

Gennadi Yanayev

Editor's note: The following interview with Gennadi Yanayev, former Vice President of the USSR, is reprinted from NorthStar Compass. It originally appeared in the Russian publication, Narodnaya Pravda.

One thing was common to all the stories of Gorbachev: his unhealthy egotism, his two-faced policies which were all to the detriment of our Motherland. He liked to speak of himself as "the most democratic of democrats," but could not stand people who had independence of mind in any situation. While he was General Secretary of the CPSU, there were many changes in the positions of First Secretaries of the CPSU and in different republics.

I was always an "outsider" but the replacements by Gorbachev and his inner clique were always of people who were unafraid to challenge this or that aspect of his policies. He saw some danger to his position from N.I. Ryzhkov, who was popularly being promoted to the position of alternate candidate for President of the USSR, so Gorbachev "forced him out" and onto an early pension. For showing his bravery and loyalty to Communism, Yegor Ligachev was replaced by a "secret" operation in behind-the-scenes actions in the Politburo and Supreme Soviets. Gorbachev effected a plan to paralyze the Secretariat and to "isolate Ligachev from its work." Ligachev's suspicions of Yeltsin was his undoing. Asked to explain the actions against Ligachev, Gorbachev said "Ligachev writes too many letters."

On the question of the proposed "Extraordinary Measures" to deal with our critical situation, Gorbachev never wanted to talk about this in our "Inner Cabinet" if Yeltsin was involved. We all suspected Yeltsin of treason. But Yeltsin talked the same as Gorbachev, and sometimes it was difficult to distinguish one from the other. For a long time to come our people will try to figure out the "fight" between these two, but events have proven it was only "shadow boxing" for the media.

I am positive that Gorbachev felt that as General Secretary he was "saddled" by the CPSU, because that prevented him from bringing capitalism more

quickly to the country. He therefore used demagoguery, swearing on his "honor" he was trying to improve "socialism" and wasn't man enough to say he really was opposed to socialism. Therefore, his tactics became two-faced. He would speak the truth about Marxism-Leninism in the Central Committee of the CPSU, while all the while acceding to the demands of his teacher, Alexander Yakovlev, in destroying the Soviet Union. But to the Democrats, in most cases former Communists, he promised total war on the CPSU, and supported them in the undermining of the entire structure of the Socialist Motherland. During the period of the "Extraordinary Measures," there is not one iota of evidence that we, or the CPSU, acted illegally.

No matter how much the Gorbachev-Yeltsin hand-picked judges tried to keep us in jail, they could not base themselves definitely on any law to warrant our being jailed. Therefore we were freed.

We welcome the opportunity to tell the people of our Motherland the truth. The absurdity of all this was already evident on August 22nd, 1991. But the Gorbachev-Yeltsin forces still tried to lay the blame on the CPSU....

During the August days of 1991, Gorbachev could still have stopped the counter-revolution. While he was supposedly on holiday in Forose in the Crimea, the inner Cabinet flew there to see him and appealed and demanded of him to take concrete measures to save the country. Gorbachev refused to do anything. He could have flown to Moscow so that we all together could decide on how to deal with this critical situation.... From the 19th to the 21st of August he could have terminated all danger and his self-imposed "isolation." His personal guard of 700 security forces with him in the Crimea were loyal to him.

There was never any Internal Security order to hold Gorbachev and his family. He could have gone wherever he wanted, including to Moscow, to save his country. He was asked to do so by all concerned, including the KGB and his own personal guard, to go to Moscow and to be with the CPSU to save the country from danger. He knew he was not in any

danger, and was free to call his Commander-in-Chief in Moscow, his Minister of Defense, and President Bush of the United States ... But his main concern at that time was to get a video made of his so-called "arrest" with his unshaven face, rumpled clothing, etc. etc., and to "smuggle" his video to the nearest TV station! Then he came off the plane in Moscow in his shirt sleeves just as in a real grade "B" Hollywood scenario.

It was absolutely certain that Gorbachev was no Allende of Chile who died gun in hand, defending his country! Gorbachev knew very well that not one of his Cabinet, his security guards or anyone else there, had a single thought of "liquidating" him or forcing him to resign his post of President of the USSR. It is nothing but falsehood, lies and deceit that a "death sentence" hung over his head. But all of these lies reached a hysterical fever pitch when all TV, radio and press were bombarded day and night that the so-called "Putschists" were gangsters that should be shot and that "they were going to eliminate Gorbachev."

On August 18th, at 9:00 p.m., the group of the Cabinet that flew to see Gorbachev returned empty handed, to our great alarm. He had always told us when he had earlier met with the five republics and signed the accord that it was to be the USSR, but behind our backs, he was breaking up the USSR. We, the ministers and government, did not see the complete text of the document that Gorbachev signed on behalf of the Government in August until it was published on August 15th. Thus, he completely ignored the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Government and the Central Committee of the CPSU, and all the other governmental and non-governmental institutions of all the Soviet republics! He did not call the delegations of the republics even once to discuss this document before it was signed.

It was also interesting why Gorbachev ordered Lukianov, the KGB Chief, to go on holiday and not return until after August 20th. This proposed document that was finally signed by Gorbachev agitated us all. He had come up with the name of Commonwealth of Independent States himself, and without consultation or discussion with anyone. The document carried a great many unanswered questions and had so many items to be finalized "later" that the Supreme Soviet did not even want to discuss it. What was sure from the start was that this "behind the scenes document" spelled the end of the USSR.

Knowing the unstable character of Gorbachev,

his indecisiveness and his vacillation, back and forth, we did send a delegation of eight Cabinet members to try and convince him of the grave situation facing the country.... The Inner Cabinet, with the recommendation of the Supreme Soviets, presented him with two requests: 1) to return immediately to Moscow and use his prestige and image to save the country, and 2) to temporarily give the Vice President the power to implement the "Extraordinary Measures" to stabilize the country. Then, at an emergency meeting of the Supreme Soviet, he would give his assent to these measures. In the event that the Supreme Soviet did not support the "Extraordinary Measures," we told him, it was agreed that the entire Cabinet, excepting President Gorbachev, would resign. We knew full well that in this event, our careers and the lives of our families would be ruined, but as Communists we were more concerned with the fate of our country.

Following August 21st Gorbachev was very tricky in his utterances, publicly saying "Yes, the Putschists were right according to the laws of the USSR, but they overstepped their authority...." He knew well there was no "putsch." The disconnection of his telephone in his immediate holiday office was done to provide negative materials to his "democrat" friends with whom he was in cahoots! He could have used the telephones of his security guards or his personal guards who had direct lines to Moscow, or from his yacht that also had direct connections with the Kremlin....

On August 21st, knowing that the Supreme Soviet would uphold the appeal of the Inner Cabinet for "Extraordinary Measures" before he returned to Moscow, Gorbachev gave orders for our arrest. Yeltsin was thus provided with the opportunity to call us a "Junta" and gave the media information that he (Yeltsin) was now in control and that we shall be "liquidated" ... This was logical for Gorbachev who now had to wash his hands of us and the "Extraordinary Measures" of which he was a part. He tried desperately to save his Presidency and tell the people and his "overseas advisers" that he was a "born-again democrat and a democrat above all democrats." ...

We shall ask many questions of Mr. Gorbachev at our trial, you may well believe.... We are sure Gorbachev will never repent. To repent, you must be an honest man and admit the immense harm you have done. But that is not Gorbachev's way, nor his fate. □

Manifesto of the National Salvation Front of Russia

Editor's Note: The following statement of the National Salvation Front of Russia, which groups most working-class, revolutionary and democratic forces in the country, is reprinted from NorthStar Compass, published by Concerned Friends of the USSR, formerly the Canada-USSR Association.

Today, before every honorable person, looms a terrible question: What is happening with us and with our Motherland? Who is to blame? What must we do in order to get our country back on the road and on its feet? How to work, not on words, but on deeds for the benefit of our dear Motherland?

The National Salvation Front gives here direct answers to these questions.

WHAT IS HAPPENING? ■ The country and the government is destroyed. Even now, on the edges of our great country internal ethnic strife between brothers is getting worse, [as indicated by] the formation of "sovereign republics" with their separate presidents and growing bureaucracies. None of these "countries" is actually sovereign, none of them can feed its people or defend its territory.

The question of disintegration affected not only former republics in the USSR, but became inter-territorial wars of attrition and chauvinistic ethnic strife, such as in Moldova, Georgia, Azerbaijan and Tajikistan. Hundreds of thousands of people who are blameless became the victims of ethnic wars, while thousands of others became displaced and had to flee for safety in their own country. Today, we have now the Russian Federation as an entity, but already the internal turmoil of ethnic chauvinism is being heard inside of our republic.

Russia - the biggest country - became one-sided, dependent and manipulated by the United States of America. The present government of Russia is not capable of governing or leading the country, either internally or externally. In agreement with their foreign masters, the top leadership is proceeding with anti-people policies and political directions. Because we are subjugated by a foreign power, we are now selling out our former friends and partners of Russia all over the world and aban-

doning and forgetting the titanic struggles and sacrifices of our people which guaranteed peace for all the world. Because of our retreats before U.S. and Western reaction, our army and rocket forces are being devastated, paralyzed, and our arms industry is being demolished on the orders of the U.S. while their industrial complex is now in a military position to actually become the "world policeman."

Our economic situation is on the verge of collapse. With full power, the government is dismantling the industrial base, collective and state farms, and the attack against the workforce is gaining momentum. This course is for the benefit of the narrow mafiosi-corrupted circles, who are leading our country into bankruptcy and our working class into poverty. They utilize the gambit of setting the workers, managers of enterprises, collective farmers and chairmen of collective farms, the youth and veterans - all of them against each other for narrow gains, thus dividing and ruling at will. Therefore, confrontation is arising among the people.

The lack of help, the lack of leadership, the corruption, the rapid growth of the mafia clans and underground economy - this is leading the country to ruin. Banditry is growing rapidly, since all norms of behavior and culture are trampled underfoot. The streets, streetcars, buses, and subways are unsafe. There is now terrorism afoot, and all of this is being promoted by the "occupational forces" of the Yeltsin clique. Open propagation of pornography and the increase in rape go towards making our young generation become anti-law and anti-order mobs.

With deep pain and hurt in our hearts, we are forced to admit: the country is on the verge of civil war, chaos and anarchy.

WHO IS TO BLAME ■ Who is to blame? The former leadership of the USSR and the CPSU, with the leadership of M. Gorbachev but with cunning help from A. Yakovlev, Shevardnadze and company, hiding themselves under the words "perestroika," "democratization" and "glasnost" which, from the start, were meant to dismember the Soviet Union. They had a plan to sharpen the internal strife between nationalities and to support the tendencies of sepa-

ration; to try privatization and take steps toward capitalism; to discredit our history of socialism and of our Motherland, our culture, education and to have the people of Russia become ashamed of their history and lose their pride.

These political proposals were immediately taken up by nationalistic and separatist elements in the former republics and regions. They utilized the mass media in the center and in the regions to put many people into their leadership and movements. Reactionary ideas were given full play in order to divide the people and to have ethnic chauvinism grow and lead to internal strife.

The anti-peoples group headed by Yeltsin, riding the wave of mass discontent with the situation both economically and politically – and these same leaders were responsible for this – brought the country nearly to its knees because of their thirst for power in the country. This is the clique, together with Krawchuk of Ukraine and Shushkevich of Byelorussia, who are to blame for the Beloceshki Pact that they signed, to create the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Instead of uniting it, these three leaders dismembered the country.

The economic policies of Yeltsin and formerly Gaidar brought with it a death sentence to the economy and opened wide the gates to robbing of the people of the country's wealth. The politics of Yeltsin and Company is the politics of national betrayal. The only road left open to us is that Yeltsin and his government must resign, together with his henchmen all over the territory of Russia. We must utilize this right as given to us by the Constitution.

WHAT MUST BE DONE? ■ From the center and all over the country, Committees for National Salvation have been formed by patriotic forces, activists and competent people, without regard to party or nationality. We must strongly unite according to constitutional means, and form a government of National Salvation which should have the powers to stabilize the country and lead it out of the crisis that we are in.

The first task of this National Salvation Government should be to bring the country to order, stabilize the domestic situation, eliminate the anti-peoples organizations, the mafia and all other such groupings. All attacks against the population will be dealt with severely. The new government will clean the streets of these mafiosi elements and speculators, rapists and criminal elements who parasitically

live off the hard work of the people. We shall eliminate those from government who are corrupted and traitors to policies which are anti-Motherland. The mafia in Russia will be eliminated.

The new government will take all measures to guarantee the internal and external defense of our country. There will be strict control of our borders from both internal and external enemies. Internal fighting of groups will be eliminated and all detachments that are illegal shall be disarmed.

To institute order and to save the country from economic disaster, the National Salvation Front will do away with economic experiments. To stabilize the prices and the economy, there should be set up a Government Price Control Commission on all goods. Wages, pensions and other social needs will be brought up to the price and wage controls formula. We shall stabilize the ruble currency and foreign exchange and speculations in currency will be stopped.

Our economic policy will be based on the needs of the people. The Government will control all aspects of the economy, planning and investments for the country. Our economic plans will be regulated by overall planning, keeping in mind the needs of the country as a whole. Speculation in products at enterprises will be stopped immediately. The private sector in the service industries will receive governmental permission to operate and exist.

In the agrarian sector, there will be the possibility for different forms of land ownership, collective, state and private farming. There will be a state monopoly on all products needed for internal consumption.

To rebuild the economy, we will not recognize pacts that were signed by the present or former leadership. We shall not resort to force of arms. Russia has enough sound arguments to convince the former USSR republics that in unity there is strength and a secure and stable future for all concerned. Our aim is to reunite all of the former republics into one Motherland and we will also take into account the Russian population living on their territories at this time. We will support any and all requests by these people to unite again with Russia.

Our unified armed forces will stand guard against all enemies, both singly or in coalitions that will be against us. We shall bring back our soldiers that are outside of our borders; we shall slowly start the liquidation of our war industries. We shall find ways and means for these "independent" countries

to take note of our officers and men. In order to safeguard our Russia, we shall take steps to make officers and men have the best of economic and living quarters that can be constructed and implemented.

The internal policies of the Russian government will be geared to the national interests of Russia. Strong Russia will act as a stabilizing force in the world. Since the liquidation of the Warsaw Pact, we shall find new partners with whom we shall make pacts and interchange information and technology to guarantee peace and our borders.

We shall have to find means to safeguard and develop our cultures, and our education and health care. We shall budget to save our institutes and research centers.

In the sphere of mass media, we shall ensure that we will not allow any anti-state propaganda or immoral publications. The energetic program of the National Salvation Front will bring the country out of the crisis, and will open up the path to reforms in the interests of the majority of the people.

PROGRAM OF ACTION ▣ How will we function? Despite the movements that are in existence at the moment, none can by themselves make the necessary changes. Only by uniting all forces will we be able to form the government of the National Salvation Front.

- We have to establish committees of this front all over the country, starting from districts, factories, organizations and all societies and movements.

- We shall begin forming fractions of the

National Salvation Front in all of the political movements and their representatives in the Supreme Peoples Deputies.

- We shall establish and register with the authorities in all of the regions of Russia our National Salvation Front.

- We shall begin gathering lists of those elements who are now in power and who are ruining the country, such as corrupted leaders, mafia, and we shall demand from local media press time to discuss the program of the National Salvation Front with the people.

- Work and influence the Peoples Deputies in your locality in Russia. Remember that it is only through them that the laws and the situation can be changed.

- Organize meetings, pickets, demonstrations.

- Collect finances in order that we may continue our work.

- Distribute by all legal means our Manifesto and all other documents that we may publish.

We understand perfectly that the present regime is capable of all sorts of acts that are anti-constitutional, and we ask all of our members and friends to defend the Constitution. Let us forget our ideological differences and settle them when things have returned to normal! The time has come to act! □

Licht, continued from page 28

commander, promoted to Battalion Commander and rose to the rank of Captain. He was killed in July 1937 trying to save another soldier.

- Milton Herndon, brother of Angelo Herndon, became a commander of a machine gun section, and fell in action with two-thirds of his gun crew October 13, 1937.

The list of heroes of the Battalion is endless. Many of the survivors became volunteers during World War II to defeat Hitlerism and the fascist axis.

The YCL suffered from Browder's revisionism and liquidation. Under his influence the YCL was dissolved and reorganized its forces into the American Youth for Democracy, as an attempt to wipe out Marxism-Leninism in youth work.

In this regard William Z. Foster wrote, "the American Youth For Democracy (AYD) under Browder's influence was not an effort to find the basis for a broader Marxist youth organization, but an attempt to wipe out Marxism-Leninism in youth work."

The YCL was re-established on May 1, 1983. □

Organized Labor and the Class Struggle

Ed Nelson

The reactionary concept that organized labor has become "superfluous" in our modern "global economy" can only be maintained if one fails to look beneath the surface of this question. This is usually "proven" by pointing to the decline in membership of the industrial unions. A deeper analysis will show that mass production workers and their unions have not lost their importance in the class struggle today.

The fact that union membership in the United States has seriously declined in the last decade, in the industrial unions particularly, can't be denied nor should it be. The question that must be asked is, why? Those critics of organized labor who regurgitate the nonsense about the "superfluousness" of unions, generally fail to point out the role played by monopoly corporations, in conjunction with the Reagan and Bush administrations, to bring about this decline in union membership. For these simpletons, the issue is clear: if union membership falls, the working class must no longer want, or need unions. But only a naïve person could fail to recognize that if you shut down strong unionized plants, and ship production to foreign countries or non-union states within the U.S., the effect on trade unions will be a loss in membership.

There is also the fact that the monopolies are using some of the profit produced by the workers to buy technology that allows them to produce more products with fewer workers. These policies, as well as other union-busting tactics, were encouraged by both the Reagan and Bush administrations. No honest observer can deny this.

SPECIAL SECTORS ■ Still the question is, why this decline? If unions are superfluous, why did the Reagan and Bush administrations wage such a ruthless struggle against organized labor? The answer to this question is that unions play a leading role in the progressive struggle against the worst elements of capitalism.

Gus Hall, in *Working Class USA*, points out that

within each of the two primary classes under capitalism (capitalists and workers), there is a special sector of unique importance within each that influences the struggle between the two classes, and all intermediate ones as well (farmers, white collar professionals and small business owners, etc.).

In the capitalist class the special sector is monopoly. Monopoly corporations have great economic and political power and control prices, drive small businesses into bankruptcy and force farmers off their lands. Monopoly corporations are the driving force behind efforts to bust unions and lower wages in general.

Monopoly corporations exert a dominating influence on government. Using enormous wealth, monopolies insure that governments pass laws to serve their interests and the capitalist class in general. For this reason, monopoly corporations are the leading force within the capitalist class. Monopoly capitalism is capitalism in the raw: profit making and greed are the only motivating factors – their nature is anti-human.

Milton Friedman, the guru of Reaganomics, in his book, *Capitalism and Freedom*, states it in brutally frank terms:

... There is only one social responsibility of business – to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits... Few trends could so thoroughly undermine the very foundations of our free society [read capitalist society – E.N.] as the acceptance by corporate officials of a social responsibility other than to make as much money for their stockholders as possible.

Within the working class, unionized industrial workers, and mass production workers in general, are the sector of special importance. These workers are to the working class what monopoly is to the capitalist class – the most powerful and advanced section.

Unionized mass production workers are organized to protect themselves against the worst aspects of capitalism and monopoly capitalism in particular. Due to their unique position in capitalist

continued on page 41

Friendly Spies: How America's Allies are Using Economic Espionage to Steal our Secrets, Peter Schweizer, New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1993, \$22, 342 pp.

This book is fascinating, not necessarily because the explosive allegations made here are all true. It is fascinating more because it exposes the increase in inter-imperialist contradictions that have accelerated in the wake of the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

As the subtitle of this book indicates, the author feels that while Washington has been busy fighting the "good fight" against socialism, its erstwhile allies have been just as busy picking the pocket of poor, helpless U.S.-based transnationals, and Uncle Sam himself.

There is an obvious sub-text to Schweizer's argument that he intimates but does not explore. To wit, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. and other elite spokespersons have been arguing strenuously that "multi-culturalism" or more attention in schools and elsewhere to the racial and ethnic diversity of this nation is destructive, and leads to "balkanization." Schlesinger and his ilk are more sympathetic to the idea of the "melting pot," or the homogenizing of the U.S. populace, with a decided elite Eurocentric bias that all must pay fealty to. Naturally, progressive forces have contested hotly these notions.

The Schlesingers of this land no doubt will take comfort from this book, for Schweizer alleges that not only is economic espionage increasing because of ever larger sums that these "spies" can command, but he suggests further that there is an ethnic component to this process that portends what can happen in an ethnically diverse society like the United States. He paints a portrait of Koreans in the U.S. spying on behalf of Seoul, Chinese spying for China, and those who are Jewish spying for Israel. The sub-text to the book questions whether increased focus on native roots will simultaneously hasten a form of "ethnic spying" as allegiance to the U.S. erodes. Schweizer does not seem to notice that the kind of initiative, determination, individualism and greed demonstrated by many engaged in economic espionage are precisely the qualities valorized in this "free enterprise" society.

Though many U.S. "allies" are castigated for their alleged spying in this country, Japan, Germany and France seem to be the major targets of his ire. He writes that "intelligence is one key reason for Japan's economic success. Giant Japanese companies like Mitsubishi, Mitsui, Sumitomo and others are the closest thing that you will find to commercial intelligence activities." (p. 263) With an outrage not witnessed since 1945, he accuses Tokyo of training "an estimated 10,000 commercial spies" with "most to be sent overseas." (p. 76)

The author makes much of the case of the computer scientist Raymond Cadet - who is "Haitian-born," he is careful to note. In the 1980s Cadet was alleged to have turned over the "crown jewels" of IBM, the most sensitive trade secrets of this transnational, to Hitachi. He was assisted allegedly by Barry Saffaie, who the author just as carefully notes, is of "Iranian" extraction. (p. 46)

Schweizer charges Japanese interests with destabilizing the Silicon Valley transnational, Fairchild Semiconductors. Supposedly an employee of this company who "spoke perfect Japanese" turned over "160,000 pages of confidential research results and corporate plans" to Japanese agents. Apparently this cache of documents found its way to Fujitsu, which then sought to use this information to buy 80 percent of Fairchild. (p. 39)

Japanese interests are not alone in engaging in such behavior, he maintains. "U.S. intelligence officials insist that even Canada (which few probably even know has an intelligence service) engages in intelligence operations against her neighbor to the south." (p. 19) This effort has involved both Canadian transnationals and the government in Ottawa, he writes.

Schweizer argues that during the Nixon Administration, West German intelligence had their "moles" in the White House staff that sought to influence U.S. diplomatic and economic policy toward Bonn. (p. 153) Though it is evident that the sharpness of inter-imperialist rivalry has engendered a bit of hysteria in the author, it would be a mistake to dismiss all of his claims. For example, the so-called "Korea-gate" scandal of the 1970s did demonstrate that South Korean intelligence, in collaboration with big business in Seoul, had extended

their tentacles to the highest levels of the U.S. government. (p. 187)

Accidentally, the book sheds some light on unrelated matters, such as the shooting down of the Korean airliner, Flight 007, by Soviet aircraft in 1983. At the time Moscow alleged that the commercial airliner was on an espionage mission, an allegation that was hooted at and derided in Washington. We all know that a commercial airliner would *never* place civilians in harm's way by performing such a dangerous espionage mission – don't we? Don't be so sure, for during this same period, "Air France planes served as photography platforms for French intelligence agents. Flights over Eastern Europe would at times veer off course in order to allow photos to be taken of sensitive Warsaw Pact facilities." (p. 104)

It is ironic indeed that Tokyo, Seoul, Paris, Ottawa, etc., were this helpful in building up a Cold War machinery in the U.S. that now may be turned on them. It becomes clear with each passing page that the purpose of this book is not so much to expose what "allies" are doing here, but to provide a rationale for turning the CIA, the National Security Agency (NSA) and the FBI more directly and overtly against fellow imperialists. The author laments the fact that the FBI decided to re-deploy agents from spying on the former Soviet Union to fighting "street gangs in urban centers." This, he intones, "may be a sign of a lack of appreciation for the importance of countering economic spying." (p. 307)

Schweizer proposes further unleashing the immense satellite and intelligence capability of the CIA and NSA against foreign-based transnationals. This technology, along with various agents, would be used to steal trade secrets, plans and patents.

He intimates that the U.S. should consider renouncing treaties that limit the production of chemical weapons, since the inspection regimes established to monitor compliance with these agreements can be allegedly used to discover the trade secrets of Monsanto, Dow Chemical, etc. (p. 27)

Schweizer suspects that many of the graduate students from abroad in U.S. universities are conducting espionage. Of course, he uses this suspicion as a rationale for using U.S. academics and students in a similar fashion abroad. This is a dangerous suggestion that can place otherwise innocent civilians from the U.S., who happen to be studying or doing research abroad, in extreme jeopardy. Indeed, it is well known that U.S. intelligence has deployed jour-

nalists, clergy, business executives and academics over the years.

Schweizer's approach places this entire nation in extreme jeopardy. The insane desire of the U.S. ruling class to dominate the world continues unabated, despite the so-called "end of history." This book sets out to sound the alarm about "foreigners," but ends up reminding us all of the simple fact that progressive forces must deepen our understanding of the new international situation, and accelerate our campaign against the rule of monopoly capital. □

Gerald Horne

Bill Bailey, The Kid From Hoboken – An Autobiography, San Francisco: Circus Lithographic Press, 424 pp.

The story of Bill Bailey's life is an exciting and fascinating one that is worth reading and studying for some valuable insights into working-class life in America.

Bailey was a merchant seaman and dockworker for most of his working life. He played an active part in many of the struggles of the maritime workers to build democratic unions, enabling them to improve the miserable, repressive conditions of their daily lives.

Bailey came from a family of 14 children, half of whom died young. His early years of growing up in the poverty-stricken slums of Jersey City and Hoboken are graphically described. He first shipped out as an ordinary seaman on a tramp ship – a ship travelling to wherever it could pick up cargo – in the late 1920s, going to several Gulf ports.

The merchant marine in those days operated as an open shop, with low wages, long hours and abysmal working conditions. The jobs were scarce and had to be scrounged by either paying off shipping crimps or going from pier to pier tracking down ships' officers. Bailey describes the desperation that forced many seamen and other unemployed workers to "take to the road" – riding box-cars from coast to coast, eating in hobo "jungles" along the tracks, and being harassed and jailed by police along the way.

Eventually someone gave him a Communist Party leaflet on the waterfront, invited him to a meeting, and shortly thereafter Bailey signed a Communist Party membership card. It was a turning point in his life. As he says in the book, when

reflecting on newer union members who seemed to be drifting aimlessly from drinking bouts to shipping out:

I began to see an image of myself, the way I was a few years earlier, and the way I could have been now had it not been for the Communist Party making me take a good look at myself and setting me on the track to making something of myself. If you don't care for yourself, then try at least to care for your class. You are somebody, somebody important in the class struggle.

That concern for his class led Bailey to become an active organizer for the left-wing Marine Workers Industrial Union (MWIU) and later for the Communist Party in various seaports. It was the MWIU which paved the way for the great strikes of 1934 and 1936 on the waterfronts of the West and East Coasts, and led to the formation of new, vigorous democratic unions and federations on both coasts.

Bailey's concern for his class led him in 1935, along with a group of militant seamen, to spearhead the assault on the Nazi flag flying from the staff of the ocean liner *Bremen*. After a pitched battle with Nazi officers on the ship, Bailey cut the hated flag loose and threw it over the side, after which he and others were arrested. They were later freed following a mass protest that helped galvanize the anti-Nazi movement around the world.

A few years later, Bailey joined with the 3,000 other U.S. Communists and anti-fascists who fought in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in defense of Republican Spain. During World War II, Bailey sailed on many ships, both as an unlicensed and a licensed seaman in the engine room, through many harrowing experiences against Japanese warships in the Pacific.

In the post-war period Bailey played an active role in the fight for maritime unity, as the Cold War zeroed in on the maritime unions, seeing them as major obstacles to the U.S. ruling class drive for a "Pax Americana." Bailey, along with several thousand other militant maritime workers, was screened out of the industry with the passage of the Magnuson Act in 1950. Finding and keeping any kind of job became a bitter struggle in the face of the blacklist and FBI harassment.

The House Un-American Activities Committee subpoenaed Bailey to appear before it. He gave the Committee such a hard time that they referred to him as a "contemptuous witness."

Bailey managed to get back to work on the waterfront, finding a niche as a longshoreman in the small lumber port of Eureka, California. From there he was later able to transfer to the San Francisco docks, where he worked until he retired. Bailey's autobiography ends with his leaving the Communist Party in 1956 at the time of the Hungarian upheaval, which he considered an unnecessary intervention by the Soviet army. Bailey adds criticisms of the U.S. Communist Party's policies during the Cold War period, particularly its resorting to underground operations.

Bailey's autobiography is in the main a testimonial to the validity of the class struggle and the dynamic ability of the working class to overcome overwhelming odds and bring about positive change. Within that all-embracing struggle, the Communist Party USA has made and continues to make major historic contributions. That it has made mistakes, tactical errors, human errors by individuals here and there, no one will deny. But in an overall sense, no other political organization can come close to matching its accomplishments. As Bailey himself writes at one point,

There had been dozens of other politically motivated organizations aimed at drastically changing the system, but because they lacked the discipline, they could never enter the mainstream of American thought to any substantial degree. They would wither and fade from the scene. Discipline, in the final analysis, meant contributing in every way to reach the final aim: that of changing the ownership of the means of production from the hands of the few, the capitalists, into the hands of the many, the working class. To make changes towards these goals called for organization, discipline, conviction. At times many seemingly insurmountable odds had to be faced. No time for summer soldiers.

Bailey has continued to be an activist in people's struggles. He has appeared in documentaries on the Spanish Civil War, the Communist Party, and the Un-American Activities Committee, he has been interviewed for several books such as, *The Good Fight*, *Growing Up In the Depression*, and *Workers On The Waterfront*, and he has appeared in two Hollywood movies, "On The Edge," and "Guilty By Suspicion." Quite a full life for "The Kid From Hoboken." □

Herb Kaye

THE CIO AND THE WFTU

Louis Weinstock, long-time Communist leader of the painters union who just celebrated his 90th birthday, called to point out an omission in *PA's* interview with me in the May issue which he considered otherwise excellent. Weinstock pointed out the fact that the CIO had an entirely different foreign policy from the present AFL-CIO leadership. The CIO joined with the Soviet, British, French and other trade union movements in setting up the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU). Sidney Hillman represented the CIO at the founding meeting, and Comrade Weinstock was one of the founders of the organization. The AFL refused to participate. Weinstock's comment is right on target and I appreciate his bringing it to our attention.

George Meyers

'INDUSTRIAL' NOT INTERNATIONAL

In the article by Mary Licht "Working Class Heroines," (March 1993), there is a reference to "the Wobblies (International Workers of the World)." This, of course, refers to the IWW, but its name was the Industrial Workers of the World (1905), not the International Workers of the World.

Part of the ruling class attack on the IWW was to obscure its inclusion of all workers in industrial unions. While, as its name states, it was internationalist, it was rooted in previously unorganized sectors of the working class and in class struggle. Its principle of industrial unionism was a forerunner of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), born in the 1930s. Its world labor focus also points to the need for international labor solidarity, crucial in present working-class struggles with transnational capital.

George Fishman

Editors' note: Thanks to George Fishman for pointing this out. It was an inadvertent error on the part of the editors, not the author.

LETTER FROM LONDON

I have been a British Communist since the mid-thirties and a reader of CPUSA publications for a long time. In the past I have worked with John

Williamson and Charlie Doyle, both of whom were expelled from the U.S. during the McCarthy witch-hunt period. I also recall meeting Gus Hall, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Henry Winston and other U.S. comrades when they visited London many years ago. I am a strong supporter of your party and hoped, but without success, to visit the U.S. when I was in Cuba last year.

I know that you faced difficulties with various elements of revisionism prior to and during your latest convention and that you upheld the Marxist-Leninist stance of your proud party. I am a member now of the Communist Party of Britain but I was expelled from the Communist Party of Great Britain – now the "Democratic Left" – when it became Euro-Communist some years ago. I have been a building worker by trade and was a full time functionary of the British Communist Party for 20 years, i.e., before it became revisionist.

With comradely greetings and best wishes in your struggle in the "belly of the beast" which is striving for global overlordship. Yours fraternally,

Tom Durkin

BELATED THANKS

We wish to correct an important shortcoming concerning our article, "NUCOR and Mini Steel: The New Capitalist Barbarians," in the May 1993 issue of *PA*. We failed to acknowledge the important contribution Therese D'Agostino made in research for the article. Research is always valuable, but what made Therese's help really invaluable is that she has been a fellow steelworker so she immediately understood why we were targeting NUCOR and what kind of material we needed.

Therese was one of the first women to break back into the steel mills after the companies "sent them home" following World War II. She was an important part of the rank-and-file movements in the 1970s and early 1980s. She watched first hand as the industry was decimated by corporate greed and neglect and the rise of the mini-mills. So she "dropped everything" in order to help get material to expose NUCOR for our article. Too often such important contributions are not acknowledged.

Thank you Therese.

*Scott Marshall
Paul Kaczocha*

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

The Communist Party Files Suit

The legal fight of the Communist Party, USA to regain its office and property in Northern California is an important part of guaranteeing the Party's legal, public participation in our country's political life. Coming as it does at a time when millions are gearing up to go on the offensive for jobs, peace, and equality, and when anti-Communism is on the decline, we are compelled to answer recent attempts to turn public opinion against our Party and divert attention from the real issues in this case.

The group of ex-Communists involved in the Northern California case last week initiated a public relations campaign, claiming that the Party is using "McCarthyite tactics" in our suit to recover Party property which they illegally seized.

The National Board rejects this charge as deceitful, hypocritical and false. The facts are as follows:

As you may be aware, in December of 1991, the Communist Party held its 25th National Convention in Cleveland, Ohio. It was a difficult yet historic convention, at which some important political differences within the Party were settled by the elected delegates. Prior to the Convention, a group of Party leaders, who had increasingly expressed disagreements with Marxism-Leninism and the political line of the Party, began to organize a "counter-convention." The group, which included a number of people from the Northern California district of the Party, held their meeting during our convention in a building across the street. They did not agree with the politics and decisions adopted by the Convention delegates, and a short time later, quit the Party.

When they left the CPUSA, the group in Northern California refused to turn over the Party's records, finances and other property, including the Party's office building and bookstore in San Francisco (522 Valencia Street) as well as the Pacific Publishing Company and wills, bequests and gifts made out to those institutions. The total value of this property is well over one million dollars.

Because of the McCarthy period of repression, and the continuing influence of anti-Communism in the years since then, the Communist Party has developed policies geared to protecting its resources

and property, as well as the security of those who wish to contribute financially to our work. That policy was to set up boards and other legal bodies which were collectives composed of trusted Party leaders, to administer Party property and institutions. In addition, oftentimes individuals who wished to leave money to the Party named Party leaders as their beneficiaries, with the understanding that the money would go to the Party and its press.

Many people made contributions to the Party in this way in order to protect themselves and their funds from government harassment and other problems. Most of these contributors are workers; veterans of the working-class movement who gave their hard earned dollars – in some cases their life savings – to further the cause and the organization they loved, the Communist Party.

This policy was developed and organized by the Party's national center. Potential contributors were made aware of it, as were Party leaders, who at various times received explicit instructions indicating that any funds or property willed to individuals, or resources for which individuals were given responsibility as financial officers, was done so in their capacity as leaders of the Communist Party, on behalf of the Communist Party.

Northern California was no different: 522 Valencia Street and Pacific Publishing Company belonged to the Communist Party, not to any individual; the many wills which bequeathed money to Party leaders was intended for the Communist Party – not for any individual's personal use nor for any new organizations. (This approach was developed because of bitter experience in earlier periods when the Party was under attack and former Party leaders stole resources which they claimed were their own.)

After the Northern California group left the Party, we demanded that our property be returned to us. They refused. Their claim that it belonged to the individuals on the various boards, etc., is absurd in its arrogance and completely dishonest. Moreover, if successful, it could set a dangerous legal precedent which could be used by the ultra right to

undermine the financial base of unions and other people's organizations.

We therefore had no choice but to sue to recover our property and resources. Our suit, initiated in the summer of 1992, named only Kendra Alexander, the former district organizer and public spokesperson of the Northern California district of the Party, with the others referred to as "Doe's numbers 1 through 99." This is legal terminology aimed to protect the names of the others involved in the suit.

Their response was that because we did not list all of the names, our suit had no merit, and they therefore asked the court to throw it out. This put us in a difficult position: either we list the names of the other individuals on the boards of directors of 522 Valencia and Pacific Publishing, or we allow the suit to be thrown out, and thereby lose our property. Clearly, we could not choose the latter.

At the very beginning of the case, we made a motion to the court that all names involved in the suit be kept strictly confidential. Their lawyers would not support our motion. In fact, they have twice put the choice to us: either list all of the names publicly, or drop the suit. Our motion for a protective order is still pending. If it is agreed to, any names mentioned in the case will not leave the courtroom.

As the facts reveal, those who are trying to take our property and who have charged the Party with McCarthyism are actually the ones who are pushing for "naming names."

In addition to the fact that the Party and its lawyers made several efforts to keep the names of those involved in the case confidential, a number of other facts prove the falseness of the charge of "McCarthyism," and reveal that it is simply an anti-Communist smokescreen behind which they hope to win their case.

Although of course not all members of the Communist Party are public about their political affiliation, many if not most of the leaders of the Party have for some years now worked publicly. Many of those named in the suit had long advocated such a public role, and had been known as public Communists. They have spoken at Communist Party-sponsored events, written articles, and have been interviewed by the mainstream press as Party leaders.

Even more important is the following: In the fall of 1991, a small group of now-former Party leaders, including a number in Northern California, wrote and circulated a document entitled "Initiative to

Unite and Renew the Party," in support of which they gathered signatures. Every single person who is involved in the California court case, except one, was a signer of "The Initiative." This document discussed internal matters of the Communist Party, identified the signers as Party members, and was printed - with all of the signers' names - and widely distributed, through the mail and in other ways from coast to coast, for many months.

The charge by this group of ex-Party leaders that we are forcing them to "name names" is a transparent attempt to attack the Communist Party and get away with their unlawful seizure of our property. Rather than being a "bizarre twist" on McCarthyism, as their press release states, in fact, it is their effort which is a direct continuation of McCarthyism's principal aim: to destroy the Communist Party, USA, and eliminate its role in the working-class and people's movements.

The latest legal move underscores their total lack of principles and the inherent anti-Communism of their efforts: they have now demanded that the Party indiscriminately identify a large group of its members to the court, most of whom have no bearing on the case.

Many leaders of the Communist Party, first and foremost its National Chairman, Gus Hall, spent years in prison because of McCarthyism. Under the McCarran Act, Hall and Ben Davis, a Party leader and New York City Councilman from Harlem, were ordered by the court to give the names of the Party membership, risking five years in jail for every day they refused to "name names." Despite that threat of years of imprisonment, they did refuse, and led the fight against the law, which was eventually declared unconstitutional.

Attempts by dishonest and politically bankrupt people to use anti-Communism to attack the Communist Party is not new. During other difficult periods, former Party members who had given in to political and ideological pressures, or who had personal disagreements, kept property which belonged to the Party, and in some cases simply stole money. In this of course they had the assistance of the FBI and other government agencies. This is what those involved in this dispute in Northern California are doing, and of course the Party has no choice but to fight back.

If you judge this case on its merits, we are sure you will agree that our suit is legally valid and morally right. Unfortunately, a highly political case

such as this one will not be decided purely on its legal merits. And the Northern California group has begun a public relations campaign attacking the Party. They have issued press releases, called a press conference and begun enlisting support of personalities on the left, etc.

Despite the ongoing efforts of these ex-Communists to destroy the Party, last June the Northern California district of the Communist Party elected a strong, new, leadership collective and adopted a plan of work. The district has a growing and active membership. They are determined not to be diverted from helping to build the people's fightback

against the terrible effects of the economic crisis, against racism and injustice, for peace, equality and socialism.

The Communist Party, USA is fighting to regain our resources and property so that they can be put at the disposal of this struggle. We hope we can count on your support. □

National Board CPUSA

Nelson, continued from page 28

society, these workers most clearly see and understand the nature of their exploitation. Because they work collectively in large groups, unionized mass production workers are more militant and more conscious of themselves as a class (unlike most white collar and professional workers who discover their class position in society while standing in the unemployment line). As a collective, unionized workers know that they are in the same boat and reject the "dog-eat-dog" mentality of monopoly capitalism and its supporters.

When unions are strong, the conditions of most wage workers improve. When organized workers in a particular industry (such as oil, steel and auto) win concessions from the monopolies for higher wages and benefits, the wages and benefits of other workers in that particular industry improve as well. Non-union workers benefit because their employers are forced to improve their wages and benefits in order to prevent them from organizing.

NEED FOR STRONG UNIONS ■ Strong unions also help to defend the interests of the working class in the political arena as well. Workers, organized into unions, constitute a powerful voting bloc, which can elect pro-labor and labor-friendly politicians to office at all levels of government – local, state and federal. Union workers also pay dues, part of which go to support pro-labor causes and organizations. Union funds help to pay for pro-labor lobbyists who press for laws such as a higher minimum wage for the working poor and emergency leave for working families to improve conditions for the working class in general. The organized workers of

all unions – not just mass production workers, but service and public sector workers as well – contribute to fighting anti-labor legislation that is supported and sponsored by monopoly corporations. The unprecedented assault on labor during the Reagan and Bush administrations was a particular manifestation of pro-monopoly political policy carried out against the working class by the White House and the majority in Congress.

Both special sectors constitute powerful forces within society, but for different reasons: monopoly because of its wealth which it appropriates from the working class; organized labor by its unity of numbers; and industrial workers in particular, through their strategic position in the capitalist production process.

Monopoly corporations *must* struggle against the power of organized labor, because unions work against the aims and interests of the monopolies whose goal is only to maximize profits. Within the parameters of capitalism, the organized sector of the working class is the only sector capable of defending the economic interests of the working class in general.

Industrial workers still occupy a key position within the capitalist production process in generating profits for the monopolists – indeed, with fewer numbers they are generating more profits than ever. The proper conclusion to draw is not that they are superfluous but, on the contrary, that industrial workers are essential to organizing all unorganized workers: industrial, service and public sector.

Organized labor teaches the working class how to struggle within the confines of capitalist exploitation, and there's nothing superfluous about that. The Communist Party is needed to show how to go beyond those confines. □

FOOD FOR THOUGHT



Political Affairs keeps you in mental health with a steady diet of Marxist thought and incisive comment, reflecting the views of the Communist Party, USA. Get it straight from the source all year 'round, get it right - now!

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

Be fully informed on world and national events, economic issues, political, class, race, gender, and cultural questions. Stay healthy by subscribing to Political Affairs — for an enriched regimen of ideas and writing. Spread the health with a gift subscription for a friend.

ORDER YOUR SUBSCRIPTION NOW



To: Political Affairs, 235 West 23rd St., New York, NY 10011

Enclosed please find \$ _____ in payment for the subscription indicated below.*

\$18 for 1 year \$32 for 2 years \$46 for 3 years

Name _____

Address _____

City / State / Zip _____

* All funds payable in U.S. currency, drawn on U.S. bank. Foreign subs add \$2.50 per year for sea/land shipment.

GIVE A GIFT TO A FRIEND



To: Political Affairs, 235 West 23rd St., New York, NY 10011

Enclosed please find \$ _____ in payment for the gift subscription indicated below.*

\$18 for 1 year \$32 for 2 years \$46 for 3 years

Name _____

Address _____

City / State / Zip _____

Donor's name _____

* All funds payable in U.S. currency, drawn on U.S. bank. Foreign subs add \$2.50 per year for sea/land shipment.

AUGUST, 1976

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

1976 ELECTION CAMPAIGN

THE FIGHT FOR NEW YORK CITY

Jarvis Tyner

THE PEOPLE'S FIGHT FOR BALLOT RIGHTS

Si Gerson

IQ THINKING: ITS EFFECT ON THE SCHOOLS

Ellen Tucker

COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A
PROMISE BETRAYED

Bea Lumpkin

ULTRA-LEFTISM: TROJAN HORSE
OF IMPERIALISM

Communist Party of Chile

\$1.00



1909-1976



HYMAN LUMER, Editor
BARRY COHEN, Asst. Editor

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

VOL. LV. NO. 8

AUGUST, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Communist Party, USA

A Tribute to Hyman Lumer 3

ELECTION CAMPAIGN

Jarvis Tyner

The Fight for New York City in the 1976 Elections 5

Si Gerson

The People's Fight for Ballot Rights 15

Ellen Tucker

IQ Thinking: Its Effect on the Schools 24

Bea Lumpkin

Community Colleges: A Promise Betrayed 32

Communist Party of Chile

Ultra-Leftism: Trojan Horse of Imperialism 39

BOOK REVIEWS

Joseph Harris

Economics of Racism, USA 62

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: \$10.00 a year; \$5.00 for six months; for foreign, including Canada, \$11.00 a year. Single copies \$1.00. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N.Y.

On Wednesday, July 21, Hyman Lumer died of a heart attack while on vacation in Bulgaria. His sudden death is a grievous loss to his family, his friends and comrades, and to the entire working-class and Communist movements.

Comrade Hyman Lumer—Hy as he was universally called—participated in the editorial leadership of *Political Affairs* for over a decade and a half. His work epitomized the requirements of the editor of a Communist theoretical journal combining exacting standards with persistent encouragement of creative work. Hy always regarded *Political Affairs* as a front line fighter in the ideological battle waged by the working class, and he strove in its pages to continuously deepen the foundation of the Communist Party's policy, to advance its campaigns for peace, democracy and socialism, and, not least, to strengthen its organized, conscious, leading role in the working class movement. He was unbending in his defense of the rigorous and principled character of Marxist-Leninist ideology, opposing with equal vigor overt attacks on it and efforts to dilute its content or distort its aims.

While serving as the editor of two journals—*Political Affairs* and *Jewish Affairs*, Hy still found time to write extensively. His writings embody a wide-ranging development and application of Marxist principles. In addition to those articles which have appeared in the pages of this magazine, Hy wrote frequently for journals in other countries, and recently added to his three earlier books on political economy a compilation of Lenin's writings on the Jewish question and an authoritative work on Zionism. Through these writings he deservedly became known to millions in the United States and worldwide.

Hy had an unusual talent for explaining even the most difficult questions in a clear and comprehensible manner, without ever sacrificing accuracy for the sake of simplicity. A genuinely erudite man, he brought an extensive experience and disciplined, scholarly study to bear on his analyses of any problem. For these reasons, Hy's advice was constantly sought. Though frequently ill over the last several years, he never refused such requests for help, but simply added the extra effort required to his already staggering load of writing, teaching, lecturing and organizing.

As for the many others who worked with him, Hy's death is a personal as well as a political loss for us.

The Staff

A Salute to Hyman Lumer

Hyman Lumer was a remarkable activist, a fully dedicated Marxist-Leninist in words and deeds. His passing at the age of 67—when he was so productive—is a great loss to our class, our people and our Party. The deep personal loss suffered by his widow, Dorothy, his two sons, Robert and Ernie, and his stepdaughters, Claudia, Margaret and Linda, and his stepson, Charles is shared by us.

On behalf of all comrades and literally millions who knew of Comrade Lumer, we express our sorrow and lower our banners in respect to him.

Comrade Lumer was a scientist and a scholar who earned his Ph.D. in the field of biology and became a professor at Western Reserve University and at Fenn College in Cleveland.

At a teacher, he helped organize the teachers' union in Cleveland. He soon became fully involved in union organizing during the CIO drive of the 1930's, supporting strikes in auto, steel, electrical and rubber. He left the college campus for class struggles in the mills and became the educational director of the Ohio-Kentucky district of the United Electrical Workers Union from 1947 to 1950.

Within the union he became known as a modest, skillful teacher who was always ready to discuss with shop workers the most elementary as well as the most complicated problems. His approach and his teaching always had a Marxist-Leninist class struggle quality. For this, he was made the victim of a Taft-Hartley frameup and served a term in federal prison.

Fought revisionism

Comrade Lumer was a source of strength against Browder revisionism within the Party and against McCarthyism in the unions. When the Party emerged in the struggles for its rights against the McCarthyist terror and violence, he became a leader in the fight for the Party in struggle against those of the right and left who sought to scrap the Party.

His struggle was always based on fundamental principles of working class solidarity and proletarian and socialist internationalism. He taught and organized on bread-and-butter demands, while fighting the poison of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism. He fought against racism in every area of struggle. He helped weld unity of Black and

white workers together with Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American Indian, Asian-American and all oppressed workers.

His struggle against anti-Semitism was combined with a constant, vigorous fight against Zionism. His writing and activities strengthened the struggle for national liberation, for democracy, peace, social progress and socialism—against imperialism, fascist juntas, neo-colonialism and wars of barbarous aggression and threats of nuclear annihilation.

He condemned U.S. imperialism in every area—Africa, Latin America, Asia and Europe. He called for a solution in the Middle East which would guarantee peace and the rights of the Arabs against Israeli aggression and occupation, for the rights of the Palestinians and the territorial integrity of all Mideast nations, including Israel, in a world at peace.

Comrade Lumer has been a constant champion for Communist Party candidates and participation in the Presidential elections, and for the exposure of and struggle against the twin-party domination of the electoral process by monopoly capital. He struggled to make the elections serve the needs of the people, as against the profit and power of the big business-military combine. He advocated, "Vote Communist" as the most effective vote against monopoly capital.

He wrote many books and pamphlets. Among his books are, *Is Full Employment Possible*, *Poverty: Its Roots and Its Future*, and *Zionism: Its Role in World Affairs*.

He taught and lectured and debated. He was a working class advocate, a Marxist-Leninist partisan, an unwavering champion of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

We salute his lifetime of great work even as we with heavy hearts mourn this enormous loss of our great comrade and friend, Hyman Lumer.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN

JARVIS TYNER

The Fight for New York City in the 1976 Election *

The 30 state primaries to pick the Democratic and Republican nominees for the highest office of the land was an exercise which revealed loudly and clearly that neither the Democratic nor Republican Party has a program to meet the urgent crisis confronting our nation, and that neither is really interested in developing such a program.

Neither has a program that would even begin to:

- put the 10 million unemployed back to work
- end the system of brutal racist oppression in our land
- bring massive financial aid to our cities
- guarantee a decent future for our youth
- meet the crisis in education, housing and health care
- end the contined discrimination against women
- guarantee a decent life for senior citizens
- endorse detente, end the arms race and cut the military budget.

Thus, this 1976 campaign exposes a new level of political bankruptcy of the two parties of big business.

The frontrunners, especially Ford, Reagan and Carter, go out of their way to push racist, big business and right-wing issues, as if the real issues and the real people didn't count. But the polls show that the people's will is in agreement with a program that would begin to cut back profits, corruption and big business domination of our nation.

Puny Primaries and Sham Democracy

Because such a program was ignored by the two old parties, less than one third of the eligible electorate turned out. And if one adds the non-registered voters, the real story is that 85 per cent of the voting-age population did not vote in the primaries, and only 7 per

* Adopted from June 13 Speech at Manhattan Center, New York City

cent of the total voting-age population supported Ford and Carter. Under these circumstances there could not be any genuine winners. They are all among the losers. And that, brothers and sisters, is what the millions of people who stayed away from the polls were saying to the two parties of monopoly.

These were the puny primaries. This was sham democracy at work. The candidates were looking out for monopoly's needs, not speaking to the people's needs. The lack of voter response reflects a new level of mass disgust and rejection of the two parties of big business.

We are at a historic moment, when the challenge and the dangers are great, but a moment when united action can open the way toward a people's party fighting for a people's program—and put people before profits.

The Attack on the Cities

The most vicious, criminal attack is being carried out by big business against the well-being of the working class and oppressed national minorities in our land. The attack is first against the workers of all nationalities, men and women, the workers of the mines, mills, factories and farms, the entire trade union movement. The attack is against the small farmers and the other middle strata, both urban and rural. All non-monopoly strata are under monopoly's gun. This is a racist attack which has placed the severest blows against Black masses, against Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American Indians and Asian American people, and particularly against those national minorities who reside within the cities of our nation.

The sharpest attack of the giant banks and corporation monopolies is against the cities. The urban crisis reveals much of the real aims and goals of the capitalists and helps us to understand that U.S. capitalism has no real future. The attack is against all of our cities, but New York City is getting the sharpest edge of the attack.

I want to say from the beginning that we must firmly and unequivocally reject the racist, big business lies that we've all had it too good; that the foreign-born, the Black, Puerto Rican and other Hispanic peoples are responsible. These racist stereotypes put the blame on those who are the most victimized by the crisis. The opposite is true. Rather than "living high," the Black, Puerto Rican and other Hispanic residents of New York are not only willing to work, but have been forced to take the hardest, lowest-paying, back-breaking, dirtiest jobs in the city.

Who are the majority of the garment workers? Who are the ma-

jury of the transit workers? Who are the postal workers, building superintendents, hospital workers, auto workers and longshoremens? Among these workers, Black, Puerto Rican and other Hispanic workers are numerous if not in the majority. Their hard work is the basic economic backbone of our city. I don't think there are harder-working, more self-sacrificing people on the face of this earth. If Black, Puerto Rican and other Hispanic New Yorkers are disproportionate in the ranks of the unemployed and welfare recipients, we must ask, "Why?" Is it laziness? No. That's racist propaganda. It is because the system of racist oppression that is so all-consuming in our society guarantees that vast number of people of color remain the last hired and the first fired, that they will remain on the bottom of the economic ladder.

But this system of racist oppression holds back white workers too. The problem is that there aren't enough jobs in the first place. Now, who is responsible for this? Capitalism. Capitalists do not believe in full employment. And the urban job market has been shrinking faster than that of any other area. Why is this? Who is responsible? Let's look at the record.

New York is not "in trouble" because millions of its workers have somehow walked away from their jobs to spend a "happy" life on welfare. This is absurd. It is a rare working-class person who finds welfare an easy alternative to a decent job. Listening to the official propaganda you would think that it is a crime to want a decent education, health care and decent services. To big business this is a crime because these demands infringe on their profits. For the people these are necessities, and it is our right to have them. The *real* low-lifers, the *real* "welfare recipients" are the Lockheed and Penn Central tycoons who get huge giveaways from the government. A life of luxury at the expense of working people is still the exclusive privilege of the rich.

What Happened to Jobs in New York?

Over the past five years, over fifty of the largest corporations have moved their headquarters out of New York City, taking 20,000 jobs in the private economy with them. Wall Street firms have cut back another 35,000 jobs. This flight by finance capital has led to the biggest cutbacks in commercial building in a quarter of a century, with the result that 30,000 private jobs in the construction field have already been destroyed. Various financial groups are refusing to invest any more funds in New York. For example, the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company, with \$100 million invested in New

York real estate, has decided that in view of the depressed state of the city's commerce it will not make any further investments.

The big banks used to reinvest much of their money within the city. Today most of it is exported to the suburbs and less developed areas, where immediate profits are greater. This export of money by the banks is matched by the export of manufacturing jobs. Over the past 10 years *over a quarter of a million jobs* in manufacturing have been taken out of New York City by private industry. In short, the monopoly capitalists have been systematically pumping out of New York the economic treasure *produced by its working people*. As they have done so, they have devastated the city's tax base and increased the cost of maintaining public services.

Federal Policy Makes the Rich Richer

The federal government allows multi-national corporations (who are home-based in cities like New York) to export capital overseas without real taxation. It actually offers tax incentives and subsidies which make it more lucrative for industries, higher-paid wage earners and wealthy people to move out of the cities. This undermines the tax base and turns the cities into areas of low-paid or unemployed workers. For example, in 1971 federal subsidies to suburban homeowners amounted to \$5 billion, 700 million dollars, which was twice the amount allotted for low-income public housing. This clear Federal policy of gross disregard for working people, particularly low-paid wage earners, has increased the ranks of the unemployed city dwellers to depression levels.

The only reason New York City has not been in even worse shape is that between 1969 and 1975 three-quarters of the new jobs were created by the city government. Thus, the city itself filled part of the vacuum left by big business. But city government can do this no longer and thousands more New Yorkers will be without jobs.

So, we can firmly say that the fault is not in the "corruption" of welfare recipients, but the corruption of the capitalists and their bureaucrats in Albany and City Hall. Their actions are covered up by attacking Blacks, Puerto Ricans and workers and poor people generally.

What Else Is Responsible?

The *tax structure*, too, is aimed at milking the lower-paid workers and guaranteeing big loopholes and subsidies for corporations and the rich. The rich also make a profit by the purchase of tax-free municipal bonds. The big banks loan the city money and collect a

lucrative interest. So while you and I have been paying the highest taxes in the land, the bankers and bondholders have been ripping off the city for big interest on loans and bonds. Eighteen per cent of the city budget goes to pay off the interest—that's two billion dollars!

While big real estate interests have been delinquent on their real estate taxes, even with lower-than-average taxes through under-assessment, rents have gone up by 57 per cent in the past five years. At the same time landlords have been abandoning housing at a phenomenal rate. In 1973, there were some 9 million abandoned dwelling units in U.S. cities.

Big business concerns in New York and elsewhere are delinquent in turning over the sales taxes that they collect. These taxes are deposited in banks and collect interest, but may never be fully paid out since it is solely up to the merchant to determine how much was collected and what should be paid.

Workers in New York and other cities pay more than their share to the federal government too. The federal government received some \$24-billion from New York City in the last fiscal year, but the city got back only \$3-billion. Where did this money go? Nine billion went to the military budget, a source of huge profits for the armaments producers. Another big part went to "welfare" for corporations like Lockheed and Penn Central, as well as subsidies to the oil monopoly and subsidies that actually *encourage abandonment of the cities*.

This crisis of our cities is a disgrace typical of U.S. capitalism. The big corporations and banks organized, engineered, and created the crisis. We must make them pay for it.

It is a crime of the capitalist system:

- that 50 to 60 thousand New York City workers have been laid off
- that 21,000 jobs have been lost through attrition
- that teachers and educational workers have been fired and schools closed
- that hospitals are being closed, leaving health care in a shambles, and more workers unemployed
- that building projects have been cancelled, causing the loss of thousands of construction jobs and services
- that day care centers have been closed, forcing hundreds out of work and thousands of parents onto the welfare rolls because they can't work without child care
- that *more cutbacks* are threatened.

The imposition of tuition and the destruction of open admission to CUNY is a racist crime. This destroys a 129-year tradition in

New York which made it possible for working-class students to get a higher education. The state and federal aid programs are too tiny to prevent thousands of working-class students from dropping out of school. The bulk of those who will be forced out of the City College system will be Black and Puerto Rican students. Most of the closed hospitals are in Black and Puerto Rican communities. The community colleges that are supposed to be closed have a predominantly Black and Puerto Rican enrollment. The cutbacks in New York City have hit all working people, but if we are to defeat this attack we must see its special racist edge.

The people are being attacked by big business at every point in the human life cycle—in childhood, as youth, as adults and as senior citizens.

Trade unions are under the gun, facing stiff resistance to righteous demands for long overdue wage increases. We're headed for an across-the-board wage freeze for the workers of New York City, both public and private, in addition to an inhuman increase in speedup.

The attack means big pressure on working-class families; people are being forced to move and are losing all of their hard-earned possessions. The attack means the growth of youth unemployment (already 40 per cent for Black and Puerto Rican youth), drug addiction and petty crime. The lack of future prospects for youth can lead to a drastic social dislodging; it can lead to the devastation of individuals, of a whole generation of youth.

The best qualities of a human being do not come forward when one has little to live for. With economic ruin comes social decay and destruction of the human spirit. Therefore, this is a life-and-death struggle.

Monopoly has a whole arsenal of diversions to cause confusion and misdirection. During times of crisis, racism is the number one weapon of confusion. Others are anti-Communism and anti-Semitism. These block unity and blind the people to the path of advanced thinking and action.

The government is also preparing to repress dissent against its policies. There is never any financial shortage when it comes to government repression. The FBI and the CIA continue to work to repress movements against monopoly. High on their list is stopping the Communist candidates from getting on the ballot. Watergate lives on; Watergate is a permanent part of capitalist rule. Its aims and methods must be continually fought against.

Presently there is a wave of racist violence throughout our land, spurred on by the frontrunners in both parties. Carter is a long-time

foe of busing and calls for "ethnic purity." Ford and Reagan call for resistance to school busing and publicly support segregation.

Presently, in North Carolina, there is the case of the Wilmington 10, led by Reverend Ben Chavis, who are victims of one of the most heinous racist frameups in our history. This is a basic fight. They must be freed. The Congress is now considering the most repressive piece of legislation in our history, the infamous Senate Bill 1. This also must be stopped.

The big bankers and monopolists who control the Democratic and Republican Parties have a long-term plan for the plunder of the cities.

The financial rulers aren't satisfied with their indirect rule; they have now set up the Emergency Financial Control Board and the Municipal Assistance Corporation (Big Mac). Both are financial control agencies staffed by the biggest bankers and industrialists in town. Through these boards the banks and monopolies have direct rule and veto power over the city budget. Our city is under a financial dictatorship of the richest capitalists in town. They have put the thieves in charge of the city treasury. Says Felix G. Rohatyn, head of Big Mac, "The pain is just beginning . . . (over the next four years the city will undergo) the most brutal kind of financial and fiscal exercise any community in the country will ever have to face." Arthur Burns, head of the Federal Reserve Board, put it this way (February 11, 1976): "New York City will have to live a life of austerity."

A Program to Fight Back and Win

The Communist Party's platform is such a program. It will make the creators of the crisis pay for the crisis. It puts people before profits:

1. Cancel the city's debts to the banks.
2. Tax the rich—banks, corporations, real estate firms and millionaires to pay for city services from a special super-profits tax.
3. Exempt all family income under \$20,000 from all income tax and private homes assessed under \$40,000 from all real estate taxes.
4. Municipalize the utilities and utilize the income to meet the needs of the cities.
5. A federal law that will prohibit the multi-national corporations and industries from abandoning the cities.
6. Immediate massive federal aid to the cities to guarantee no more cuts and the restoration of all cutbacks.
7. 30-hour work week at 40-hours pay.

8. Outlaw racism—make cases of racism by employers, landlords, etc., subject to criminal penalties—end all discrimination in hiring, promotion, job-training and layoffs.
9. Special programs to expand services and create jobs in the Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano, Asian-American and Native-American Indian communities.
10. Unfreeze wages and roll back prices and rents.
11. Expand trade with socialist countries (this could create thousands of new jobs).
12. 80 per cent cut in military budget—(this would mean 7.2 billion for New York City).

If all or part of these measures were won it would mean no more cuts; in fact, an expansion of services. It would mean that thousands of new jobs would be created. It would mean bringing the city towards a livable level.

This is an anti-monopoly program to meet the current crisis. To achieve these goals is a tall order. But there is enough money in our society to meet the needs of the cities, of all our people. For example, the New York banks' and financial institutions' total wealth is in the neighborhood of \$300 billion. The problem is that while this wealth was created by the majority it is controlled by a tiny minority at the top.

How To Win

To win this program will require the united might of the working class, the entire trade union movement allied with Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native-American Indian and Asian-American peoples. It will take unity between the youth and senior citizens, women and men. It will take unity of middle-class victims of monopoly aligned with the working class and oppressed national minorities. This unity can be achieved because we all face a common foe—big business.

The front line must be Black and white unity in order to win. We must learn some lessons from the New York City situation. Let us not underestimate the shrewdness or ruthlessness and the deep racism of these bankers. In launching their offensive against the people of New York City they have been using their time-honored method of "divide and rule." They seek to divide the people of the city into separate groups, disunited and squabbling among themselves. They know that if the target is welfare recipients and "illegal aliens," big business won't be the target.

These boards of financial dictators do not carry out the cutbacks all at once. First they reduce one service, then another, and still

later a third. Afterwards they return to the first target for further cutbacks. They use shock economics to demoralize and frighten the people. They try to get one group fighting the other. Thus, the entire weight of their power is turned against relatively small groups of workers and city residents each time. It is obvious that the only possible way to defeat this strategy is to unite all the victims on a fighting program.

The liberal Democrats and those trade union officials who are unwilling or unable to develop anti-monopoly unity of action will have to be replaced by more progressive and activist-minded leaders who are prepared to do this. When the working people of this city are sufficiently well organized and militant to elect a group of leaders with a program and real fighting spirit, they can win!

Nothing will be won in this fight by relying on the Democratic and Republican Parties. At this stage we all have to recognize that the Democratic and Republican Parties and their Presidential candidates are incapable of offering a solution. Both are parties that put big business first. They put monopoly profits before the people's needs. But the moment we show our independence and are able to unite around a fighting mass program, at that moment we will begin to win concessions.

We must begin from a position of political and electoral independence from the two parties of big business. That's the only way to win in either local or national elections, the only way to develop the united organizational and political strength to build a mass people's anti-monopoly party.

The lesser-of-two-evils notion is a drag on the movement for political independence. At this stage in the fight we need candidates who are neither *lesser* nor *evil*. We don't need to exchange Ford's racist anti-busing stand for Carter's "ethnic purity."

Georgia-style austerity isn't any less painful than Michigan-style austerity. The ruling class profits from either. But we don't! We've got to stand firmly *against* what they stand for. We have to show them that we are serious, that we want a real change.

We must use our votes wisely. You don't go up to an enemy and hand him your weapon. You'll get wasted. That's what a vote for the Republican or Democratic nominee means. And sitting out the election when there is a real choice is like sitting on your weapon in the middle of a major battle. You'll get wasted again.

The wisest, most meaningful, most powerful choice you can make this year is to vote for the Communist Party candidates. Every such vote will be a defeat for the powerful monopolists that run our

country because that vote is making a stand; that vote lets them know that you are for a completely new direction for this country. It is a vote they can't ignore. It is a vote powerful enough to begin to change things no matter who gets elected. They'll make big concessions to try to counter the impact of the Communist vote. We say that a big Communist vote in New York City will produce some federal funds for sure.

This attack on New York City will be tried elsewhere if they get away with it. This means economic ruin for every major urban center in the country. But it won't be confined solely to urban areas. The attack is aimed at working people and youth as a whole. Their long-range plans mean disaster for the vast majority.

But we have a long-range plan too. Our plan means a new society, a new life for all. No more racism and anti-Semitism, full equality for women. It means a society that provides medical care for all, free education for all. It means a society in which our youth can flower and reach their full potential, socially and economically. Such a society can be realized in our country, in our life-time. There's no question about it. The warm sun of socialism will rise in these United States. And big business knows it's coming.

They are working overtime now at the FBI and the CIA to keep us off the ballot. They recognize how important our campaign is. In state after state the laws have been changed to make it more and more difficult to get on the ballot.

If they'll spend millions to destroy Unidad Popular in Chile and millions to set back the MPLA in Angola, or save South African apartheid, or stop a Communist election victory in Italy, brothers and sisters, you can imagine how much a big Communist showing here in the U.S. will shake them up!

That's why a vote for Hall-Tyner is the most meaningful, most important vote you can cast.

The People's Fight for Ballot Rights

If we look more closely into the mechanism of capitalist democracy, everywhere, both in the "petty"—so-called petty—details of the suffrage . . . and in the techniques of the representative institutions . . . on all sides we see restriction after restriction upon democracy. These restrictions, exceptions, exclusions, obstacles for the poor, seem slight, especially in the eyes of one who has himself never known want . . . but in their sum total these restrictions exclude and squeeze out the poor from politics and from an active share in politics.

—V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*

• • • •

Lenin wrote the above words 59 years ago but the thrust of his argument remains valid today. Lenin makes specific reference to the exclusion of woman from suffrage, residential qualifications and "the techniques of the representative institutions" as well as "the purely capitalist organization of the capitalist press."

Details have changed over the years, of course. We now have women's suffrage, the elimination of the poll tax, considerable registration of Black voters in the South—all following prolonged popular struggles. But a close examination of the electoral process in the United States in the Bicentennial year of 1976 confirms Lenin's basic conclusions as to the nature of capitalist democracy.

The essence of the matter is that despite all the gains made over the decades of struggle, capitalist democracy still remains as Lenin said, "a democracy for the rich and powerful." Government is dominated by the two major parties, those cartels of power brokers operating on behalf of the giant monopolies that dominate the economy of the nation. The big trusts finance the major candidates—just check the campaign reports of Jimmy Carter, Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan—and it is chiefly corporate money that bankrolls their lavish expenditures for TV and radio time and newspaper advertising. Recent "reform" legislation providing treasury funds for major candidates simply supplements to the tune of an estimated \$60 million the huge sums coming from corporate-connected sources. (The legislation carefully excludes minority parties and independents from this golden flow.)

Growing recognition of big business control of the two old parties as well as popular disgust with the policies of both major parties—Vietnam and Watergate, for example—has literally turned millions off the conventional political process. In 1972 about 54 per cent of the eligible electorate voted; in the 1974 congressional elections it sank to about 40 to 45 per cent. In the 1976 primaries about 20 to 25 per cent participated. And most of these who abstained are to be found among the poorest sections of the population, the Blacks, the Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and working-class whites.

Significantly, among those who *do* register to vote, an increasing number record themselves as independents, avoiding formal affiliation with either major party. It is estimated that at least one-third of the voters are in this camp. Clearly, the non-voters and the independents today constitute the majority of the eligible electorate.

Dissatisfaction with the two major candidates is already evident. Support for Jimmy Carter in the Congressional Black Caucus, for example, is at best lukewarm and many other liberal Democrats are adopting a wait-and-see attitude. Some idea of the attitude of many can be seen by an unpublished survey taken by the Louis Harris polling organization that gives independent candidate Eugene McCarthy 10 per cent. A new Gallup poll reportedly gives him 5 per cent.

But—and here we get back to the difficulties thrown up against minority parties and independents—even McCarthy is finding it difficult to attain ballot status. He admits that he will be lucky to get on the ballot in 40 of the fifty states of the union. Some idea of the difficulties that McCarthy, a former Democratic U.S. senator faces, were outlined recently by syndicated columnist Tom Tiede:

As an independent he is not automatically included on state ballots, as are the representatives of major parties. So he must qualify for the right in each state, which is usually difficult, always expensive and sometimes impossible.

Every state has its own laws governing the placement of independent names on its ballots, and often the laws are the kind that give democracy a bad name.

In West Virginia, for example, voters who signed petitions for McCarthy were automatically expunged from the Democratic and Republican rolls, making themselves liable to a \$1,000 fine if they tried (some did) to vote in any primary.

In Michigan, a court ruled that McCarthy's name on ballots would 'clog the election system.' In Massachusetts, the McCarthy bid was invalidated because too many of his petition signatures

lacked middle names or precise addresses.

quality for the right in each state, which is usually difficult, always six states. The 100,000 signatures he's gathered have cost him \$200,000, or \$2 a piece. (*Waterloo, Iowa, Courier*, July 19, 1976).

A week earlier (July 12), the same newspaper carried the column of conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick discussing McCarthy's problems, noting that the former Minnesota Senator now "must master 50 different requirements for the filing of petitions."

"In some states," Kilpatrick continues, "the number of signatures is low; in some it is high. Here the signatures must be notarized; there they must be obtained by counties or Congressional districts.

"Filing deadlines vary enormously. Filing fees are high and low. State laws on challenges are a swamp of ambiguity."

Kilpatrick's concern for the ballot rights of independents and minority parties should not be mistaken for any progressive rebellion against the status quo. A diehard reactionary, he is a voice of that grouping of Big Business which seeks to bring into being an ultra-Right party. "This," he writes portentously, "is a pregnant time for the birth of new parties. In the name of a free society, we ought not to see them strangled in the womb."

His thinking is close to that of another right winger, Associate Justice William A. Rehnquist of the U.S. Supreme Court, who has expressed sharp criticism of the treatment of third parties and independents by Congress. He dissented sharply in a case in which the court's majority approved the law providing federal financing out minority parties. Rehnquist wrote (*Buckley v. Valeo*, decided January 30, 1976):

I find it impossible to subscribe to the Court's reasoning that because no third party has posed a credible threat to the two major parties in Presidential elections since 1860, Congress may by law attempt to assure that this pattern will last forever. I would hold that, as to general election financing, Congress has not merely treated the two major parties differently from minor parties and independents, but has discriminated in favor of the former in such a way as to run afoul of the First and Fifth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

Rehnquist and Kilpatrick are in fact speaking for that section of the ruling class which has traditionally supported the Republican Party as the most consistent party of Big Business. Now they have their doubts as to its viability, doubts expressed most clearly in recent months by William Rusher, publisher of the *National Review*, the intellectual organ of neo-fascist thinkers, owned by William F.

Buckley. The Buckley-Rusher group has talked up the idea of a right wing third party that will corral conservative Republicans and Democrats and also attract the supporters of George Wallace. In the current inner-Republican struggle they have in the main thrown their support to Reagan against President Ford, while keeping their eyes fixed on their long-range objective—a political realignment and the formation of a party of the extreme Right. Unquestionably it will represent the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital, mingling national chauvinism, a thinly-veiled racism with a demagogic populism and opposition to “big government.” It will oppose the “welfare state” and detente and boost militarism.

Their criticism of restrictive election laws, while frequently accurate and cogent, carefully avoids any defense of the rights of a working-class party such as the Communist Party—the principal target of reaction. Virtually all independents and minority parties have felt the weight of restrictive ballots, but in varying degrees. The Right-wing efforts have in practice always found them to be much less of a barrier, as was demonstrated by the Wallace candidacy in 1968.

Baring Communists From the Ballot

It is unquestionably the Communist Party against which reaction's fire has been chiefly leveled. A look at the record confirms the charge of Communist presidential candidate Gus Hall that there is in fact a national conspiracy to bar the Communists from access to the ballot.

The historical record is plain. In 1932, Communist votes were recorded in 38 of the 48 states. In 1972, primarily because of legal restrictions, Communist candidates achieved ballot status in only 13 of the 50 states. Besides finding its way in the maze of the varied election laws in 50 different states, the Communist Party today is faced in 12 states with outright anti-Communist provisions. One state, Delaware, requires that the Communist Party and its members register with the state police. Georgia has an anti-subversive clause under which election officials can easily deny ballot status to Communist candidates.

But anti-Communist laws—invalidated in some states after court fights—are only part of the story. There are fantastic requirements for signatures on nominating petitions in many states. California recently liberalized its election law; it now requires “only” about 100,000 signatures. Massachusetts calls for 37,000; Missouri, 18,000; Arizona, two per cent of the last vote for governor, etc.

But here against one runs into a series of barbed wire fences, some of those innumerable "petty restrictions" Lenin discussed. For even the process of collecting signatures is hedged with problems. In Texas, for example, the collector must have a notary with him or be a notary himself and have the signer attest to his signature. In many states, filing the signatures becomes a deeply-trapped obstacle course. Thus, Massachusetts and 10 other states decree that signatures be submitted first to town or country clerks or probate judges before filing with the state government. In Connecticut, the petitions have to be filed personally with about 160 town clerks!

At least four states—Louisiana, Missouri, Tennessee and Virginia—require one elector from each Congressional district. For a Communist elector from a bayou district of Louisiana merely to appear on the ballot or nominating petitions is an act of considerable courage.

West Virginia gives you a little more rope—enough to hang you. A canvasser needs a county clerk's certificate authorizing him to collect signatures in the magisterial district where he resides, and it is a felony for an out-of-stater to circulate petitions. The final irony is the requirement that candidates for President and Vice President pay a filing fee of one per cent of the annual salaries paid to those officers. So, Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner must shell out \$2,000 and \$625, respectively. They refused.)

Michigan has added a Catch-22 wrinkle. After filing the requisite signatures, the Communist Party was faced with a brand new law compelling minority parties to enter a primary election in which some would be eliminated. Michigan authorities argue that there are too many parties and that the voting machine can't accommodate them all; the Motor State's technology is apparently unable to cope with the problem. . . .

Apart from the legislative thimblerrigging, canvassers have met threats of violence and arrests. In Mobile, Alabama, the comptroller of Bishop State Junior College leveled two .45 revolvers at canvassers, accompanying his gun flourishes with a stream of anti-Communist invective. In Birmingham, a canvasser was arrested on the charge of threatening the life of Vice President Rockefeller, some 700 miles away. (The indictment was finally dropped.) In Louisville, Kentucky, two Communist canvassers were arrested for allegedly trespassing on a college campus. (The charges were dropped.)

And there is far more, including vindictive harassment by challenges after petitions have been filed, imposing new strains on the meager resources of minority parties.

Challenges to the Party petitions were filed in Michigan, New Jersey, Utah and Maine. In Michigan, the attack was spearheaded by some Democratic machine hacks. In New Jersey, the challenge was submitted by the so-called U.S. Labor Party, the political arm of the National Caucus of Labor Committees, widely believed to be CIA-connected. In Utah, state authorities pushed the challenge. In Maine, the assault was led by a reactionary Democratic state representative, one Louis Jalbert, and was publicly backed by ultra-Right "independent" Governor James Longley. Maine, the Governor declaimed, "is not and has no intention of becoming a refuge for the Communist Party." The challenge was rejected in New Jersey and the Party is certified to ballot. The challenges are still pending in the other three states at this writing.

A Struggle for Democracy

But these reversions to the spirit of the late and unlamented Joe McCarthy are meeting substantial resistance, paced in the first instance by the Communist Party and its candidates. American Civil Liberties Union lawyers have gone into the courts in a number of states on behalf of the constitutional rights of the Communist candidates. The National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee issued a strong statement declaring that it "deplores the violation of democracy . . . experienced by the Communist Party U.S.A. in seeking ballot staatus for its 1976 ticket." It charged that the ballot restrictions "run counter to the Bill of Rights" and added this warning to all democratic-minded people:

"To the extent that arbitrary and onerous filing requirements impede the appearance on the ballot of minority parties, they deprive us all of the full exercise of our rights."

In Massachusetts, 82 leading figures, including some public officials, joined in a statement published as an advertisement in the *Boston Globe*. The statement defended the rights of minority parties, noting that the "restrictive provisions are applied with exceptional vigor against Communist candidates."

In Maine, the *Portland Press Herald*, while treating the subject gingerly, nevertheless editorially warned that opposition to Communist philosophy must "never be used as an excuse to deprive a minority of the rights and privileges available to all under the law." (July 7, 1976.)

In Iowa and other states, newspaper voices have been raised, in one form or another, supportive of the Party's right to the ballot. Candidates Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner have found an almost uni-

formly friendly reception among media representatives, some of whom indicated support for ballot access by the Party. And even the august *New York Times* found space for a column on the Party's ballot fight on its famed Op-Ed page (July 17, 1976).

In a word, the fight of the Communists for ballot rights is increasingly seen as a broad democratic struggle involving the rights of all, particularly those independents and minority parties seeking access to the ballot.

This is not always understood clearly even on the Left and in the Party. Thus, even some members of the campaign committee, in speeches or writing, repeated rumors and speculations respecting various independents and minority parties which would tend to disrupt the unity of democratic-minded people in the struggle against the monopolies. This was quickly corrected in a statement issued by the Hall-Tyner Election Campaign Committee and signed by its chairman, Henry Winston, and this writer as campaign manager. The statement, published in the *Daily World* of July 15, restated the Committee's basic position:

We totally oppose any and all laws that restrict the ballot rights of independents and minority parties which stand for democracy. We may disagree with one or another party in its attitude towards our view of socialism but we oppose all efforts of the state to restrict the ballot rights of such parties.

We face a national conspiracy to keep us off the ballot and thus prevent the voters from having a working-class alternative to the candidates and policies of the two old parties. We see the attack on the Communist ballot rights as the leading edge of the whole assault upon the democratic rights of the people to make a choice outside the confines of the corporate-controlled two-party system.

We call for unity of all democratic-minded forces, inside and outside the two old parties, in the common struggle to defend the elementary right to the ballot. This is a crucial aspect of the struggle to maintain and extend democracy.

The firm and prompt restatement of the committee's position echoed favorably among progressive people who had followed the matter, and efforts by one or another splinter group to work up a hullabaloo against the Party and its candidates fizzled. Progressives recognized the statement as another expression of the Party's basic line of struggle for an anti-monopoly coalition.

The Anti-Monopoly Essence

The relationship between the anti-monopoly struggle in the United

States and the maze of election laws is not immediately obvious. But study of the historic trend reveals that the efforts to choke off third party movements roughly parallels the growth of monopolies in the nation and the struggle of the people against them. There is evidence—too detailed to recount in one brief article—that the two major parties, acting on behalf of big business, sought to strangle independent movements with renewed viciousness after each upsurge of a third party or insurgent movement. Thus, new restrictive laws were adopted after the 1912 elections in which Theodore Roosevelt and his Progressive (Bull Moose) Party, a split-off from the Republican Party, polled more than 4,000,000 votes and, more important, Eugene V. Debs, heading the Socialist ticket, garnered over 900,000 votes.

A similar tightening of the noose was felt after the 1924 election when Robert M. LaFollette, running as a third party candidate on the Progressive ticket, polled 4.8 million votes. Ditto after the 1948 elections when Henry Wallace received 1,157,000 votes on the Progressive line.

This is not to say that big business and the two old party bosses attacked third party movements only after the 1912, 1924 and 1948 presidential elections. They were busy year in and year out buttressing their control of the election process by many means—through legal gimmicks, outright ballot stealing, preventing minority party access to the media, and countless other ways.

A brief examination of the vagaries of the electoral process in New York, considered a "liberal" state, is instructive in this regard. In 1920, during the post-World War I Red Scare period, faced with the election of five Socialist assemblymen, the State Assembly simply expelled them—by a bipartisan vote. Later, the two parties ran "fusion" candidates to defeat them. In 1936, the Legislature upped the necessary number of votes required for ballot status from 25,000 for governor to 50,000, thus dropping the Communist Party off the ballot as a recognized party and forcing it to get signatures on nominating petitions.

Later, after the American Labor Party was formed, the Legislature passed the Wilson-Pakula law—known informally as "the anti-Marcantonio law"—in order to prevent Laborite Congressman Vito Marcantonio from entering any other party primary than his own. (He had a habit of entering major party primaries and winning their designations because of his popularity with voters of all affiliations.) That same year, 1947, the old party bosses joined in a campaign under the slogan of "Beat Communism" to knock out the

proportional representation system of voting for the New York City Council. This was the democratic system under which Communist Councilmen Peter V. Cacchione and Benjamin J. Davis, along with a number of Laborites and other progressives were elected. The old party bosses' campaigns succeeded in the hysteria of the cold war.

From the foregoing it is clear that big business has operated in a variety of ways to crush democratic struggle that has sought expression through third party movements and insurgent movements within the two party system. Control of the electoral law-making process in the legislatures is one of the chief elements by which the two old parties exercise their domination, a fact recognized by close students of the process. Warren Moscow, former chief of the Albany bureau of the *New York Times* and a cynic familiar with the ways of old party politicians, said of this process:

"A word about the election law. Though passed by the Legislature, it is actually written by the legal counsel of the two major parties and designed by them to make smoother functioning of their machinery. . ." (*Politics in the Empire State*, New York, 1948.) Some years later in a discussion on the difficulties encountered by minority parties and independents, Ralph Nader and Theodore Jacobs concluded in an article in the *Harvard Law Record* (October 9, 1959) that the electoral system is rigged by statutes to maintain "a practical monopoly of the ballot by the Democratic and Republican parties."

Such is the real character of the vaunted capitalist democracy. But enormous though the obstacles be, they can be overcome by mass movements. Barriers can be broken and the repeal of restrictive laws won as the drive for independent political action widens. More and more, as the popular anti-monopoly movement grows there will be increasing attention given to this arena of struggle. The fight for genuinely democratic election laws will be seen as an essential part of the total struggle for democratic advance. In this struggle, the Communists, as partisans of socialism and therefore partisans of the fight to maintain and extend democracy, will continue to be in the forefront.

IQ Thinking: Its Effect on the Schools

IQ theory has been effectively discredited by many social scientists and demonstrated to be racist and anti-workingclass in character. But theory dies slowly, especially when given sustenance by the ruling policy-makers. Meanwhile, a whole population has been and continues to be indoctrinated with the myth that "intelligence," though any used to sort children into "ability" groups. Without a ured and used to sort children into "ability" groups. Without a generally accepted concept of what "intelligence" is, even its most loyal psychometric adherents are forced to settle for its operational definition: "intelligence" = "what it is the test measures." In reality, these tests measure the predictability of academic success in a white middle-class dominated public school system. They measure the degree of assimilation into the dominant culture and value system. They are so infected with cultural assumptions that not ability or potential is being tested but race and class.

In spite of growing objections to intelligence testing, the continuing effects of IQ thinking in the school are disastrous. The thinking of generations of teachers has become permeated by the doctrine that intelligence is essentially inborn, rather than the result of teaching or training. It is assumed to refer to a generalized quality of mind responsive to all types of challenges, rather than specific to the task and based on life experiences. Teacher training curricula emphasize theories which teach that intellectual ability can be measured with accuracy and ease. Ranking children according to this "ability" is therefore assumed to be valid and is inculcated in yet another generation of teachers. One of the major and most pernicious aspects of this is the acceptance and advocacy of homogeneous grouping.

Even where group intelligence tests have been eradicated as a result of community protest, standardized tests have taken their place to assign children to slow, average, and fast tracks. Group intelligence tests are pencil-and-paper tests designed to test general information and reasoning, while standardized tests are meant to evaluate school learning. Both types of tests, however, unrealistically assume that basic reading and writing skills have been taught in

the first place. Whichever type is used, strangely enough, but not so strangely, the groups always end up reflecting the income and race of the child. Many Blacks, Hispano-American and other minority as well as non-minority social scientists have emphatically stated that testing serves as a gatekeeping function to keep poor people and minorities at the lowest levels of the economic and social scale. Resulting from such testing, tracking becomes the means by which equal educational opportunity is denied in the schools. For example, in New York City, the disproportionate number of Black and other minority children placed in classes for the retarded on the basis of an IQ test is incredible. Studies conclude that the majority of these children had been misplaced and had suffered "irreparable harm and injury."

Tracking generally begins in the very early grades. Whether groups are called "bluebirds," "doves," or "eagles," the children soon find out that these euphemisms really mean "smart," "average," "dumb." Reading is usually the key to tracking within the school. Where group IQ's are no longer given, it is by reading scores that pupils are ranked. In many school systems, standardized reading readiness tests are given at the beginning of the first grade. These tests claim to be able to predict a child's ability to read. On the basis of these tests of questionable validity, children who do not do well enough must wait while the other groups are taught to read. What six-year old would not be demolished at not receiving a book while others of his classmates start what can be an exciting adventure in reading. Actually, these tests have little relevance to the reading process. The really effective way of gauging a child's reading potential is to teach him to read, observe his progress, and test the results of teaching. Placed in a slow group at the very start of his school career, the child finds it difficult to catch up without help, and a retarded reader develops. The slow-tracked child rarely gets into a higher track.

The destructive effects of the IQ theory of measuring ability penetrate even more deeply into the fabric of the child's education. Instead of having a definite course of study for each grade, IQ theory argues that it is inconsistent to have the same goals for all children. Instead, children should be expected to work "up to the level of their ability," which, of course, is demonstrated by the IQ test, or other standardized tests. Test scores are seen as providing the ceiling on the amount of learning children are expected to achieve. If the scores are low, they are not expected to learn much and therefore no great effort is made to teach them

much. The theory that these should be individual standards based on the child's "ability" has been an important cause of the alarming amount of reading and language retardation in the schools today.

To continue the IQ line of thinking, being promoted or retained in a grade loses its significance since there are no grade standards anyway, and so the practice of one hundred per cent promotion was put into affect (and only lately and meaninglessly modified). The way was made clear for hundreds of thousands of children throughout the country to coast through school without attaining their basic skills. With standardized reading tests employing the multiple-choice type of guessing-game response, which conceals more skill deficiencies than it reveals, parents have no way of knowing how widespread reading and language disability is at every level of our educational system. Mistakenly, they join those teachers who blame the victims for being "lazy," "unmotivated" or "low IQ."

Since reading is the key to tracking, it is important to analyze the reasons intrinsic to reading disability. Studies in depth of the reading process attest to its great complexity. For years, reading performance was simplistically tied to "intelligence," again as tested by IQ tests. Children with low IQ's were denied reading remediation they so sorely needed on the assumption that they did not have the intelligence to profit from remedial instruction. But later studies showed that many children with average or even high IQ's also were found to have reading disabilities. How is it possible to explain this seeming contradiction?

Actually, reading and writing are developmental processes and are learned in stages. The beginning stages of training in phonics and handwriting are crucial in helping the child decode letter symbols into words. These processes need the coordination of the auditory and visual-motor perceptions. It is quite true that some children need more training than others in these early stages of perceiving and making automatic word-sounds and letter-forms. In the same way, some children have a better perception of musical tones than others. Neither is a process related to "intelligence," and both are strongly dependent upon training.

Unfortunately, careful training in phonics and letter forms has for decades been by-passed. Since the thirties, children have been taught reading by the "look-say" method of introducing new words. A very large percentage of children could not learn to read a phonetic language such as English by the "look-say" method because it provides no means of fixing the learning in the child's mind. Because letters were not related to sounds, each word became an

arbitrary configuration, a pure memory feat. Reading texts were so graded that all new words were repeated over and over with the mistaken notion that if the child saw a word often enough, he would remember it. But many did not remember it because they needed the auditory clues that would have impressed and stabilized the pronunciation and meaning upon their minds.

Black and other minority children, particularly, had problems with beginning reading as it was taught, for reasons that had nothing to do with intelligence. Coming from cultures other than middle-class white, they experience standard English as a second language. Especially is this so with Spanish-speaking children who are not being afforded a bi-lingual program. Black English, spoken by many Black children, has phonetic, syntactic and intonational differences as well as rich, unique imagery of expression often incorporated into standard English. Ignorant of these cultural language differences, the white middle-class teacher fails to provide the necessary bridge between the cultural language differences and the teaching of beginning reading of standard English. These language differences made it more difficult for minority children to learn the initial stages of reading and writing without the kind of knowledgeable teaching that could bridge these differences. As a result, they were tracked into the slowest groups from the start, and the fault was believed to lie in the child himself, that is, in his IQ. Teacher training courses tied to IQ theory continue to institutionalize this kind of mis-teaching.

When the fallacies of the "look-say" approach to reading were exposed in the 1950's, a great theoretical controversy arose around reading methods, a controversy which exists to this very day. In practice, many schools did begin to incorporate a phonic approach, among others. Publishers began to publish many different methods, including the phonic approach, in competition with each other. It became fashionable to be "eclectic" and to have many methods around so that the teacher could choose the appropriate method to fit the individual "learning style" of the child. The trouble was that teachers were ill-equipped to make such choices based upon their very superficial and fragmentary training in how to teach reading, not to mention the difficulties in determining the "learning style" of a child.

What happens in practice is that there is no uniformity of approach and schools teach children by several different approaches simultaneously, including the "look-say," the "phonic," the "language-experience," the "linguistic," the "structural," or any combination of

these. As children pass through the grades or change schools, they may be exposed to several different methods. The over-all learning experience of the child shapes up as being discontinuous, inconsistent, an overburdening hodge-podge of tasks which present many types of barriers to learning to read. Most remedial teachers, also trained in the use of different reading approaches, "to be adapted to the individual needs of the child," have provided "more of the same" of what was being offered unsuccessfully in the classroom. This trial-and-error method of teaching reading makes guinea pigs of children and produces semi-literate and illiterate graduates at every level of the school system.

What a far cry from the systematic, carefully sequenced phonic method of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries which have phonetic languages. Here, methodology is developed by master teachers and educational psychologists, carefully researched, and if found effective over a period of time, used throughout the country. Individual differences are dealt with in the context of the commonality of learning process based on Marxist psychological theory. Children who learn more slowly are given additional support and remediation using the same system. Children are not permitted to fall behind without being helped and brought up to grade. The overall result is that illiteracy has been reduced to the vanishing point.

The use of the IQ and standardized tests, and particularly the interpretation of test results, are increasingly seen as the barrier to social equality. But what are the alternatives? How can we reverse the present downhill direction of education, particularly of poor and racial minority children? On the most basic level, the schools must repudiate the IQ theory and break with all the practices that stem from it.

Back in the 30's, education in the Soviet Union broke with its own brand of IQ theorists, called "pedologists," who were being influenced by bourgeois educational thinking. After a long ideological struggle toward a dialectical materialist approach to how children should be educated, a new theory arose, and stemming from it, a system of education, which, in socialist countries, results in high levels of achievement and a very minimal degree of failure. It is important for us to understand this theory and how it might be applied to illuminate our own fight for high level achievement schools.

Soviet psychologists and educators point to the work of L.S. Vygotsky, a prominent psychologist of the Soviet Union at the time,

as providing the basis for their educational practices today. Vygotsky rejected the idea that the child's intellectual development is determined by innate intelligence. On the contrary, he believed that intellectual development is formed in the process of a child's activity under the influence of environmental stimulation both at home and at school. He saw the child's interaction with his surroundings as the basis for the development of complex functional connections within the brain. He stressed the role of the school learning because it could stimulate these internal processes of development, but only when such learning was consistent and systematic. His work, which was later developed by Luria and others, led to a new theory of education based not on fictitious innate ability ceilings, but on its active role in *forming* these abilities. This is a profound conception, which, when applied, is capable of unleashing creative forces in children far beyond any limits we establish today.

In practice, intelligence tests only classify. They serve no useful purpose in teaching. Teachers should receive training in perfecting their own evaluation techniques both in formal and informal ways in order to discover the level of preparation of the children for new learning. This practice is, in essence, one of diagnostic teaching. This two level testing procedure pretests to discover what a child has already learned in a specific area, provides for systematic teaching and then tests results. Before the testing industry became a mammoth business, good teachers had always constructed short assessment instruments to provide feedback for both the teacher and the pupil about his progress. Good teachers continue to do so. But it is the standardized test that determines educational policy today.

The schools should abolish the tracking system based on "ability." Instead, definite grade standards of achievement should be established in each area of skill or knowledge. This does not mean ignoring individual differences in performance, but a different interpretation of them. A low score and many errors should be understood to mean a low level of preparation and not a low level of innate ability. A low score should stress the need for more intensive help for the child to enable him to reach grade standards. For the large numbers of children who are being pushed through the grades in deteriorated schools without their basic literacy skills, massive remedial support systems are indispensable. These are by no means to be considered other tracks or special classes with watered-down curricula. Instead, they should become feeders for the main track in which remedial services should be offered for

all those who fall behind. When such remedial instruction is not provided and children are automatically and meaninglessly "promoted" from grade to grade without learning the curriculum, not only do the basic skills remain unlearned, but failure and frustration set in with all their accompanying emotional problems. Not only is the child's education harmed but, in many ways, his intellectual development as well.

Vygotsky was convinced from his research and from Marxist theory that "the mastery of socially determined experience changes not only the contents of the psychological life (one's range of ideas and knowledge) but also develops new forms of mental processes . . . thus creating a more solid structure for the conscious activity of man." Though he includes the child's total social activities as instrumental in developing intellectual abilities, he emphasizes that such mastery is best carried out systematically in a well-organized school. To apply Vygotsky's theory to school activities is to recognize that when a child is systematically taught phonics, he trains his auditory perception for sounds in words as well. When he is carefully taught handwriting skills, he develops his eye-hand coordination for written language. When he is taught language concepts, he also develops his verbal thinking. When he is effectively taught arithmetic, at the same time he develops logical mathematical thinking. When he is routinely engaged in appropriate learning activities, he is thereby lengthening his attention span for such activities and developing powers of concentration. Failure to develop these intellectual abilities in the process of mastering reading, writing and other language skills prevents the child from competing at the levels of abstraction required for educational advancement in the average school.

Does this mean that the child is neurologically damaged, or mentally retarded, or that his learning problems need be permanent? Certainly not, to all three questions. The child who is not properly taught the necessary knowledge and reading and writing skills acquired in schools is not a mentally retarded child. In terms of formal learning, however, he does lag behind since his language experience is "poorly suited for complex intellectual activity of the kind developed in school" (Luria). If not remediated, the child is placed at a disadvantage in becoming a productive adult in a technologically highly organized society.

In our country, such children have been labelled "learning-disabled." In the Soviet Union, there is no such social problem, but when cases do occur, they are diagnosed as "developmentally back-

ward," a condition indicated by Soviet psychologists to be caused by "pedagogical neglect." A developmentally-backward child is identified as one who goes to a regular school but who cannot keep up with the curriculum. With a special program in the regular school, the intellectual development of these children can be hastened and they can be returned to the mainstream at some future date. Because of the abysmal conditions in our schools, there are many children with the types of learning and language problems described above. A small percentage of these children do have neurological disorders. Most of them have problems which could have been prevented with well-organized sequential schooling.

The use of labels, in general, has tended to spread confusion. Labels continue, in many places, to reflect an outdated emphasis on medical or psychiatric diagnoses. Educational administrators and teachers often use them as excuses to cover up their own neglect of children's education. Instead of labelling children, our focus should be on the educational remediation of their performance problems. To effectively remediate their problems, teachers will have to be retrained away from IQ thinking and toward a developmental philosophy which involves an understanding of the process of intellectual development formation in children. "More of the same" kind of remediation now practiced in the schools will continue to be ineffective.

IQ thinking is one of the basic forms that racism takes, permeating the theories and practices of our school systems. We should be under no illusions that such thinking can be eradicated under capitalism. Only socialism can revolutionize the thinking of the educational system and eradicate racism from our schools as well as from our larger society. What is crucial now is to initiate a fight against this institutional form of racism. The responsibility for educational deficiencies must be shifted from the child to the school system. We can oppose this form of educational racism most effectively if we understand its nature ideologically together with its insidious effects upon our children's development.

Community Colleges: A Promise Betrayed

The two year community colleges have been the entry point to higher education for many students who have continued their study for a college degree, and who otherwise could not have gone to college.

One thousand community colleges in the U.S. now serve 3.8 million of the nation's 11.1 million college students and are the fruit of struggles by the working class and the civil rights movement for admission to higher education. Most Black and Latino students come from these community colleges and many, if not most, of Black college teachers work at these colleges (*New York Times*, 3/20/76). In Illinois, the community colleges led the increase in college enrollment, with a current enrollment of close to 200,000 students at 48 campuses.

This increased enrollment reflects the belief of working-class families that higher education is needed to compete successfully for the dwindling number of job openings. They are not succumbing to big business propaganda, such as the *Newsweek* article (4/26/76) titled "Who Needs College," and the reply—not the children of the working class. Although unemployment among PhDs has reached disaster proportions, workers are keenly aware that unemployment is high in industry also and they do not want their children educationally handicapped for years ahead in the bitter competition for jobs under capitalism.

Since propaganda against higher education has not reduced enrollment, more forceful, brutal methods are under way to reverse the gains of open admissions and affirmative action for minorities and women. The best known examples are the cutbacks at City University of New York. But throughout the country, including in cities like Chicago which are not facing immediate bankruptcy, master plans for higher education are being written to restructure public colleges to favor private colleges and to narrow education to a restricted elite.

These reactionary steps to restrict access to higher education come at a time when science is becoming a direct productive force as a result of the scientific-technological revolution and higher

education is a requirement for an increasing number of jobs.

In the 2-year public colleges, this attack has taken a particularly vicious if somewhat masked form, to not only quantitatively reduce the *number* of students, but also to water down the *content* of education. An example of this policy is outlined in the Master Plan for Higher Education of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, which would restructure the community colleges to divert students from the 2-year college programs into short term, dead-end vocational training. "Educational Genocide" was the apt title given to this policy in a paper by John Yeatman in 1973, then City College Union Vice President, in which he exposed these plans of state monopoly capital to deny college education to "Blacks, minorities and especially the poor."

A Case Study—The Master Plan for Chicago City Colleges

Neither faculty, student, community nor labor participation was invited when the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, a private company, was hired to produce the May 1974 Master Plan for CCC. Although the CCC Board of Trustees has never officially adopted the Plan, because this would have opened it to public discussion, the trustees have moved swiftly to implement it, step by step.

Master Plan statistics show that the CCC reach over 80,000 students, full and part time. 41 per cent of the students have family incomes under \$6,000, 25 per cent between \$6,000 and \$9,000, 47.7 per cent are Black, 3.9 per cent Latino and 5.1 per cent "others." The ACT average score was 14.8 compared to the national average score of 20.2.

From 1911 to 1974 CCC was tuition-free. In 1933 CCC was closed in an "economy" move, but protests caused the Board to rescind its action a few months later, proving that the Master Planners can be forced to retreat. In 1969 a perennial bill to force CCC to impose tuition was narrowly defeated in the state legislature as a result of a demonstration by students and faculty, assisted by Operation Breadbasket, in the state capital.

With the publication of the Master Plan in May 1974, a deceptive argument was advanced, that tuition should be imposed because state scholarships would be available and "85 to 90 per cent of the students will not have to pay more." This transparent deception has been given the lie by the actual statistics; only 6,000 students, less than 15 per cent, received state scholarships. These figures were stated in a letter by CCC Chancellor Oscar Shabat to the *Chicago Sun Times* (4/16/76), stating that about one half million

out of the 100 million dollar budget was raised by tuition.

Despite a broad coalition against tuition, which included PUSH, community and student groups as well as rank-and-file teacher unionists, tuition was imposed in September 1974 of three to five dollars per credit hour. Tuition was increased to \$11 per credit hour by a secret motion of the Board of Trustees in April 1976. Tuition has thus become an important tool in implementing the Master Plan, because it provides a way to control admissions—scholarships can be given selectively.

The key organization in the fight against tuition increases is the Cook County College Teachers Union. Unfortunately, the Swenson leadership follows the Shanker policy of not working with community organizations and, to date, has given only lip service to the fight against tuition. Hopefully, the 220 to 366 per cent tuition increase will spur this leadership to action. Rank-and-file teachers, whose caucus won 43-46 per cent of the CCC vote in March 1976, have the potential of mounting a successful fight against the increases but are at a disadvantage when the union leadership drags its feet. In addition to the rank-and-file caucus, there is a Black teachers' organization which has taken a strong stand against tuition. In view of the composition of the CCC student body, the tuition increases are blatantly racist. Students have already begun demonstrations to stop the increases but the student body changes so often that sustained leadership is difficult.

Master Plan Goals

It is not accidental that the Master Plan was initiated by imposition of tuition, a means of controlling the size and composition of the student body. The plan calls for "radical instructional changes" and "new and more flexible teachers." "Accelerated curricular reorganization" with emphasis shifting to "courses in occupational, semi-technical or technical fields leading directly to employment" is cited by the Plan as the mandate of the state legislature. Some clue to the desired proportion of college transfer subjects to non-college level subjects is supplied by the Master Plan list of 212 programs, of which 28 are college transferrable. Already cutbacks have begun in foreign languages, communications, literature, physical education, social sciences and other courses not part of the "core."

The Master Plan shift of emphasis to vocational instruction would not be objectionable if the other side of the coin were not drastic cutbacks in the academic, traditional college programs of the two-

year colleges. That this contradicts the wishes of the students themselves is clear from student responses to questionnaires, according to which over 80 per cent want to go on for a four year degree. For students who will be diverted away from college studies, the promise of the community colleges has been betrayed.

What Kind of Vocational Studies?

Careful scrutiny of the vocational programs shows that for these programs, also, the Master Plan calls for downgrading of academic content. The January 1973 Chadwin report of the state legislature (Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission, M. Chadwin, chairman, *The Illinois Public Junior College System*) complains that "over a third of the occupational students surveyed said they were planning on transferring to a four-year school." The Master Planners want to close the door leading to the four-year schools, making the vocational programs truly dead-end. Accordingly they want the community colleges to introduce more six month and one year programs in place of the two year programs carrying an AA (Associate of Arts) degree. The nursing programs at CCC have just been arbitrarily changed from AA to AAS (non-academic), reportedly to get more state aid.

How useful such short-term vocational programs may be to the students seems of little concern to the Planners. Many of these positions are the type for which employers used to give on-the-job training while the workers received their pay. To convert the community colleges to this purpose places the financial burden of training on the public, while at the same time the student-worker is deprived of pay while learning.

A basic fallacy of the Master Plan is its claim that people are unemployed because they are not "employable." Yet on page 59 of the same Plan, a survey shows that over 50 per cent of CCC graduates of occupational programs are not employed in their field of study, despite their "employability." Even from the viewpoint of employability, the broader the base of education, the easier it is to adapt to new developments. For example, in the technical fields, basic science background on a college level is necessary to avoid training that is too narrow and quickly becomes obsolete.

Since the Master Plan has met resistance from students who want to register for academic subjects and from faculty who refuse to disappear quietly, the state legislature is using financial weapons to accelerate the demise of liberal arts. They have introduced a differential in state support so that the current \$19.50 support per

credit hour is increased for vocational subjects but is chopped down to \$5 an hour for remedial subjects. This is a further betrayal of open admissions because many students who wish to take college courses need preliminary or remedial subjects to bring their skills up to the needed level.

Affirmative Action

The Master Plan briefly mentions affirmative action, but fails to make a single proposal on this subject. An attempt is made to cover up the racism which permeates this document by vague statements favoring "more vigorous affirmative action."

The shocking truth is that far less than one per cent of faculty and administrators are Latino. Failure to hire Spanish-speaking teachers is no doubt a factor in the under-representation of Latinos in the CCC student body. About 12 per cent of the faculty is Black, far less than the percentage of Black students (47 per cent). Most of the Black teachers have been hired in the last 7 years and any serious cutbacks in faculty size would wipe out these gains of affirmative action if the present seniority system is followed. Women are also under-represented, especially in administrative positions.

In practice, affirmative action has largely been ignored in hirings during the last two years. A joint Union-Board committee on hiring policy is provided for by the union contract but has not functioned. Pressure from the union could change this situation but the American Federation of Teachers, under the presidency of Albert Shanker, has dropped its support of affirmative action, giving the Board a relatively free hand on this subject.

Integration of faculty is mentioned in the Plan as a vague goal but not one step toward this goal is suggested in the Plan. At present, three of the campuses have almost no Black teachers.

Recently, the Chicago Police Department lost federal funds because of failure to follow affirmative action and the elementary and high schools are under similar federal pressure to integrate their teaching staff. Yet the Board of Trustees of CCC saw no need to incorporate affirmative action and integration into their Master Plan for the colleges.

The Union has lost much of its effectiveness because of failure to come to grips with this question. The potential of a teacher-student-labor-community coalition strong enough to defend the colleges from the evils of Master Plans can be realized only if the union takes a forthright position against racism and for affirmative action.

Schools Without Teachers?

In practice, the students are the first victims of this Plan; they now pay tuition for what had been free for 63 years. They often cannot get the courses they need to complete two years of college work. But in terms of the written Master Plan, the visible enemy is the faculty, and especially the union. The Plan states: "What is inhibiting the development of vigorous occupational and special programs is the conventional nature of the preparation of most members of the faculty." The plan attacks the union contract, tenure, the wage scale and the 12-hour contact load as well as the class size limits. Under the circumstances it is amazing that the union, Local 1600 AFT (American Federation of Teachers) has made no response to the plan. However, the Faculty Council, whose membership greatly overlaps that of the union, has made an extensive study of the academic implications of the plan.

The Plan wants college teachers replaced with an "instructional team" which will include paraprofessionals at one end and a great deal of hardware at the other end. TV instruction, computer terminals, cassettes, modules and auto-instructions are to be emphasized for greater "productivity." The dream of a school without teachers, similar to the capitalist dream of a factory without workers, is still fondly cherished by the CCC Board of Trustees.

But Chicago has already seen this nightmare, carried out to the ultimate end of destruction of education, during the presidency of Dr. Hurst at Malcolm X College, formerly a leader of Blacks for Nixon. Under Hurst paraprofessionals conducted classes of hundreds (class size limits were ignored); tape players and movie screens replaced classroom instruction. The North Central Association, the national press, and of course, the Board of Trustees applauded in the name of innovation. John Yeatman, then union leader at Malcolm X, led a group of rank-and-file teachers who exposed this fraud. As a result of persecution heaped upon Yeatman he had a fatal heart attack, but not before he lived to see these innovational frauds exposed. But the Master Plan would like CCC to go down that path again.

Funding the Colleges

Funding remains a crucial issue, but the Plan has no solutions other than imposing tuition in 1974 and raising tuition in 1976. Before tuition was imposed, the Plan reports that 48 per cent of funding came from local property taxes, 39 per cent from state

aid and 13 per cent from federal aid. The federal moneys are for special projects, not academic instruction. Under the Illinois-wide Master Plan, the formula for state funding is 50 per cent, and this additional 11 per cent is a major source of additional revenue which must be won.

But only 39 per cent of the federal tax dollars taken out of Illinois are returned to the state in any form. (*Economic Notes*, April 1976). Yet President Ford proposes a \$3 billion cut in basic grants to veterans and others attending college and elimination of social security support to survivors attending college. Federal aid to higher education is a vital issue in the Presidential election campaign.

Detente and a peace budget which diverts large sums from the military budget to education, health and welfare is the only hope for adequate federal aid to public higher education. The AFT, in the 2 years since Albert Shanker became the AFT president, has opposed detente and supported increased military spending. Yet as long as tax dollars are siphoned off for war, CIA interference in other countries such as Chile and high interest paid to the banks, just so long will education go from one crisis to the next with disastrous results. A change in AFT policy on the military budget is an important aspect of the defense of the city colleges and education generally.

National Coalition Needed

What is needed is a national coalition in defense of the community colleges as higher education, not merely post-secondary schools. It would be natural for such a coalition to form first in a number of cities around the issue of free tuition, open admissions and against cutbacks. The struggle to save CUNY is a stimulating example for other cities. Although the proposal for a National March on Washington for Funds for Education, made by the militant Washington teachers' local, was defeated by the Shanker machine at the 1975 AFT convention, the pressure of local coalitions can reverse this policy and bring the labor movement forward as the heart of a national coalition for public higher education.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHILE

Ultra-Leftism: Trojan Horse of Imperialism

At present, the central task of the popular movement in Chile is the creation of a broad anti-fascist unity capable of overthrowing the dictatorship and carrying out the revolutionary transformations needed by our society. The decisive role in this new democratic, popular, revolutionary unity belongs to the working class. To succeed in the effort to regroup and unite the supporters of revolutionary transformations of the popular government and to extend the political front of all forces opposed to fascism, in is indispensable to guarantee the unity of the working class on the basis of fundamental positions. This, in turn facilitates its ability to take account of and perceive the progressive ideas advanced by all strata who suffer from the dictatorship.

The chief cause of our temporary defeat was that the enemy was able to increasingly isolate the working class from its allies, and to set against us many of those who had held neutral positions and even those who had sympathized with the revolutionary experiment of the Allende government. Therefore, of prime importance is the need overcome our shortcomings and weaknesses in the ideological struggle against sectarian and dogmatic tendencies imposed on part of the popular movement by petty-bourgeois revolutionism, or ultra-leftism.

From the first it became necessary to wage an ideological battle against bourgeois ideology, which even during a surge of working-class struggle tries to "dominate" the situation. In addition, there was the need to counter petty-bourgeois revolutionism—*anarchism, Trotskyism, Maoism and MIRism (Revolutionary Left Movement**)—which attempted to infiltrate the working class. All these "brands" of ultra-revolutionism ended up in the bog of opportunism, primarily due to their anti-Communism.

The most eloquent instance is the collusion of the Maoist clique with the Pinochet fascist dictatorship. Maoism also presented itself in Chile as an ultra-revolutionary trend. Our enemies loudly repeated its "radical" postulates in front of the North Americans while at the

* MIR—Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario.

same time using of its anti Soviet attacks. The Chinese clique launched a virulant campaign against the Communist Party of Chile.

After the fascist coup in September 1973, not a single progressive person has any doubt regarding the position of those who support the policy of the Maoist clique. In our country, we witness fraternization between the openly anti-working-class, bloody regime and the representatives of Peking. We are witnesses of how far adventurism and revisionism of Marxism-Leninism can lead! They do what even many representatives of the bourgeoisie cannot afford to do. By abandoning fundamental principles, they end up in the service of the most infamous cause: defense of Yankee imperialism.

Every conscious worker knows that in the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic struggle, and all the more so in the struggle against fascism, united action with the democratic and revolutionary contingents of other classes and strata is obligatory. It is just as clear that unity cannot and should not exclude confrontation of ideas, opinions, education of respective opinions, while maintaining the absolute independence of proletarian positions. From our experience we know what a high price the popular movement has to pay for internal weakness, when a part of the petty-bourgeoisie succumbs to revolutionism, to spontaneity, and, instead of approaching the positions of the proletariat, imposes on the working-class parties a policy of division and confrontation. Such tendencies surface owing to the weakness of the working-class movement, its inability to smash them through ideological struggle, to ensure unity and establish the leadership of the working class. This is one of the mistakes that must be corrected.

Some may ask, is it not wrong to insist on these accusations, to prove the harm of extremist tendencies, speak out against people who declare in support of the revolution, which it is a matter of struggle against the dictatorship? Is there not a favorable climate for convergence with all democratic forces, with those who upheld Popular Unity, as well as those who did not? Does it not smack of "sectarianism"?

Answering these questions already before September 11, that is, at the time when the scale of the attempts to set up fascism could be clearly seen, Comrade Luis Corvalan said: "We are not against the ultra-left *a priori*, and do not deny that there are consistent revolutionaries among them. We proceed from facts, from the actual situation. Today, as before, we place above all else the historic necessity for unity of all anti-fascist forces, democratic, popular and revolutionary organizations and elements. Those ultra-leftists who

without resorting to sectarianism or splitting activities facilitate this unity and adopt an anti-fascist program will have a place next to the Communists and other revolutionaries.”

The necessity for unity of all anti-fascist forces is today more urgent than ever. But it is a matter of creating a front that would be widely recognized by the people, which would not commit mistakes tomorrow and would not become meaningless as a result of internal strife or incorrectly defined objectives. To achieve this, the revolutionary core, the working class and peasantry, broad urban and rural sections must overcome the tendencies noted by Comrade Corvalan: sectarianism and splitting tactics.

Ultras Attack the Popular Movement

Precisely sectarianism and splitting tactics mark the activity of the Revolutionary Left Movement (MIR), which appeared as a political organization in 1965, when the political situation in Chile was characterized by a certain ebb in the popular movement due to the defeat in the 1964 elections, when bourgeois reformism, as represented by the Frei government, had reached its apex. Created on the basis of a few groups of intellectuals of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois origins, MIR united practically all the old, dispersed trends of petty-bourgeois revolutionism: Trotskyists, Maoists, Vanguardists, etc., as well as individuals earlier expelled from working-class parties. It was also joined by some who saw it as a militant revolutionary organization. On the other hand, there were not a few who came to MIR because of their anti-Communist positions. MIR proclaimed itself a new revolutionary force opposed to the “tradition parties,” and openly professed anti-Communist views, practiced anti-Sovietism and made terrorism its main political tactic. In line with these criteria, up to 1970 MIR opposed the creation of Popular Unity and announced its own line of boycotting the elections, but a month before the elections when the victory of the Popular candidate became a reality, it revised its position.

Petty-bourgeois revolutionism defined the Allende government as “reformist” and directed all its efforts to creating a “revolutionary pole” with clearly anti-Communist features and oriented on splitting the Popular Unity. Left opportunism was presented as an alternative to the working-class parties and their policy. Its main concern was to achieve a relation of forces favorable to extremist positions inside the broad revolutionary mass movement, while disregarding the need to strengthen the positions of the popular government and to extend its social base.

Implementation of such objectives inevitably led to MIR playing into the hands of the enemies of the government and virtually turning it into a center of provocation which, as it became clear after the coup, was widely used for the infiltration of police agents who launched subversive activities. Such a center always provided fertile soil for shady adventures.

The striving of the MIRists to counterpose themselves to the working-class parties, and particularly the Communist Party, led to their indiscriminate use of revolutionary phraseology, in support of both right and "left" positions.

In line with their dogmatic conceptions, the MIRists declared everyone not belonging to the proletariat or semi-proletariat an adversary of the revolutionary process. To justify their contentions, they denied the need for an anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic stage of the revolution, proclaiming its immediate socialist character. Losing sight of the principal enemies, they followed a primitive policy of isolated clashes with small and medium owners and the middle sections. This led to the isolation of the revolutionary forces, providing a mass base for the enemies of the popular government and facilitating preparations for the coup.

This course was counterposed to the policy of compromise and alliance needed to direct all forces against imperialism and the oligarchy. The shortsightedness of the slogans advanced against the measures of the popular government to strengthen its positions is evident in analyzing the history of the events.

Today it is clear that opposition to the dialogue of Popular Unity with the Christian Democrats was unjustified. The Christian Democratic Party, as is known, is a multi-class party, including, besides representatives of the monopolistic oligarchy, large groups of the democratically oriented small and middle bourgeoisie, middle sections, the peasantry and the working class. From dogmatic positions, this party was seen as a single mass. This facilitated the activity of the reactionary bourgeois groups led by Frei and striving to unite around itself the entire party and direct it along a path of blind opposition to the popular government. In these circumstances, it was easy for the right forces in the CDP to frustrate the attempts of the democratic-minded leaders to prevent the CDP from slipping into collaboration with the fascist plotters.

Today we can clearly see that the ultra-left actions to frustrate cooperation between the popular government and the constitutionalist sections of the armed forces were untenable. The attacks against General Carlos Prats, when he assumed the post of head of the

government, palpably demonstrate the sectarianism and irresponsibility resulting from the ultra-left's striving to counterpose themselves to the left parties, and to picture as "reformists" the revolutionary leadership, the Popular Unity and the President.

Equally, we should not underestimate the harm caused by opportunist tendencies inside the popular movement, that demobilized and diverted its forces from the urgent task of forming new economic and social relations, which was of fundamental importance in defending and developing the revolutionary process.

Progressive government measures met with the resistance of the monopolies, latifundists and imperialist companies, which resorted to boycott, sabotage, disorganization and chaos in all branches of the economy. This was the key aspect of Kissinger's plan of "destabilizing" the popular government. In these circumstances, the task of organizing production along new lines and struggle against the growing chaos was of decisive importance. Nevertheless, the ultra-left organizations, particularly the MIR, rejected the plans of the popular government. They opposed the battle for production proclaimed by the government and revolutionary parties. The ultra-leftist declared that "economic and production problems cannot be placed above the objectives of the class struggle," concluding that "big business is responsible for production" (*Punto Final*). In other words, they proposed that the popular masses disavow responsibility for the decisive field of social development precisely when the capitalists concentrated their forces there.

At the time, influential bourgeois parties like the Christian Democrats encouraged putting forward unrealistic demands to bring about a head-on-clash between the popular masses and the government. The ultra-left entered the game, striving to win more supporters among backward workers and peasants and advancing all kinds of limited demands which, while satisfying the interests of separate groups, disregarded the interests of the movement as a whole. And on this the ultra-left based their policy. They concealed their right opportunism by revolutionary phraseology, which was no impediment to their acting in concert with reaction. One of the many instances of such collaboration was the copper miners' strike, which CIA agents organized and used for their own aims, together with the ultra-left.

Such actions had a harmful effect on the popular movement because they sowed confusion inside Popular Unity and in the revolutionary leadership. One of the chief causes of our defeat was the lack of a united leadership of the movement capable of conducting a principled policy, which created the danger of opportunist deviations

of both right and left varieties. And behind this looms the subversive activity of petty-bourgeois revolutionism that is called upon to hamper the establishment of the necessary hegemony of the working class and its parties in the guidance of the revolutionary process.

Extremism—An Offspring of Bourgeois Ideology

The methods the ultra-leftists use in achieving their aims are yet another evidence of their sectarianism. Proclaiming the principle of "self-reliance" as their objective, they practiced infiltration of political parties to effect changes in their policy in the interest of the ultra-left. The policy of infiltration was practiced mainly with regard to the Socialist Party, a decisive party in the leadership of the movement, on whose orientation implementation of a united leadership of the revolutionary process largely depended. The positions of the ultra-left frequently found an audience in this party, causing great harm to the process, as well as to Socialist-Communist unity.

The revolutionary leadership, as well as our Party, unquestionably bear responsibility for the shortcomings in the ideological struggle, which should have ensured and deepened unity on the basis of fundamental positions and made it possible to resolutely prosecute an independent working-class line. In general, experience shows that petty-bourgeois revolutionism flourishes only where the work of consistent revolutionaries is weak or insufficient. And though it is evident that revolutionary rhetoric finds a ready response in the nonproletarian social sections, a solution can be found to any situation by decisively defending unity. Unity of the proletariat with the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie will be the stronger the better the working-class party defends its fundamental positions. One aspect of ultra-left activity requires a somewhat different assessment. They conducted work in the armed forces, trying to strengthen their influence. True enough, it was imperative to promote left ideas among the military, but this was largely underestimated by the popular movement. However, it is also true that the narrow sectarian line serving as the basis of the ultra-left work among the military linked this work with their struggle against the effort of the government to develop cooperation with the constitutionalist sector of the army, and turned into provocative actions against the officers who supported the government, thereby weakening our positions. In ultra-left propaganda, the armed forces were artificially divided "horizontally," presenting as a decisive factor contradictions between officers and men; the very forms of their work in the armed forces permitted infiltration by agents-provocateurs, facilitating the creation of a correlation of

forces favorable for the fascist coup.

Petty-bourgeois revolutionism rejected the lesson of this experience. There is not a single document attempting a self-critical assessment of these positions, or proving the seriousness of these organizations. On the contrary, their policy after the fascist coup contains all the features of their former opportunism. Nor are there any modification of their striving to establish themselves as an alternative to the workers' parties, or of their adventurism that places them outside the mass movement.

The slogans put forward by MIR in the wake of the coup are directed primarily against the popular movement. The dastardly campaign of the fascist junta—striving to depict the popular government as a corrupt regime and to call in question the activity of Comrade Allende and the most outstanding leaders—was also used by the ultra-left. Their leaflets claimed that "MIR cannot be accused of unseemly dealings," thereby inferring the legitimacy of the fascist calumnies. The ultra-left hoped thus to win over supporters of the popular parties.

With the same aim they spread the slogan: "MIR is not asking for asylum," striving to call in question the legitimate and indisputable actions of the left parties, temporarily sending abroad some of the more prominent cadres to safeguard their lives and guarantee continuity of the revolutionary leadership. Besides the falsity of these statements, the very fact that they were made is evidence of the divisive intentions of the ultra-left. As to asking for political asylum, this has been done by hundreds of MIR-ists.

The most striking evidence of ultra-left political adventurism in the period immediately following the coup was, undoubtedly, the negotiations between MIR and the Intelligence of the Air Force (SIFA). This is adventurism pure and simple, because attempts were made to reach agreement without mass participation, in complete disregard of the process of mass struggle. And although in the end most of the leaders adopted a sound stand, these actions led to open betrayal by others.

Negotiations between MIR and SIFA centered on the fascists' proposal to discontinue repressions against MIR with the aim of isolating the Communist Party and concentrating attacks exclusively against us. The very fact that the arrested MIR leaders agreed to begin talks with the fascists on these conditions is indicative. Their emissaries were in contact for almost two months and though in the end MIR publicly rejected the junta proposal, there is no doubt that this episode caused the betrayal of four persons, who made pitiful

appeals to the revolutionaries to submit to fascism. This fact was widely used by the junta to demobilize the popular movement. We were all outraged at the murder of many MIR leaders. Everybody is now helping to protect them from repressions. Most of these crimes occurred after the negotiations between MIR and SIFA. Among the victims is Miguel Hendriquéz, general secretary of MIR, who was killed after the dictatorship announced an alleged assault on a bank. This was done clearly with the intention of distracting attention from another crime—the killing of General Carlos Prats.

Many arrested MIR-ists obviously lack revolutionary consciousness, for time and again they betray new data to the enemy. This information has resulted in the destruction of many units of their organizations and frequently does harm to activists of other parties, who helped some of the MIR leaders.

In a recent resolution the MIR leadership adopted a self-critical attitude to both its line of open opposition to the working-class parties, particularly the Communist Party, and the use of terror tactics. But this process was not developed further. Moreover, in letters to Popular Unity and our Party, MIR is once again reverting to positions that separated and frequently counterposed it to the popular movement.

Confirmation of this is a letter addressed to our Party leadership at the end of February 1975, where MIR comments on our document of December 1974.

This letter, formally couched in terms of unity, emphasizes resolute opposition to the tactical line being elaborated by the revolutionary movement and directed at struggle against the fascist dictatorship, for its overthrow.

To Draw Inspiration From Lenin's Teaching

Apart from the secondary questions—attempts to justify attacks against the popular movement and to impose their own point of view as the criterion of truth—this lengthy letter leaves no doubt that the assessment of the MIRists differs profoundly from that of the Chilean Left.

Let us examine the principal difference.

The fundamental point of difference is around the policy of unity conducted by the popular movement. The ultra-left say that in our document "many pages are devoted to appeals to the Christian Democrats," and add: "It is with concern that we note in this document an appeal to the Christian Democrats as a whole, without distinguished between those in the CDP who represent the democra-

tic and anti-fascist small and middle bourgeoisie, and the supporters of Frei and Aylwin, who represent the interest of the reactionary big bourgeoisie."

"What surprises us," they continue, "is that it has so soon been forgotten that these CD groups, in the service of the big imperialist bourgeoisie headed by Frei and Aylwin, bear the main responsibility for the boycott and subversive activity against the Popular Unity government, and also for the coup, as a result of which Allende was overthrown and murdered."

This is the strongest argument, and on its basis opposition is voiced on the next three pages to the policy of Popular Unity and our Party aimed at building a broad antifascist front.

The above assessments represent simply a development of the criteria adhered to by MIR before the coup, and which were analyzed earlier. In an attempt to conceal their inconsistencies, they distort our positions.

We distinguish in the Christian Democratic Party not only between the small and middle bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the big bourgeoisie, on the other; we single out—and this is much more important—the workers, peasants, broad middle sections, including artisans, professionals, the intelligentsia, etc., who belong to this party or support it. We take account of this pluralism, without idealizing it or concealing its essence. Our document mentions the successes won by the people when the CDP and the Left acted jointly, pointing out, however, that it is "one side of the coin. There is another side: the CDP is a pluralist party, frequently reflecting contradictory interests. Therefore . . . when sectarian forces, linked with the monopolies and supported by the sectarianism flourishing in the left forces, established themselves in the CDP leadership, a split was imposed and even a clash (between various sections of the people), benefitting the reactionaries." And the document specifies: "CDP participation in a blind opposition to the popular government, into which it was drawn by a part of the leadership, resulted in the fascist coup, the grievous consequences of which affect the entire people, Marxists and Christians alike."

In our document the problem is analyzed in detail, and therefore the attempt of MIR to counterpose us to Popular Unity has no justification or sense.

In a way this is natural, because essentially it is not a matter of posing the problem, but of the form in which it is posed, of the understanding of the role the CDP plays as a mass party in Chile. Clearly in the CDP itself there are two trends conflicting over the basic lines

of policy. One facilitated the coup, then collaborated with the junta in a bid for power, and is now searching for a bourgeois way out that would deny the working-class movement a corresponding role in the democratic future of the country. This trend is led by Frei. The other trend, uniting democratic sections and expressing the interests of the majority of the Christian Democratic masses, is seeking an understanding with the left forces in line with its liberal principles and favorable attitude to social change. In these circumstances, MIR urges a split in the CDP as a condition of building an antifascist front and demands that Popular Unity accept its stand. We, however, are of the opinion that the Christian Democrats must themselves decide on their political direction in a way that suits them, that they themselves determine. We are not imposing organizational conditions on them and restrict discussions to political issues which pave the way to a united front. We see the struggle for anti-fascist unity as a process based on the political realities and correlation of the main classes. Anti-fascist unity is projected primarily into the future, built up at grassroots level and its success is determined by ideological struggle, by the defeat of conciliation and sectarianism, which are still sowing discord among the people. To accentuate discussion around one individual, while obscuring the fundamental problems that are of decisive importance for the masses, means to help those who are seeking a bourgeois way out of the crisis, i.e., an alternative that can only be defeated by building a strong antifascist unity. In other words, in this case a situation will be repeated when part of the people, including workers and peasants and particularly the middle strata, serve as a springboard for establishing a new bourgeois government. Division among the people, contributed to by dogmatic positions, in a very real sense serves to subordinate them to the bourgeoisie. Unity, on the contrary, will guarantee the revolutionary prospect of the democratic process.

In justification of its sectarian line, MIR writes: "In our opinion, this erroneous policy of seeking alliances with the bourgeois factions of the Christian Democracy is directly linked to the incorrect characterization of the Chilean military dictatorship as a fascist dictatorship." MIR itself refutes this proposition: it shows that the dictatorship is ruling exclusively in the interests of the monopolies and imperialism (no mention is made of the latifundists, but presumably they too are taken into consideration); that the junta deals blows not only at the proletariat, middle urban and rural strata, but also at the national bourgeoisie; it does not dispute that terror is used as a political instrument, a tool to liquidate the democratic forces; but a conclu-

sion is drawn nevertheless that this is not a fascist dictatorship. What is it then? MIR answers: "On our continent these regimes are widely known as gorilla military dictatorships and they were resorted to by the creole bourgeoisie and imperialism in countries such as Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Uruguay, etc." Note the scientific precision of the definition.

The Ultras—Apologists of the Junta

Fascism, essentially, is a form of political rule expressing the interests of finance capital and the monopolies and is aimed at absolute domination over society. As the power of monopoly capital, it tends to eliminate every form of democratic government. It is totalitarian: it does not and cannot accept democratic coexistence even within the bourgeois class. Traditional forms of coexistence of the interests of various sections of the bourgeoisie (parliament, plurality) are liquidated because the aim of fascism is to bring the entire society under the sway of the oligarchy and imperialism. The antagonism between fascism and democracy is absolute; hence, resort to terror derives from its very character, is an inevitable concomitant of all such regimes, and is used against whoever does not accept its positions, with only some difference as to degree.

Fascism is a product of counter-revolution, the violent interruption of the revolutionary process. The hatred of the old ruling classes is increasing due to fear of losing their privileges and they are resorting to ever more brutal repressions. Such is the experience of Spain, Hungary, Bulgaria, to mention only a few of the more distinctive cases.

Fascism uses an ideology in which the decisive part is played by the most reactionary bourgeois nationalism. It extols the so-called racial and national values, proclaims an expansionist policy, seeking aid and justification in geopolitical theories. From this derives the tendency to military provocations. Another feature of the fascist theories is the definition of the state as a supra-class body, designed to suppress the class struggle (not the classes themselves), claiming that this struggle exists solely due to the will of individual Marxists. The struggle against politicians in general, inherent in fascist propaganda, implies the imposition of the interests of monopoly capital on the bourgeoisie as a whole and on the entire society.

True, this phenomenon is and has been an inherent feature of the developed countries, but today it has shifted to the less developed capitalist countries, where it is characterized by the use of the armed forces as the decisive factor of power. This should be seen as a con-

sequence of the role of imperialism and its influence on the national development of dependent countries. In this sense, this form of fascism can be defined as military fascism. That is why the definition of the junta given by the popular movement of Chile and the whole world is correct.

How did MIR arrive at the negation of this reality, which in the final count plays into the hands of the junta? Why does it feel a "theoretical obligation" to negate the fascist character of the dictatorship? It does so to buttress its narrow conception of possible allies of the proletariat. For this, fascist demagogy is used in order to obscure its class character. Making uncritical use of bourgeois interpretations of history, which stress the mass character of nazism up to 1933, or the influence of Italian fascism on the middle peasantry, they embellish the system and allege that it owed its stability to mass support. In their delirium they are outdoing even the bourgeoisie in attributing to fascism something it never had to any significant degree: influence among the working class. Its successes in this field were the result of maneuvering designed to widen the split of the proletariat—between the Social Democrats and Communists, between the reformists and revolutionaries. The phenomenon, profoundly analyzed at the Seventh Comintern Congress, serves as a lesson in our present struggle and is decisively at variance with the ultra-left positions. MIR has distorted this without a twinge of conscience. Its digressions do not make it clear why "such a stable system" as fascism must resort to brutal terror in order to stay in power, which is widely recognized as its characteristic feature.

That is the problem: While some are dealing with superficialities, the revolutionary working class is delving into the essence of the phenomena in order to formulate its policy.

True, substitution of a popular approximation for a scientific definition (which we in no way disparage) is no theoretical achievement. Of gorillas there have been many, but not all of them have been able to establish a fascist system.

Now MIR itself is calling attention, as we have already mentioned, to the fact that fascist dictatorship is opposed to all social strata, with the exception of the oligarchy and imperialism. It declares: "Even sections of the petty bourgeoisie (we frankly say, the majority) which yesterday supported the coup are today turning away from, or against, the fascists." Or: "The monopoly bourgeois sections, and the contradictions among the bourgeoisie are increasing with each passing day" (that it did, there is no doubt, another thing is whether it is to the liking of the national bourgeoisie).

And what is the conclusion MIR arrives at? That we need not create an antifascist front!

The ultra-leftists claim that building an antifascist front means "subordinating the working class to the bourgeoisie." And they accuse the European working-class movement of having done so by creating antifascist fronts during the Second World War. Regarding such accusations, they should hear what the bourgeoisie of the respective countries have to say on this score. The Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Polish, Rumania, Yugoslav, Hungarian, German, as well as the French and Italian bourgeoisie could produce arguments demonstrating the exact opposite.

These contentions, unless combated, lead to sectarian narrowness of the working class. It cannot and must not renounce its democratic demands, must participate in the popular movement and play the leading role in it, which is the immediate objective today. That is the essence of Leninism. This was stressed especially during the struggle against tsarism. According to the ultra-leftists, inclusion in the program of the front of such objectives as agrarian reform, is a typically bourgeois-democratic measure, signifying "subordination to the bourgeoisie." Life has shown that this is simply ridiculous.

The Working Class and the Mass Struggle

The working class cannot win hegemony by clamoring for it. And to demand it before achieving unity is to put the cart before the horse. The working class will establish and consolidate its hegemony as a result of mass actions, through struggle, by pursuing a policy taking into account the interests of diverse classes and social strata opposed to fascism, that is, the interests of a stable majority.

The problem of armed struggle is plainly one of the problems on which the MIR lays special emphasis in the letter we have mentioned. "Your document," it writes, "is not quite clear in regard to the problem of developing the people's military rule and the forms of armed resistance of the masses . . . Indeed, the document seems to suggest that your leadership fully rejects the use of armed forms of resistance to the military dictatorship and, moreover, to mistake every form of armed struggle for terrorism, for action by small groups, for adventurism."

A few lines further, the above takes the form of a categorical statement. "Nowhere does your leadership explain," the letter says, "why resistance to the military dictatorship should reject armed forms of struggle." Indeed, we do not explain this anywhere because we have never asserted any such thing. Yet the letter goes on harping on this

subject: "Such pacifist tendencies . . . can only help the bourgeoisie and dictatorship. The working class and the Chilean people have already paid for that harmful pacifist policy with the most painful defeat ever, with thousands of victims, tortures, concentration camps, poverty and hunger." This is how the MIR gives us its views on military problems.

The party of the working class has always borne in mind the need to solve the military problem, the problem of the balance of forces from the military point of view, which is of decisive importance in the fight for power. This is a Marxist axiom following from our concept of the state and its class character.

But what is no longer an axiom but a result of creative application of Marxism in a specific historical situation and in a particular society is the issue of how the working class and the people go about achieving a balance of military forces favorable to the revolutionary process and enabling the revolutionary forces to prevent or crush the attempts of the reactionaries to maintain their privileges by force of arms.

The mistakes made by the Chilean popular movement (our Party assumes its share of responsibility for them) were not due to a pacifist conception of the class struggle, as the ultra-leftists irresponsibly allege. In fact, it was precisely the influence of narrow-minded and sectarian militarist concepts that undoubtedly did much harm, greater perhaps than the harm done by overestimating democratic trends in the Chilean social system and in the armed forces.

Be that as it may, an analysis of the military problem aimed at learning the lessons of the past and choosing the right policy today should proceed from the fundamental principle that there is no, and nor can there be, a favorable alignment of military forces guaranteeing the success of the revolutionary process, without a favorable alignment of political forces, without the revolutionary forces rallying the majority of social strata and opposing them to the forces which the people's enemies succeed in grouping around them. This kind of consolidation is a primary condition which we were unable to meet under the popular government and which became the main cause of our defeat.

At that time, the popular movement was oriented toward strengthening the positions of constitutionalists in the armed forces loyal to the popular government and resisting fascist efforts to make the armed forces protectors of oligarchic and imperialist power. Leaning on the constitutionalists for support, the government tried to bring the armed forces into solving the country's economic and social problems. In this way they embraced the interests of the majority of the nation and

joined in the effort to end the backwardness and poverty inherited from the old regime. It was in that period that a trend developed toward a growing community of the interests of the armed forces and the exigencies of the country's advancement and hence the revolutionary process.

In keeping with these criteria, the military were invited to help in forming a government, with the result that the employers' strike in September 1972 was defeated. It will be recalled that the ultra-leftists opposed that orientation and thereby facilitated fascist subversion.

Yet the position chosen by Popular Unity and President Allende was best suited for combatting reactionary trends in the armed forces themselves, blocking the rebels, winning support for the government, the working class and the people, and fighting reactionary army officers should they venture on a fascist military coup.

The reason why this orientation failed was that the balance of political forces deteriorated sharply to the detriment of the popular movement and that the revolutionary forces did not promote this general orientation consistently. We were unable to exert direct influence on the armed forces or counter fascist plotting, especially when the positions of the constitutionalists were weakened. Indeed, we overrated the constitutionalists' potentialities in the armed forces and democratic influence in military institutions.

The military policy of revolution must be in harmony with the process of mustering forces in support of revolutionary positions. We are opposed to the MIR concepts because our experience and international revolutionary experience has convinced us that the MIR proposals and policy in this respect frustrate the prospects of the working class and its allies to bring about a balance of political and, hence, of military forces favorable to the revolutionary process.

Let us verify this against the proposals and criteria set out in the letter the MIR has sent our Party.

The Dividing Line Runs Between Fascism and Anti-Fascism

Work in the armed forces is a matter of prime importance. The MIR persists in its sectarian position, which did so much harm under the popular government. It proposes that the popular movement should join in struggle against army officers and regard the antagonism between officers and non-officers as a "fundamental" contradiction of the same nature as the contradiction between fascism and democracy, between patriotism and subservience, between defense of human rights and the practice of crimes and tortures.

This is not a policy for victory. The popular movement cannot

shackle itself by the dogmatic criteria of those who refuse to draw conclusions from events, such as the recent events in Portugal.

The rebels fully committed the armed forces to politics. They renounced all constitutional traditions, seen as unquestionable gains, and thus paved the way for open discussion in the armed forces. This happened for the first time in 40 years of Chilean history. The duty of the Chilean popular movement is to strengthen the influence in the armed forces of the ideas and sentiments of the majority of the people and organize systematic work among these tens of thousands of Chileans in uniform. A few months ago we succeeded in acquainting thousands of servicemen with our more important political documents.

In carrying on this work, the popular movement must undoubtedly take into account privates and petty officers first of all, whose social standing and association with the people's drama makes it easier for them to realize the need to end fascism. In a somewhat different sense this also applies to most of the army officers connected with the middle strata, which are likewise oppressed by fascism.

This is why, to quote Dimitrov, we are ready to join up even with generals who live by their job and have no hand in crimes or embezzlement, for the dividing line between the people and their enemies does not run at anyone's whim but is necessitated by history and leaves the oligarchy and imperialism and the fascists in their service on the other side of the barricade.

It follows that armed forces who are loyal to the people (this is the goal of the antifascist front) and really respect political rule freely established by the people and from whose ranks all fascists, torturers and venal elements have been removed, will also include many of today's officers. In such armed forces there will be no more injustice or discrimination against petty officers or privates while hierarchical principles, the principles of discipline and organization guaranteeing the normal functioning of this institution will be preserved. In fact, these principles will acquire a new content under a democratic system.

The antifascist orientation of most servicemen will be primarily influenced by the development of the working-class and popular struggle. When the broad masses come into movement, antifascist sentiments in the army will revive the unity of the people and the soldiers will be strengthened in the course of class battles. We are already witnessing the beginnings of that. Already many employers go out for wool and come back shorn. Confronted with workers' strikes, they call in the army, but the workers' firmness in pressing their demands induces the soldiers to come out against the employers. That attitude is shared by the officer in command of the detachment.

Of course, such cases are still the exception—on the whole the army remains subservient to big capital. But it would be wrong for the revolutionary movement not to take account of such phenomena and their development. The movement must not confine itself to conspiracies and consider the problem of the armed forces out of context with the general purpose.

In saying that we are not belittling the importance of work within the armed forces and the problems connected therewith. We consider them as part of our general plan and subordinate to it.

Terrorism—A Product of Bourgeois Ideology

The ultra-lefts hold up terrorism as the decisive element of all their political plans. The MIR people say in their letter that they are combatting adventurism, are “against actions by small groups not connected with the masses and against terrorism because we do not punish innocent people, something the dictatorship does day in and day out.” A few lines further on they give a more precise formulation of their demands in the present period: “We must confine ourselves to defense or armed support of certain forms of political and economic struggle against the dictatorship (propaganda, certain specific demands, etc.) that will weaken the dictatorship and wear out its machine of repression (simple mass sabotage, actions against the repressive machine), punishment of the murderers, tortures and henchmen of the dictatorship . . .”

These actions add up to a plan of terror, even if they mean the death not only of innocent persons. Every such action can only be performed by individuals or small groups with no ties with the masses, and the latter will not, in the present conditions, have any part in such actions. The terrorist character of the organization does not vanish by claiming that the terror is in behalf of the “masses.”

Terrorism as a method of struggle was rejected by Lenin in his fight against the Socialist-Revolutionaries way back in 1902. And his criticism has lost none of its relevance today, for the MIR arguments look very much like a carbon copy of those advanced by the Socialist-Revolutionaries 70 years ago.

There is no doubt in our minds that we have to be guided by the tried and tested Leninist principles. There is the proof of analyzed experience that, far from adding to the strength of the revolutionary movement, terrorism only brings on more repression by the dictatorship.

They resent our exposure of terrorism, our revelation of their opportunistic actions, which we maintain only help fascism. “To develop

the armed struggle of the people does not mean providing the dictatorship with a 'pretext.' We know that it does not need any pretext to kill and torture, destroy democratic freedoms and impose a reign of terror," the MIR people say. What sort of society are ultralefts living in? Haven't they ever heard of plan Z, the Leopard Plan, the raid on the Bank of Chile, Bloody Easter, the war in Peru, and so on and so forth? No matter how criminal the fascists really are, they need to carry out their—let us euphemistically call it—"policy of the masses," a policy of demagogic deceit, and if the maturity of the people provides no pretext for operating that policy, they manufacture such pretexts.

This is beyond all doubt: terrorism does not help the people and serves reaction. The opposite is true of real mass struggle. Don't the MIR people know how carefully the dictatorship conceals the news of mass actions, strikes, sit-ins, demonstrations? There have been dozens of these and there is a growing militancy in many of our proletarian centers and among diverse social strata. And yet the MIR-ists draw no conclusions from this. They fail to realize that precisely this is what the dictatorship fears above all. Mass work is much more useful and helpful to the revolution than preparation of terrorist acts in which the masses refuse to have any part. And when terrorism goes under the label of "popular," it does even greater harm to the fight against the dictatorship. For it has nothing in common with the people, with the masses, and this is decisive. The ultra-lefts have deprived the word "people" of its dignity and prestige, and they will need both at a definite stage in the development of the mass struggle.

Insistence on these erroneous concepts of work in the armed forces and on the supposed value of terrorist tactics have led the ultra-lefts to the mechanistic conception of the forms through which the popular movement can achieve a favorable correlation of military forces. The whole theory is capsuled into the formula "our own military power."

Let us see what they have to say on the subject: "Even if the vast majority of the people come out against the dictatorship and want to topple it, the bourgeoisie can still for a long time maintain its repressive regime if the dictatorship is not weakened militarily and politically." And there is this piece of reasoning: "In the final analysis . . . the working class and people can halt the armed suppression only if they establish a popular and proletarian military power and destroy, by armed struggle, the repressive forces of the bourgeoisie."

It would be hard to be more confused. If the vast majority of the people want to topple the dictatorship and act in accordance with their wish (to question that inevitability is to grossly underestimate the

masses), the days of the dictatorship will draw to an end. That is the first consideration. Only mass struggle can create a revolutionary situation, and consequently, the basic conditions for a favorable military and political correlation of forces. But apparently MIR attaches secondary importance to that. Its main concern is "military power," though, as it itself explains, it is fighting against all militarist deviations.

The "popular and proletarian military power," which according to the MIR blueprint will be the result of terrorist acts, capable of destroying the repressive forces of the bourgeoisie (which means, having a military and technical machine superior to that of the armed forces) is simply an illusion, especially since it is discussed out of all context with the real class struggle. Such an attitude will never produce anything worthwhile for the real revolution, as long as it is based on division of the political and military forces, as if we are dealing with two independent categories.

The People Will Themselves Overthrow the Dictatorship

Our Party is working to give the people a correct understanding of the key problems. We are bringing to the fore what is of fundamental importance, viz., the mass struggle. "No revolutionary process can win without reliance on the masses. In this sense violence is necessary for any form of establishing the power of the working class and people. But the form of violence depends on the degree of resistance offered, or let us better say, might be offered, by the reaction, and this in turn depends on the activity of the proletariat, on the degree to which it can isolate the enemy, on the situation that takes shape within the armed forces, on the international situation, etc. And since these conditions cannot be determined today, it would be wrong to preclude any plan because the development of the revolution will introduce the necessary correctives."

We do not rule out the probability that the fascist dictatorship will offer armed resistance and unleash a civil war against the offensive of the masses which will inevitably develop and sound the death knell of the dictatorship. But even in these circumstances the revolution will not triumph with the help of a phantom military power unrelated to the mass struggle.

Lenin pointed out that if the revolution does not acquire a mass character and does not influence the army, there can be no talk of serious struggle. We must take that into account in our social, political and also geographical situation in the event of an armed clash. It need hardly be said that action ability of the popular and workers' detachments will play a crucial role. That is beyond doubt and has nothing in

common with the concept of "military power" advocated by MIR.

On the other hand, even MIR sees the "theoretical possibility of overthrowing the gorillas' military junta with the help of a popular political and economic struggle (accompanied by simple forms of armed struggle and revolutionary work in the army), without recourse to wider military clashes." And though this possibility is later abandoned without any serious argument, it doubtlessly exists.

Whatever the circumstances, no serious revolutionary can precisely forecast how the dictatorship will be overthrown. We make no such predictions, for we are convinced that any dogmatic determination of the process will only do harm and delay the hour of victory. Organizations that claim a vanguard role must form indestructible links with the mass movement, overcome the weaknesses and mistakes of the past, master all forms of struggle, and particularly concrete day-to-day patient work among hundreds of thousands of people. It is to this that we address our efforts; we are working to build up unity and develop anti-fascism actions, for this is decisive for victory, the very basis of success.

It is only natural, we hold, that the political criterion of the ultra-leftists has led them to the idea of forming an anti-dictatorship organization of selected cadres based on action by these cadres, and not on mass struggle. Their sectarian conception of strategy and tactics has led to a sectarian conception of organization, and will therefore lead to defeat.

In one of their documents, dated March 1974, they said: "We intend to promote popular power that could today assume the tasks of resistance, tomorrow a mass offensive, and in the future an insurrectionist movement. Today, we must sow the seeds of this popular power in every factory commission and in every resistance committee."

This is not a serious approach. What would popular power stand for today? It is just another phrase, like "youth power," "women's power" and other gimmicks of the bourgeoisie, which have never really opposed the reactionary power of the state, whereas the working class and the people are interested, first and foremost, in radically changing it.

To set out to create an alternative power worthy of the name at this moment is to breed harmful illusions, to confuse the masses. Where and over whom could this power be exercised?

What is really necessary, instead of dreaming about a mythical "popular power," is to investigate devolutionary action in fields where it will pave the way to victory: democratic activity where the people live, work, learn, and rest. The fascists may impose terror, but will

never be able to prevent trade union activity, the activity of tenants' groups, of women in maternity centers, students' centers, the activity of Party clubs, and cultural and art activities. That is where indestructible foundations will be laid for the people's struggle against fascism, setting the stage for a really serious battle for power against the oligarchy and imperialism.

This is entirely contrary to the idea of resistance committees as "seeds of popular power," which lead through revolutionary rhetoric to splits in the mass organizations, to parallel organizations isolated from the people's mass organizations.

The resistance committee concept arose in March 1975 on the proposal of the MIR. In a letter to us they said: "You have advanced the idea that the prime duty of resistance is to participate in mass organizations." It would appear from this that we could reach an understanding. Unfortunately, however, 30 lines below they added: "But we note the absence in your document of a concrete proposal for a mass underground resistance organization." What do they mean? Either we work in the mass organizations, or create underground organizations which, naturally, cannot be mass organizations in the full sense. Quite right, we make no concrete "proposal," because we have decided to work in the mass organizations which the people have been able to form and which encompass the vast majority, uniting millions of Chileans. We have decided, furthermore, to help revive the organizations that fascism succeeded in destroying, but, despite brutal repressions, constitute the historical basis for popular organization. It is our firm belief that in Chilean conditions parallel organizations would be a fallacious and suicidal policy leading to defeat of the popular movement.

In the present conditions it is the vanguard political forces, from local branches right up to the leadership, that should work underground. The liaison between the anti-fascist forces at local level should also be underground. We have made a concrete proposal on this score; to form anti-fascist committees connecting party organizations and individuals, and serving as centers of leadership for the various mass organizations. But that is an entirely different matter.

Deadly Struggles Against Anti-Communism

Each of the MIR deviations concerning mass work betrays opposition to the popular parties and the latter's role in the revolutionary process, and the wish to destroy their organization, to make them abandon their vanguard role. Substantiating the idea of resistance committees, the MIR people write: "We hold that unity in resistance should not be expressed solely through the front of political parties,

but—and this is the main thing—it should be created on the basis of underground organizations of the masses.”

What are the political parties the MIR can refer to if it thinks they are able to form a top-level front and cannot form a front on the basis of the mass organizations, which is really the decisive question? Surely not the workers' parties. Their scheme would possibly fit some petty-bourgeois party, which rejects ties with the masses “in principle.” For us leadership at primary level implies the presence of a party. To deny this is to abandon our vanguard role and sink deeper and deeper into opportunism.

We are prepared to work at primary level with all antifascists. More, we have always emphasized this. That is the road to a united front confirmed by experience. But we consider it wrong and unacceptable for ourselves and other Popular Unity parties to use organizational forms in which we have no experience, and to destroy our primary organizations. Yet this would be the result if we were to form the resistance committees suggested by the MIR.

The MIR suggests, in fact, that these committees should consist of tested representatives of the left forces in each enterprise, whether Communists, Socialists or independents. But who would pick them? The MIR itself. Each group should form its own leadership “democratically” (which would be no problem by means of appropriate elections). And these bodies of leadership are to establish ties among themselves first at local level, then at provincial, etc. But who would tie them together? Naturally, the MIR.

This type of organization has two basic features: first, it is to be completely independent of the political front, and, second, the parties must not interfere in the affairs of the primary organizations, because these are groups of individuals formed to avoid “sectarianism” and facilitate the forging of “unity.”

To put it more bluntly, the MIR proposal is less concerned about the ability or inability of the popular parties to head the struggle at mass level, and amounts, in fact, to just another demonstration of party chauvinism strongly colored with anti-Communism, previously expressed in the impertinent thesis of a “revolutionary pole.” The MIR people hope that in this conglomerate of resistance groups divorced from the political parties there will prevail principles that by disorganizing the popular parties will give the MIR some influence among the masses. Needless to say, the nation will never be able to win if it follows this path. It is bound to fail, and the masses understand this and refuse to be drawn into this suicidal scheme.

The severe trials that have fallen to the lot of our people under

fascist rule have generated a striving for antifascist action unity. Decent people who did and still do consider themselves members of the MIR participate in concrete actions along with representatives of Popular Unity parties and the Christian Democrats chosen by the workers to express their demands. That is how, on a popular basis, through antifascist unity committees involving parties and all or the vast majority of the working people, antifascist unity is being forged. Like all the Popular Unity parties, our Party encourages unity. Attempts to impair this process by advancing sectarian criteria, instigating struggle against parties, imposing division or unilateral "criteria" concerning allies in order to "turn them into the prow of the ship while we hold the helm" (from MIR documents on organizational work), are malicious and harmful, and sure to be rejected by the people.

These are some of our ideas concerning irreconcilable struggle against sectarianism, divisive actions and dogmatism, which have done so much harm to the struggle of the Chilean people. An objective analysis of the recent past shows that our Party, the party of the working class, has not fought firmly enough for its own independent policy, against right and left opportunism within the working-class movement. And it would be a crime to repeat this mistake. To fight more effectively against the main enemy, to consolidate the unity of the people, we shall conduct our ideological struggle more vigorously than before in order to combat confusion, sectarianism, divisive tactics and conciliation.

This struggle is not designed to dissociate a single decent fighter from the revolutionary movement. On the contrary, it is our purpose to attract every real revolutionary to the positions of the working class movement. And we are convinced that in this case his or her contribution to the revolutionary process will be really fruitful.

BOOK REVIEWS

JOSEPH HARRIS

Economics of Racism, USA

*Economics of Racism, USA** is a pioneering work in Marxist literature. In its 256 pages, Victor Perlo examines "the roots of Black inequality" and provides massive documentation and cogent arguments to prove that "today . . . economic discrimination against Blacks is the nation's number one economic problem." As Perlo informs his readers, although the book is a scientific work, it is also partisan. "This book aims to contribute to the factual and analytic basis for attempts to solve that number one problem, and to provide ammunition for the mass struggles that must become a major part of such attempts."

Economics of Racism focuses on the relative conditions and positions of Blacks and whites, stressing the questions of income, occupation and industry, wages and unemployment—the most fundamental aspects of economic situation. (While questions such as housing, health services and education are important to an all around comparison of the quality of life, little space is devoted to

them. Another book, examining comparatively these conditions of Blacks and whites—with the same scientific, statistical probing and sharp argumentation—would be an additional valuable contribution to the subject.)

Perlo begins by examining the U.S. census count of Black and other minority people. The way in which they are seriously and disproportionately undercounted by the census is analyzed. The discriminatory implications of this undercounting in terms of federal aid and electoral representation is explained.

Perlo then proceeds to examine the class composition of Black people in the United States. He notes that "By 1970, about 2.8 million Black workers, or 40 per cent of all gainfully employed Blacks, were engaged in industrial production." Regarding location of the population, Perlo points out that "In 1970, 58 per cent of all Blacks lived in the central cities of large urbanized areas . . . among the white population, however, only 28 per cent lived in central cities."

Since "personal income is the most meaningful indicator of living standards," an entire chapter

*Victor Perlo, *Economics of Racism, USA*, International Publishers, New York, 1975. Paper, \$4.25. Forward by Henry Winston.

is devoted to probing the income trends and current position of Blacks, other oppressed minorities, whites, and the so-called ethnic groups. Perlo proves that the relative position of Blacks is either not improving at all or that the improvement is so slow as to be negligible. In contrast to the claim of the Commerce Department, for example, that "since 1964 . . . the income differentials between Negro and white families have narrowed," Perlo demonstrates that this is not the case, and that since 1969, in fact, the gap has probably increased.

One way the Commerce Department arrives at a distorted conclusion is to count almost all Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other peoples of Latin American descent, themselves the victims of extensive discrimination, as "whites," thus lowering the recorded white median income. Blacks' per capita income was 54 per cent of "white Anglo" income in 1969, Chicanos' was 55 per cent, Puerto Ricans' was 54 per cent and Native American Indians' was only 46 per cent. (Since the number of Spanish surname people in the U.S. is growing more rapidly than the average, this distortion tends to grow over time.) Distortion also results from the undercounting of Blacks, especially the poorest. Additionally, undercounting and noncounting of property income and capital gains, more significant on the average for whites than for Blacks, lowers the reported median income of the white sector of the population.

Perlo polemizes throughout against theories which downgrade the centrality of the struggle against racism. Thus, in the chapter "Trends in Income," he argues against the idea that the motion of the economy can by itself account for the fluctuation in the relative position of Blacks. While some argue that demands for full employment or job creation are adequate for satisfying the needs of the Black population, Perlo is persuasive that "the political struggles of the Black people and their allies, and the counteroffensive of racist reactionaries, have been decisive in the gains and losses of the Black people. . . . Thus, the sharp economic gains of Blacks during World War II were not due only to the labor shortage. They were very much connected with the rise during the 1930s of united struggles and organizations of Black and white workers. . . . On the other hand, political factors of an opposite character were very much in operation in the 20 years following World War II."

Migration from South to North and from farm to city continued during 1945-1965. As Perlo remarks, these population trends "all other things being equal . . . should have led to a steady upward trend in the national average ratio of Black to white incomes." But "these were the decades of the cold war, of virulent anti-Communism and racism." The result was a stagnation of the ratio of Black to white income.

Similarly, the racist offensive of the past few years, spearheaded

by the Nixon Administration, continues to strongly affect the relative position of Blacks. The goal of the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill of a three per cent adult unemployment rate is inadequate, since it implies four per cent overall unemployment—and at least eight per cent for Blacks, given present racist practices. Lack of attention to alleviating the special oppression visited upon Blacks and other minorities means that racist practices not only continue, but worsen, since the racists continue to apply their pressure.

Discrimination in employment and wages is analyzed by Perlo in depth. Kinds of jobs, trends in Black employment patterns, discrimination in promotion, lower pay for the same job, Black workers in low wage plants and sex discrimination in wages are some of the subtopics of Perlo's treatment. One very interesting section deals with employers' increasing substitution of female for male clerical workers, and within that framework of Black for white women workers. Does this represent a lessening in discrimination against women and especially against Black women? *No!* Perlo shows that employers "got away with a substantial reduction in money wages, and a more marked reduction in real wages, considering the rising level of prices."

Further, "the gains of Black women in white collar, especially clerical employment, while socially important, are diminished in economic significance to the extent that employers use this to hold salaries for clerical occupations

down to levels which, relative to wages and salaries in other occupations, are at historical lows. It is a fact that today the average salary of a full time, year-around clerical worker is lower than the average wage of a full time, year-around factory operative."

Super-unemployment is the topic of still another detailed study. To get a full understanding of unemployment statistics—and their weaknesses and biases—of the Department of Labor, you must read this chapter. It is the finest treatment of the subject I have seen.

The last half of *Economics of Racism* has fewer statistics than the first half, and so for many readers it may prove easier sledding. Ideological questions are treated in a more free-wheeling manner.

"Blaming the Victim" contains an especially fine treatment of Edward Banfield's racist program. The question of capitalist responsibility for economic discrimination is examined concretely. American Telephone and Telegraph, the nation's largest employer, the "most ubiquitous monopoly . . . with the most ramified political and economic ties" receives particular attention.

In "Extra Profits From Discrimination" and "What Whites Lose" Perlo clinches his argument as to who is responsible for racism and why all workers must, in their own interest, actively struggle against it.

Perlo devotes a chapter to "Black Capitalism," showing it to be largely an invention of the

ruling class to siphon off militancy among Blacks. He examines the number, size and influence of Black owned firms, discusses the reasons for their weakness, and suggests that while the demand for the right of Blacks to own their own business is one that must be defended, Black capitalism cannot solve the problems of the Black masses.

In "Labor Union Influences" and "Government Influences" Perlo examines further the sources of discrimination. While the unions do not receive a clean bill of health, Perlo makes it quite clear that racism is the result of capitalists and their government. Overall, the unions have played and continue to play a positive role in the struggle against racism, but serious flaws, especially among the craft unions, remain. Perlo's statement that "If the Black struggle for equality has gained, on balance, from the activities and policies of the organized labor movement, the working class as a whole and the trade union movement in particular have gained even more from the struggles of the Black working people" deserves much reflection.

On the other hand, "In the most fundamental sense, the regime of racism and discrimination could not be maintained except through enforcement by the government . . . the government, despite Constitutional guarantees

and laws to the contrary, is the essential protector and enforcer of the entire system of discrimination and super-exploitation of Blacks in the United States. This fundamental role of the government of monopoly capitalism is moderated by the course of political struggle, in relation to economic discrimination as with other specific issues."

Finally, Perlo outlines a program for winning the struggle against economic discrimination —against racism. The argumentation for this program of struggle will be an education for many. For those who have had trouble defending "preferential" treatment or the "quota" system, read this chapter carefully. The treatment of the De Funis case provides the information you need.

It is impossible to quote more than a smattering of the many examples which dot this book—but they are the meat, and will provide valuable ammunition with which to defeat the many and varied racist and racist-influenced views.

Economics of Racism makes a lasting contribution to Marxist literature because it raises the struggle against racism to a new level. As Henry Winston wrote in his Foreword, "It helps light the way to the struggle here and now, to overcome all of the ignorance, and erroneous conceptions, which hold back the forces of anti-monopoly unity."

travel. . .

with Anniversary Tours

. . .meet our friends around the world

- * GROUP TOURS
USSR, Eastern and Western Europe, Greece,
Portugal, Middle East, Latin America
- * WORKER-TO-WORKER BUDGET TOURS
to the Soviet Union
- * YOUTH BARGAIN TRAVEL
- * INDIVIDUAL TRAVEL
USA or world-wide
- * AIR TICKETS
domestic and international
- * CRUISES
- * HEALTH SPAS/ SANATORIA



ANNIVERSARY TOURS

250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019 (212) 245-7501
1741 Ivar Avenue, Hollywood, Ca. 90028 (213) 465-6141