

APRIL, 1973

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

PAUL ROBESON'S 75TH BIRTHDAY

Editorial Comment

NIXON'S ECONOMIC POLICIES

Hyman Lumer

NEO-KEYNESIAN DOCTRINE: ESSENCE AND
CONTRADICTIONS

Irina Osadchaya

ARENA OF CLASS STRUGGLE: THE UNITED NATIONS

John Pittman

THE TIME IS NOW

Paul Robeson

TOWARD COUNTER-REVOLUTION: THE
SLAVEOWNERS AND SECESSION

Herbert Aptheker

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF DANIEL DE LEON

William Weinstone

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Editorial Comment</i>	1
Paul Robeson's 75th Birthday	
<i>Henry Winston</i>	4
The Example of Peekskill	
<i>Hyman Lumer</i>	5
Nixon's Economic Policies	
<i>Irina Osadchaya</i>	17
Neo-Keynesian Doctrine: Essence and Contradiction	
<i>John Pittman</i>	31
Arena of Class Struggle: The United Nations	
<i>Paul Robeson</i>	41
The Time Is Now	
IDEAS IN OUR TIME	
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	53
Toward Counter-Revolution: The Slaveowners and Secession	
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>William Weinstone</i>	58
The Life and Times of Daniel De Leon	

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

Paul Robeson's 75th Birthday

April 9, 1973, marks the 75th birthday of a truly great, heroic figure of our times, one who has become a legend within his own lifetime. The name of Paul Robeson is known throughout the world. It commands the admiration and respect—more, the love—of hundreds of millions. In vain have the ruling-class forces of reaction in this country tried to silence him, to erase his name from people's minds. Today his music is heard by growing numbers and his stature grows ever greater in the eyes of our people, both Black and white.

A particularly striking expression of the durability of his name and his contributions was the dedication, on April 2, 1969, of the Paul Robeson Music and Arts Lounge in the new student center at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey. For it was as a student at Rutgers (then Rutgers College) that Paul Robeson's extraordinary talents first became widely known. Winner of a four-year scholarship, he was both a Phi Beta Kappa student and an outstanding athlete—a four-letter man and an All-American football star.

After graduating from Rutgers in 1919 he attended the Columbia University Law School, from which he received a degree in 1923. However, his career was to unfold not in the courtroom but on the stage. Possessed of unique talents in these fields, he was to become world-famous as a singer and an actor. His pursuit of his stage career took him to England and, repelled by the pervasive racism which surrounded him on all sides in the United States, he decided to settle there. But then, as he relates in his book *Here I Stand*, living in the center of the British Empire he acquired an interest in the study of African culture—a culture whose very existence was denied by the racist colonialists. This in turn led him to the Soviet Union where, he had learned, formerly oppressed peoples were making enormous cultural strides in the new socialist society.

He writes: "Well, I went to see for myself and on my first visit to the Soviet Union in 1934 I saw how the Yakuts and the Uzbeks and all the formerly oppressed nations were leaping ahead from tribalism to modern industrial economy, from illiteracy to the heights of knowledge." (Beacon Press, Boston, 1971, p. 34.) His experiences in the Soviet Union profoundly influenced his thinking and his outlook. Paul Robeson now came forward as a great champion of the freedom of his people, of world peace, of socialism, and as a staunch, unshakeable friend of the Soviet Union.

He won great acclaim as singer and actor. He received many honors,

among them the following:

Honorary degrees from Rutgers, Hamilton, Morehouse and Howard Universities.

The Abraham Lincoln Medal in 1943 for notable and distinguished service in human relations in New York.

The Donaldson Award in 1944 for the best acting performance of that year. This was given for his performance in the role of Othello, considered to be the greatest performance of that role in the history of the U.S. theater.

The Spingarn Medal, awarded by the NAACP, in 1945.

But Robeson the artist was never divorced from Robeson the fighter for freedom. In him the two were always fused. Of his singing his wife, Eslande Goode Robeson, wrote on the occasion of an earlier birthday:

When he sings folk songs and classics, he translates them from the past into the present, or transports his listeners from the present into the past, and either way adds new life and significance to the songs, and new understanding and appreciation to the listeners.

When he sings "Were You There?" he sings not only of the crucifixion of Jesus, but also of the lynching crucifixion of the Negro people, the cremation of the Jewish people, and of the intolerance, fear, hatred and brutality which caused these tragedies. One can almost hear him sing: "Were you there when they crucified the Moores?"*

When Paul Robeson sings songs of sadness, people weep; when he sings songs of hope, they take heart; when he sings songs of protest, guilty governments tremble. ("Robeson: The World's Symbol of Freedom," *Freedom*, April 1952.)

William L. Patterson, the noted Black Communist leader, states, in an earlier birthday tribute appearing in these pages:

Paul was a statesman. Not in the realm of politics, although he stood head and shoulders above many others in that arena. He was a statesman in the sphere of art and culture. He studied the relation of art to liberation movements. Paul was an artist of the revolution. He was a fighter for a democracy of the people. He did not believe that the other cheek should be turned to the aggressor. He was in the midst of the fight for the lives of the Scottsboro Boys, Angelo Herndon, Willie McGee, the Trenton Six, and a number of other civil rights victims. That distinguished him from

*Harry T. Moore, militant NAACP leader, and his wife, Harriet Moore, were brutally assassinated by the explosion of a bomb in their home in Mims, Florida on Christmas night, 1951.

the artist-reformer. . . .

That is why Paul went to Spain during its civil war and sang to the troops in the trenches, Spanish workers and peasants, Americans, Europeans, men and women who were heroically seeking to stop Hitler and Franco at the gates of Madrid. He was a "premature anti-fascist," one of those far-sighted peace lovers who recognized that if Hitler was stopped in Spain, a second world war might be prevented, just as a third world war may be prevented if American imperialism is stopped in Vietnam. Paul's experiences at home forewarned him of the nature of fascism. Paul hated Hitler and every aspect of Hitlerism, especially its anti-Semitism. He hated imperialist wars, and American imperialism persecuted him for it. ("In Honor of Paul Robeson," *Political Affairs*, May 1969.)

Paul Robeson was in the thick of struggle at all times. With William L. Patterson, he took part in presenting the petition "We Charge Genocide" to the United Nations in December 1951. He headed the Council of African Affairs during the fifties and was chairman of the editorial board of the monthly publication *Freedom*. And always his magnificent voice and inimitable artistry were on hand in the cause of freedom, peace and progress.

With the advent of the cold war the forces of McCarthyism descended on him with exceptional fury. The concert stage was closed to him, as were radio, television, films and other media of artistic expression. He was denied a passport; even more, he was denied the right to go to Canada and other countries where no passport is required. A campaign of silence was decreed, and when *Here I Stand* was published in 1958, virtually no white commercial newspaper or magazine so much as mentioned its existence.

But Paul Robeson did make himself heard. In 1949, when an outdoor concert at Peekskill, New York, was broken up by a gang of racists and fascists, a second concert was organized on the initiative of the Fur Workers and other unions in New York—and carried through—with the protection of a large body of trade unionists, mainly white. In 1952, when he was forbidden by the State Department to go to Canada to attend a convention of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, a concert was organized for him at Peace Arch Park on the border between Washington and British Columbia, to which 30,000 Canadians came. When he was forbidden to travel to England to sing before the miners of Wales, he sang for them by telephone. Concerts were organized for him in churches, in halls. He sang at meetings. McCarthyite reaction could never silence this heroic fighter.

(Continued on p. 52)

The Example of Peekskill*

A shining example of the mobilization of white workers in such a cause [the struggle against racism—Ed.] was shown by the events in Peekskill in 1949. Comrade Irving Potash, then an official of the Fur Workers Union, played a leading part in these events. Here is an account of them, as told by him:

In 1949 during the Smith Act trial of the Party's "eleven," Paul Robeson and a large audience at a concert in an open lot in Peekskill, New York, were attacked by a white mob of racists and fascists. Robeson was barely saved from serious injury, but his audience was dispersed and the concert was broken up. The fascist racists were protected by the local police.

When we learned about this attack, the Fur Workers Union accepted my proposal that we not only protest but also publicly invite Robeson to go back to Peekskill under the protection of active fur workers and other trade unionists and Communists.

The Fur Workers Union then officially invited other unions to take similar action and to join with us in organizing a mass self-defense body to protect Robeson and the concert audience. We called a special meeting of all shop stewards and active workers and they unanimously backed our decision.

Robeson accepted the invitation and the offer. So did District 65 and other unions and, of course, the Communist Party of New York. Hundreds of rank-and-file white and black workers volunteered for the self-defense organization.

When the concert took place, a chain of hundreds of black and white workers and Communists armed with baseball bats and other appropriate means of defense surrounded the open lot and also the concert platform. Most of the volunteers were veterans of World War II and they wore their veteran caps.

We did not call for insurrection or violence. We did not make public declarations about arming the workers. But we were adequately prepared to meet any attack of the racists and the police and to protect Robeson from bodily harm, and in this manner safeguard our Constitutional right to self-defense.

The fascists and the police knew that and therefore did not dare attack Paul and the audience on the concert grounds. This was a significant defeat for the racists and a great victory for black and white united action against racism.

(Continued on p. 40)

* This is an excerpt from Henry Winston's report to the 19th Convention of the CPUSA.

Nixon's Economic Policies

In his yearly economic report, presented on January 30, President Nixon hails 1972 as "a very good year for the American economy" and promises that 1973 will be even better. In Part 3 of his State of the Union message, delivered on February 22, he goes further, saying: "I am pleased to report that our economic prospects are very bright. For the first time in nearly 20 years, we can look forward to a period of genuine prosperity in a time of peace. We can, in fact, achieve the most bountiful prosperity that this nation has ever known." And all these blessings, actual and potential, he attributes to "the policies that began in 1969."

In actual fact, however, the period of Nixon's administration has been marked from the beginning by growing economic instability and by mounting problems and difficulties of all kinds. And "the policies that began in 1969" have had as their primary purpose to place these burdens on the backs of the working people.

The 1969-70 Recession

The years 1969-71 witnessed the longest economic downturn since World War II. It was, moreover, a downturn displaying a number of significant new features, among them the following:

1. It was the first ever to occur in a period of major war activity and greatly increased military expenditures. Such periods have in the past been periods of wartime boom.

2. It was marked by serious financial strains, with the emergence in early 1969 of a severe "credit crunch" which sent interest rates soaring to record heights and created a shortage of liquid funds in the hands of the big corporations, almost reaching the proportions of a major financial crisis.

3. It was characterized by the simultaneous occurrence of both rising unemployment and mounting inflation, a development which led to the coining of a new term: "stagflation."

4. It was accompanied by mounting balance of payments deficits, persistent shakiness of the dollar in the world arena and a reduced surplus of exports over imports.

With the onset of the downturn in the latter part of 1969, the rate of unemployment, according to the official figures, rose from about 3.5 per cent to a peak of 6.1 per cent by December 1970. The consumer price index rose by about 5½ per cent in 1969 and by about 6 per cent in 1970. Real take-home pay fell, for the first time since the thirties.

Nixon's program, on his coming into office, was centered on "fighting inflation." It was aimed not at doing away with rising prices, which are to the advantage of the capitalist class, but only at reducing the rate of increase to a more "reasonable" level—about 2½-3 per cent a year. And since, in the view of monopoly capital and its spokesmen, inflation is caused by too much purchasing power in the hands of the workers, the program was designed to reduce this purchasing power.

Nixon continued the policies initiated by the Johnson Administration of limiting private consumption on the one hand and federal expenditures for civilian purposes on the other. He continued the 10 per cent income tax surcharge initiated by Johnson (it was further continued at a rate of 5 per cent in 1970) and he vetoed Congressional appropriations for education and other social services on the grounds that these were "inflationary." The policy of deliberately holding back economic growth introduced by Johnson, with the consequent rise of unemployment, was maintained. And it contributed to the downturn which set in later in 1969.

From a peak of 115.0 in September 1969 the index of industrial production fell to a low of 102.0 in December 1970. A sluggish recovery then set in, interrupted by a drop to 102.1 in July 1971. After that, output rose slowly and did not exceed the July 1969 level until June 1972. During 1971 the consumer price index rose by close to 4½ per cent over the previous year and the officially estimated level of unemployment remained at about six per cent.

Thus, even in terms of the official yardsticks, which are rigged to underestimate the real extent of price increases, Nixon's so-called anti-inflation campaign had proved singularly unsuccessful. At the same time, some 33 months of his first 48 months in office were months of recession—of increased unemployment and economic hardship for the working class.*

During this period Nixon resorted to a policy of stimulating the economy through increased deficit spending. This policy was continued into 1972 with the aim of making the economy look as good as possible by Election Day. As a result the federal budget ran deficits of \$23.0 billion in fiscal 1971 and \$23.2 billion in 1972, with an anticipated deficit of \$24.8 billion in 1973—among the highest deficits in our history.

The "New Economic Policy"

In 1971 the perennial balance of payments deficit rose to astro-

* For a more extended discussion of this point, see Victor Perlo, "The Economic Situation," *Political Affairs*, August 1972.

nomical proportions, with the deficit in net liquidity balance reaching \$22 billion and the official reserves transactions balance \$30 billion.* A new crisis of the dollar broke out in midyear, with a growing rush to unload the mounting accumulations of dollars abroad for firmer currencies such as the West German mark. On August 15, Nixon was compelled to announce that the U.S. Treasury would no longer pay out gold for dollars offered by central banks of other countries. And on December 14, he was compelled to devalue the dollar, raising the price of gold from \$35 an ounce to \$38, or 8.57 per cent.**

Contributing to the record balance of payments deficit was a shift from a trade surplus of \$2.7 billion in 1970 to a deficit of \$2.0 billion in 1971—the first such deficit to be incurred since 1893. The devaluation, it was expected, by lowering the prices of U.S. exports and simultaneously raising the prices of imports, would serve to overcome the trade deficit and thereby materially reduce the balance of payments deficit.

But Nixon's original design, prior to devaluation, was to improve the competitive position of U.S. exports by reducing inflation, raising productivity and holding wages down. Toward this end, on August 15 he also introduced his "new economic policy." This began with imposition of a 90-day "wage and price freeze," followed by the introduction of a system of formal controls in what came to be known as Phase 2. A Pay Board was set up, consisting of five labor, five management and five "public" members, charged with maintaining a limit on wage increases. A Price Commission was also established, whose function was supposedly to control prices.

The Pay Board functioned with great diligence. It promptly voted to limit wage increase in 1972 to 5½ per cent and proposed to make the limit still lower in 1973. It countermanded wage increases won in several important contract negotiations and was so outrageously anti-labor in its conduct that four of the five labor leaders were impelled to resign. On the other hand, the directives of the Price Commission were so beset with complexities and loopholes as to be largely meaningless. Thanks also to the leniency of the Commission, prices continued to rise with little hindrance.

In short, the meaning of the "new economic policy" was the im-

* The former measures the balance in the over-all transfer of liquid assets between the United States and other countries, the latter the balance in transactions between official agencies in the United States and abroad.

** For a detailed account, see Hyman Lumer, "The Devaluation of the Dollar," *Political Affairs*, February 1972.

position of wage controls. Moreover, it tied what wage increases were permitted to heightened speedup in the name of "increasing productivity." The effect of the devaluation on top of this was to elevate the cost of living still more by way of increased prices of imported goods and the tendency of such increases to spread to other products.

Nixonian "Prosperity"

In 1972 the upturn accelerated. The real gross national product rose by 6 per cent. Industrial production was up 7 per cent over 1971 and investment in new plant and equipment was up 8½ per cent. This was Nixon's "very good year." But for the masses of working people, and especially for the Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican workers, it left much to be desired.

Unemployment declined slowly from the 1971 level and by January 1973 the official figure had fallen only to 5 per cent. But this figure is misleading, since the official estimate is designed to conceal unemployment rather than to reveal it. It omits those not actively looking for work at the moment, classifying them not as "unemployed" but as "not in the labor force." It likewise omits those who are involuntarily working part time; these are classified as "employed" even if they work only a few hours a week. When these two categories are added, the actual rate of unemployment is closer to 10 per cent than to 5. And this is a high level of unemployment indeed for a period of "prosperity."

But this is not the whole story. Among teen-age youth (age 16-19), unemployment averaged 14.3 per cent in 1972 according to the official figures. Among Black teen-agers the rate was 34.2 per cent, a level rivaling that of the thirties.*

The picture is further rounded out by a study of subemployment made in the 1970 Census for 51 urban areas. In these, which are largely ghetto areas, 60 per cent of the population lives on incomes insufficient to provide a decent standard of living and 30 per cent on incomes below the officially designated poverty level. Subemployment is defined as including the discouraged jobseekers who no longer actively look for work, the involuntary part-time workers and those who, though employed, are grossly underpaid. For all the areas the total of unemployed plus subemployed averaged no less than 61.2 per cent of the labor force.

* The classification currently employed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is "Negro and other." But more than 90 per cent of those included in this category are Black.

The unemployment level in such areas is much higher than that shown by the over-all figures. Thus, a recent Urban League study of Black poverty areas in 44 cities discloses an average unemployment rate of 23.8 per cent. To be sure, these figures fluctuate with the ups and downs of the economic cycle. But they are not *basically* altered by them. The over-all trend is indicated by the fact that the numbers on the welfare rolls have grown from 8 million in 1969 to almost 15 million in mid-1972 and are still rising. It is indicated also by a renewed rise in the numbers below the poverty level. In short, working people among the Blacks and other oppressed minorities live in a state of unending and even worsening depression.

Furthermore, over the past several years, according to a study by AFL-CIO economist Nat Goldfinger, real take-home pay has barely increased. Says Goldfinger:

... in June 1972 the buying power of the weekly earnings of the average worker in private industry, after federal tax payments, was up only 5.5 per cent from 1965. Moreover, state and local government taxes on income and payrolls increased during this period of several years—washing out about half of the improvement. After payment of these state and local taxes, as well as deduction of federal income and Social Security taxes, the buying power of the average wage and salary earner's weekly pay in June 1972 was only slightly greater than it had been in 1965. ("The Economic Squeeze on the Worker, 1972," *AFL-CIO American Federationist*, December 1972.)

While taxes paid by workers have continued to rise, the big corporations have continued to receive generous tax benefits in the form of accelerated depreciation write-offs and tax credits on investments in new plant and equipment. These, according to AFL-CIO estimates, have effectively cut corporate tax rates by 15 to 20 per cent. And in 1972 a new benefit was added: a 25 per cent tax credit on wages paid to newly hired "disadvantaged" workers.

Consequently, corporate cash flow (after-tax profits plus depreciation allowances) rose from \$82.9 billion in 1965 to \$120.2 billion in 1972. Even with a generous allowance for price increases during this period, this amounts to an increase of more than 8 per cent. Further, between 1970 and 1972 after-tax corporate profits rose 30 per cent and cash flow 26 per cent, while the average take-home pay of a worker with three dependents rose only 15 per cent.

In short, the share of the product appropriated by the capitalists

at the expense of the workers continues to rise unchecked. And the Nixon policies are designed to step up the process.

To all this must be added the spectacular new spurt of price increases which are giving the lie to Nixon's claims to have brought inflation under control. In January 1973 the consumer price index rose 0.5 per cent, or at an annual rate of 6 per cent. Propelling this jump was the highest one-month rise in grocery prices in the country's history. Retail food prices increased by nearly 3 per cent. February witnessed a 4.6 per cent leap in wholesale prices of farm products, accompanied by a continuing record rise in retail food prices. In addition, wholesale prices of industrial products began to rise steeply in February, presaging new jumps in retail prices in coming months.

It is clear that these price increases will continue for some time to come; indeed, it is impossible to say where they will end. They have already made a mockery of Nixon's pronouncements about reducing the rate of inflation to 2½ per cent a year. And he has, as of this moment, come up with nothing better than advice to beat the price increases by changing one's dietary habits. Meanwhile, real take-home pay is again on the decline and working-class families are experiencing growing difficulties in making ends meet.

Coincidentally with these developments the ailing dollar suffered a new relapse in January 1973. The 1971 devaluation, contrary to expectations, did not improve the balance of trade. Instead, 1972 witnessed a trade deficit of \$6.5 billion, an all-time high. The balance of payments deficit remained at a high level, and now a fresh monetary crisis developed, with a run on the dollar which compelled a second devaluation on February 12. This time the dollar was devalued by 10 per cent, the price of gold being raised from \$38 to \$42.22 an ounce.

The devaluation added to the upward pressure on prices. In fact, the sharpest surge in wholesale food prices took place in the week immediately following it. At the same time, it appears very dubious that the devaluation will lead to any real improvement in the status of the dollar. Moreover, it was accompanied by renewed demands that other countries lower their barriers to imports from the United States, with threats of precipitating a trade war should they fail to do so. Such a war, if it should come, would mean still more price hikes and more hardship for working people.

The New Offensive Against the People

As anticipated, since the 1972 elections the Nixon assault on the living standards and social welfare of the people has become more

pronounced and more naked. And Nixon's demagoguery has been carried to new extremes.

First, the Phase 2 "mandatory" controls have been replaced by a Phase 3 system of "voluntary" controls. The Pay Board and the Price Commission have been abolished and the administration of controls has been placed in the hands of a Cost of Living Council. The previous guidelines have been retained, including the 5½ per cent limit on wage increases, only now they are to be "voluntarily" enforced. However, the Cost of Living Council is empowered not only to check on compliance but to issue mandatory orders whenever it sees fit. Toward this end, Nixon has asked Congress for a one-year extension of the Economic Stabilization Act, which provides authority for mandatory controls.

The effect of these changes has been to loosen what few controls on prices existed while maintaining the pressure to limit wage increases. Rent controls, for example, were wiped out altogether. To be sure there is much talk about "flexibility" in wage controls in Administration circles. But we may be certain that with the new wave of price increases there will be growing pressures to hold wages down in the name of "fighting inflation." And as major contract negotiations approach, particularly those in the electrical and auto industries, the threat of imposition of mandatory wage controls will become very real. In addition, we may anticipate a continuation and stepping up of the drive for increased productivity as a condition for wage increases.

Thus, the Phase 3 regulations bring out even more sharply the pro-monopolist, anti-labor character of the Nixon policies. They leave no question that the aim is solely to hold wages down, not to control prices or profits.

The most glaring expression of Nixon's new reactionary drive is his proposed budget for fiscal 1974. Having spent money with utter recklessness and having accumulated enormous budgetary deficits prior to the 1972 elections, he now comes forward as a champion of the homely virtues of self-reliance, thrift and frugality. We must put an end to skyrocketing government expenditures, he says in a radio address on the budget. We must cease living beyond our means. The federal budget must be kept at a level which will neither require increased taxes nor lead to increased prices. We must not permit excessive spending to overheat the economy and thereby threaten our golden prosperity. And not least, we must learn that "relying on bigger government is not the way to meet our nation's needs."

Budget expenditures for fiscal 1973 are estimated at about \$250

billion. For 1974 Nixon proposes a budget of \$268.7 billion. He further proposes to reduce the deficit from \$24.8 billion of 1973 to \$12.7 billion, a cut of \$12.1 billion.

Where are the required cuts to be made? Not in military spending; on the contrary, this is to rise from \$76.4 billion to \$81.1 billion, and may well go above \$100 billion by 1976. To those who think that the end of the fighting in Vietnam should produce a *cut* in military outlays the answer is that there will be no "peace dividend" from this source since the money saved has already been spent elsewhere. Outlays for the war in Indochina have gone down from \$21.9 billion in fiscal 1969 to \$6.1 billion in 1973, we are told, and the difference has been used for other purposes.

But the other purposes, it is essential to note, are *other military expenditures*. The fact is that the bulk of the huge military budgets of recent years has not been occasioned by the costs of the Indochina war. These are *cold-war* military expenditures, the expression of the permanent war economy under which we have been living since World War II. Politically they have been motivated by the drive of U.S. imperialism for world domination. And economically they have served monopoly capital as a highly profitable form of deliberate waste—of disposing, in a manner most satisfactory to the monopolies, of the surplus which is generated by modern industrial production and which cannot, under capitalist conditions, otherwise be profitably absorbed. Ruling-class pressures are always in the direction of increasing military budgets, not cutting them, war or no war.

Not surprisingly, therefore, Nixon's newly acquired frugality does not extend to military outlays. Instead, the cuts are to be achieved almost entirely by slashing or abolishing social service programs. There are more than 100 such cuts or terminations, taking up 7½ pages of fine print in the budget. Chief among them are the following.

1. Dissolution of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which was created as the instrument for carrying on the "war on poverty" launched under President Johnson. The Community Action Program, with 907 local agencies engaged in various forms of community activity, is to be abolished, as are a number of other programs. Some programs are to be transferred to other federal agencies. The Legal Services Program is supposedly to be continued under a new agency, which has yet to be established by Congress.

2. Phasing out over two years of the Emergency Employment Program, which provides some 280,000 public service jobs in high unemployment areas.

3. Medicare charges are to be more than doubled, reducing government contributions by \$1.6 billion. The Hill-Burton hospital construction program is to be eliminated, on the grounds that there is now a surplus of hospital beds and the program is therefore no longer needed.

4. Indefinite suspension of housing subsidy programs, which now aid some 2½ million families.

5. Phasing out of 515 local mental health centers.

6. Abolition of the Economic Development Administration, an agency for aiding depressed areas.

7. The ending of all urban renewal programs.

8. Dismantling of most of the existing elementary and secondary school aid programs. It is proposed to replace these with a \$2.5 billion revenue sharing program. However, such a program has yet to be adopted by Congress; moreover, it would simply give money to state governments with no conditions on how it is to be spent.

9. Elimination of "ineligible" welfare recipients, providing a saving of \$600 million.

10. Confinement of expenditures in the field of civil rights mainly to assistance to businessmen, with restriction of outlays for enforcement of civil rights legislation.

Anticipating that there will be battles in Congress to restore these and other cuts, Nixon has announced that he intends to impound any funds which may be appropriated for these purposes and refuse to spend them. He has placed his obedient stooges in key positions to assure the carrying out of his wrecking program. Howard J. Phillips, a former organizer of the ultra-Right Young Americans for Freedom, has been made acting director of OEO and is diligently dismantling it in order to confront Congress with a corpse. Housing, Education and Welfare Secretary Caspar Weinberger is engaged in cutting the heart out of the already grossly inadequate child care and other programs.

Nixon seeks to justify his actions on the grounds that a) these programs are either worthless or have already served their purpose or b) they can be more efficiently handled at the local or state levels. But such explanations only serve to conceal his real motives.

These programs are admittedly weak and inadequate, and in some cases are little more than gestures. What is required, however, is not their abolition but their improvement and expansion. That they exist at all is the result of decades of struggle based on the concept that the government bears a responsibility for the social welfare of the masses of working people. What Nixon is now proposing is not merely the elimination of certain programs but *the*

repudiation of this concept. What he calls for is a return to the economic medievalism of a Herbert Hoover, who preached "self-reliance" to unemployed workers and distributed government funds with a lavish hand to the capitalists.

Nixon's injunction not to depend on government for the solution of problems is likewise addressed only to the workers. He proposes no serious reduction in the largesse received by the giant corporations. On the contrary, these are to benefit from ever larger military expenditures. Moreover, Nixon's tax program calls for no reduction in the tax rebates to them through accelerated depreciation allowances, investment credits, etc. Nor has he the faintest intention of demanding the necessary tax reforms to correct the outrageous class inequities which now exist. True, in his usual demagogic fashion he calls for tax reforms, but the only ones he specifies are tax relief for the elderly and tax credits for payment of tuition to private schools.

Nixon's economic policies are a direct blow against the workers, against the poor and hungry, and especially against the Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican and other oppressed peoples, who are doubly hit by his proposed elimination of social service programs. These policies represent the advancement of state monopoly capitalism in its crassest, most naked, most callous forms.

Finally, we must reject Nixon's strictures against "overheating" the economy. The chief danger the country faces is not that the economy will be plunged into a runaway speculative boom but rather that the shaky "prosperity" which now exists will soon come to an end. This concern is being expressed in top capitalist circles. Thus, the Chase Manhattan Bank, in its circular *Business in Brief* (December 1972), states: "If the experts are correct, the economy will still be growing a year from now. But by then, the expansion will be three years old—approaching old age, as cycles go. . . . Thus, a key economic question next year [1973] is likely to be: How much longer can the expansion continue?" Further, writes the *Wall Street Journal* of February 22: "Recent events have convinced many economists that a sharper-than-expected slowdown is likely late this year or in 1974." These realities Nixon ignores.

The Fight Against Nixonomics

Clearly, the situation calls for all-out opposition to Nixon's economic policies in their entirety.

In particular, the demand must be pressed to scrap wage controls. The continuing shameful collusion of Meany and other top labor leaders in the Phase 3 program must be repudiated. The issue is

not whether the limit on wage increases should be 5% per cent, 7% per cent or 8% per cent. It is not the removal of inequities in the Phase 3 program. It is rather the scrapping of the program altogether. The action of unions like the ILWU ought to be widely emulated. The February 23 issue of its newspaper *The Dispatcher* contains a letter to be clipped, signed and mailed, headed "Dear Congressman—Dump Phase 3!" Essential in this is rejection of Nixon's request for renewal of the Economic Stabilization Act, which expires on April 30. Also important is opposition to all demands for increased productivity.

Equally urgent is the campaign against the Nixon budget cuts, which recently found expression in the mobilization of some tens of thousands of people in Washington. In this connection it is necessary to build a fire under Congress, to demand of every member of that body: "What are you doing to defeat this drive against the people?" It is necessary also to raise the demand for a drastic reduction in military spending, for scrapping the whole cold-war system of U.S. military bases and troops abroad, and for the use of these funds for tax reductions and increased spending for social welfare.

Special consideration must be given to fight against the skyrocketing of food prices. This calls for picketing of supermarkets, with the demand that prices be cut. The big supermarket chains are not merely retailers. They are also processors and wholesalers, and sometimes even farmers. They should not be allowed to escape responsibility for price increases. Campaigns should be mounted for emergency legislation in Congress to roll back food prices. At the same time the demand for cutting military budgets must be raised also on the grounds that these are the main cause of inflation and rising prices.

A massive federal jobs program is needed, especially to provide jobs for unemployed youth and Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican workers. Special programs must be mounted for the reconstruction of the ghettos and barrios, employing the available workers who live in them. Some years ago, such programs were projected by the Communist Party; these should be brought up to date and made the basis of renewed struggles. They must be seen not as incidental but as a central part of the over-all struggles. In addition, the movement for the shorter work week must be greatly stepped up.

The export of jobs must be combatted, but not through "Buy American" campaigns which pit U.S. workers against those of other countries to the advantage of the international monopolies. What is required is the advancement of international solidarity, of united struggles against the common exploiters. What is required is a

fight to raise the living standards of workers in developing countries through a policy of severely restricting U.S. private investment abroad and replacing this with genuine aid toward industrialization through long-term loans at little or no interest and with no strings attached. The opening up of full-scale trade with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is also of great importance as a source of jobs.

Vital to the success of all these struggles is the building of working-class unity, which requires in the first place a vastly sharpened fight against racism. The splitting of the working class through the escalation of racism and the stepping up of racial discrimination is an essential ingredient of Nixon's policies. These policies cannot be defeated without combatting racist ideology and launching struggles against discrimination in all its forms. It is particularly necessary to press the fight for compensatory hiring and upgrading to overcome the effects of discrimination, which Nixon rejects on the spurious grounds of being opposed to quota systems.

Nixon's offensive against the working class has an especially severe impact on women. It wipes out the meager services available to working women. In freezing wages it freezes the gross inequities in pay suffered by women. And it is the housewives who mainly feel the brunt of trying to make ends meet in the face of skyrocketing prices. Hence the fight for women's rights takes on growing urgency in relation to the over-all economic struggles of the working class.

It is the responsibility of Communists to take the initiative in all aspects of these struggles and to carry them into the 1973 elections. They must be made the basis of the struggle for political independence, for the building of a mass people's party which will oppose a Nixon not with another spokesman of monopoly capital, but with a spokesman of the people against the monopolies. And we must never lose sight of the goal of socialism, which provides the only real solution of the economic problems arising from the class exploitation and national oppression that are the hallmarks of the capitalist system.

Neo-Keynesian Doctrine: Essence and Contradiction*

Western ideologists frequently describe the contribution made by John Maynard Keynes to economic science as the "Keynesian revolution," which "shook the foundations" of modern bourgeois economy. What Keynes wrote in the 1930s under the impact of the deepest economic crisis in the history of capitalism has long since become a part of the record of economic thought. One no longer hears heated debates between enthusiastic admirers of Keynes, who were wont to exaggerate the originality of his ideas, and his rabid opponents, who held that where Keynes was right he was not original, and where he was original he was not right. What is more, Keynes's followers themselves had criticised virtually every paragraph of his works.

Nevertheless, Keynes's theory continues to attract attention. Neo-Keynesianism, which has developed on the basis of the principal tenets of his theory, has become a major trend in bourgeois political economy, especially where it attempts to clarify the most general national-economic interconnections, and the mechanism of the functioning of the economy as a whole (the macro-economic area). Keynesianism has not been ousted by a peculiar revival, since the end of the 1950s, of neo-classical theories, which had been prevalent before Keynes, and whose spread had been promoted by the failure or ineffectiveness of various Keynesian recipes for economic regulation. Besides, Keynesianism is something like the principal component of the so-called neo-classical synthesis, which is characteristic of the present stage of the development of bourgeois political economy.

Keynes and Modern Bourgeois Political Economy

Keynes's theoretical views, which have had a decisive influence on bourgeois political economy, were set forth in his work entitled *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, which was published in 1936. Its success was promoted by two circumstances: the historical conditions, which turned Keynes into a "hero of his

* Reprinted from "Critique of Anti-Marxist Theories," *Problems of the Contemporary World*, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow, No. 1, 1972. Slightly abridged.

day," and, largely, his own personality.

Among the ideas one felt in the air as an imperative in the 1930s was the need for state intervention in the process of production, the need for fresh points of departure in analyzing the economic mechanism, whose imperfection was so patently revealed in the tragic forms of the 1929-1933 crisis, and finally the need to find new methodological principles of research. After all, in the 1930s, almost every advanced capitalist country was forced to probe blindly for ways of stimulating the sputtering economic machine.

The academic theory then dominant in economic science was out of touch with these problems and so could not offer either any methods of analysis or new forms of apology for capitalism. What were the main concerns of this academic theory? Price-formation on the various commodity markets; optimal use (allocation) of resources to maximize profits within the framework of individual enterprise; the structure of consumer demands—all this, as a rule, with an assumption of perfect competition—that was the compass of problems which constituted the essence of bourgeois science and which served as a basis for an apology of free-enterprise capitalism. Consequently, there was a wide gap between economic reality, which had long since lost its atmosphere of free competition, and theory, with its assumption of such competition.

Keynes's role in bourgeois economic thinking consisted in the fact that, himself a product of the academic school (he was said to be A. Marshall's best disciple), he criticized a number of its fundamental tenets and made economic theory face problems which were of vital importance for state-monopoly capitalism. It should also be borne in mind that his own personality helped him to fulfil his mission. A graduate and then a professor of Cambridge University, he was also a highly astute businessman, and in the inter-war period and during the Second World War held prominent government posts and actively influenced the government's economic policy. The American historian of economic thought, Ben B. Seligman wrote: "He was at the same time a successful banker, mathematician, college bursar, don, writer of fascinating polemical pamphlets and profound essays on probability, and patron of the arts."^o

In contrast to many of his colleagues, who urged a political neutrality for economic theory, Keynes was an avowed adherent of the capitalist mode of production and made no secret of his hostility to Marxism.

Keynes's main contribution to bourgeois political economy can be

^o Ben B. Seligman, *Main Currents in Modern Economics*, New York, 1962, p. 731.

summed up as follows:

1. He showed the special importance of analyzing general national-economic processes and, in effect, introduced into modern bourgeois political economy a method for such analysis in the form of a new and highly important department, known as "macroeconomics." Without this method it would be impossible to substantiate the state-monopoly regulation of the capitalist economy.

Many bourgeois economists have remarked on the role of Keynes's analytical method in adapting economic theory to the needs of state-monopoly regulation. Gardner Ackley, for instance, writes: "Yet with all its acknowledged deficiencies, the Keynesian analysis still stands as the most hopeful point of departure in macroeconomic theory. Itself incomplete and imperfect, it remains the foundation of the great majority of the significant theoretical works in macroeconomics of the past two decades. It has also long provided the basic framework for most governmental analyses of economic conditions and forecasts, and, increasingly, of the analyses and forecasts made by private groups and firms."^o

Macroeconomic theory deals with an analysis of aggregate national-economic magnitudes which determine the structure and dynamics of social reproduction (national income, savings, investments, consumption, etc.). The regularities in the national economy as a whole differ from those in its economic units. That is why the advance of state-monopoly regulation was bound to produce analyses of interaction and interconnection between the aggregate national-economic magnitudes.

A characteristic feature of macroeconomic theory is that the subject of its analysis is largely made up of technico-economic, quantitative aspects of the process of production. As a rule, the socio-economic prerequisites, the internal regularities of development, which are determined by the nature of property and which, for their part, ultimately have a crucial influence on economic processes within the given economic system, are left outside the framework of this theory. This naturally makes it possible to use the theory to back up various apologetic conclusions while enabling bourgeois economists to analyze the technico-economic interrelations which are of definite practical importance in the regulation of capitalist production.

2. Keynes drew the economists' attention to the problem of shaping "effective demand" as a condition for the realization of the product and the movement of social production as a whole. Keynes criticized "Say's Law" which had been predominant since the mid-19th cen-

^o Gardner Ackley, *Macroeconomic Theory*, New York, 1961, p. 428.

tury, and which said that production itself generated demand. He showed that for capitalism, especially technologically mature capitalism, the shaping of demand and the realization of the product was of crucial importance.

3. Keynes's theory of the national income has had a great influence on bourgeois political economy. According to his theory, the dynamics of the national income is determined by the movement of spending for consumption and assimilation. The multiplier concept, which is closely allied with this theory, and which characterizes the relation between national income growth and the growth of spending has been generally adopted as an instrument in the modelling of capitalist reproduction.

4. Keynes's theory for the first time recognized that unemployment may result not from an excessively high level of wages, as had been held up to then, but from the general conditions of reproduction characterized by an inadequate level of "effective demand."

These theoretical propositions constituted the foundation for the formulation of a Keynesian policy of regulation aimed, in the first place, at sustaining "effective demand," or in other words, at regulating the conditions of realisation. That is why it has become the basis of a so called anti-cyclic policy which is designed to damp down the short-term fluctuations in the economy.

Keynesian theory was in a sense an expression of the specific features of reproduction under monopoly capitalism in general and in the period of the "great depression" in particular. It recognizes the fact that the domination of monopolies in the economy has for all practical purposes done away with the flexibility and mobility of prices. But it also takes account of the unprecedented growth in the strength and organization of the working class, which is now capable of fighting any reduction in wages. From these real starting points it follows that prices have ceased to be the ideal mechanism which establishes and automatically restores the equilibrium between the demand and supply of resources, between their production and consumption. Therein lies one of the crucial distinctions between the Keynesian system of "macroeconomic equilibrium" and the neo-classic system.

Once he became aware of the essential specifics and contradictions in the development of monopoly capital Keynes reached the conclusion that the state was bound to play a growing part as regulator of effective demand, with emphasis on measures capable of compensating any shortfall.

Keynes's theory quite obviously expressed his class limitations. He reduced the real contradictions of capitalist production to natural

and psychological laws. Thus, he defined as the "basic psychological law of society" the share of consumption in the national income, which crucially depends on the class structure, on the relation between profits and wages and on the absolute level of wages. He insisted that this law explained the fact that as income rose people were inclined to consume less and to save more. All of which generated a tendency for the share of consumption to decline. The "law" of diminishing returns allegedly explains the decline in the rate of profits, whose fluctuations are said to depend on the mood of businessmen. Keynes also explains many economic indicators by means of psychological "inclinations." Consequently, his theory obscures the real socio-economic laws of capitalism, while serving as the ground for the spreading of illusions about the possibility of overcoming its contradictions with the aid of the state.

Keynes' theory also bore the mark of the specific conditions of the 1930s. One need merely recall his negative attitude to savings as a source of investment, and his denial of the internal incentives to investment.

These aspects of Keynesianism were subsequently revised and criticized both by his followers and by his opponents.

Neo-Keynesianism and the Theory of Growth

Keynes made the first step in the development of the bourgeois theory of economic growth, which is why when dealing with neo-Keynesianism as a further elaboration of Keynes's theory the first thing to be considered is the neo-Keynesian conception of economic growth.

There were several reasons why the development of Keynesian theory ran along this line. It was becoming increasingly obvious that state intervention in reproduction at every phase of the cycle was an inevitable condition for the growth of the capitalist economy. Accordingly, ever greater practical importance attached to the theoretical analysis of growth. Besides, the long-term rate of economic growth, its level and definitive factors became a highly pressing problem in view of the build-up of effort in the competition between the two systems, and the growing unevenness of capitalist economic and political development.

As a result, two approaches to analysis crystallized within the theory of economic growth: analysis of the problem of dynamic equilibrium, of keeping the system in balance, and also of the causes behind its instability, and analysis of the factors of interrelationship determining potential rates of economic growth.

Among the well-known bourgeois economists who had developed

Keynes's theory of economic growth are R. Harrod, E. Domar, A. H. Hansen and J. Robinson.* Their concepts were basically formulated in the prewar period, but their works in the sphere of economic growth were recognized in the postwar period, especially in the early and mid-1950s.

The neo-Keynesian theory of growth arose on the basis of a critical reformulation of Keynes's ideas, with the criticism being directed above all at the static character of his theory. It subsequently led to the use of dynamic elements, which made it possible to go on to an analysis of the conditions of equilibrium and disequilibrium in a developing economic system.

The main and essential link between Keynes's theory and neo-Keynesian conceptions of growth is the idea that a spontaneously developing capitalist economy is not an ideal self-regulating system. Its feed-back mechanism does not ensure complete or the most rational use of material and human resources or uninterrupted economic growth. This conclusion, drawn by Keynes on the strength of his analysis of the factors which determine the magnitude of effective demand in static conditions, became the keynote of neo-Keynesian theories.

The denial that capitalism has a capacity spontaneously to ensure the fullest use of economic resources is the watershed between the Keynesian economists and the neo-classicists, the modern advocates of the "free enterprise" economy. The latter believe that the price and profit mechanism is adequate to the regulation of the capitalist economy, and that the task of the state is merely to safeguard this mechanism from disruption by trade-unions, monopolies and the state itself.

The central problem of the neo-Keynesian concept of growth is that of dynamic equilibrium, that is, the conditions which determine stable growth on the basis of full employment of production and human resources. In this, broad use is made of the Keynesian idea that the problem of realization is of crucial importance for the development of modern capitalism. If the movement of demand helps the full use of the available potentialities of production, the economy will be in a state of dynamic equilibrium. Any deviations from this generate long or short-term difficulties in the development of production. . . .

* See R. Harrod, *Towards a Dynamic Economics*, London, 1948; R. Harrod, *Economic Essays*, London, 1952; W. Fellner, *Trends and Cycles in Economic Activity*, New York, 1956; D. Hamberg, *Economic Growth and Instability*, New York, 1956; E. Domar, *Essays in the Theory of Economic Growth*, New York, 1957; J. Robinson, *The Accumulation of Capital*, London, 1956.

The instability of economic development, of deviations from the line of dynamic equilibrium, which takes the form of cyclical fluctuations on either side of this line, that is, the problem of crises, is central to the neo-Keynesian theory of economic growth.

It must be said that the problem of crises arose in bourgeois political economy long before Keynes, but it was something of an illegitimate child because it was nowhere rooted in the theories propounded by bourgeois researchers. Thus, most economists before Keynes started from a more or less flexible form of "Say's Law," assuming that any disruption of the equilibrium between supply and demand in the capitalist economy can be no more than accidental or temporary. Under free competition and in the absence of state intervention the price mechanism was supposed constantly to work to restore equilibrium.

The pre-Keynesian theory of crises developed mainly as a theory of external shocks to which the economy responded with general short-term fluctuations. These external shocks were seen as coming from the credit-monetary system, the mentality of businessmen, the specific features of technical progress (Schumpeter's innovation explosions), and so on. These theories as a rule described the specific and derivative causes of crises, never going to the tap-root contradictions of capitalist growth. A step forward in the analysis of the cycle mechanism was made by the economists who drew attention to the techno-economic features of the accumulation of capital as the material basis of the cycle, namely Wicksell, Tugan-Baranovsky and Spithof.

Keynes paved the way for the formulation of a concept of economic cycles and crises which was to become a component part of the general theory of the functioning and growth of the capitalist economy as a whole, and to explain the instability of its growth as a process generated by its built-in mechanism. Of course, even this theory—in virtue of the starting methodological principles of analysis—cannot expose the internal laws of the capitalist economy which generate the cycle as a form of its movement.*

In his *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, Keynes does not consider the problem of cycle as such, but merely expresses his views on the causes of crises, which he saw as lying in a re-

* Many bourgeois economists now admit that it was Marx who first made a comprehensive analysis of the cycle as the form of movement of capitalist production. The American economist H. Sherman, wrote: "Among the rebels, Karl Marx had long before described the business cycle as an inherent part of capitalist growth, had attacked Say's Law, and had foreshadowed elements of every theory that was later to be popular. . . ." (H. Sherman, *Macrodynamics: Growth, Employment and Prices*, New York, 1964, p. 61).

duction in the expected rate of profit ("marginal effectiveness of investments"), in view of the diminishing returns on investments. For its part, this process is caused by an inflation in the mass of functioning capital, whose consequences are now and then compounded by sudden panic, pessimism, loss of trust, etc. In other words, according to Keynes, crises are caused by the tendency of the rate of profit to decline, a tendency intensified by psychological circumstances.

How have the neo-Keynesian theorists of economic growth advanced this view?

First, they shifted the accent on the problem of crises as such to the broader problem of the cycle in general. This was connected with their recognition of the fact that instability in the capitalist economy was inevitable and that a danger to capitalism was presented not only by crises, but also by long "booms," that is, an overheating of the economy going hand in hand with inflationary tendencies which paved the way for crises. Second, they tried to tie in the concept of cycle with the theory of long-term deviation trends in the development of the capitalist economy which determined the duration and depth of the separate phases of the cycle in different historical conditions. Third, they tried to discover the causes for the instability and cyclical fluctuations in the specific features of the mechanism of the reproductive relations themselves and not in any external disruptions of the economic system or in any price changes. The key problem for neo-Keynesian theorists is the change in effective demand which determines the movement of actual production and its departures from potential levels. They also attach special importance to the so-called switches in the economic system which determines the "turning points" generating either a recession or, on the contrary, excessive growth. Fourth, they formulated a government anti-cyclical policy aimed to damp down cyclical fluctuations. Its character has to change depending on the phase of the cycle.

The Keynesian concept of cycle describes many qualitative inter-relationships which arise in the process of reproduction, and whose analysis helps to understand the mechanism behind the cycle. There is, for instance, their description of the operation of the "multiplier-accelerator" system reflecting the interdependence of savings and consumption.* This interdependence is expressed in the following

* The multiplier shows the connection between the growth of investments and the subsequent growth of the national income; the accelerator shows the connection between the growth of the national income and the subsequent growth of investments.

scheme: growth of investments → growth of national income → growth of consumption → growth of investments, etc. The behavior of the consumer or the consumer function is an important aspect in the description of this process. It is assumed that the growth of consumption tends gradually to slow down. This also means a gradual slowdown in the growth of investments and, consequently, of the national income, so that the multiplier-accelerator effect caused by initial investment tends to disappear.

The limitations of the Keynesian concepts of cycle appear to lie not so much in the kind of relationships they bring out as in the way their nature and causes are explained. The process described above at once suggests this question: Why does consumption not grow at a steady rate together with the growth of the national income? That is the very answer the Keynesians fail to produce, since it requires an analysis of the internal laws of capitalist production.

Replying virtually to the same question, Marx showed that the tendency for consumption to slow down as compared with the potentialities of production was rooted in the laws of the capitalist mode of production, in the narrow framework placed on consumption by the value of the labor power. State-monopoly capitalism, on the one hand, and the workers' class struggle, on the other, leave their mark on the operation of this law, substantially modifying the relationship between the growth of production and of consumption. But the Keynesians make no social analysis at all. Having described the mechanism behind the connection between the growth of consumption (or national income) and the growth of productive investments (the principle of "production demand"), the Keynesian theorists tend to ignore the fact that under capitalism this connection is not a direct one, but one which is mediated by the contradictions between production and consumption. There can be no smooth decline in productive investments because this connection is revealed spontaneously and forcibly, as an overaccumulation of capital, as excessive production, that is, ultimately in the form of a crisis. That is why there is no smooth transition but a break and a decline in production. It is true that state-monopoly capitalism introduces its own correctives into this process as well. Seeking to control this law, the governments of the capitalist countries seek to coordinate the expansion of production facilities with the growth of consumption. But experience has shown that this kind of policy cannot entirely rid capitalism of crises. Restrictionist policies frequently merely serve to whip up latent crisis processes and help further to advance them.

The cause of crises is rooted in the fundamental contradiction of

capitalism, which is expressed as a conflict between production and consumption, as the anarchy of social production, as a discrepancy between the conditions in which surplus value is created and the conditions in which it is realized. However, these contradictions are not in any way reflected in the neo-Keynesian theories of economic cycle.

Neo-Keynesianism and Contradictions of State Regulation

Neo-Keynesianism has laid the groundwork for a theoretical substantiation of state-monopoly regulation of the process in capitalist reproduction and serves as a basis for present-day anti-cyclical policies. The latter boils down to a regulation of demand through a manipulation of government spending, especially military outlays, adjustment of tax rates, and the relevant credit and monetary measures.

Even in their long-term analysis of the mechanism of economic growth the Keynesians stress the importance of demand as the main condition for realizing the potentialities of the capitalist economy. The late 1950s and the 1960s were marked in bourgeois political economy by a sharp increase in the criticisms of Keynesianism, and a curious "revival" and "renewal" of neo-classical ideas. The latter was expressed in two main forms: first, in the emergence and development of a "neo-classical" theory of growth (G. Mead and R. Solow), and second, in a growing popularity of so called "monetarism" (Milton Friedman) which for all practical purposes rejects every form of government intervention in the economy.*

The reasons were several. Keynesian theory, concentrating on instability and the factors constituting demand, proved to be unfit for analyzing the causes of potential economic growth under intensive economic development. Investments were the mainspring of economic growth in the Keynesian range of recipes. However, the assessments made on the basis of production functions showed that in the new conditions decisive importance in growth attached to outlays on science, education, and the improvement of management and organization of production, in short, all that helps to enhance its effectiveness and that is expressed by the idea of "technological change" or "technical progress." It is in this context of the criticism of Keynesianism that the "neo-classical" theory of growth has been most widespread. It has become the main source for the recommendations underlying policies for long-term economic growth and

* See I. Osadchaya, "The Neo-Classical Theory of Growth in Modern Bourgeois Political Economy," *World Economy and International Relations*, No. 3, 1967; V. Usoskin, "Monetarism in the USA: Sources Essence, Impact on Economic Policies," *ibid.*, No. 5, 1971.

for an increase in growth rates.

Another line of criticism sprang from a complex of causes connected with the growing functions of the state in general, and with the negative consequences which have gone hand in hand with it. This criticism to some extent expresses the protest of the ideologists of monopoly capital against growing government intervention in the economy, which by its very logic clashes with the immediate interests of the monopolies. An expansion of the economic positions of the state helps to ensure the general conditions for the development of capitalism, but this intervention also creates something like the prerequisites for a rejection of private capitalist economic operations and in some conditions may allow the democratic forces to use the government apparatus against the interests of the monopolies.

The discontent with Keynesianism was intensified by the obvious fact the government intervention, while it has proved capable of easing some of the "traditional" difficulties of development, has simultaneously generated a host of new ones. There is the growing bureaucratization of the government machine, its growing inefficiency, and, of course, the dangerous development of inflationary tendencies when inflation and recession cease to be mutually incompatible. That is the situation characterizing, for instance, the U.S. economy in the second half of the 1960s.

In these conditions, the contradictory and ineffective nature of Keynesian recipes, which leave the roots of inflationary processes intact, was brought out with especial force. The neo-Keynesian policy of regulating demand results in a situation in which the boosting of outlays and the stimulation of demand at a time of recession enlarge the breathing ground for inflationary processes. At the same time, the attempts to contain the inflationary price spiral by restricting spending at the boom stage has failed, as practice has shown, to eliminate the causes of inflation, which is now connected with the monopoly structure of capitalism itself, and expresses its deep-rooted contradictions. On the other hand, these efforts may well intensify the crisis tendencies coming to a head in the economy in boom time. All this explains the growing criticism of neo-Keynesian theory and the policy of regulation, and also the spread of "monetarism" in the second half of the 1960s. The installation in office of the Republican Nixon Administration has made it possible for these ideas to be applied in practice.

However, modern capitalism is no longer capable of developing without the aid of the state. When the crunch comes, the politicians are forced once again to fall back on neo-Keynesianism, which for all the contradictory character of its recipes, remains for the time

being the main source of policies against recessions and depression. In this context, the following fact does not appear to be so surprising after all. In early 1971, faced with a grave economic crisis, the Nixon Administration, which had up to then pursued a policy of keeping the economy in check through rigid neo-classical recipes, adopted the Keynesian policy of increasing government spending, with Nixon himself announcing his conversion to Keynesianism.

Thus, the theory and practice of neo-Keynesianism are to some extent an expression of the deep-rooted contradictions of capitalist reproduction, so that ultimately everything boils down to tacking between the Scylla of inflation and the Charybdis of recession, with preference invariably going to the former in face of the threat of grave crisis upheavals.

Neo-Keynesian Niche in Bourgeois Political Economy

Bourgeois political economy and Marxist economic science have always developed as antipodes, but like the latter, the former had to explain the involved complex of socio-economic and technico-economic relations which constitute the substance of the given system and determine the regularities of its development.

Have the bourgeois economists managed to produce a theory in contrast to Marxism which, for all its internal defects, constitutes a more or less comprehensive system ranging over the main aspects of the capitalist economy and giving an idea of the mechanism of its functioning and the tendencies of its development? Has Keynesianism helped to solve its problems considering that Keynes and his followers claimed to have created a "general" theory of capitalism and investment boom, thereby averting spontaneous overproduction, and a "new" political economy? The answer is "no" to both questions.

Most present-day bourgeois economists tend to tackle a very narrow range of problems, mainly technico-economic, quantitative interrelations. It is true that compared with "neo-classicists" and their "microeconomic" method and "microeconomic" problems, the Keynesians have sought to reform bourgeois political economy in such a way as to have it face the pressing economic problems of state-monopoly capitalism as a whole. They have produced a "macro-economic" theory, and have suggested the lines and means for the state regulation of the processes of reproduction. However, even this theory has failed to go beyond the limits of quantitative interrelations in the economy. What is more, neo-Keynesianism has many vulnerable points because of the excessively general nature of its theoretic models and failure to take account of various factors, in particular monetary and price factors.

However, the basic defects of Keynesian theory lie in the fact it tends to ignore or take for granted the whole complex of socio-economic relations and institutions within the modern capitalist system. For that reason it has failed to show the sources of the contradictions whose outward forms it has itself been forced to recognize. However this attitude is a convenient starting point for an apology of capitalism and for spreading illusions that state regulation can help to solve all its internal problems.

In this light, it is quite futile for some Western theorists to draw a parallel between Keynes's theory or neo-Keynesian theories of growth, on the one hand, and Marx's theory of reproduction on the other.* The latter deals above all with an analysis of the socio-economic laws and historical tendencies in the development of the capitalist mode of production, and its main content is an analysis of the specific laws governing the growth of the productive forces under capitalism which tend to sharpen its socio-economic contradictions and prepare the objective and subjective prerequisites for its destruction.

To show the essence of capitalist exploitation and to analyze the internal contradictions of capitalism, Marx analyzed some of the most important technico-economic regularities of reproduction, like the structural proportions in the national economy, value and natural proportions, their interrelation, and also the factors behind their change. However, technico-economic aspects are merely a part of the whole which is Marx's theory of capitalist development.

Emphasizing this fundamental distinction between Marxism and the "orthodox" bourgeois theory, the U.S. sociologist D. Horowitz wrote: "The fact remains that to base an analysis of capitalism and capitalist development on the fundamental institutional (class) relations of capitalist production, and to lay bare its glaring irrationalities in the Marxian manner, is to call into question the very existence of the social system, and to pose, albeit even implicitly, a 'Marxist' socialist alternative."**

Bourgeois economists seek to compensate the flaws in Keynesian explanation of the functioning and regulation of capitalist reproduction through a "synthesis" of Keynesianism and the neo-classical theory ("neo-classical synthesis"). This is essentially an attempt to

* The U.S. economist K. Kurihara wrote, for instance, that "The Marxian theory of capitalist development anticipates many modern long-run growth theories, namely, the stagnation theories of Keynes and Hansen, the dynamic theories of Harrod and Domar, and 'cyclical growth' theories of Schumpeter, Kalecki, Kaldor, and Goodwin, and Mrs. Joan Robinson's theory of structural underemployment." (David Horowitz, ed., *Marx and Modern Economics*, London, 1968, p. 12).

create a more general conception of state-monopoly capitalism as a system of the interaction of state regulation and the market mechanism. However, even the "neo-classical synthesis" cannot fill the gap in the analysis of the socio-economic nature of capitalism. The theories constituting the "neo-classical synthesis" do not help to make a fresh approach to the study of present-day inflation, the problem of growth in the light of its aggregate social consequences for society, and the problem of sharpening class conflicts. No wonder there is growing dissatisfaction among bourgeois economists themselves over the instrument box for operational analysis into which bourgeois political economy has been turned. One hears calls for a "new Keynes," a return to institutionalism, etc.

The development of bourgeois economic thinking since Keynes has clearly shown that these problems can be truly solved only in the light of Marxist-Leninist political economy, provided there is recognition that the internal contradictions of the capitalist system are insoluble, that it is historically transient, and that the general crisis of capitalism is steadily gaining in gravity.

** *Ibid.*, p. 17.

(Continued from p. 57)

of an oligarchy determined to resist its demise by any means including the employment of force and violence against the Republic.

Successful resistance to the oligarchy's counterrevolution made possible the achievement of the second revolution in our history. Not least in the content of that resistance was the activity of the Black people in the South and the growing disillusionment with and opposition to the Confederacy on the part of most white people in the South. Both would have been expected by any one who understood the realities of the slaveocratic south; it is those realities and their fruition during the Civil War which are still largely omitted or denied in dominant history-writing. The omission and the denial—the perversions of history—have served and now serve as props to the racism that corrodes life in the United States.

With the Confederacy's collapse, Edmund Ruffin wrapped his head in the stars and bars and blew out his brains. But he left this diary and it serves as a damning witness of the values, activities and purposes of his class.

February 10, 1973

Arena of Class Struggle: The United Nations*

Actions Against Colonialism and Apartheid

Next to its preoccupation with questions of peace and international security, the 27th General Assembly gave most attention to *problems of decolonization, racism and apartheid*. It debated and adopted resolutions worked out by its Special Political Committee, Decolonization Committee and the Unit on Apartheid, Social Committee and the Committee on Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. These committees were aided in their work by delegations of the World Peace Council headed by its secretary-general, Romesh Chandra and, despite opposition from the United States, Portugal, South Africa and other imperialist states, by representatives of the African peoples' liberation movements in the capacity of observers. These included Amilcar Cabral, Secretary-General of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, who later was murdered on Conakry, Guinea, on January 20, 1973, allegedly by Portuguese gunmen; Marcelino Dos Santos, Vice-President of the Mozambique Liberation Front; Jane Ngwenya of the Zimbabwe African People's Union; and Richard Hove of the Zimbabwe African National Union. Two petitioners, Barbara J. Rogers of the Friends of Namibia Committee, London, and the Reverend G. Michael Scott of the International League for the Rights of Man, were heard in the Trust Committee on the question of Namibia.

During the debates on decolonization, the Assembly was told that since the adoption in 1960 of the Declaration on Decolonization on the initiative of the Soviet Union, about 30 territories and 60 million people had been liberated from colonialism, but that more than 40 territories and 34 million people remained under colonial domination. Of these, 18 million are suffering increasing oppression in Namibia, Zimbabwe and the territories under Portuguese domination. On November 2 the General Assembly ended the debate and adopted four resolutions.

The main resolution reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggles of colonial peoples and of peoples under foreign domination to exercise their right to self-determination by all necessary means.

* This is the concluding part of an article begun in the *March Political Affairs*.

It was adopted by 99 votes to 5 with 23 abstentions. The United States joined Portugal, South Africa, France and the United Kingdom in negative votes. The continuance of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations was declared incompatible with the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration of Decolonization, and a threat to peace and international security. It called on all states, specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies to provide material and moral aid to peoples struggling for their freedom and independence.

A second resolution called for the "widest possible dissemination of information on the evils and dangers of colonialism," and urged the Secretary-General to maintain a close working relationship with the Organization of African Unity. It was adopted by 113 to 2 (Portugal and South Africa) with 12 abstentions.

A third resolution, asking the Secretary-General to organize an international conference of experts to support the victims of apartheid and colonialism in southern Africa in cooperation with the OAU, was adopted by 118 votes to 2 (Portugal, South Africa) with 7 abstentions. The conference is to be held in Oslo, Norway, April 9-14, 1973.

The fourth resolution, adopted by 91 to 2 (Portugal, South Africa) with 30 abstentions, authorized the General Assembly to appeal to all governments and peoples to hold an annual "Week of Solidarity with the Colonial Peoples of southern Africa and Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde," and proposed that the week should begin May 25, 1973, African Liberation Day. Meetings and dissemination of information are suggested to begin on that day.

On November 14 the Assembly decided by 98 votes to 6 with 8 abstentions that national liberation movements in Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Mozambique are the "authentic representatives" of the aspirations of the people of those territories, and deemed it imperative that Portugal enter into negotiations with these representatives. The United States joined Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom, Brazil and Spain in opposing this action.

On the question of Rhodesia, strong denunciation of the United States violation of sanctions it had voted for as a permanent member of the Security Council was expressed by many delegations. In a vote of 93 to 8 with 23 abstentions, the General Assembly emphasized the urgent need to widen the scope of sanctions so as to include Portugal and South Africa. The resolution condemned the import of chrome and nickel from Rhodesia by the United States. Opposing votes were cast by the United States, Portugal, South Africa, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

By 111 votes to 4 with 9 abstentions, the Assembly urged the United Kingdom to convene as soon as possible a constitutional conference in Rhodesia, "where the genuine political representatives of the people of Zimbabwe would be able to work out a settlement relating to the future of the territory." Opposing votes were cast by the United States, Portugal, South Africa and the United Kingdom.

On the over-all question of Namibia, the Assembly—by 112 to 2 (Portugal, South Africa) with 15 abstentions (United States and other NATO countries)—condemned South Africa for its continued refusal to terminate its illegal occupation of the territory and for its continued efforts to destroy the unity of the people and the territorial integrity of Namibia. Further, it called on all states to refrain from all direct or indirect relations, economic or otherwise, with South Africa where it purported to represent Namibia.

Another large majority of the General Assembly reaffirmed "that the activities of foreign economic, financial and other interests operating at present in the colonial territories of Southern Rhodesia and Namibia, as well as in those of Portuguese domination, constitute a major obstacle to political independence and to the enjoyment of the natural resources of those territories by the indigenous inhabitants," condemned "the policies of colonial powers and other states which continue to support those foreign economic and other interests," called on governments concerned to take "all the necessary measures" to terminate the participation of their nationals and corporate bodies in the construction of the Cabora Bassa project in Mozambique and the Cunene River Basin project in Angola, "which are designed further to entrench colonialist and racialist domination over the territories in Africa and are a source of international tension," called on the administering powers "to abolish every discriminatory and unjust wage system . . . and to apply in each territory a uniform system of wages to all the inhabitants without discrimination."

This important resolution, sponsored by 22 states, followed earlier action by the 27-state Economic and Social Council in July 1972 at Geneva. At the third United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in Santiago, Chile, in April, and at the International Labor Conference at Geneva in June, Chile proposed the United Nations study the impact of multi-national corporations on development and international relations. The Economic and Social Council resolution called on the Secretary-General to appoint a group of from 14 to 20 eminent specialists in international relations and economic problems, representing different geographic areas, to undertake such a study, to submit a progress report in 1973 and to complete the study for the 1974 summer session of the Council.

In a resolution adopted December 12 by a vote of 89 to 8 with 18 abstentions, the General Assembly strongly condemned those NATO states and other powers which assisted Portugal and other racist regimes in refusing to implement the 15th General Assembly resolution on decolonization. The United States joined Portugal, the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, France, Israel and Nicaragua in opposing this Assembly decision. During the debate on this resolution, in which the Assembly decided to study ways and means of supporting the peoples of liberated areas, of colonial territories and territories under foreign subjugation, the question of United States colonialism in Puerto Rico was raised. Earlier, the decolonization committee had decided to investigate the U.S.-Puerto Rican relationship.

On a number of questions, actions of the General Assembly duplicated and strengthened decisions on the same questions by the Security Council. The Council's position was thereby upheld by the majority of UN member-states.

On *questions of racism and apartheid*, the 27th General Assembly adopted 10 resolutions strengthening and extending earlier United Nations efforts to eradicate these sources of international tension and threats to peace. These earlier measures date back to 1946 and originate in the Charter provisions on the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms "without regard to race, sex, language or religion." In 1963 the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, reaffirming the dignity and equality of all human beings, as proclaimed in the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In 1966, in commemoration of the 69 Africans killed and 180 wounded, many of them women and children, at Sharpeville, South Africa, in 1960, where they were peacefully demonstrating against the racist pass-laws, the General Assembly established March 21, the date of the massacre, as an annual International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. On January 4, 1969, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination entered into force, with states party to it undertaking to prohibit and eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction to race, color, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law in the enjoyment of civil, economic, social and cultural rights. The United States, Portugal, South Africa and Israel have neither acceded to nor ratified this Convention. At its 24th session the General Assembly in 1969 designated 1971 as the International Year to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

The 27th General Assembly, acting in the spirit of these and other earlier measures, decided unanimously to proclaim a Decade for

Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, beginning on December 10, 1973, the 25th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The principal resolution of the session in this sphere, adopted by 100 to 4 with 21 abstentions, condemned the South African racist minority government for its "inhuman policy" of apartheid, which it is "continuing and intensifying" while condemning the opponents of apartheid to "ruthless repression." It reaffirmed its belief that economic and other sanctions are one of the essential means of achieving a peaceful solution of the situation in South Africa. It condemned the "continuing and increasing" cooperation of certain states with South Africa in the military, economic and political fields. The United States joined South Africa, Portugal and the United Kingdom in voting against this resolution. A majority of Western capitalist states abstained.

Another resolution protesting the maltreatment and torture of prisoners and detainees in South Africa and demanding cessation of these practices was adopted by 121 votes to 1 (South Africa) with 1 abstention (Portugal).

A third resolution, adopted by 103 to 1 with 21 abstentions, urged the Commission on Human Rights to consider at its next session, as an item of priority, the Draft Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. This draft was sponsored by the Soviet Union and Guinea, joined later by Nigeria.

In a resolution adopted by 65 votes to 40 with 21 abstentions, the Assembly refused to approve the credentials of the South African delegation to the 27th session. A similar resolution was adopted in 1971 by a vote of 60 to 36 with 22 abstentions. These votes, short of a Security Council recommendation to the Assembly to expel South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, constituted censure by majorities of the international community and a growing disposition to take more stringent measures against the apartheid regime.

An international conference of trade unions on action against apartheid, to convene at Geneva in 1973, was sanctioned by 102 votes to 2 with 6 abstentions. The Assembly authorized the Special Committee on Apartheid to participate, and appealed again to all national and international trade union organizations to intensify their actions against apartheid. Portugal and South Africa voted against this resolution, and the United States abstained.

In another resolution, the Assembly appealed for funds for the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, decided to increase the dissemination of information on apartheid, and, by a vote of 123 to

none with 1 abstention, expressed concern over the *de facto* discrimination against foreign workers in certain countries of Western Europe and other continents.

In sum, by their actions against racism, racial discrimination and apartheid, as by their actions on questions of peace and international security, large majorities of the 27th General Assembly exhibited strong anti-imperialist views and increasing intolerance of international outlawry and contempt for human rights. These attitudes were noticeable also in respect to several other questions on the agenda.

Other UN Accomplishments

Significant actions of the 27th General Assembly on various other questions dealt more setbacks to the imperialist bloc and their client states. These included actions on terrorism, Charter revision, the environment, and television broadcasts. The imperialists headed by the United States secured a \$13 million reduction of the United States annual assessment for the United Nations budget, and a postponement to the 28th session of Korean questions.

The item on terrorism was inscribed in the agenda on the initiative of the Secretary-General, following the murder of Israeli athletes at the Olympic Games at Munich. The imperialist bloc, led by the United States and Israel and supported by Portugal and South Africa, seized on this item for General Assembly sanction of counter-revolutionary and repressive activities against national liberation struggles. But the maneuver, which also sought to divert the Assembly's attention from important questions, was blocked by the European socialist countries and Third World states. Speakers cited U.S. bombings in Indochina, Israeli attacks on Arabs in the occupied territories and neighboring states, Portuguese chemical warfare against African liberated areas, and South African barbarities against its Black majority as the most flagrant examples of international terrorism. They pointed out that "terrorists" as defined by the imperialists would have included George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin and the "heroes resisting Nazi and Fascist occupation in Europe."

The proposal of the United States for an international convention against international terrorism was defeated in the Legal Committee, and, the General Assembly, by a vote of 76 to 35 with 17 abstentions, approved a resolution emphasizing the need to study "the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to effect radical change." An *ad hoc* committee of 35 was authorized to carry out the study and report to the 28th General Assembly.

States were invited to submit observations and proposals to the Secretary-General beginning April 10, 1973.

The Legal Committee, by a vote of 63 to 33 with 22 abstentions, adopted a resolution declaring inadvisable any further consideration at this session of proposals for revising the United Nations Charter. The Peking representative was the only permanent member of the Security Council to oppose this resolution.

The Assembly unanimously approved establishment of a new United Nations organ with responsibility for protecting the environment, and decided to locate its secretariat at Nairobi, Kenya. Its operations began January 1 under a governing Council consisting of the United States and 11 other Western bloc states, the Soviet Union and four other Eastern European socialist states, 16 Black African, 10 Latin American and 13 Middle and Far Eastern states including China.

The isolation of the United States was strikingly revealed in a vote of 102 to 1 approving a Soviet motion for an international convention to regulate satellite television broadcasts. Under the resolution a committee will outline measures for dealing with TV broadcasts, which any state will have the right to veto if it considers them distasteful or interfering in its domestic affairs. It was the first time in 27 years at the General Assembly that the United States stood alone on a vote.

At the beginning of the 27th session, the Assembly voted—70 to 35 with 21 abstentions—to defer the question of Korea until its 28th session. The vote represented a victory for the imperialist bloc. It assured the continuation for another year of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK). The Assembly deleted from the agenda items on the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea, and for the dissolution of UNCURK.

On an item on "Admission of New Members," the Assembly reaffirmed the right of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to membership "at an early date." The decision followed a veto in the Security Council by the Peking representative. The question will be considered again during the 28th session, but China has threatened to bar Bangladesh from membership indefinitely. The Charter requires a Security Council recommendation to the General Assembly for approval of membership, and China has the right of veto. However, Bangladesh and the German Democratic Republic were accorded "observer" status. The German Democratic Republic also became a member of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Economic Commission for Europe and

the board of directors of the new environmental organization. Its full membership, along with that of the German Federal Republic, is expected to be approved at the 28th session.

Many resolutions were adopted on economic and social matters. During the debate on development questions, Peru urged Third World countries to forge a common policy for gaining freedom from economic oppression by imperialist powers and securing fairer terms of trade. Peru's representative also sharply criticized attempts of the United States and its client regimes to isolate Cuba. Owing to the deep interest of Latin American countries in questions of development and international security, the Security Council decided to hold a series of meetings in Panama City, beginning March 15, 1973. The United States expressed serious misgivings concerning this action, but refrained from using its veto.

The foregoing actions were the most important on questions before the 27th General Assembly. The record of votes reveals the extent to which the foreign policies of United States imperialism are out of step with the realities of the new balance of world forces. The record shows that the United States stood in opposition to most of the measures for restoring and maintaining peace and international security, for eradicating the remnants of colonialism, and for combating racism, racial prejudice and apartheid. It is not surprising that the *New York Daily News*, representing the know-nothingism of U.S. right-wing circles, in a December 20 editorial expressed its chagrin at the "do-nothing ways" and "futility" of the United Nations! Yet, this constructive session had many remarkable aspects. For instance, it was the first time in the World Organization's history that a woman, Madame Jeanne Martin Cisse of Guinea, a mother of six, presided over the Security Council, and the second time a Communist, Poland's Deputy Foreign Minister Stanislaw Trepczynski, was President of the General Assembly. The first Communist in this office was Rumania's Foreign Minister Corneliu Manescu, who presided over the 22nd General Assembly in 1967.

Assessment of the UN's Work

A balanced estimate of the work of the United Nations requires taking into account the Organization's limitations and deficiencies. During its existence many constructive proposals have been made to correct these weaknesses: measures to improve the functioning and strengthen the enforcement power of the Security Council; to accelerate progress toward universality of membership; to make the Secretariat and the committees and organs of the Organization more representative of the membership; to guarantee democratic practices

in the election of committee chairpersons; to effect economies in the Organization's annual expenditures, and other changes in the Organization's structure. However, strict observance of and adherence to the principles of the Charter and the Assembly and Security Council decisions, rather than attempts to revise these principles, remain the basic and most necessary way of improving the Organization's effectiveness in all areas of its work.

As for the positive role of the United Nations in international relations and in the affairs of its member-states, the list of its accomplishments is extensive. The foregoing summary of the work of the 27th General Assembly indicates how the Organization serves the fundamental interests of the majority of the people of the United States—the working masses, the national and racial minorities, youth, women, the jobless and other victims of discrimination, exploitation and governmental neglect. These accomplishments are recent additions to the Organization's contributions to peace, democracy and social progress.

The prevention of a Third World War in the age of nuclear weapons is the foremost achievement of the past quarter of a century. Of course the United Nations cannot be given full credit for this, yet its contributions were not insignificant. Certainly its efforts have given impetus to the eradication of colonialism and the attainment of political independence by former colonial peoples. Although most of its decisions and resolutions are declarative rather than imperative, many have contributed to the body of international law and established norms of international behavior. These in turn influence legislation and governmental action in member-states. Among such United Nations initiatives are the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity. Moreover, discussion in the United Nations bodies of the most acute and burning problems plays a positive role in preparation of the international political atmosphere for actions toward *détente*.

To further the continuation and strengthening of this trend of United Nations activities, support of the people is necessary, and especially the support of the majority of the people of the United States. In the past, the U.S. working class and its organizations have seemed indifferent to the possibility of advancing the interests of their class and other sections of the population through the United

Nations. Yet, the struggle for peaceful coexistence, for the eradication of colonialism and the elimination of racism, for the preservation and expansion of democracy, and for progress in eliminating hunger, poverty, illiteracy and preventable disease—this is the class struggle on a national as well as an international level. And one of the world's principal arenas in this struggle is the United Nations.

(Continued from p. 4)

Paul did sing his mighty songs of freedom.

The racists did hide in the hills surrounding the roads leading from the concert grounds and from there pelted with stones the cars leaving the concert.

A number of us arranged to drive our cars ahead of Robeson's so as to take the brunt of such an attack. Some of us were injured when the stones hit our windshields. My eyes were filled with glass, but the hospital to which I was rushed managed to remove most of the glass and save my eyes. A few of the worker-defenders were seriously injured. But we succeeded in preventing any injury to Paul Robeson.

It should be known that we recruited white workers for the defense of the great black freedom fighter, Paul Robeson, by convincing the white workers, that the fascist racists who threatened the life of Robeson also threatened the life and welfare of white workers and our unions, and that if they were allowed to take the freedom and the life of Robeson, the black man, they would strike a blow to black-white unity and also dare attack the unions and the rights of all workers, black and white. Peekskill was thus a lesson in "self-interest" as a weapon for black and white unity and on how to approach self-defense.

Peekskill showed how, under certain conditions, trade unions and white workers can be involved in the struggles of the black people for their just demands and for their freedom. Active participation of Communists in the life and struggle of the trade unions and of the workers in the shops—these are the prerequisites for a Communist's successful leadership of workers in struggle against racism, for unity and class consciousness of our working class.

The Time Is Now*

As I see it, the challenge which today confronts the Negro people in the United States can be stated in two propositions:

1. Freedom can be ours, here and now: the long-sought goal of full citizenship under the Constitution is now within our reach.
2. We have the power to achieve that goal: what we ourselves do will be decisive.

These two ideas are strongly denied or seriously doubted by many in our land, and the denial and doubt are demonstrated both by action and inaction in the crisis of our time. Let me begin by discussing the first proposition.

Those who are openly our enemies—the avowed upholders of the myth of White Supremacy—have bluntly stated their position on the matter: Not now and not ever shall the Jim Crow system be abolished. "Let me make this clear," declared Eastland, the foremost spokesman for this group, in a Senate speech ten days after the Supreme Court outlawed school segregation, "the South will retain segregation." And the strength of this viewpoint was shown when a hundred other Senators and Representatives from the South signed a manifesto in which they denounced the Court's decision and pledged that they would resist its enforcement. The whole world has seen how these defiant words have become defiant deeds.

Others, who claim to be our friends, insist that the immediate enforcement of our lawful rights is not possible. We must wait, we are told, until the hearts of those who persecute us have softened—until Jim Crow dies of old age. This idea is called "Gradualism." It is said to be a practical and constructive way to achieve the blessings of democracy for colored Americans. But the idea itself is but another form of race discrimination: in no other area of our society are law-breakers granted an indefinite time to comply with the provisions of law. There is nothing in the 14th and 15th Amendments, the legal guarantees of our full citizenship rights, which says that the Constitution is to be enforced "gradually" where Negroes are concerned.

"Gradualism" is a mighty long road. It stretches back 100 long and weary years, and looking forward it has no end. Long before Eman-

* On the occasion of Paul Robeson's 75th birthday we reprint here chapter 4 from his book *Here I Stand*. *Here I Stand* is now available in a reprint by Beacon Press (Boston, 1971, \$5.95, paper \$2.45) of the original edition (International Publishers 1958).

cipation was won, our people had learned that the promises of freedom in the future could not be trusted, and the folk-knowledge was put down in the bitter humor of this song from slavery days:

*My old master promised me
When he died he'd set me free,
He lived so long that his head got bald
And he gave up the notion of dying at all.*

Well, chattel slavery was finally abolished—not gradually but all at once. The slave-masters were never *converted* to liberal philosophy; they were *crushed* by the overwhelming force that was brought to bear against their rotten system. They were not asked to *give up*, penny by penny, the billions of dollars they owned in human property: the 13th Amendment *took* it all away in an instant.

Some of our “best friends” are really enemies, and “Gradualism” is but a mask for one of their double faces. But there are also well-intentioned white liberals and various Negro spokesmen, too, who honestly believe that the advancement of colored people can be made only gradually, that progress cannot be forced, that the reactionaries should not be pushed too hard, that five years or ten years, or even generations must pass before our civil wrongs can become civil rights. And there are many of my people who, looking at a place like Mississippi, sadly shake their heads and say that it's going to be a long time before a real change comes about: the white bosses are too set in their ways and they are rotten mean to the bone.

The viewpoint that progress must be slow is rooted in the idea that democratic rights, as far as Negroes are concerned, are not inalienable and self-evident as they are for white Americans. Any improvement of our status as second-class citizens is seen as a matter of charity and tolerance. The Negro must rely upon the good will of those in places of power and hope that friendly persuasion can somehow and some day make blind prejudice see the light.

This view is dominant in the upper levels of government and society throughout the land. It is easy for the folks on the top to take a calm philosophical view and to tell those who bear the burden to restrain themselves and wait for justice to come. And, Lord knows, my people have been patient and long-suffering: they have a quality of human goodness, of tenderness and generosity that few others have. As the *New York Times* put it: “When one regards the violent history of nationalism and racism in the rest of the world, one must be thankful for the astonishing gentleness and good humor of the Negroes in the United States.”

But patience can wear out—and if the patience of some of us wore

out before that of others, it doesn't matter today. The plain fact is that a great many Negroes are thinking in terms of *now*, and I maintain and shall seek to prove that the goal of equal-rights-now can be achieved.

It has been said, and largely forgotten, that by the year 1963, the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation, full freedom should be won. Well, I believe that still. The year of 1963 can indeed celebrate the winning of full citizenship rights, in fact and not only on paper, for every Negro in every city, county and state in this land. In 1963 a Negro statesman from Mississippi can be sitting in the Senate seat now disgraced by Eastland, just as the Negro Senator Hiram Revels once replaced the traitor Jeff Davis in that same office. I say that Jim Crow—and “Gradualism” along with it—can be buried so deep it can never rise again, and that this can be done now, in our own time!

Is this but a dream, a fantasy that “can't happen here”? For an answer let us look with our eyes wide open at the world around us: let us look to the reality of our day, the *changed situation* which indicates that the time is ripe, that the opportunity is here.

The changed situation is this: *Developments at home and abroad have made it imperative that democratic rights be granted to the Negro people without further delay.* A century has passed since Frederick Douglass pointed out that “The relations subsisting between the white and black people of this country is the central question of the age,” and a half century since Dr. Du Bois proclaimed that “The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the Color Line.” Today we see that the prophetic truth of those statements has grown a thousandfold, and that the time has come when the question of the age and the problem of the century must be resolved.

It is obvious today that the issue of Negro rights is a central question in our national life. A typical comment is that of the editors of *Look* magazine who see in this issue “America's greatest legal, political and emotional crisis since the Civil War”; and typical, too, is the opinion of the *New York Times* that “a social revolution with profound implications for domestic accord and world leadership confronts this country today.” But in all of the discussion of this question which fills the press and the air waves and which resounds from platform, pulpit and conference table, little light is shed on the basic factors that are involved.

It is not merely a matter of “domestic accord” that is involved in our national crisis. The fact is that constitutional government in the United States cannot be maintained if Negroes are restricted to second-class citizenship. President Eisenhower, against his will and inclination, was compelled to recognize that the very structure of our

government was imperiled by the defiance of Faubus in Little Rock; and for the first time since Reconstruction days Federal troops were moved in to uphold the Constitution. But the Administration and the dominant group it represents has not yet been compelled to recognize an even more fundamental question: democracy cannot survive in a racist America. When a government spokesman appeals to the White Supremacists "to remember America as well as their prejudices," he reflects the persistent blindness of those who still hope to eat their cake and have it, too.

I say that it is utterly false to maintain, as so many do, that the crux of the issue is personal prejudice. In a baseball game, an umpire's decision may be based upon some prejudice *in his mind*, but a state law that makes it a crime for Negroes to play baseball with whites is a statute *on the books*. The Jim Crow laws and practices which deny equal rights to millions of Negroes in the South—and not only in the South!—are not private emotions and personal sentiments: they are a system of legal and extralegal *force which violates and nullifies* the Constitution of the United States.

We know that this condition has prevailed for many years, and it might be asked at this point: Why can't it go on like this for years to come? What compelling factor in our national life calls for a change at this time?

The answer is: The interests of the overwhelming majority of the American people demand that the Negro question be solved. It is not simply a matter of justice for a minority: what is at stake is a necessity for all. Just as in Lincoln's time the basic interests of the American majority made it necessary to strike down the system of Negro enslavement, so today those interests make it necessary to abolish the system of Negro second-class citizenship.

Increasingly it is becoming clear that the main roadblock to social progress in our country—for labor, for education, for public health and welfare—is that very group which stubbornly opposes equal rights for Negroes. The 100 Congressional signers of the Southern manifesto against desegregation are not only the foes of the Negro minority: they are a powerful reactionary force against the people as a whole. Holding office by virtue of Negro disfranchisement and re-elected term after term by the votes of a handful of whites, these lawless Dixiecrats are lawmakers for the entire nation. The White Supremacy they espouse does not elevate the white workers in industry or the poor white farmers, and they have helped promote and maintain the economic process that has drained off most of the wealth from Southern resources and has made that section much poorer than the rest of the country.

The upholders of "states' rights" against the Negro's rights are at the same time supporters of the so-called "right-to-work" laws against the rights of the trade unions. The reactionary laws which have undermined the gains of Roosevelt's New Deal—the anti-labor Taft-Hartley Act, the anti-foreignborn Walter-McCarran Act, the thought-control Smith Act—all were strongly backed by the Dixiecrats in Congress. Until their political power is broken, there can be no real social or economic progress for the common people anywhere, North or South. Indeed, it is clear that not only will there be no progress, but there will be further retrogression unless this political cancer is removed from public life.

The attention of the nation is focused now on the words and deeds of those who are resisting the Supreme Court's decision that segregated schools are unlawful. The national conscience, which has for so long tolerated segregation as a "local custom," cannot and will not permit the defenders of Jim Crow to substitute mob violence and anarchy for constitutional government. The conflict today pertains mainly to the schools, but the signers of the Southern manifesto were not wrong when they saw the Court's decision as a threat to the "habits, customs, traditions and way of life" of White Supremacy. If the evil doctrine of "separate but equal" was struck down in reference to public schools, how can it be lawful in any other area of public life?

The die has been cast: segregation must go. The White Citizens Councils may foment mob resistance, and Southern senators and governors may rant and rave against a new Reconstruction, and the President may try to look the other way—but the vast majority of Americans, the indifferent and lukewarm as well as the most progressive, are not going to give up their democratic heritage in order to deny that heritage to fellow citizens who are colored.

We know, of course, that the democratic-minded majority is slow to move, and that the poison of race prejudice has deeply corroded the whole of our national life. The make-up of the Federal government is not too different from the state governments in the South: it, too, is a white man's government. Not a single Negro is a member of the powerful Senate and there are only three among the 435 members of the House of Representatives. Legislation in behalf of civil rights could not be defeated or emasculated by the Dixiecrats without the support of Congressmen from other parts of the country. In a later chapter more will be said about the situation of Negroes outside the South, but suffice it to say here that hypocrisy concerning Negro rights has existed throughout our land ever since the Declaration of Independence affirmed the truth that "all men are created

equal." And so it must be recognized that if there were not another factor in addition to the domestic one, the changed situation I speak of might not exist.

That other factor—relentless, powerful, compelling—is the pressure of world opinion against racism in the United States. This pressure is widely recognized in our national life, and both the pressure and our recognition of it are constantly growing. The case of Emmett Till, lynched in Mississippi, and of Autherine Lucy, barred from the University of Alabama, aroused a storm of condemnation from beyond our borders; and the story of Little Rock—in words and pictures—shook the world. Indeed, the pressure of world opinion was itself an important factor in the very decision of the Supreme Court which evoked the defiance of the Arkansas governor. In his argument in support of school desegregation, the Attorney General of the United States reminded the high tribunal that "The existence of race discrimination against minority groups in the United States has an adverse effect upon our relations with other countries."

There is a lack of understanding in American life, however, as to the sources of this pressure which has been seen as a hostile force, endangering this country's rightful (and self-appointed) place of world leadership. The source of the pressure is said to be "Communist propaganda" among the colored peoples who comprise the majority of the world's population. Since the pressure arose from the dissemination of "lies" and "slander," it could be done away with by a "truth crusade" which would show that the situation of the American Negro was to be envied rather than deplored. Although it was evident to Negroes generally that the pressure could and did benefit the struggle for our rights (the speedy desegregation of schools, restaurants and hotels in Washington was an obvious case in point), a number of prominent Negroes offered their services in the grand campaign to take the pressure off! A rather unflattering comment about these individuals was recently made by a columnist in the New York *Amsterdam News*:

Our government has been employing Negro intellectuals, entertainers, ministers and many other to play the roles of ambassadorial Uncle Toms for years. They are supposed to show their well-fed, well-groomed faces behind the Iron Curtain as living proof that everyone is free and equal in the U.S., and the color bar is a myth.

Now, it is not my intention to engage in personal criticisms of any kind, and I know a number of performing artists who went on these government-sponsored tours because they needed work and who were out to show the world, as they did, that the American Negro has

talent and dignity deserving of respect anywhere. Yet it must be said that the Negro spokesmen who have set out to calm the clamor of world humanity against racism in America have done a grievous disservice to both their people and their country. To proclaim abroad that "A peaceful revolution has occurred overnight; it is a mark of distinction to be a Negro in the United States"—and those words were actually uttered by a well-known Negro minister to an Asian audience—can do nothing except to discredit the speaker.

By now it should be recognized by all that this global advertising campaign to deny the obvious has failed in its purpose. Facts still speak louder than words. The charge that the foreign protests on this issue are provoked by "Communist propaganda" expresses contempt for the intelligence and sensibilities not only of the colored peoples but of the democratic-minded people of all races and creeds. Of course, the Communists of the world denounce racism; that's nothing new and it seems rather silly to charge that this is some kind of newfangled weapon of the "cold war" when anyone can go to the library and read that Karl Marx said, a hundred years ago, that "Labor in a white skin can never be free while labor in a black skin is branded." But to assert that the revulsion of world humanity against racist outrages in America is simply the result of Communist agitation can only insult public opinion abroad, just as American public opinion rejected as nonsense Eastland's charge that our Supreme Court has been "indoctrinated and brainwashed by left-wing pressure groups."

What, then, has brought about the persistent and growing pressure from all parts of the world on this issue? One cause is the shattering experience of World War II—the untold havoc and horror committed by the Nazis in their drive to win domination for their so-called Master Race. Millions were slain and millions more suffered disaster. The world has learned the terrible lesson of Hitler: racism, backed by the power and technology of a modern industrial state, is a monster that must never be unleashed again. What difference is there between the Master Race idea of Hitler and the White Supremacy creed of Eastland? Who can convince the European peoples that the burning cross of the white-robed Klan is different from the swastika of the Brownshirts? America, of course, is not a fascist nation, but the deep-rooted racism here and its violent outbursts arouse the worst fears of those who survived the holocaust of Hitlerism.

Those who tell the world that racism in American life is merely a fading hangover from the past, and that it is largely limited to one section of our country, cannot explain away the infamous Walter-McCarran Immigration Act passed by Congress since the war. No decree of Nazi Germany was more foully racist than this American

law which is, in the words of Senator Lehman, "based on the same discredited racial theories from which Adolf Hitler developed the infamous Nuremberg Laws." Look how our immigration quotas are allotted: from Ireland's 3 million people, 17,000 may come to our country each year; but from India, with her 400 millions, the quota is—100! Usually we Negroes do not think much about immigration laws because we've been here for centuries, but in our midst there are many from the West Indies, and their talents and vitality have been important to our communities far beyond their numbers. Under the Walter-McCarran law, with all of its provisions to reduce "non-Nordic" immigration, the number of Negroes who can come from the Carribean or anywhere else has been drastically cut down.

After the defeat of Hitlerism, the nations came together in a world-wide organization; and our country, which had not belonged to the old League of Nations, became a leading force in the United Nations. Founded in San Francisco and making its headquarters in New York, the U.N. brought the eyes of the world upon the United States. From the outset, Negro leaders of vision saw in the new organization a new opportunity to win backing for their people's democratic demands. Shortly before he was ousted from his leading post in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (which he had helped to found), Dr. Du Bois addressed an appeal for Negro rights to the U.N. In that historic document, he pointed out that racism in America was now an international problem. He wrote:

A discrimination practiced in the United States against her own citizens and to a large extent in contravention of her own laws, cannot be persisted in without infringing upon the rights of the peoples of the world. . . . This question, then, which is without doubt primarily an internal and national question, becomes inevitably an international question, and will in the future become more and more international as the nation draws together.

That is exactly what has come to pass, and those in our midst who were too blind to see that truth ten years ago can read it today in the headlines of the world. The U.N. itself reflects the great changes that have come about "as the nations draw together." Today there are twenty-nine nations in the Asian-African bloc in the U.N., and as the roll call of the General Assembly is taken we hear the names of new nations that are members now—among them African nations like Ghana and Sudan and others. Like a great barometer the U.N. registers the changing climate of the world as the wave of colonial liberation sweeps onward.

Here, then, in the changing bases of power abroad, is the main

source of that pressure for changes at home. The era of White Supremacy, the imperialist domination of the East by a handful of Western nations, is rapidly coming to an end. A new era is being born. We, the Negro people of the United States, and of the Carribean area as well, are a part of the rising colored peoples of the world. This is not merely a matter of racial identification and common sentiments: the course of history has made it so. The plunder of Africa by the nations of Europe, which brought our ancestors to this hemisphere as slaves, was the beginning of the era that brought most of Asia, too, under white domination. Now when that era is ending, it is inevitable that our own destiny is involved.

Freedom is a hard-bought thing and millions are still in chains, but they strain toward the new day drawing near. In Kenya Colony, for example, the African patriots—the so-called Mau Mau—are hunted like wild animals and the people's leader, Jomo Kenyatta, is jailed. I knew this brave man well in the years that I lived in London; like Nehru of India and many others from colonial lands who were my friends in England, he dreamed of freedom for his people. Well, Nehru was jailed in India, and many thousands more; but the road to independence and power ran through those prison walls, and Kenyatta, too, will travel on.

A new China has arisen, young in strength and ancient in culture—a world power of half a billion people. This China is a mighty big fact not to "recognize," yet there are some stubborn statesmen in Washington who insist that "China" consists of the island hideout where Chiang Kai-shek and his outlaw gang are living off the American taxpayers' money. But the real China's neighbors in Asia—the people of India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia—recognize in her a powerful friend. So Prime Minister Nehru is happy to shake hands with Chairman Mao, and Burma's premier, U Nu, has this to say about the leading power in the Orient:

Although Burma has disliked communism at home, we are not meddling in the affairs of the Chinese who choose communism to suit their circumstances. Communist leaders in China have abolished foreign economic exploitation and wiped out bribery and corruption for the first time, thus winning the admiration of fellow Asians. They are building a new world for their masses.

(We Negroes should realize, when we read in the daily newspapers denunciations of a newly emancipated country like China, that what we are told "ain't necessarily so." We might well remember that Douglass in his time, defending liberated Haiti from the newspaper charges that it was "a nation of cutthroats and robbers," observed

that "white Americans find it hard to tell the truth about colored people. They see us with a dollar in their eyes.")

Washington may not yet recognize the new People's Republic of China that has arisen—and it certainly has changed a lot since the "good old days" when Europeans put up signs in the parks of Shanghai: "NO DOGS OR CHINESE ALLOWED"—but the great conference of Asian and African free nations at Bandung welcomed new China to a place of leadership in their midst.

It is high time for Negro leadership to take a new look at the world beyond our borders and to stop parroting the fearful wails of Washington officialdom that Asia and Africa may be "lost to the Free World." No doubt there are some folks who stand to lose a great deal as the colonial peoples take over their own lands and resources, but what in the world do Negro Americans have to lose over there? Our problem is how to get some of that freedom and dignity that other colored folks are getting these days. What we have to be concerned about is what we can *get*, and not be worrying our heads about what the Big White Folks might *lose!*

Negro leadership would do well to ponder the significance of a recent event at the United Nations. On September 19, 1957, Mr. Dulles made a speech at the U.N. and although he said nothing new, repeating his stock charges that in Asia and Africa the Communists were "inciting nationalism to break all ties with the West," his words were reported throughout the country. The newspapers and radio ignored what the next speaker said, but I believe that his remarks had historical significance. The speaker was Ako Adjei, Minister of Justice of Ghana (on the west coast of Africa from whence so many of our ancestors came), and he told the General Assembly:

... Ghana has a special responsibility and obligation towards all African peoples or peoples of African descent throughout the world who are struggling to free themselves from foreign rule, *or even who, by the mere reason of their color, are denied the enjoyment of the very elementary civil and political rights which the Constitutions of their own states guarantees to all their citizens.* I should like to request all Members of the United Nations to take note that the new State of Ghana is concerned with the freedom of all African peoples and *also with the treatment that is meted out to all peoples of African descent, wherever they may be in any part of the world.* We appeal to the conscience of the nations, great or small, to join in the crusade for the observance of fundamental human rights and freedoms which are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. (Emphasis added.)

Amen, brother, amen! I am sure your message will be warm in the

hearts of Africa's children all over this land.

Yes, the peoples of the free colored nations are our natural friends: their growing strength is also ours. When the Ambassador from India is Jim Crowed in Texas, and when the Finance Minister of Ghana is Jim Crowed in Delaware, they and their people feel exactly as we do. Diplomatic apologies are made to them, but they know that the President and the Secretary of State make no apology or restitution to the 16 millions of us who daily undergo the indignities of race discrimination, nor to the millions of others—the American Indians, the Mexican-Americans, the Puerto Ricans and people of Asian descent—who are insulted and outraged in this "Land of the Free." And so it is that the colored peoples, two-thirds of all mankind, are shouting that the Walls of Jericho must come tumbling down.

There are some diehard White Supremacists in our country who scorn the thought that public opinion abroad must be taken into account. Governor Timmerman of South Carolina told the press that "India isn't interested in the Negro—or the white man. It is ridiculous to think that these people worry about what Americans do." And he went on to advise that diplomats from colored nations should, when traveling in the South, stay "in the best available nigra hotels."

But fortunately for us—and even more fortunately for the country as a whole—the controlling group in national leadership is not that ignorant. Whatever may be their personal prejudices, the men who direct our foreign policy know beyond the shadow of a doubt that the United States cannot afford to ignore the pressure that comes from abroad. Race discrimination can cost us much more than national prestige: it can drastically hurt our national economy. Those who are vitally concerned with foreign trade and investment, with the raw materials our industries must get from other lands, are much more realistic and infinitely more powerful than are people like Eastland, Timmerman and Faubus. Faced with the fact that our country must co-exist, if it is to exist at all, with the new nations that have emerged, there can be no doubt that the powers-that-be in America will have to reckon with the new situation.

The viewpoint that I have presented above is not a hasty appraisal of the headline news and current events: it is based upon an outlook which I have had for many years. Long before the "cold war" began—during World War II when our country was an ally of the Soviet Union against Hitlerism—I pointed to certain new developments that would bring about a changed situation for my people. In an interview published in the *New York Times* on April 12, 1944, I said:

The problem of the Negro in this country is a very serious one.

We in America criticize many nations. We know that international conscience has great influence in spite of wars. One important part of the solution of the Negro problem here will be the pressure of other countries on America from the outside. There are 100,000 Negroes now in the Army in the English theatre of operations. Americans wanted their segregation, as at home. The English, however, insisted upon their being mixed in, without segregation. This shows the possibility of action within the Anglo-Saxon world, and it also shows the power of foreign opinion.

While pointing to the pressure from the outside, I was also convinced that the pressure from the Negro people themselves was also a factor that would have to be reckoned with, and I said so in these words:

This is obviously not a race war—it turns, rather, on the idea of people that are free and those that are not free. The American Negro has changed his temper. Now he wants his freedom. Whether he is smiling at you or not, he wants his freedom. The old exploitation of peoples is definitely past.

That was my viewpoint more than a decade ago and that is my stand today.

I have outlined in this chapter the factors which, I believe, make it possible for Negro rights to be achieved at this time. But, as we well know, opportunity is not enough. No situation, however favorable, can solve a problem. "If there is no struggle," Douglass taught us, "there is no progress. Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will." So let us next discuss the struggle that still must be waged, and the Negro power that can win our demand.

(Continued from p. 3)

In later years, with the defeat of McCarthyism, avenues of artistic expression began to open up, the right to travel was regained, and Paul Robeson began again to come into his own. Unfortunately his activities were cut short by illness, which has incapacitated him for a number of years. But his influence is nevertheless increasingly felt. Eslanda Goode Robeson wrote: "Yes, indeed, Paul Robeson, while still living, has become a *symbol* and a *challenge*, the *symbol and challenge of freedom and peace*." He is still that symbol today.

In this of *Political Affairs* we reprint a chapter of Robeson's book (another was reprinted in August 1967.) And it is with a deep feeling of love and reverence that we join with the countless others, in this country and abroad, who are saying: "Happy birthday, Paul!"

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

Toward Counter-Revolution: The Slaveowners and Secession

One of the main treasures with which to enrich one's knowledge of the crucial Civil War period in United States history has remained unpublished in the archives of the Library of Congress for decades. This is the manuscript diary of Edmund Ruffin (1794-1865) which he began in 1856 and which consumed fourteen books before its author took his own life with the collapse of the Confederacy.

Ruffin made important contributions to agronomy, but his main historical interest—and that which monopolizes his diary—was his ideas concerning slavery, racism and imperialism and his ideological and organizational leadership in the secessionist movement. Ruffin was one of the wealthiest slaveowners in Virginia, had been a member of the State Senate (1823-1826), was president of Virginia's Agricultural Society some thirty years later, was a prolific author of newspaper articles, pamphlets and books, and founded the League of United Southerners, which helped create the actual movement for secession. In recognition of his services to the latter cause, it was Edmund Ruffin who was given the "honor" of actually firing the first shell at Fort Sumter in April 1861.

Except for the biography of Ruffin by Avery O. Craven—first published in 1932 and sympathetic to Ruffin's outlook—no book was devoted to this central figure until forty years had passed, when the project to publish the Ruffin diary saw the appearance of the first of two volumes* covering the manuscript entries from their commencement in 1856 until the launching of the armed attack upon the United States in April 1861.

As indicated below, this volume is subtitled "Toward Independence" and in the foreword by Avery Craven one reads that this diary "sheds some light on the psychology of a whole people on their course to revolution." The volume itself, however, substantiates the fact that the secession represented not revolution, but counter-revolu-

* William K. Scarborough, ed., *The Diary of Edmund Ruffin, Volume I: Toward Independence, 1856-1861*, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1972, 664 pp., \$20.

tion, that it did not reflect the psychology of "a whole people" but the desires of a small oligarchy acting contrary to the desires of that "whole people"—by which, of course, Mr. Craven means that 65 per cent of the population in the South which was white. In this sense, to refer to the effort spearheaded by Ruffin as one seeking "independence" in any way comparable to efforts for national liberation is misleading; secession was a frantic effort at counter-revolution undertaken by and on behalf of a desperate slave-holding oligarchy faced with internal disintegration and external replacement.

Very little of the external forces—national and international—is in this book; but something of the internal challenge both as this came from the mass of non-slaveholding white people and from the four million Black people in the South is present, and it is this evidence—even in the diary kept by secession's chief propagandist—which gives the present volume its great interest and importance.

Ruffin, it must be remembered, not only was of the class and had the experiences and role summarized earlier; he was himself present at the Southern Commercial Convention in Montgomery, Alabama in 1858; at the execution of John Brown in 1859; at the conventions of the two Democratic Parties, held in Baltimore and in Richmond in 1860; at the secession conventions in South Carolina, Florida and Virginia, 1860-1861; and at the Fort Sumter bombardment in 1861. This, then, is a man of great influence, one who was politically and organizationally at the center of affairs and present at decisive acts of the unfolding of the great drama culminating in the Civil War.

Ruffin was a person whose every interest was to favor secession and whose every motive would be to present the effort to achieve secession as one reflecting a united southern will and "a whole people's" desire. Thus, he insists that those who do not understand "the South" suffer from two "delusions": the notion that "there exists hostility between the non-slaveholders and the slaveholders of the southern states" and that "our slaves" are anything but "loyal" to their owners (entry of March 1, 1860, p. 408). It is an insistence that both these ideas were "delusions" which has been basic to the propaganda of the Bourbons for over a century; they remain dominant to this day in the consciousness of most white people in the United States and still constitute a main part of "history teaching" in this country.

So far are these realities from "delusions" that even this diary of this person, so motivated and so occupied, demonstrates that it was the Ruffins who suffered from delusions—delusions characteristic of exploitative ruling classes who insist that they know "their" people and who in fact know nothing of the masses of people at all. This

was true in the past of Ruffins who looked upon Black people as significantly less than people and upon poor white people as rabble and ruffians and wretches; it is true in the present of Nixons and their advisors like the Banfields who look upon the so-called common people as "children" or as defective humans who create their own impoverishment and then prefer that condition.

In the 1850's, during the years of this diary, the farms of Ruffin and his sons were devastated five times by fires. He resisted believing that these were the deliberate work of slaves as long as he could; it was only with the fifth conflagration that he was forced to the "dreadful" conclusion that the slaves were in fact responsible (entry of November 13, 1859, p. 355). The reader is not told what this conclusion meant in the lives of the slaves, but he will observe that Ruffin's insistence on the slaves' "loyalty" nevertheless is reiterated by him as late as March 1860.

On another occasion, the train in which Ruffin is riding barely escapes destruction; the rails clearly have been sabotaged and he decides to dismiss it as the work of "some villain" (September 9, 1860, p. 455). As for the fires that frequently devastate the pine trees so vital to the economy of North Carolina, Ruffin affirms that "It is thought that much of this destruction is also committed by the negroes" (April 5, 1857, p. 52), but the reason they do this is because the turpentine work is not of a gang nature and "a negro cannot abide being alone"! This reminds one of the fact that the flight of slaves was seriously ascribed among those slaveowners—and their medical authorities—to a disease peculiar to Black people (and to cats) called "drapetomania" which manifested itself in this otherwise inexplicable impulse among such people (and cats) to flee their environs! As humanity's experience has shown many times—and not least in the present era—"whom the gods would destroy" etc.

As for the class divisions and hostilities among the white population of the South—absolutely basic to its internal politics in the pre-Civil War generation—the entries and the evidences in the Ruffin diary refute his verbalization about northern "delusions" on this point.

Thus, Ruffin records (December 4, 1859, p. 373) a conversation with a Virginia friend who insists that there was widespread popular opposition to secession, especially among the non-slaveholders. The friend is persuaded that among the non-slaveholders, "their jealousy of the richer, as well as self-interest, would cause them to side with the north, and to go for the abolition of slavery."

Ruffin himself records his own feelings (November 11, 1860, p. 482) that "I fear that not one [southern state], unless South Carolina, will be ready to declare for secession as soon as the election of Lincoln

is certain." He repeatedly records very considerable Unionist sentiment late in 1860 and early in 1861 that he himself observes in Virginia, Georgia and Florida (pp. 483, 492, 501, 504, 534-35, 543). In the elections to the emergency convention called in Virginia in February 1861, Ruffin himself observes that "open and avowed immediate secessionists have been successful in but few cases" (p. 544). In similar elections held that same month in Tennessee, Ruffin is forced to confess that there was a majority of 50,000 opposed to secession. And in March 1861, in North Carolina, the result was two to one against secession (pp. 465, 577). As late as April 1861, in his own Virginia, he knows there was a majority opposed to secession and that in the Convention elected to consider the emergency in that State, there were 48 for and 98 against secession as late as April 5, 1861 (pp. 577-58).

Perhaps the decisive admission comes in his entry of April 2, 1861 (p. 576) where Ruffin records a conversation with a former governor of South Carolina, John P. Richardson:

Heard (confidentially) from ex-Governor Richardson, a member of the [South Carolina secessionist] Convention, that it was certain, (as communicated privately by members of each delegation to the General Convention at Montgomery),* that it was supposed by the delegates that the majority of the people of every State except S. Ca. was indisposed to the disruption of the Union—and that if the question of reconstruction of the former union was referred to the popular vote, that there was probability of its being approved. (Emphasis added.)

It is no wonder, then, that Ruffin, on the same date, tells his diary that it is of greatest importance that the Virginia convention hasten its actions towards secession, so that "a new political machine" would then be "put in full operation"; when that was done, he thought, "the superiority of southern independence and separate nationality [would] be evident to all."

All this should be made explicit. What we have is the assertion by a former South Carolina governor (Mr. Richardson held this position 1840-42) that delegates to the general secessionist convention held in Alabama had told him that they knew that secession was *unpopular among the electorate* of their states. This is why in that Alabama convention the idea of submitting the question of secession to a vote—prior to secession itself—was rejected; the members of that

* This has reference to the convention held in Montgomery, Alabama, in February 1861, attended by delegates from South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana; it is this convention which formed a provisional Confederate government and drafted its constitution.

convention believed, as they said, that were the question so submitted it would be voted down.

Those delegates, let it be noted, came from the deep South; the feelings on this question in such states as Tennessee, North Carolina and Virginia were stated by Ruffin himself earlier in his diary and reference has been made to this.

We have, then, leading *advocates* of secession affirming—"confidentially" or in the privacy of diaries—their knowledge that the *Southern electorate*—all white, all male and generally propertied—was in its majority opposed to secession and these affirmations are being made in the very month that Fort Sumter is attacked. So much for the idea that this was a movement for national independence or a movement—as Mr. Craven put it—"of a whole people on their course to revolution."

On the contrary, as the present reviewer wrote some years ago:*

In origin, the Civil War in the United States was an attempted counterrevolution carried out by a desperate slaveholding class. . . . The Confederate assault upon Washington and the secession from the United States was a counterrevolutionary development. It was counterrevolutionary not only in its regressive motivations and its profoundly anti-democratic essence . . . it was counterrevolutionary, too, in that it was done secretly, with malice aforethought, and *against the will of the vast majority of the Southern people.*

As one would expect, Ruffin's position on slavery and secession was part of his generally reactionary outlook. This diary throws light upon his rejection of Jeffersonian democracy and especially of the concepts in the Declaration of Independence; his doubts as to the wisdom of the suggested termination of serfdom in Czarist Russia; his contempt for the people of Latin America and his hope that various filibustering assaults upon them might be successful; his support of the aggressions by British imperialism then making history in Asia and Africa.

It shows also the coordinated nature of the secessionist movement, with Ruffin in active organizational work with fellow traitors in Alabama and Mississippi and South Carolina years before the coup actually occurred. Such evidence is not to be dismissed—as the editor of this book does—with the rather flippant remark that it seems to serve those "attracted to the conspiracy theory of secession" (p. xxxvii). The evidence proves prior planning and activity on the part of leaders
(Continued on p. 30)

* Herbert Aptheker, *The American Civil War*, International Publishers, New York, 1961, pp. 6, 15. Italics in original.

BOOK REVIEWS

WILLIAM WEINSTONE

The Life and Times of Daniel De Leon

In his biography of Daniel De Leon*, Carl Reeve has made a useful contribution to the history of the U.S. labor and Communist movements. Oakley Johnson writes an informative foreword on the personal life of De Leon.

De Leon (1852-1914) was born on the Dutch-ruled island of Curacao, 40 miles off the coast of Venezuela. After study in Holland and Germany, he came to the United States in 1876. He became Professor of International Law at Columbia University, but resigned after six years because of petty persecution by the authorities for his radical activities. For a brief time he was associated with Henry George's Single Tax Movement, followed by a short adherence to Edward Bellamy's Utopian Nationalist Movement. After that he studied Marxism and joined the Socialist Labor Party in 1890. Within two years he became its leader and editor of its paper, the *Weekly People*, which later became the *Daily People*.

At the time of his death in 1914, brought about by poverty and overwork, De Leon was

* Carl Reeve, *The Life and Times of Daniel De Leon*, Humanities Press, New York, 1972, \$6.50. Foreword by Oakley C. Johnson.

mourned by masses of working people as an incorruptible and outstanding leader who introduced a whole generation of workers to Marxist writings. But since his death his name has become a symbol for sectarianism and dogmatism. His chief merits as a fighter against capitalism and reformism—have been forgotten. In his biography, Reeve undertakes to give an accurate picture of this man who dominated the socialist movement in the United States for almost two decades.

A Fighter Against Right Opportunism

Reeve quotes the tribute of William Z. Foster, "perhaps De Leon's most most severe critic," who wrote that "De Leon was a tireless and devoted fighter for the revolution as he understood it. He was a brilliant writer and from 1890 until his death in 1914, he exercised a greater revolutionary influence on the revolutionary movement than any other American intellectual before or since." (*From Bryan to Stalin*, International Publishers, New York, 1927, p. 33.) Foster also wrote: "Above all, De Leon was a relentless fighter against Right opportunism, his attacks against the

DANIEL DE LEON

Right-wing Social Democracy and against reactionary leaders of the trade unions being classics of polemics." (*History of the Communist Party of the United States*, International Publishers, New York, 1952, p. 97.) At the same time, Foster made sharp criticism of De Leon, to which I shall refer later.

Reeve states that De Leon remolded the Socialist Labor Party in the 1890's, aligned it with the Left wing of the Second International in the fight against the mounting threat of revisionism in the Socialist Party and the crass class collaborationism of the AFL leadership, designating them by the phrase which became world-famous: "labor lieutenants of the capitalist class."

The book relates the vigorous opposition movement against the imperialist Spanish-American War, in which De Leon took a leading part, calling on the U.S., Spanish and Cuban workers to join in a common fight against the war and for socialism. He exposed the small numbers of socialists such as Abraham Cahan, editor of the *Jewish Forward*, as well as the so-called liberal Democrat William Jennings Bryan, who supported the war. Unfortunately the book does not give the SLP position after the annexation of the former Spanish colonies by U.S. imperialism. Did it fight for their independence? There is good reason to think it did not, leaving such a vital democratic question and others to be solved by the future establishment of socialism in the United States.

59

Dual Unionism

Reeve devotes several hard-hitting chapters to De Leon's dual unionist policies. He relates De Leon's efforts to win SLP leadership of the AFL and tells how when that failed he shifted the SLP members to the Knights of Labor. Both organizations refused to seat branches of the SLP or to accept prominent political leaders as delegates. Gompers stated that he was not opposed to SLP members belonging to the AFL but argued that it was not a political party and did not accept direct political affiliation. After these setbacks, De Leon concluded that work in unions not controlled by socialists, or unions which were anti-socialist, was futile. Only "unions of socialism" were vital.

De Leon then proceeded, without consulting the membership, to call a conference of unions which SLP members led and to organize a new socialist labor movement, the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance, on December 13, 1895. Foster described it as "the first dual union of a general character and a revolutionary makeup." This, Reeve writes, led to the isolation of the SLP from the mass unions and to its steady decline.

The policy encountered considerable opposition within the organization from members and leaders which was met by expulsions by the De Leon leadership and to the split which led to the formation of the Socialist Party. De Leon ignored or overlooked the warning of Frederick Engels who

wrote: "I think all our practice has shown that it is possible to work along with the general movement of the working class at every one of its stages without giving up or hiding our own distinct position and even organization. . . ." (Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Letters to Americans*, International Publishers, New York, 1953, pp. 18-19.) Reeve adds that De Leon failed to discern the difference between corrupt, opportunist *leadership* and the *membership* of the unions.

The book pays high tribute to De Leon as one of the founders of the IWW, which was organized because the corrupt, bureaucratic AFL leadership refused to organize the unorganized unskilled workers whose numbers were steadily mounting with the growth of trustified industry. De Leon fostered its development in its first two years but then had the SLP withdraw over differences in program and formed a dual organization called the "Detroit IWW," thereby weakening the original IWW.

A serious weakness in De Leon's theory was his acceptance for some time of Lassalle's theory of the "iron law of wages" according to which it was impossible for workers to secure any improvement of wages and working conditions under capitalism.* De Leon also vehemently rejected "immediate demands" and reforms, declaring that the only reform must be the socialist revolution. "De Leon's message," writes Reeve, "in article after article is clear. Do not struggle for higher wages. It is a waste

of time. Only socialism will stop the decline of wages." The book cites writings of Marx and Engels which disprove these utterly sectarian views.

De Leon's Sectarianism

The book's discussion of De Leon and the Black liberation struggle is very brief. It deserved a much fuller treatment. Reeve states that De Leon in the Second International and in the U.S. movement conducted a resolute struggle against proposals of the U.S. Socialist leaders Victor Berger and Morris Hillquit to ban Chinese immigration to the United States. He adds that De Leon bitterly attacked the Socialist Party policy of segregating its Black members in the South into separate locals. He then criticizes De Leon who, he writes, "mistakenly agreed with Debs that race equality was no special question, apart from the achievement of socialism." He says further: "Neither De Leon nor Debs proposed special programs to champion the rights of Black people or for race equality. . . . Such demands De Leon considered unnecessary." These views were not only wrong theoretically but were reflections in the SLP and SP of the centuries old influences of white chauvinism among the people.

An important contribution of the book is the chapter on De Leon's failure to support the struggle for women's suffrage and equal rights. Reeve makes a devastating criticism of De Leon's aloofness from this outstanding movement of the time and of his

total lack of understanding of the need to advance the battle for democracy generally. De Leon's position, he notes, was like that of the Right-wing leaders of the Socialist Party.

Another interesting contribution is the chapter on the differences between De Leon and James Connolly, the Irish revolutionary socialist leader who was shot by the British for his part in leading the Easter Rebellion in 1917. Connolly was for a time an organizer for the SLP but disagreed with its sectarian policy and its anarchist views on religion. He was dismissed by De Leon over these differences.

A further chapter which throws light on De Leon's sectarianism is that discussing his opposition to the Populist Party of 1890-1895. Many SLP members and many trade unions supported this party of workers, farmers and Black people which for a time became a mass movement, particularly in the South. In assessing blame for its dissolution or merger with the Democratic Party the book cites the Right wing of the party, Samuel Gompers, and also De Leon, who denounced it.

While he advocated the ideas of socialism, of working for an independent party and of the development of the working class as a separate class, De Leon did not understand the advice of Marx and Engels and later of Lenin. They maintained that in the United States, where the workers have not broken with the capitalist parties and where socialist influence is weak, it is necessary to form a broad, labor-based, people's

party even if at the beginning its program is not socialist.

Anarcho-Syndicalist Ideas

Extremely important in the fight against Trotskyite, ultra-Left and anarchist views prevalent today is Reeve's comprehensive criticism of De Leon's anarcho-syndicalist ideas of the state. De Leon failed to understand the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat for defending socialism and creating the conditions for the abolition of classes. Reeve quotes a distortion of Marx's views on the state which was spread by J. Hamman, a German Social-Democratic union official who, in reporting an interview, attributed to Marx anarcho-syndicalist ideas of the primacy of the unions in establishing socialism, with political activity playing a secondary role. De Leon embraced this falsification fully and said that "the Marxian motto 'that only the union can give birth to a political party' became the guiding light of the SLP." Reeve adds that in taking this position "De Leon denies the leading role of the political party of the workers." De Leon also stated that the "economic organization is not 'transitory' but is the present embryo of the future Government of the Republic of Labor." (Quoted in A. Lozovsky, *Marx and the Trade Unions*, International Publishers, New York, 1935, p. 155.)

The book quotes Lozovsky as calling the interview "doctored." He quoted the conclusions De Leon drew from it, accepting the formula that the industrial revo-

lutionary union is "primarily responsible to carry out the socialist revolution." Lozovsky said that De Leon "could not despite all his distinguished political, critical and literary ability create a party or head a movement of the masses. Why? Because in the basic problems of party, trade union and class, he had a non-Marxist platform, though he thought he was a real Marxist." (*Ibid.*, p. 155.)

Reeve points out that in the Soviet Union several factions headed by Trotsky, Bukharin and the Workers' Opposition fought against Lenin, taking positions similar in some ways to De Leon's. Lenin called the Workers' Opposition line a "syndicalist deviation," and while noting the important role of the unions he pointed out that

. . . the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be exercised through an organization embracing the whole of that class, because in all capitalist countries . . . the proletariat is still so divided, so degraded, and so corrupted in parts . . . that an organization taking in the whole proletariat cannot directly exercise proletarian dictatorship. It can be exercised only by a vanguard that has absorbed the revolutionary energy of the class. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 21.)

De Leon's Concept of the Party

There are some references to De Leon's internal party policy, his relations to people and his attitude to criticism. Reeve states that in his internal reorganization of the SLP, "many of his concepts were similar to those worked out by Lenin's Bolshevik Party." This

is not correct. What he did was to build a centralized party which emphasized activity of members, discipline and unity. But this was not Lenin's two-sided concept of democratic centralism—of "freedom of discussion and criticism and unity of action." De Leon too readily regarded differences as cause for expulsion. Also, as Bill Haywood wrote: "De Leon always insisted that he was right. He made it impossible for any except his devotees to work with him. One able man after another had to leave him." (*Autobiography of Big Bill Haywood*, International Publishers, New York, 1966, p. 222.)

Lenin advocated expulsion for crass violations of discipline or for fundamental opposition to and struggle against the basic principles of the movement. But he worked collectively with others, learned from the masses and taught those who were in error, as a means of attaining the highest degree of conviction and unity.

Above all, De Leon lacked Lenin's concept of the Party as a vanguard which leads the daily struggles of the working class in the direction of socialism.

Finally, Reeve discusses the attitude of Lenin toward De Leon. He explodes the myth spread by De Leon's close co-workers that Lenin approved of De Leon's concept of the state and regarded it as identical with that of Bolshevism. He states that Lenin praised De Leon's fight against reformism and class collaboration, referring to his phrase "labor lieutenants of the capitalist class" as "the splendidly and profoundly true

expression of the followers of De Leon" in his pamphlet "*Left-Wing" Communism—An Infantile Disorder*." He writes that "Lenin was on the one hand praising De Leon's fight against Right-wing opportunists . . . and at the same time calling on workers to drop all sectarianism and throw themselves into the mass economic struggles."

Lenin also recommended in a letter to Bukharin that De Leon's pamphlet *Two Pages from Roman History* be translated and published in Russian with an appropriate introduction. Reeve states that Lenin was entirely aware of De Leon's sectarianism. This is evident in many of Lenin's writings including his "Letter to the Socialist Propaganda League" of Boston in 1915 in which, favoring unity of the SP and SLP, he adds that "we always quote letters from Marx and Engels where both condemn the sectarian character of the SLP."

A One-Sided Picture

In the final chapter, dealing with De Leon's legacy, the book states that "in spite of his sectarianism, De Leon gave a Marxist substance to the socialist movement of this time. He carried the message of scientific socialism to countless thousands of people . . . though his work was limited by his underestimation of the importance of non-Socialist organizations of the masses." This summation is grossly one-sided and only partly true. It is also open to the possible misjudgment that De Leon was mainly Marxist in theory but wrong in practice. But

that would tend to play down his serious deficiencies in theory, which were a major source of his errors in practice. De Leon regarded himself as a Marxist and, as indicated, he was a popularizer of the Marxist classics. But actually he was only partly Marxist. He was an eclectic and his outlook was a mixture of Marxism, Lassalleism* and syndicalism. Foster was right in stating that "De Leon formally accepted such Marxist concepts as historical materialism, Marxian economics, and the class struggle." ("Formally" is the correct term because he oversimplified them.) "Nevertheless," adds Foster, "De Leon was fundamentally a revisionist as he rewrote Marx on many important essentials." (*History of the CPUSA*, p. 79.)

This conclusion, though not stated in the summation, logically follows from Reeve's criticism. It would have stood out more sharply had he included some important facts presented in an unpublished doctoral thesis by Daniel

* Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864) was a German politician and publicist who played a big role in the history of the German workers' movement. He called himself a "pupil" of Marx but did not adopt the standpoint of the proletarian revolution. He led the party he founded along an opportunist path, putting forth reformist slogans and advocating the achievement of socialism through a "free" (*i.e.*, bourgeois) state with universal suffrage and producers' cooperative societies enjoying the aid of the Prussian government. Marx called him a "practical politician" and suspected him of having a secret alliance with Bismarck. History proved Marx correct.

K. McKee (*The Intellectual and Historical Influences Shaping the Political Theory of Daniel De Leon*, Columbia University, 1955.) McKee points out that De Leon regarded Volumes II and III of *Capital* as not really Marx's work but that of Engels who, he said, had only Marx's notes. (*Weekly People*, March 29, 1913.) Further, De Leon maintained that "there is nothing of value in these two additional volumes, that the volume by Marx himself (Volume I) does not cover." He stated that he found reading them "time wasted." (*Weekly People*, December 18, 1909.) In his prefaces to Volumes II and III, Engels demolished this type of criticism and revealed the tremendous merits of these volumes, whose original drafts Marx himself had written before Volume I appeared.

McKee writes that in publishing Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Program* (which contained an attack on Lassalle's wrong views) in the *Weekly People* of January 7, 1900, De Leon omitted all of Section 4 of Part I, indicating in a footnote that some sections of the original work had been cut. Taking such liberties with a basic work was not only arrogance on De Leon's part but was due to his false belief that Marx's criticism did not apply to the United States. The omitted section criticized Lassalle's view that all parties and groups other than the proletariat represented "one reactionary mass," a view akin to that of De Leon, who opposed any alliance or relations with sections of the farmers (regarding all farmers as capitalists).

McKee states further that De Leon was "an ardent admirer" of Lassalle, regarding him "as a thinker of deep penetration." He specifies a number of propositions on which, he says, "De Leon was closer to Lassalle's views than Marx's." And "even when presenting Marx's theory he often bent it until it looked more like Lassalle's doctrine than Marx's." (P. 32.)

McKee writes that De Leon rejected Lassalleism toward the end of the 1890's but remained under its influence. He also notes that after embracing syndicalism in about 1905, trying to synthesize it with Marxism, De Leon, while adhering basically to his earlier views, with no self-criticism made important changes in his ideas on the role of unions, strikes, the party, who is to make the revolution and other questions. McKee's thesis was not a Marxist study, but these correct observations of his should have been included in Reeve's book.

Reeve's work is a sympathetic and critical study of the life and times of Daniel De Leon. It correctly stresses and warns against his sectarianism. However, the weaknesses of the book—some important omissions, understatements and overstatements, etc.—have the effect of mitigating De Leon's severe faults. In his eagerness to give a balanced account, Reeve at times tipped the scale too much in his favor. But despite these shortcomings the book is an important and useful contribution and a beginning to the further study of this prominent socialist figure.

THE WORKING CLASS AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN THE UNITED STATES

A conference sponsored by

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

MAY 18, 19, 20



FRIDAY, MAY 18 7:00-10:30 p.m.

INTRODUCTION

Henry Winston

The Status of the Working Class

Hyman Lumer, Barry Cohen

SATURDAY, MAY 19 10:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

Women, Youth, Intellectuals and the Working Class

Alva Buxenbaum, Jarvis Tyner, Donna Ristorucci

SATURDAY, MAY 19 2:00-5:00 p.m.

Black Workers

Victor Perlo, Roscoe Proctor

SUNDAY, MAY 20 10:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

Chicano and Puerto Rican Workers

Lorenzo Torrez, Jose Ristorucci

SUNDAY, MAY 20 2:00-5:00 p.m.

The Class Struggle Today

Tom Curtis, George Meyers, Gus Hall

All sessions will be held at 300 Ninth Avenue (at 28th Street), New York City
\$6.00 for five sessions; single sessions \$1.50

For more information call POLITICAL AFFAIRS at 364-3650

Return this coupon for advanced registration

Enclosed find \$6.00 for pre-registration		
Please send my reservation to:		
Name _____		
Street _____		
City _____	State _____	Zip _____

Return to POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUBLISHERS
23 West 26th Street, New York, New York 10010

TRAVEL WITH
ANNIVERSARY TOURS

AND MEET THE PEOPLE FACE TO FACE

*The Personal Travel Agency With
the Lowest Prices*

*Come With Us . . . See for Yourself. Our Tours Emphasize People.
Take One of the Following and You, Like so Many Others
Who Have Travelled With Us, Will be Deeply Impressed.*

May 28-July 11
(45 days)

M.S. PUSHKIN Cruise to Leningrad,
Followed by Land/Air Adventure \$1,445.00
Visit Leningrad, Moscow, Kiev, Lvov,
Odessa, Sochi, Minsk, Vilnius, Riga

June 12-July 18
(37 days)

M.S. LERMONTOV - Maiden U. S.
Voyage \$1,225.00
Visit: Leningrad, Minsk, Kiev, Odessa,
Moscow

July 4-July 25
(3 weeks)

MONGOLIA—Our Most Exotic Tour\$1,635.00
Visit: Moscow, Irkutsk, Lake Baikal,
Ulan Bator, Gobi Desert, Kara-
korum.

First-class hotels, double occupancy, 3 meals daily.

Send for our New 1973 Travel Brochure, listing all our Tours and
suggesting trips for those who prefer independent travel.

Prices reflect dollar devaluation



ANNIVERSARY TOURS

Room 932, 250 W. 57th St., New York, N.Y. 10019

Telephone: (212) 245-7501

Cable Address: Anniversary