

JANUARY, 1974

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE ENERGY CRISIS:
MONOPOLY EXTORTION

Gus Hall

THE WORLD CONGRESS OF PEACE FORCES

Ray Ellis

MAOISM: ON THE WRONG SIDE OF
THE CLASS LINE

Michael Zagarell

STERILIZATION, EXPERIMENTATION AND
IMPERIALISM

Herbert Aptheker

60¢

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

VOL. LIII, NO. 1

JANUARY, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Gus Hall

The Energy Crisis: Monopoly Extortion 1

Ray Ellis

The World Congress of Peace Forces 9

Michael Zagarell

Maoism: On the Wrong Side of the Class Line 23

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

Herbert Aptheker

Sterilization, Experimentation and Imperialism 37

COMMUNICATIONS

John Vago

A Comment on Skinner and Pragmatism 49

Joseph Reynolds

Author's Reply 50

David Englestein

Political Economy and Alienation 53

Editorial Note

Exploitation and Alienation 60

BOOK REVIEWS

Hyman Lumer

Our Unstable Economy 61

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$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.

The Energy Crisis: Monopoly Extortion*

The mood in our country is characterized by a sense of bewilderment. They are bewildered because the foundations of their "take it for granted" beliefs are crumbling. Those with traditional beliefs, the middle-of-the-roaders and the more conservative, are getting the most serious of the shocks. One by one their heroes, their symbols of patriotism and virtue, are exposed as swindlers and crooks.

The silent majority, if there ever was one, is now the angry and disillusioned majority. Never before in our history have so many, in such a short time, become so disillusioned. It is one of those moments when, in a matter of days, the masses learn more than they do under ordinary circumstances in whole epochs.

That it is not a silent majority was clearly demonstrated by the mass political explosion that followed Nixon's firing of the Special Prosecutor, the Attorney General and the Assistant Attorney General.

In a matter of days over a million telegrams and millions of letters reached Washington. What triggered that massive reaction is possibly the most important question we should probe and try to understand. It is a key to our broad mass work.

In addition to the initial reaction of bewilderment, there is growing a deeper concern, a deeper anger. It is igniting a new wave of radicalization. As long as the people believe that the problems they face are momentary, they accept many difficulties. This explains why they do not immediately react to some crises even if they are severe. What is new is the growing consciousness that the crises we are in are of long duration and many are here to stay. As this sinks into the mass consciousness it will give rise to a different kind of mass response.

This longer-range outlook of the crises should make a deeper imprint on our political consciousness as well.

State Monopoly Capitalism

As with all phenomena, state monopoly capitalism is not a static

* This article is excerpted from Gus Hall's opening report to the December 1-3, 1973, meeting of the Communist Party's National Council and Central Committee. The full text of the report is available under the title *The High Crimes and Misdemeanors of Monopoly Capitalism*, New Outlook Publishers, New York, January 1974.

affair. Therefore it is always necessary for us to seek out the new developing features. It is necessary for us to study their effects on the lives and the struggles of our people. It is in these new features of state monopoly capitalism that we are going to find more basic explanations of many of the very perplexing and complicated problems—the continuing inflationary spiral, the energy crisis, the new issues in the class confrontation and, of course, Watergate.

State monopoly capitalism is not some Madison Avenue innovation. The basic laws that have always propelled capitalist development continue to do so in the present stage. State monopoly capitalism is a response to the problems of the system's decay.

The fact that the present level of state monopoly capitalism is associated with the unprecedented leap in technology adds an additional dimension. The development of the conglomerates and the totally unprecedented internationalization of capital through the multinational corporations further adds to its complexity.

New Patterns

The fact that the present level of state monopoly capitalism now influences the nature of economic cycles is generally accepted. We have not fully examined the effects that a change in the cyclical pattern has on the development of capitalism, including the accumulation of problems that were momentarily resolved under the old boom and bust cycles. The change in the cyclical economic patterns presents the working class with new problems.

But the present level changes some other patterns as well. In a new way state monopoly capitalism is now able to interfere in the relationship between supply and demand. Supply is more and more monopoly controlled and prices are more and more monopoly dictated prices. This is one of the factors influencing the inflationary spiral. It creates the basis for a continuous inflationary pressure.

In a new way state monopoly capitalism has woven inflation into a continuous trend in all of its operations. Inflation has become a continuous trend in all the capitalist countries. Perhaps it is more accurate to say that the inflationary trend is inevitable at this level of state monopoly capitalist development. Inflation is defended as a solution to all economic ills. It is now presented as a solution to the energy crisis.

In a new way state monopoly capitalism is able to create and use crises of shortages. In past periods monopoly corporations took advantage of war-time crises to put into effect so-called wartime measures that then became a permanent part of capitalist development. They

used the war-time crises to undo legislative victories of the working class and people. The system of taxation is only one of these war-time measures. In a sense the crises of shortages have replaced the war-time crises as a moment of profit orgies for the monopoly corporations. That is why they have created crises of shortages. In the present moment, in a matter of days, the big corporations have bypassed all anti-trust regulations in a conspiracy to set prices. Nixon has given his blessings to this price gouging in his energy crisis messages. As we know, there has been a period of unprecedented price gouging and skyrocketing profits. But with the energy crisis in full swing we are going to see a profit and price orgy such as this world has never seen. All restrictions on robbery and rape by corporations have been removed.

The crises of shortages have now become a new excuse for the unprecedented drive to increase labor productivity.

In a new way state monopoly capitalism is a factor in the unprecedented scale of the intensification of labor. In a new way the state operates as an open partner, in fact the driving wedge, in the corporate drive for greater profits by turning the screw of labor productivity. This intense drive is paced by the new technology. More than replacing the human element in production, it has become an instrument for dehumanizing speedup.

It is not accidental that at this stage most of the large corporations have a new full-time executive officer called the "vice president in charge of governmental affairs."

At the present level of state monopoly capitalist development there is a qualitative change in the role of the banks, including the Federal Reserve System. They are increasingly a key factor in the manipulation of economic patterns, including the pattern of continuous inflation. The role of banks is just a reflection of the further development of parasitism and inner rot of capitalism. They are the absent masters of the production process.

The process of monopolization has given birth to a pattern where mainly three, or a maximum of four, monopolies control entire economic areas. We have a largely four-corporation economy. Four corporations control 80% of automobile manufacturing; 65% of steel production; 67% of aircraft production; 71% of tire production; 94% of telephone equipment; 80% of typewriters; 90% of laundry equipment; 81% of cement; 61% of beer; 71% of can production; 98% of locomotive production. Add to that the fact that single banks control a number of these areas. Further, single conglomerates control many lines of production. This is monopolization on a new scale. What has further complicated the problem is that increasingly there is a single monopoly

control of every stage of a commodity production cycle, from the raw materials to the checkout counter. Eventually these are monopoly closed-circuit processes.

And, of course, the very latest in this new development is the growth of the multinational conglomerates. They add a new dimension to U.S. state monopoly capitalism because most of these multinational octopi are, in fact, extensions of U.S. firms. This makes most of the large plants in the U.S. just one plant in a world-wide network.

These new patterns of capitalism are not momentary departures or an interlude after which life under capitalism will return to its old ways. These are permanent, dominant factors of the new reality. We must take them into account, we must adjust our policies and approaches to problems as they arise out of this situation. This is a new structure, a new level of attack by monopoly capitalism to destroy the living standards of the mass of American people.

That monopoly capitalism is able to influence economic patterns does not mean it is now in control. On the contrary, each move it makes opens up new avenues of contradictions and new crises. It continues to be buffeted by the winds that are propelled by laws and forces that are beyond its control. It is an orgy on a new scale.

Crisis of Energy

The energy crisis that we have talked about has now become a stark reality. By January or February we are going to begin to see its full impact. It is going to remain as a part of life for years to come. It is also going to change some patterns in the capitalist process.

That oil has become an instrument in the struggle against imperialism is now very obvious to everyone. In this regard, it is interesting to watch the contemptible phonies and even the disbelief by some, that the U.S. should be getting the other end of the stick in the very game it invented. This game has been the central pillar of U.S. foreign policy for at least 50 years. The game is called "economic blockade and embargo." That is what the Jackson Amendment to the U.S.-Soviet trade bill is about. For over 50 years embargo and blockade has been an exclusive U.S. weapon. It has been used especially in the struggle against the socialist countries and the countries that have won independence. It was used against the democratic government of Chile. It is the main weapon against Cuba. But now the countries in the Mid-East are deciding to whom and at what price they want to sell their oil. So now the hypocrites, the double-dealers, people without any moral standards who have, and still are, supporting the U.S. policies of embargo, are now screeching from the

housetops against the Arab people—how dare they use the very weapon that for 50 years has been an exclusive U.S. weapon. When the U.S. used this policy as an imperialist weapon it was acceptable. But when the Arab people use the same policy it is called “blackmail.”

This reactionary wave gets its leadership from the old cold warriors and the top leadership of the Zionist movement. The pack is led by Senators Jackson and Javits, and by the social democrats in the top leadership of the AFL-CIO.

The leadership of B'nai B'rith has also launched a nationwide campaign to counter “the Arab politicizing of oil and their use of blackmail to dictate.” These are people who support Israel's policies of annexation, who support the Jackson Amendment and the U.S. policies of blockade and embargo, but who now pull out all stops against the Arab nations. Then there is the hypocrisy of the eight economists who have won Nobel prizes in economics, including Samuelson and Galbraith. They emerged from their economic mothballs to proclaim: “Our foreign policy should not be deflected in the slightest by illusions that giving in on oil blackmail will in fact gain us anything. If we do we will be blackmailed again and again.” I suppose we should listen to these professors because after all they have won their Nobel prizes by studying an economy that has been immersed in and based on embargo and blockage. After all, they are the economic theoreticians and the masters of this practice by U.S. imperialism.

Of course it is necessary to understand that while the form of the embargo is the same, the essence of the matter is totally different. The policy of embargo has always been used by the U.S. as a tool of aggression and a tool of enslavement. The countries in the Mid-East are using it as an instrument in a totally just cause—the cause of national liberation, in an effort to regain the land that has been annexed and stolen. This fact makes the phony protestations of the economists all the more reprehensible and degenerate.

The cry of “Arab blackmail” is calculated to create an atmosphere in which it may be possible to use U.S. troops to break the oil blockade.

The policy of embargo is a new weapon against imperialism. It is an effective weapon because of the new relationship of world forces. Without the powerful anti-imperialist power base in the socialist countries, and in the first place the Soviet Union, imperialism, and U.S. imperialism in particular, would not have hesitated to have its way in the Mid-East by military force. It is the new balance of world power that makes the difference. The socialist countries are the re-

liable shield against imperialist aggression.

But let's get back to the energy crisis. The world is not running out of sources of energy. The U.S. is beginning to run short, but that is not the basic reason for this crisis. At a reasonable price world sources are available. Put an end to the policies of imperialist aggression and annexation in the Mid-East and the oil will flow at full capacity. On a short-term basis the Mid-East crisis has added to the problem, but it is not the source of our problems. What then are the basic causes of the energy crisis? Again, the real culprit is monopoly capital and it is, again, a reflection of the new stage of its development.

Monopoly state capital now has such a grip on the industrial process that it can create crisis by creating shortages. The energy crisis is real, but it has been largely created. It is a result of a long range policy of monopoly capital. The shortages and the crisis that this system brings about have become, in fact, an instrument of greater profits.

There is a shortage of natural gas because a handful of corporations that control its extraction and distribution decided some years ago not to drill for new wells. A gas shortage has been inevitable for years because this handful of corporations decided to use the weapon of creating a shortage until they can get their way on prices, pollution and taxes.

There is a shortage of gasoline and heating oils not because there is a basic shortage of raw fuel available. There is a shortage because the top oil corporations some time ago, in a clear criminal conspiracy, decided not to build new oil refineries. They calculated how much they were refining, how fast the gas and oil was being used up, and they calculated then to create an energy crisis. There was a gasoline shortage last year but the corporations did not move to build new oil refineries. The root of the energy crisis is a shortage of refining capacity. As of this day no new refineries are under construction and the oil corporations have not lifted a finger to build new refineries. The existing refineries have been working at full capacity for some time. It is this that explains why, even if the Mid-East oil were to return to full flow, the energy crisis would not be over.

Because of the conspiracy not to build refineries, the usual reserve of fuel oils and gasoline is depleted. That explains why the Mid-East cut-off has such an immediate effect.

Why this conspiracy? It is a clear-cut policy of extortion. The monopolies are holding the gun. It is a highjacking of the greatest magnitude. The demand of the monopoly gangsters is: "Let us in-

crease the price and pollute the air, or else!" Among other things, they want the government to build refineries and hand them over to the corporations. They want still more tax allowances, even though the federal government's oil depletion allowances are the biggest crimes of this century.

How is it possible for these few corporations to get away with this conspiracy? They are able to get away with it because: 1) the energy establishment is in the grip of two or three corporations; 2) because the state, too, is in the conspiracy with them.

The top ten corporations control 70% of the fuel production. The same top ten corporations control most of the oil, gasoline and coal production. They have a grip on the energy jugular vein of the nation. There is no limit to what the corporations want. During the third quarter of 1973, the profits of the energy vultures went up as follows: Gulf Oil—91%; Exxon—80%; Mobil—65%; and Occidental by 7,153%. But in spite of this, they want more and more.

It is a sad fact that the extortion conspiracy is working—they are getting their way. Let us look at what has happened: 1) In a matter of days they have destroyed all, or most, of the anti-pollution restrictions. At the present level of industrial activity this is murder. This action condemns untold numbers of people to an early grave; 2) This extortion has given the fuel gunmen a free rein on price increases; 3) It opened the oceanfronts for their oil operations; 4) They pushed through the Alaska pipeline; 5) They have destroyed most of the "unnecessary" independent dealers and 6) They will get new tax write-offs and huge government grants for explorations, new drillings, and free use of government lands such as they are now getting in the shale territories in the western states. State monopoly capital is running roughshod over all the rights of the people, including the rights of Indian Americans and the Eskimo people in Alaska. Tens of thousands of workers are being laid off.

However, they did not need the crisis in order to force the government to act. The Nixon Administration has been more than willing to act right along. They needed the crisis to create the atmosphere in which they can ride roughshod over the opposition. Whatever the corporations want, the Nixon Administration is underwriting.

This is criminal extortion on a new scale. It is state monopoly capitalism on a new level. Energy has become the hostage.

Of course the energy crisis points also to the anarchistic nature of capitalist development. When there is no planned relationship between supply and demand, great distortions can take place. It was possible for the corporations to create the crisis because the anarchistic nature of capitalism had already distorted the energy situation.

The crime of extortion is serious. Therefore, the solutions must fit the scope of the crime. This is a moment to initiate a campaign to nationalize the whole energy sector of the economy. The nation cannot afford to have its life and death resources in the hands of irresponsible, cold-blooded gangsters without a social conscience. Public utilities must belong to the public.

There is a need for a totally new energy structure. There is a need for a democratically elected and controlled National Energy Council—a Council of People's Power; a council that will own and operate all energy related businesses from the oil, coal and gas fields to the refineries, to their distribution, including all power plants and nuclear plants. This National Energy Council would operate the energy related establishment on a non-profit basis as a real public utility. It is an idea whose time has come—it is an anti-monopoly measure that can get the support of broad masses of people. In the process of campaigning for it we can expose the criminal nature of monopoly capital. We should combine this campaign with more immediate demands such as:

1. Building of government owned and operated refineries.
2. Stop the flow of fuel to all military operations, including the production of munitions.
3. Take a forthright stand on UN Resolution #242; close the military pipeline to Israel, to South Vietnam, Cambodia, South Africa and Chile—and open the oil pipeline to the world.
4. No energy crisis layoff of workers; demand that the corporations who created the crisis continue to pay the wages of the workers who were laid off.
5. Cut off the luxury fat of the rich, such as private planes, limousines and yachts.

These are important demands. But only by taking over the energy complex from start to finish can there be a rational plan for the use and production of energy, with safeguards of conservation and avoidance of pollution.

This development has opened up important new possibilities for the anti-monopoly struggles. Once the people see the connection between the crisis and the monopolies the struggle can emerge on a new level.

From this meeting we will issue a call for a National Energy Council. We must formulate legislation which will nationalize the entire energy sector of the economy—from the raw materials to the finished product to the consumer. Freeze the corporate thieves out of the fields of energy. This campaign must involve the hundreds of millions who are victims of the energy crisis. Because of the scope of this problem, it can be a key link that will move into the struggle against monopoly.

The World Congress of Peace Forces

When the World Congress of Peace Forces convened in Moscow on October 25, 1973, for seven days of intensive discussion and program formulation, Romesh Chandra, the chairman of the Congress, defined its character as "the first General Assembly of the Peoples of the World."

As the work of the Congress unfolded through the participation of 3500 delegates from 143 countries embracing a broad span of representatives from international, national, regional and local groupings, the validity of Chandra's definition was apparent. A significant historical achievement had been recorded, one whose reverberations will be felt on every continent.

A New Type of Congress

Chairman Chandra posed the question, "How has it been possible to bring together a Congress of this new type, prepared for jointly by so many different kinds of organizations? Why was it not possible before? What has happened that has created the conditions to make this gathering possible?"

"The answer," he continued, "is clear and straight: A Congress of this new type could be held in this period, when a new climate prevails in the international situation, marked by victories for peace and détente, for the cause of national independence and international security."

The discussions and documentation of the Congress were of such length, depth and variety that the limitations of space restrict a description to the highlights. It should be known that the proceedings of the Congress, involving the work of fourteen commissions, will be made available. They deserve study and discussion of their application in each particular country. This is especially true in the United States, the command headquarters of world reaction, where even the staunchest peace activist needs assistance in gaining a universal appreciation of the powerful forces dedicated to the improvement of humanity.

The responsibility for the dissemination of this information in our country lies in great part upon the U.S. delegation, a wide grouping of some 180 from many states who were engaged in the many facets of the Congress.

To elaborate on the multifold representation in Moscow the pres-

ence should be noted of participants from the United Nations, the International Labor Organization, the Organization of African Unity, the League of Arab States, ruling parties, government ministers, intellectuals, Social Democrats, Christian Democrats, Radicals, Liberals, Communists, National Democrats, religious bodies, World Federalists, peace partisans and numerous other categories. The greeting sent to the Congress by Kurt Waldheim, secretary general of the United Nations, wishing success in its deliberations, brought home dramatically the change in that international organization. Dominated by the U.S. government in the aftermath of World War II, the UN is freeing itself from the manipulations of Washington. It is possible now for that body to exercise its authority for world peace under the charter and the revitalization of the UN accounts for the shift in U.S. policy whereby the UN is more and more denigrated.

While the reports to the Congress reflected the enormous gains toward peace, no one was unmindful of the "regions in the world where tensions are running as high as before, where flashpoints of aggression fraught with danger for all mankind have not yet been eliminated."

The Congress agreed that "While the foundation is being laid for relations of peaceful coexistence between states with various social systems, those who wish to tear down what has already been built and drag the world back to the cold war are still at work. The arms race has not been stopped. The nuclear bombs have not been destroyed. The military budgets of many countries are still growing. And the military blocs have not yet been destroyed."

Peace, too, has its casualties and this was tragically dramatized at the Congress in speeches by Hortensia Bussi de Allende, widow of the heroic Salvador Allende of Chile, and A. M. Cabral, widow of Amilcar Cabral, leader of the struggle for an independent Guinea-Bissau who was assassinated by an agent of the Portuguese colonialists.

Realistically, the Congress emphasized that "peaceful coexistence does not signify reconciliation with injustice. On the contrary, it presupposes that aggression is effectively checked and that the nations have the right to fight by all necessary means for their political and economic liberation and social progress, to freely determine their own destiny without any outside interference. For this reason it is in keeping with the interests and ethical ideas of peoples about the principles that must underline a just peace."

Brezhnev's Address

On the second day of the Congress in a setting of extreme world tension (President Nixon had ordered a nuclear alert by U.S. armed

forces) a calm and rational voice addressed the Congress. It was that of the general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev. His address was a major policy statement with respect to the Soviet Union's attitude on major world problems and unquestionably had a remarkable impact on the various viewpoints represented at the Congress. Here was a basic program where peace activists could find an affiliation of identity and strength. Its firmness and consistency stood in striking contrast to the frenzy and bombast sounded across the Atlantic.

Without ambiguity Brezhnev reviewed the conflict in the Middle East and Israel's "stubborn refusal to reckon with the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples." He emphasized that the October 22, 1973 resolution of the Security Council was far more than a mere cease-fire because it also called for the immediate fulfillment of Resolution 242 adopted by the Security Council on November 22, 1967. The November 22 resolution provides for the withdrawal of Israel's armed forces from territory occupied during the 1967 conflict, respect for territorial integrity and the right to live in peace, and a fair settlement of the claims of the Arab people of Palestine.

"It will be easily seen that had all these provisions adopted in 1967 been translated into life there and then, a dependable peace would have already reigned in the Middle East for six years," Brezhnev continued. "However, this did not take place. It did not take place because of the same shortsighted and adventurist policy of Israel's ruling circles, encouraged by external forces." He continued:

In accordance with the letter and spirit of the resolution adopted by the Security Council on Monday, October 22, the parties concerned are to start immediately, under the appropriate auspices, negotiations aimed at establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of such negotiations. A historical responsibility devolves on their participants. Let me say that the Soviet Union is prepared to make and will make a constructive contribution to this matter. Our firm stand is that all the states and people in the Middle East—I repeat, all of them—must be assured of peace, security and the inviolability of borders. The Soviet Union is prepared to take part in the relevant guarantees.

Secretary Brezhnev, turning to the Asian continent, called for collective effort to consolidate peace in that area. He has since made a trip to India for consultation with that nation's leadership and received a remarkable demonstration of good will from the Indian public.

Brezhnev referred to the contention of the Chinese leadership that a collective peace effort in Asia had the intention of "isolating" or "surrounding" China. He asserted that "these contentions are either the product of morbid suspicion or a reluctance to face the facts." Declaring it "ludicrous" to think of isolating China, Brezhnev asserted that the Soviet Union "would welcome the participation of the People's Republic of China in steps aimed at strengthening Asian security."

The present attitude of the Chinese, unrepresented at the Congress despite an open door, was then described by the Soviet spokesman.

"For reasons they alone know, China's leaders refuse to halt their attempts at poisoning the international climate and heightening international tension." Brezhnev cited "absurd territorial claims on the Soviet Union," drumming up war hysteria because of the "threat from the North" while refusing to enter into an agreement of non-aggression. "And all this," Brezhnev added, "is accompanied by the dissemination of preposterous slanderous accusations against the Soviet Union and other countries, by brazen attempts to interfere in our—and, in fact, not only our—internal affairs." He added:

What strikes the eye is the total lack of principles in the foreign policy of the Chinese leaders. They say they are working for socialism and peaceful coexistence, but in fact they go out of their way to undermine the international position of the socialist countries and encourage the vitalization of the aggressive military blocs and closed economic groups of capitalist states. They style themselves proponents of disarmament, but in fact try to block all the practical steps designed to restrict and slow down the arms race and, defying world opinion, continue to pollute the earth's atmosphere by testing nuclear weapons. They keep assuring the world that they support the just struggle of the Arabs . . . but at the same time they do their utmost to discredit the real assistance rendered to the victims of aggression by their true friends, the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. They call themselves revolutionaries, but cordially shake the hand of a representative of the fascist junta of Chilean reactionaries, a hand stained with the blood of thousands of the heroes of the revolution, the sons and daughters of the working class, of the working people of Chile.

The possibility of a change in this policy, Brezhnev said, "depends wholly and solely on the Chinese leaders."

Of particular interest to the U.S. delegates was the Brezhnev discussion of détente and "human rights." It is in the United States where a melange of war hawks, social democrats, anarchists and

others with pretensions of "liberalism" have enjoyed lavish publicity as they wring their hands over the "plight" of Soviet citizens and utilize this cover for an attack against détente.

"Some initiators of this campaign claim that détente is impossible unless some changes are effected in the internal order of the socialist countries," Brezhnev said. "Others leave the impression of not actually opposing détente, but declare with amazing frankness their intention to use the process of détente to weaken the socialist system, and, ultimately, to secure its destruction. For the public at large this tactic is presented as a concern for human rights or for a so-called 'liberalization' of our system." He declared:

Let us, dear friends, call a spade a spade. With all the talk of freedom and democracy and human rights, this whole strident campaign serves only one purpose: to cover up the attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist countries. . . . They talk of "liberalization," but what they mean is elimination of socialism's real gains and erosion of the socio-political rights of the peoples of the socialist countries.

We have no reason to shun any serious discussion of human rights. Our revolution, the victory of socialism in our country not only proclaimed, but have in effect secured the rights of the working man of every nationality, the rights of millions of working people, in a way that capitalism has been unable to do in any country of the world.

He proceeded to point out that unlike socialism capitalism has not guaranteed work, social security, free medical aid, rest and leisure, rights of women and national minorities.

Brezhnev said:

We are being told: "Either change your way of life or face a cold war." But what if we should reciprocate? What if we should demand modification of bourgeois laws and usages that go against our ideas of justice and democracy as a condition for normal inter-state relations? Such a demand, I expect, would not improve the outlook for sound development in inter-state relations. . . . It is impossible to champion human rights while torpedoing the principles of peaceful coexistence.

To put it in plain language, no one is any longer able to subvert the socialist world, but regrettably it is still possible to subvert peace. For peace depends on multilateral efforts, and not least of all on mutual—and I stress mutual—respect for the principles of sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs. As concerns the Soviet Union, plying across the ripples of propaganda campaigns hostile to socialism, our ship of state will continue on its

course, seeking constructive solutions for the problems on the international order of the day.

An exceedingly small ripple of this character was initiated later at a session of the Commission on Human Rights by Paul Mayer of the U.S. delegation. In a statement also signed by a fellow delegate, Grace Paley, and by Noam Chomsky, David Dellinger, David McReynolds and Sidney Peck, none of whom were delegates, was the flat declaration: "We support the Soviet dissidents." The statement made it clear that the substance of dissidence was unimportant, indeed it indicated differences with "our Russian friends." This approach is the familiar libertarian approach of free speech for warmongers, racists and fascists, a doctrine which proved repugnant to the Congress and to the U.S. delegation, which disavowed Mayer's position. Mayer, a co-chairman of the U.S. group, resigned his post after the incident.

The capitalist press, silent on the Congress proceedings except for Brezhnev's speech, which could not be ignored, gave Mayer's action extensive publicity. Upon his return to the United States Mayer was saluted as a man of "courage" by the notorious reactionary columnist William Buckley.

The Commission Reports

The attention of the U.S. delegates was far more concerned, however, with the functioning of the fourteen commissions where representatives from every section of the world were transforming their experiences and judgments into documents for action. It is worth noting that the differences were slight, that both in the adoption of the reports by the commissions and in the confirmation by the main body approval came with an overwhelming consensus.

Here are some of the highlights of the commission conclusions:

Peaceful Coexistence and International Security—"Peace cannot be ensured without the world-wide acceptance and implementation of the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states, regardless of their social systems.

"Peaceful coexistence is not simply an absence of war; it gives each nation the possibility of upholding its independence and sovereignty within inviolable frontiers and, on that basis, promotes all-sided cooperation, ensuring exchanges and concerted action by nations in the interests of peace and social progress."

The commission described a "balance of fear" as "unstable and dangerous" in that it justifies war preparations and aggravates military confrontations.

Indochina—Pointing out that neither the Paris Agreement nor the

Protocol on Laos have been fulfilled because of the opposition of the Saigon government and the reactionary forces of Laos, assisted by the U.S., the commission asserted that "the utmost support must be rendered to the people of Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam who, under different conditions, are fighting for peace and independence."

The Middle East—Israel's "continued, persistent aggression" and her refusal to implement UN resolutions with the continued occupation of Arab lands was held responsible for the absence of peace in the area, ". . . such intransigence by Israel cannot yield success in the modern world." The commission placed primary emphasis on the immediate implementation of the Security Council Resolutions of October 22, 23 and 25, 1973, which embrace the implementation of Security Council Resolution 242 adopted as a consequence of the 1967 war. The resolution calls for negotiations based on mutual acceptance of two principles: restoration of the occupied territories and recognition of the right of all countries to live in peace and security.

European Security and Cooperation—"The successes of détente in Europe" call for "the speediest attainment of an agreement on ending the arms race . . . and on reducing the numerical strength of national and foreign armed forces in Central Europe." Conversion of the EEC into a military bloc with nuclear arms "would strike a heavy blow at détente." Signing of the documents of the Conference on European Security and Cooperation should be followed by the establishment of a permanent body to promote the work that has been started.

Peace and Security in Asia—"Peace and security in Asia are threatened primarily by the imperialist policies of aggression, subversion and by dividing Asians against Asians." Growth of the non-alignment policy by Asian nations, the victory of the Vietnamese people, the emergence of Bangladesh, the Japanese people's anti-militarist movement, and progress toward peace on the Indian sub-continent—all these have brought about "a decisive shift in the balance of forces for peace and freedom. . . ." A system of collective security in Asia must replace foreign military bases and nuclear testing in the Pacific region. There is an especial need, the commission said, for governments and social forces in the Asian countries to coordinate their approach to the common problems of peace and security.

Disarmament—" . . . the processes of international détente and disarmament must stimulate each other." A World Disarmament Conference should be held as soon as possible, nuclear free zones established, foreign military bases dismantled, and nuclear weapons on foreign territory prohibited." The report endorsed the proposal of the Soviet Union that a portion of the reduction in over all military

spending should be assigned to aid developing countries.

"Every step closer to real disarmament is a step closer to the peaceful reconversion of the economy. . . ."

The National-Liberation Movement, the Struggle Against Colonialism and Racism—One of the main elements of the world anti-imperialist movement is the drive for national liberation, the commission declared. "The existence today of colonial and racist regimes built on terror and truly barbarian exploitation of millions of people, is a monstrous anachronism. These regimes have the full support of international imperialism which seeks to preserve them by the most disgraceful maneuvers and undisguised aggression."

Specific steps advocated by the commission were "every possible support and aid" to the liberation movements of Africa, Asia and Latin America, full isolation of the fascist and racist governments of Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia, "complete and unconditional implementation of the many UN resolutions on the elimination of colonialism, apartheid and other forms of racism," recognition of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau by all other countries.

Development and Economic Independence—"It is intolerable that in this time of scientific and technical revolution, the legacy of colonialism and colonial social structures has not been overcome in a vast section of the globe and that in many regions of the world there is still hunger, disease, economic and cultural backwardness, and poverty . . . all this is aggravated by the blackmail and pressure of international monopolies, which, hand in glove with local reactionaries, support or install anti-popular and blatantly fascist regimes."

Efforts by the developing countries, aided by international solidarity and strict respect for the right of people to control their own resources, and economic, scientific and technical assistance without any political strings were deemed by the commission to be required steps for progress.

Protection of the Environment—"The peoples of the world have a vital stake in protecting the resources of the Earth, our common home." Multilateral international cooperation and the rational use of natural resources are called for to improve the ecological balance and eliminate the pollution of the environment.

Cooperation in the Field of Education and Culture—"International and cultural cooperation and broader human contacts will be of great value in fortifying mutual understanding among peoples and nations and dispelling mistrust, prejudice and preconceived ideas. They will help combat the propaganda of military psychosis, fascist and military ideology, chauvinism and racism, and everything else that undermines the moral health of the individual. But this effort will not be

achieved unless cooperation in this field is based on the democratic principles of sovereignty, noninterference in internal affairs, and respect for the historical traditions and laws of every country."

Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation—"Economic, scientific and technical cooperation is not only a result, but also a guarantee of peaceful coexistence." The commission predicted that normalization of the world situation would promote the international division of labor, greater scientific, technical and economico-industrial cooperation, particularly "in the case of large-scale international projects."

Social Progress and Human Rights—Central to this commission's conclusions was the statement: "People cannot be genuinely free without possessing economic and social rights and their real guarantee, any more than they can be free without their civil and political rights." Moreover, "In every country the citizen should have equal access to the fruits of social progress."

All states should ratify the International Covenants on Human Rights. Torture must be abolished, states should move toward the total abolition of capital punishment. "The right of life also raises the problem of the right to refuse to kill."

Cooperation Between Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental Organizations—Bolstering efforts for peaceful coexistence on the part of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations would be found in more vigorous cooperation on a global scale, such as through the UN, and regionally, such as the Arab League and the Organization of African Unity. Areas of common interest and action, especially in relation to the UN system, should be defined.

Chile—The fascist putsch which overthrew the Popular Unity Government of Salvador Allende "is a reminder that the international monopolies, and the forces of external and domestic reaction are prepared at any time to mount a counteroffensive, including an armed coup, to establish a military dictatorship and plunge the people into a bloodbath." The Commission called for "solidarity with the Chilean people, liberation of all democrats and patriots and the genuine rebirth of Chile."

In a summary of these fourteen commission reports, the Congress repeatedly underscored that "time does not wait," and pressed upon the delegates the urgency of transforming the decisions into action.

"We Must Work Together"

Chairman Chandra, whose skill in leading the large and complex Congress was appreciated by members of that body, singled out "the main characteristic" of the work. "Whatever the political differences

between us, our Congress has vividly shown that we can work together. It has also shown each of us that we must work together if we want world opinion to become the mighty invincible force which it must become, for the sake of the future of mankind."

Chandra spoke of the many messages received by the Congress:

Here, for instance, is a sheet of paper, which is precious, invaluable. It is signed by political prisoners who languish in jail near Madrid. The first line of this letter says: "We are addressing you with a hope that our cause and our suffering may be known to you. But we are aware that our problem is only a tiny grain of sand in the vast desert of the most urgent problems facing mankind today."

And now, there is not a single problem, not a single aspect of human life that is insignificant for us. All the grains of sand command our attention and love.

The solutions of problems of the smallest countries or regions or cities or villages concern the Congress, the Assembly of the Peoples of the World. That is why our hearts are with the grains of sand . . . in Madrid and everywhere else.

Chandra made the prediction that: "When we pool the efforts of the millions of people represented here, the result will be several times greater than the sum total of the results obtained through our work separately. Millions of people will join our work—these who, until now, have stood aloof from the struggle for peace on the sidelines, will join our ranks and work together with us." He continued:

Quite recently, when we had already assembled in Moscow, the world lived through tense days, times of dangerous international provocations (the Nixon nuclear alert). There was a moment when certain forces sought to bring us again to the brink. . . . But let these provocateurs know: the peoples are on the alert, and thanks to their vigilance, the alert of the peace forces thwarted the alert with which the imperialists tried to intimidate them.

This General Assembly of the Peoples of the World warns the warmakers to beware. Our Congress does not die today. It lives on. Our work will continue for building a new life on this earth. The peoples have the power to defend and build peace.

The U.S. Delegation

In all the sessions of the Congress and its commissions the U.S. delegation was a diligent participant. That delegation was composed of a wide sample of peace activists who have been engaged in a variety of actions over a considerable period of time. Represented

were youth, women, Blacks, Chicanos, Native Americans and Asians. There were middle-class and labor representatives, though in the latter instance most were present in an individual capacity rather than officially elected by their particular unions. There were delegations from the National Welfare Rights Organization, from Women Strike for Peace, from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, as well as from religious bodies. Many of those journeying to Moscow had contributed to the massive demonstrations that had forced L. B. Johnson to forego his aspirations for re-election to the U.S. presidency.

The great diversity of the delegation led to many problems, among them manifestations of white chauvinism. But the Congress served also to unify these diverse forces and to bring them closer together.

Apart from the official sessions of the Congress and its subsidiary bodies, the U.S. delegation sought out and arranged a series of special meetings with representatives from countries that had been victims of the worst brutalities of American imperialism, such as the peoples of Indochina. There were also meetings with Arab and Israeli delegates. Added to this were a considerable number of exchanges between individuals and informal groups. These points of personal contact were a valuable stimulus to those who had come from the U.S. where the day-to-day drumfire of chauvinistic propaganda by the media tends to blur the perspective of even the most ardent protagonists of peace. Thus there was a refinement or clarification of the focus on peace by a comprehensive insight into the multitude of strengths working toward a common objective.

Another factor: many of the U.S. delegates were visiting Moscow for the first time and had the experience of exploring Soviet society, its culture, its factories, schools, centers for children, the magnificent boulevards, the famous subway, how the people dressed and ate. In a feast of hospitality, for which the Muscovites take second place to no one, the delegates explored a city without ghettos, filth, disorder and poverty, a metropolis where commodity prices decline and public facilities expand. These experiences together with those of the Congress will be a part of the accounting brought back home to be shared with friends and associates.

Problems of the U.S. Peace Movement

But, as was freely admitted, there were weaknesses in the delegation that could not be fully overcome given the intensity of the work and the time span of the Congress. To understand this it must be appreciated that the delegation was a reflection of the state of organization of the peace movement at home which even at its height

never emerged from a loose coalition into a firm organizational structure on a national basis. Demonstrative actions on Indochina which were unparalleled in history usually were ad hoc with the sponsors dispersing after the staging of the event. Consequently, after the signing of the Paris Peace Treaty a relaxation occurred which was not warranted in the face of Washington's actions along with concealment of its determination to sabotage the intent of the treaty.

Another element that must be included is the class composition of the peace movement. The working class, hampered by a hawkish leadership in the AFL-CIO officialdom, had not been drawn into the mainstream of peace activity and its decision-making process. Blacks, whose rejection of the warmakers has been deep-seated, by and large had not found in the peace movement the dedication to the struggle against racism that was foremost on their agenda.

Even those who were acutely aware of these shortcomings had been unable in past years to weave together effectively these essential strands with their capability of dealing a crippling and decisive blow against the generals and admirals of the armed forces.

Still another element was the eruption of new or renewed outbreaks of violence provoked by the policies of Washington. Patterns were different. Chile was not Cuba. And the resumption of the war in the Middle East thrust to the foreground a conflict far more complicated than Vietnam in the sense of domestic reaction. In the years of activity of the U.S. peace movement the problem of the Middle East had been continually shelved by an apparent unspoken agreement. Part of this came from a fear that its projection would result in a serious division of opinion in the ranks of the peace forces. The absence of a functioning representative national leadership permitted failure to come to grips with this serious problem. And there was a widespread lack of understanding of the role of Israel as the aggressor and spearhead of U.S. imperialism in this area.

Frequently this was coupled with an opportunistic capitulation to the illogical contention that in the Middle East the Washington Administration was taking a pro-democratic posture, an exception to its favoritism elsewhere to military dictatorships and fascist regimes. The avoidance of making a hard-headed examination of the issues permitted unbridled chauvinistic support to the leadership of Israel to go without substantial challenge. It is to the credit now and the future credit of the Communist Party of the U.S. that in the interests of *both* Arabs and Israelis it spoke out from a principled position.

Going back through the years of peace demonstrations was the harmful influence of shallow, "ego-tripping" individuals who used the demonstrations as a stage for the exhibition of their "talents"

with self-serving stunts rather than serious struggle. They were reinforced in their antics by the irresponsibility of a highly vocal ultra-Left. The thinness of their devotion has in a number of instances been illustrated by a turning to the worship of a guru, involvement in narcotics, or simple desertion. Such departures are not to be regretted.

Thus the U.S. delegates arrived in Moscow without, in many cases, having had the experience of working together in the past. They tended to be a combination of localities rather than a product of a national outlook that had been fashioned out of consultation and debate. The consequence was a handicap in the search for a smooth-functioning and productive mode of operation. These shortcomings did not go unnoticed and there was a continual expression of a determination to set up some form of national organization after returning home. What form this will take has not emerged at this writing and the problem is not one to be solved by simple formulistic solutions. But the awareness of its need marks an advance.

The New U.S. Scene

The restructuring of the U.S. peace movement is required at a time when the economy of the nation is being badly shaken by the world crisis of capitalism. Today's economic problems are having a profound effect on the population; what many accepted as the status quo is challenged. Basic doubts are voiced about "the American way of life" by larger and larger numbers. Thus the peace movement finds itself working within a qualitatively different public mood than that of a few years ago, and this radically changing mood must be taken into account in programmatic projections. The shrinkage in public support for governmental leadership is without precedent and receptivity to bold new approaches has become vastly enlarged.

Both the White House and the Congress, so long in servitude to the monopolies, stand exposed as enemies of the public welfare, unwilling and incapable of stemming the swelling crisis.

The Republican Party under the domination of President Nixon and his criminal associates is detested by a growing majority. Along with this is the public realization that a slogan of the past—"Throw the rascals out"—is not sufficient unto the day. A recent national poll showed that voters who classify themselves as independents are now in larger numbers than those who profess a Republican affiliation. But this has not resulted in a gain for the Democrats who, like the Republicans, show a decline in the number of their adherents. Thus, the number of independents is rapidly increasing.

This shifting of political allegiance is of enormous significance to the peace movement but it presents both opportunity and danger.

In past years, roughly covered by the presidential candidacies of Eugene McCarthy and George McGovern, peace partisans were divided in their attitude toward electoral activity. Some would have no part of electoral work, which they described as a dead end. Perhaps a majority felt that through progressive Democratic candidates that party could be remolded into a people's vehicle, a hope that began to diminish after the last presidential election. McCarthy, McGovern and others, with their expressions of defeatism, contradiction and confusion, liquidated their followings who were searching for a firm, unwavering position.

Along with this, evidence was mounting that the Jackson-Meany--Strauss combination was meeting with success in its determination to maintain corporate control of the party and thus preserve the class possession of both parties. The reasoning of these Right-wing Democrats—always hungry for power in the service of their masters—was that the animosity of the electorate toward the GOP, as a result of the exposures in Washington, would enable them to recapture public office without being forced to propose radical change.

That hope is based on very little substance. Municipal elections in 1973 have shown a continued decline in voter participation (there are a few exceptions) and the continuation of this trend does not forecast a fundamental change as a result of the forthcoming 1974 congressional elections. Democratic victories are not automatically people's victories and this is more and more sensed by the electorate.

Then, too, the Administration and Congress, concerned with bailing out the rich and increasing their profits, add to inflation, unemployment, scarcities in fuel and other commodities, bankruptcy of small business, and a continuous decline in social services, transportation, housing and education. The impulse for decisive change is enhanced, bringing with it the dangerous agitation for dictatorial solutions.

Clearly, the peace movement, in common with labor, oppressed minorities and all the elements of the population who have nothing to gain through traditional politics, must face the knotty problem of constructing a force, both electoral and demonstrative, that will provide a meaningful rallying standard. They must face the need to bring together all sectors of the people oppressed by monopoly capital into an ever more cohesive anti-monopoly alliance which will provide the base for such a political force.

There is no Aladdin's lamp for the creation of such a force. Nor will generalities suffice, for to progress is to be specific in actions in community, state and nation. Today the bulk of progressive voters remain within the Democratic Party influence but the possibility is

(Continued on page 36)

Maoism: On the Wrong Side of the Class Line

For over a decade a sharp ideological struggle has been taking place within the youth movement, reflecting in great part the world ideological struggle between Marxism and Maoism. In the past few years this struggle has taken on some new aspects. It developed a qualitatively new character following the recent secret Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of China—a Congress which was not known publicly in China until after it was over. This is, of course, a most peculiar procedure for a Communist party in a socialist country.

In characterizing Maoism we must begin by asking what criteria should be used. Lenin gave a clear answer to this question. He said:

We are constantly making the mistake in Russia of judging the slogans and tactics of a certain party or group, of judging its general trend, by the intentions or motives that the group claims for itself. Such judgment is worthless. The road to hell—as was said long ago—is paved with good intentions.

It is not a matter of intentions, motives or words but of the objective situation, independent of them, that determines the fate and significance of slogans, of tactics or, in general, of the trend of a given party or group. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 262.)

It is in these terms that we must judge Maoism—not by its slogans but concretely by its actions and by how these actions affect the struggle.

Following the Congress we can say that Maoism is characterized by its all-around capitulation to imperialism. It can be said that on all questions Maoism stands on the wrong side of the class line. In this respect Chou En-lai's report signaled a qualitative leap. It is on these new aspects that I wish to concentrate. I propose to discuss the following four points: 1) the "superpowers" concept; 2) peaceful coexistence; 3) the "third world"; 4) the future of Maoism.

The "Superpowers" Concept

One of the key ideas of the Maoists, reiterated at the Congress, is that of the "two superpowers." Chou En-lai stated: "Today it is mainly the two superpowers—the U.S. and the USSR—that are con-

tending for hegemony.” Jack Smith of the *Guardian* develops this line more fully. In his pamphlet, *Unite the Many to Defeat the Few*, he states:

In China's view, the world is dominated by the two superpowers—the U.S. and the USSR—which collude and contend with each other in dividing up the world into spheres of influence which each would control and exploit. . . . The superpowers want to be superior to others and lord it over others. At no time will China be a superpower subjecting others to its aggression . . . a major aim of Chinese foreign policy is to reduce the power of the U.S. and the USSR and increase the power of the rest of the world's countries. The method used to achieve this is to encourage small and medium-sized countries to take an independent position in foreign affairs, independent of Washington and Moscow. (*Guardian*, New York, 1973, p. 2.)

The first thing that must strike us about such ideas is that they are devoid of class content. They attempt to divide the world on the basis of the size of countries, not on the basis of class structure, to divide it into the “good guys” and the “bad guys.” Such ideas are not new; they are taught to school children every day in classrooms across the country.

This is a concept calculated to hide the class nature of imperialism. While the Maoists like to pretend that this idea originated with Mao Tse-tung, it was actually developed before Mao by Norman Thomas and other social democrats. Only they called it “a plague on both your houses” and sought to develop a “third camp” position. The similarity of the Maoist and the social-democratic positions is shown in the recent call to a founding convention of a new socialist party, signed by such people as Michael Harrington. It states:

The globe of the late twentieth century is not the Europe of Metternich, as Nixon thinks, and we do not put our trust in a conspiracy of superpowers to guarantee peace any more than we think that the priorities of corporations and commissars will eliminate the poverty of mankind. (*We Are Socialists of the Democratic Left.*)

If we did not see Harrington's name on this document we would be sure that the author was none other than Mao Tse-tung.

To the youth and progressive movements the “third camp” position is not new. We had to do battle with it in the early sixties. It was against this position that the peace and Black liberation movements had to struggle before they could assume the anti-imperialist posi-

tion they have held in recent years.

One thing we have always found to be true of the "third camp" position is that beneath its "even-handedness" there lurks a cover-up for imperialism and an attack on socialism. This is no less true of this position in its present Maoist form. Thus, Jack Smith states: "Soviet . . . social imperialism . . . is even more deceitful than the old-line imperialist countries and therefore more dangerous." (*Op. cit.*, p. 4.)

Underlying this standpoint is the view that the Soviet Union is a capitalist country. The Maoists spare no names. They refer to the Soviet leaders as fascists, new czars and social imperialists. But they offer no real proof. Evidently they think it is enough to build on the already developed anti-Soviet prejudices.

At the recent conference of non-aligned countries, Fidel Castro laid bare the revisionist character of the "superpowers" notion. He said:

The theory of "two imperialisms," one headed by the United States and the other allegedly by the Soviet Union, encouraged by the theoreticians of capitalism, has been echoed at times deliberately and at others through ignorance of history and the realities of the present-day world, by leaders and spokesmen of non-aligned countries. This is fostered, of course, by those who regrettably betray the cause of internationalism from supposedly revolutionary positions. . . . How can the Soviet Union be labeled imperialist? Where are its monopoly corporations? Where is its participation in the multinational companies? What factories, what mines, what oilfields does it own in the underdeveloped world? What worker is exploited in any country of Asia, Africa or Latin America by Soviet capital? (*Granma*, September 16, 1973.)

While at first glance the "superpowers" concept appears to be classless, it is in fact the classical line of all petty-bourgeois movements. A key feature of the petty bourgeoisie is that while it wants to fight the monopolists it is also afraid of the working class, especially when it holds power. Thus it projects the idea of the "third course"—neither imperialist nor working-class. However, it is characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie that it is incapable of developing an independent line. Either it sides with big capital or with the working class. This is why all concepts of a "third course" inevitably mean capitulation to imperialism.

In developing the revisionist theory of "superpowers" the Maoists have rejected a class approach and have instead aligned themselves with the bourgeoisie. Nowhere is this so clearly shown as in the

newly-resurrected "two-zone" theory of the Maoists. Jack Smith expresses it in these words:

One aspect of this line was to break U.S.-Soviet hegemony over the world by supporting the independence of small- and medium-sized nations in the "first and second intermediate zones." The concept of intermediate zone was first put forth by Chairman Mao Tse-tung in 1946 to signify countries belonging to neither the Soviet nor U.S. bloc. During the 1960's consistent with the Chinese theory that the focus of world revolution had temporarily shifted to Asia, Africa and Latin America, the Chinese developed a "two-zone" perspective, the first intermediate one being the third world, the second being Western Europe, Oceania and Canada (assuming these countries were not in the complete control of the U.S.). Most recently, the Chinese seem to think that even some countries heretofore regarded as belonging solidly in either the U.S. or Soviet bloc may now be gravitating to one or another zone between the blocs. (*Op. cit.*, p. 24.)

The most obvious feature of this theory is its classlessness. It places imperialist countries like Britain, France and West Germany in the same group with socialist countries like Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Poland. Through this position the Maoists support Right opportunists like Ota Sik from Czechoslovakia who, like the Maoists, supports independence from the socialist world. But most importantly, the two-zone theory is simply a rationale for capitulation to imperialism—to the imperialist countries of Western Europe and Japan in the first place, but to U.S. imperialism as well. This capitulation begins by denying the existence of imperialist countries other than the United States and ends by setting up opportunist alliances with countries like the FRG, Britain and Japan directed against the Soviet Union. Jack Smith illustrates this when he writes: "The Soviet government gained ground in South Asia by sponsoring the dismemberment of Pakistan and the establishment of the client state of Bangladesh, *but this has been offset by China's new relationship with Tokyo.*" (*Op. cit.*, p. 24. Emphasis added.)

The policy of opportunist alliances with imperialism against socialism is also evident in Chinese publications. For example, a recent article on the FRG in *Peking Review* states:

Situated in highly sensitive central Europe, the FRG has to face the reality that a superpower has massed huge forces near its eastern borders. It feels that it must rely on the other superpower, rely on the armed forces of the United States and those of Britain and France stationed on its soil to attain a military balanced

security. . . . During our visit representatives of the FRG ruling and opposition parties made it clear that though there were big differences over their Soviet policy, they were unanimous in wanting U.S. forces to remain in the FRG.

The people of Europe, including the German people, have suffered in two world wars. They of course want a détente in Europe and to avert a new big war. These sentiments are fully understandable. But the social-imperialists, while making a big fuss about 'détente,' 'peace' and 'security,' have not in the least eased up in their military buildup. Thus we found all sorts of reactions among the FRG people. (August 10, 1973.)

The FRG is one of the most powerful imperialist countries in the world. To this day it remains riddled with ex-Nazis in government. Yet the Chinese tell us that German militarism is simply a reaction to the threat coming from its socialist neighbors. Thus they prettify imperialism and support revanchism in West Germany. Such a policy supports not just the FRG monopolies but the most Right-wing sections of its ruling class. In this regard it is important to note that Peking gave Gerhard Schröder, a leader of the Right-wing Christian Democrats the VIP treatment in the summer of 1972, at a time when the Rightist paper *Bayern Kurier* was saying that "for Peking a federal republic that will stand up to the Soviets is an enormously important negotiating partner." (Quoted in *New Times*, No. 2, 1973, p. 28.) Accordingly, the Maoists have attacked the Brandt policy of détente.

.....
This is justified as support of the "independence" of the FRG from the "superpowers." But in reality it is support for U.S. and West Germany imperialism, since they support the continued presence of U.S. troops in the FRG.

It is in this context that we must look at China's reversal of its position on European borders. In 1957 China issued a joint statement with Poland, warning against revanchism and supporting the present borders. But in 1964 Mao stated that he had "doubts about the borders which emerged after World War II." (*International Affairs*, March 1973.)

The policy of capitulation to imperialism is expressed also in support of the European Common Market and the strengthening of NATO. In 1957 the Chinese Communist Party agreed with the European Communist parties that the Common Market was only a new level in the formation of international monopolies and would result only in sharper attacks on the conditions of European workers.

But today the Maoists have abandoned the internationalist line and support the European Common Market. They state that "it

helps to carry out a more effective fight against the monopoly of the superpowers." (*Peking Review*, July 2, 1971.) They cover up their position by saying that the Common Market will become a force against both the United States and the Soviet Union, but as always the "third camp" position is really aimed only against socialism. Thus, when Britain joined the Common Market the Maoists fully supported it even though they knew it meant that U.S. capital was further penetrating it through joint companies with Britain.

They wrote that "the entry of Britain and three other countries into the Common Market will mean a further development of the economic and then of the *defense* and diplomatic alliances of the Western countries." (*Peking Review*, August 3, 1973. Emphasis added.) They try to make it appear as if the Common Market will improve the conditions of the peoples of Europe. For example, they say: "In talks with British officials and industrial circles we often heard the following point of view: To maintain the status she desires in the world, Britain had to join the Common Market and become part of the united Western Europe." But this shows the complete lack of a working-class approach. Such is the position of "British officials and industrial circles." But what about the British trade unions? This the *Peking Review* fails to speak about.

As for the word "defense" stressed above, it is important because it implies that the Maoists support the unity of West European capital not only economically but militarily as well. Thus, the article states: "Nothing was more dangerous than sabotaging Europe's balance of power in the name of force reductions. A friend in press circles was of the opinion that Britain could not relax her defense efforts, *and this is why Britain, in spite of her need for money, still spends 5 per cent of her GNP*—which is a rate higher than of ordinary West European countries on defense." (Emphasis added.)

Marxists always thought Britain spent so much on arms because it is an imperialist country, because all imperialist countries are war-like, because British capitalists made money from arms production, because they used these arms to support reactionary regimes. According to the Maoists, however, we have all been wrong. According to them the real reason for such expenditures is that Britain faces a danger from the Soviet Union.

The logic of all this is that the Maoists now support NATO, one of the most reactionary instruments of imperialism. There can be no other meaning of Maoist talk of European defense tied to the continued presence of U.S. troops in Europe. It should be added that the Maoists also support the Japanese-U.S. security pact.

Hence, under the guise of opposing the "superpowers," the Maoists

support the Nixon policy of strengthening U.S. imperialist alliances. *This is now the common line of the Maoists and the Right-wing social democrats.* And while they support the international unity of capital, they are very specific in stating that the revolutionary movements must base themselves on a policy of "self-reliance." Thus the Maoist policies can be summed up in the slogan: "Imperialists of all countries unite; workers divide."

Peaceful Coexistence

In its attempt to cover its capitulation to imperialism, Maoism resorts to extreme demagoguery. Formerly they used to rail against peaceful coexistence. Lately, however, they have changed their tactical line.

The Maoists have never understood the policy of peaceful coexistence. They have never understood that it is a policy of struggle against imperialism, of forcing the imperialists to retreat in the face of the superiority of the progressive forces of the world. That U.S. imperialism must accept the existence of socialist Cuba 90 miles off Florida is a result of struggle. It is also a victory of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Even though the Maoists have begun to speak a great deal about peaceful coexistence they still do not understand it as a policy of struggle against imperialism. They have suddenly decided that peaceful coexistence is all right if carried out in the proper way. But what is the proper way? They have welcomed Nixon and Kissinger, but each such overture is matched by new talk of war with the Soviet Union.

Between socialist countries there should be unity at levels higher than peaceful coexistence. The Soviet Union has repeatedly proposed relations on at least that level and joint activity against imperialism where there is agreement. But while the Maoists call for joint action of the European monopolists they oppose joint action of Communists.

In his report to the recent CPC Congress, Chou En-lai said:

Recently the Brezhnev renegade clique has talked a lot of nonsense on Sino-Soviet relations. . . . If you are so anxious to relax world tensions, why don't you show your good faith by doing a thing or two—for instance, withdraw your armed forces from Czechoslovakia or the People's Republic of Mongolia and return the four northern islands to Japan? China has not occupied any foreign country's territory. Must China give away all the territory north of the Great Wall to the Soviet revisionists in order to show that we favor relaxation of world tensions and are willing to improve Sino-Soviet relations? (*Documents of the Tenth Na-*

tional Congress of the Communist Party of China, Peking, 1973, pp. 26-27.)

Let us examine these words more closely. To establish relations of peaceful coexistence China wants the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from countries as far away as Europe. Does the Chinese government believe that to have relations with another country that country must have no troops stationed abroad? If so, how does it justify its new relations with the U.S., which has more soldiers outside its borders than any other country in the world and which even occupies Chinese territory? The U.S. does not even recognize China, yet there is no talk of war with it. The Soviet Union does recognize China, yet the Chinese government refuses to improve relations with it. Clearly the Maoists' standard of friendship favors the imperialists.

The Maoists demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its troops from Czechoslovakia but do not demand that the U.S. withdraw its troops from Europe. On the contrary they support the presence of these troops.

This says a great deal. The FRG is one of China's biggest trading partners. At the same time the situation in the FRG has always been closely tied to that in Czechoslovakia. The defeat of the revisionists in Czechoslovakia was also a setback for the West German revanchists. Thus the new, more realistic approach of the FRG ruling class toward the Soviet Union and the GDR came at almost the same time as the defeat of the Czechoslovak revisionists. But the Maoists oppose this more realistic assessment. Therefore the demand for removal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia accompanied by support for the continued presence of U.S. troops in the FRG is in direct behalf of the most Right-wing sections of the FRG ruling class.

With regard to the presence of Soviet troops in Mongolia, the Maoists fail to say that they consider Mongolia to be a part of China, though they have issued maps, based on ancient conquests, purporting to show this. B. Shirendyb, a leader of the Mongolian Communist Party, writes:

... as early as 1935 Mao Tse-tung told the American author Edgar P. Snow that when the people's revolution triumphed in China it might happen that the Republic of Outer Mongolia would mechanically become part of the Chinese federation. Eight years later he again declared that the Government of China must recognize Outer Mongolia as a national region (province-*Ed.*) enjoying the right of self-administration. Another ten years went by and Mao Tse-tung began to style himself as "the great leader of the

CPC," "a true Marxist," but even after the Chinese revolution and the establishment of diplomatic relations with the MPR he and his associates, speaking behind the back of the Mongolian people, declared time and again that the MPR should be part of China. . . .

The long procrastination of the MPR's admission to the UN was due to the opposition of Chiang Kai-shek and his representative in the United Nations Organization: supported by reactionary circles in the USA they blocked the MPR's admission to the UN on the illegal grounds that it is allegedly part of China. However, the MPR's right to membership in the UN was so obvious that the member states adopted a positive approach to this issue. . . .

It is therefore utterly astonishing that the Government of the People's Republic of China did not at any time officially state its attitude to the question of the MPR's admission to the UN. Yet the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic continues, as it has always done, to support the demand for the restoration of the PRC's rights in that organization. (*Maoism Through the Eyes of Communists*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970, pp. 100-102.)

Maoism makes much of Stalin. But in the capital of Mongolia there stands a big statue of Stalin, to honor him for his constant refusal to accept Maoist demands that Mongolia be annexed to China. It is therefore no surprise that the Maoists demand that Soviet troops leave Mongolia. But it is also no surprise that the Mongolian government wants them to stay.

The third demand of the Maoists is that the Soviet Union return four islands off the Kamchatka Peninsula to Japan. Here they have a particularly difficult task, for they must attack Lenin himself. He said:

. . . Kamchatka belonged to the former Russian Empire. That is true. Who it belongs to at the present moment is not clear. . . . The Far East is dominated by Japan, who can do anything she pleases there. If we lease to America Kamchatka, *which legally belongs to us but has actually been seized by Japan*, we shall clearly be the gainers. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 445. Emphasis added.)

But the main question is not legalities. Even if the history of the borders in this area is as murky as it is almost everywhere else, the question is what is the class perspective of a group that demands that territory now regarded as legally part of a socialist country be turned over to a leading imperialist power. The imperialists will draw certain conclusions from these actions. We should also not hesitate to draw them.

Lastly, Chou En-lai wants to know "must China give up the territory north of the Great Wall to the Soviet revisionists to show that we favor relaxation of world tensions?" But this is not true. The Soviet Union has emphasized that she wants to sign agreements guaranteeing the present borders. It is the Maoists that lay claims to Soviet territory and have drawn up maps based on ancient conquests including not only parts of the Soviet Union but all of Burma, Thailand, Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia, Malaysia, Korea, Bhutan-Nepal, substantial parts of India and corners of Bangladesh. (*Daily World Magazine*, August 4, 1973.)

It is clear from all this that the Maoists have distorted the policy of peaceful coexistence from one of struggle to one of capitulation. One consequence of this peculiar form of peaceful coexistence is that formerly embargoed materials for nuclear weapons are allowed by the U.S. to go to China while the embargo mainly continues for other socialist countries. Another is that China, with little interference from capitalist countries, has been recruiting scientists with a Chinese background from around the world. For example, the leader of China's missile program is Dr. Tsien Hsueh-sen, a former U.S. Air Force colonel who helped to develop the first U.S. nuclear warhead. (*New Times*, No. 2, 1973, p. 28.)

Maoism and the "Third World"

The Maoists try to make it appear that they oppose the socialist camp in order to advance the struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. But this is impossible. The Soviet Union is the most powerful military, economic and political contingent of the world working class and is therefore of strategic importance to the world movement. The founding document of the Young Workers Liberation League correctly pointed this out when it stated: "To isolate and destroy the Soviet Union remains the main strategic task of imperialism."

Consider, for example, the Middle East. Are the present advances of the Arab countries in their efforts to get their lands back possible without the aid of the Soviet Union? Only a fool or a CIA agent would answer "yes." Yet the Maoists say the Arabs should not accept Soviet aid. They abstained on the cease-fire vote and advised the Arabs to keep fighting, and this even though they *have never provided the Arabs with a single missile*. More, when the Israelis ignored the cease-fire and sought to entrap the Egyptian Third Army, and when the Egyptians put the matter before an emergency UN meeting, the Chinese organized a filibuster. In this key moment they proved one thing. *When you want guns, go to the Soviet Union;*

when you want Red Books and incantations, see the Maoists.

The Maoists say they support the Arabs but also want a strong NATO against the Soviet Union. But these goals are contradictory. A strong NATO is precisely what the U.S. and Israel were hoping for, and it is precisely the weakness of NATO that has so infuriated both Kissinger and Golda Meir. Soviet ships in the Mediterranean Ocean were key to the air support to the Arab armies, but China has been calling on the Mediterranean countries to extend their territorial waters to two hundred miles to keep Soviet ships out.

Or consider Portugal, which is waging a vicious colonial war in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands—a war which has all but caused Portugal's bankruptcy. In December 1971 the U.S. loaned Portugal \$435 million in return for the renewal of the lease of U.S. bases in the Azores. These bases have been used to ferry materiel and troops to places like the Congo and the Middle East. This is how NATO affects the struggle for national liberation, the very NATO that the Maoists refer to as "progressive."

Anti-Sovietism and big-power chauvinism also lead the Maoists to other reactionary positions. We need only recall how they brazenly supported the West Pakistan butchers who murdered masses of people in Bangladesh. To this day they have given no real explanation for their betrayal of the Bangladesh liberation struggle, although their supporters will offer some feeble excuse. For example, Jack Smith writes:

Why did China support the West Pakistan government in its suppression of the autonomy movement in East Pakistan in 1971?

The answer is simple; it didn't—although this absurd notion has gained widespread currency throughout the world, largely due to bourgeois revisionist and Trotskyist propaganda. . . .

The five principles governing Sino-Pakistan relations forbade China from making any statements that could be construed as interference in the internal affairs of Pakistan, a decade-long ally in the struggle against Indian expansionism. (*Op. cit.*, p. 30.)

This statement shows how little principle the Maoists have. What is presented here is simply a revisionist concept of peaceful coexistence, which is used to rationalize alliance with imperialism against the national liberation movements. Do they mean to say that China cannot even issue statements in support of people's struggles because of its policy of peaceful coexistence? That it will not support the struggles of the working class and the national liberation movements because it is signing agreements with Nixon? Such an approach has nothing to do with peaceful coexistence, which is a

policy of struggle aimed at keeping imperialism from unfolding just such brutal attacks as took place in Pakistan. The truth is that China did not support the Bangladesh liberation movement and that this revisionist concept was developed to cover up that fact.

The Revolutionary Union is even more blunt. In its pamphlet *China's Foreign Policy* (February 1972) it says of China: "It does not oppose but supports the just struggles of the people of Pakistan and India to throw off their oppressors. It is opposed to the establishment of a regime in 'Bangla Desh' that is nothing more than a pawn of India and Soviet Union." (Pp. 33-34.) In other words, the anti-Sovietism of the Chinese leaders causes them to oppose this just struggle.

We can surmise that the same concepts were involved when the Maoists rushed to make loans to the reactionary regime in the Sudan which engaged in wholesale executions of Communist leaders. China is also developing the warmest relations with the Shah of Iran, one of the most reactionary rulers in the world. The Revolutionary Union defends this by saying: "China is willing to unite with the Government of Iran on the basis of its efforts to resist imperialist domination. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 37.)

But if this is true, how does the Revolutionary Union defend a recent article in *Peking Review* which says: "On a visit to the United States, the Shah of Iran confirmed at a July 25 press conference that Iran wants to buy U.S. fighter bombers to counter new-type Soviet Migs." (*Peking Review*, No. 31, 1973, p. 21.) Nowhere in the article is there even a hint of criticism of the Shah. Is this what the Maoists mean by "supporting independence"?

The list of examples is too long to present all of them here. But we must include the most recent instance—the fact that China was among the first countries to recognize the Chilean fascist junta. So far as anyone knows, they have made no real attack against this regime. And while the embassies in Santiago are filled with those seeking asylum, China has allowed none of them to enter its embassy. Perhaps they fear that it will weaken their efforts to make the Chilean fascists independent of U.S. imperialism.

The Future of Maoism

Some in liberal circles are enamored of the seemingly sensible character of Maoism, and among them it is gaining new support. But among most of its supporters in the Left there is deep shock that what had once appeared to be a "Left" alternative to the world Communist movement has now shown itself to be simply capitulation to imperialism. Maoism is losing ground in the Left, but its lessons must not be overlooked.

"Left" opportunism and Right opportunism are not opposites. They are only two sides of the same coin. Lenin long ago noted this when he said of such "Left"-wing Communism: "The instability of such revolutionism, its barrenness, and its tendency to turn rapidly into submission, apathy, phantasms, and even a frenzied infatuation with one bourgeois fad or another—all this is common knowledge." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 32.)

The Chinese people have fought and will continue to fight bravely against imperialism, but the ideology of Maoism is capitulation. On this we must be particularly sharp with the Maoist sects of our own country—the *Guardian*, the Revolutionary Union, the October League and others.

We are critical of them not because they are too "Left," because they are too zealous or too militant, but because they are cowards in the face of the enemy. They are cowards because they declare that someone other than their own ruling class is the main enemy, because they have given in to bourgeois demands that the Left be anti-Soviet to be considered legitimate, because they support NATO, the U.S.-Japanese security pact and other imperialist alliances. And because the Maoists do not have the courage to declare their views openly but hide behind "Left" phrases, they are all the more cowardly.

The Maoist leaders in the United States reflect the crisis in petty-bourgeois radicalism. They are like drowning vermin trying to hitch a ride on Maoism's passing ship. True, the ship comes equipped with a "great helmsman" but that does not change the fact that the only place it is going is down. The number of Maoist parties is steadily declining, and in the United States the youth movement is scattered with the debris of those who thought the ship was going somewhere—the Weathermen, RYM II, the Panthers, Progressive Labor, the Young Lords, to name just a few. And now the ship is coming apart at the seams. The Black Workers Congress appears to have dissolved. The Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization is down to a handful of members. Those who are left have more disagreements than agreements. This is not surprising because a party cannot be held together through opportunism.

Maoism is a sinking ship because it is guiding itself by alliances with the most reactionary forces—forces opposed to peaceful relations with most of the socialist world, forces on the downhill side of history. In China itself, Maoism has led the country into one crisis after another—the "big leap," the "cultural revolution," the events leading to the death of Lin Piao, etc. More important, the Maoists have no perspective for getting China out of these crises. In his

report to the Tenth Congress, Chou En-lai tells the Chinese people to expect not one but as many as ten more crises like the "cultural revolution."

Chou tries to justify this perspective by the grounds that there are contradictions in socialism between base and superstructure. But this is absurd for, as every beginner in Marxism learns, one thing which differentiates socialism from capitalism is that such contradictions are *not antagonistic* under socialism. Consequently, they are not resolved through "revolution" in a socialist society.

The fact that the last convention was held in secret shows that China is still in crisis. In the future this crisis will deepen, because there is a new and important contradiction in China—the contradiction between the petty-bourgeois ideology of the Maoists and the working-class nature of the social ownership of the means of production.

In past years, revolutionary forces across the world have made great headway. These advances could have been accomplished only with commensurate strides in the field in ideology. Life is daily proving that the universal victory of the working class is assured. This victory is assured also in the field of ideology. Thus it is that Maoism is declining and will continue to decline. History determines that just as the working class shall be victorious, so shall Marxism-Leninism be victorious over Maoism.

(Continued from page 22)

open to move that majority into combination with those who in increasing number are classifying themselves as independents. Simultaneously the level of independent thinking must be elevated to include an understanding of the role of American imperialism, whose predatory designs include not only the people of other countries but the people of the United States.

"Time does not wait," was the alarm sounded by the World Congress of Peace Forces. Nowhere is this more applicable than in the United States, where a crippled and outmoded capitalism is capable of vicious blows against the universal aspiration for peace and security.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

Sterilization, Experimentation and Imperialism

Ideologists serving exploitative social systems always have insisted that the extant order was not only sensible and proper but also inevitable. Hence, slavery reflected the nature of the slaves; its existence, therefore, was not only logical but also beneficial—to the slaves, of course—else “who will take care of them?” Colonialism existed because of the nature of those colonized; hence, again it was both logical and philanthropic, as it were—*i.e.*, “the white man’s burden.” Racist segregation exists because of the nature of those segregated and again is both logical and humane. Slums exist because of the nature of the slum dwellers; the impoverished are in that condition because of their nature; class positions reflect the realities of the respective capacities of the classes, with those on the bottom being there because in merit and intelligence—in capacity—they are in fact at the bottom.* Of course, all standards are assumed to be those of the exploiters and rulers and all “tests” are created by them, based upon their values and assumptions, administered by them, and evaluated by them. Naturally.

Ruling-class rationalizers have never lacked ingenuity. If Black slaves in the United States were prone to flee from their owners—despite the latter’s well-known benevolence and the former’s colossal contentment—this is due to the “fact” that they—like cats—were subject to a particular disease, drapetomania, which induces its victims to suddenly “scat.” And medical texts some one hundred and thirty years ago described this disease and suggested remedies—as strange as the affliction—such as removing toe nails or placing bits in the mouth of the patient.

* The entire body of ruling-class literature documents this paragraph; but on the last two positions in particular, see the work of Edward C. Banfield and of H. J. Eysenck. Mr. Banfield, late of Harvard and Chairman of Nixon’s Commission on Model Cities, is now at the University of Pennsylvania; Mr. Eysenck is founder and director of the Institute of Psychiatry at the University of London. On Banfield see this writer’s critique in *Political Affairs*, December 1970; a typical expression of Eysenck’s views is “IQ, Social Class and Educational Policy,” in *Change*, September, 1973.

If slaves rebel, or workers organize, "outside agitators" are at fault. If rebellions rock ghettos or jails, it is because aggressive instincts have manifested themselves; these, too, explain the wars that incessantly have marked human history. Indeed, social ills in general reflect the rottenness of people in general, the devil in all of us, humanity's incorrigible foulness—whether in theological or in secular language, one thing is clear and that is that the fault does not lie in those who rule and possess and control and luxuriate. Perish that thought—and let perish those who think it!

A potent variant of this ruling-class practice of blaming the victim* was to ascribe impoverishment to a superfluity of population—an idea first systematically presented by the Reverend Thomas Malthus at the close of the 18th century when ruling classes from Europe to the islands of the New World were being challenged by mass upheavals and by democratic and egalitarian concepts held to be "self-evident truths." In neo-Malthusian terms, these false and anti-human ideas have been refurbished until one finds seriously expressed the idea that "people, in themselves, constitute a pollution."^o

The political form reflecting the institutionalizing of imperialism's antihumanism is fascism; its main propaganda device is racism. The ultimate logic of this are crematoria; people themselves constituting the pollution and inferior people in particular, then crematoria become really vast sewerage projects. Only so may one understand those who attended the ovens and concocted and conducted the entire enterprise; those "wasted"—to use U.S. army jargon reserved for colonial hostilities—are not really, not fully, people.

Two dramatic developments recently exposed in the United States are significant signs of fascistic tendencies among important components of the ruling class. We mean here to note these developments, comment upon their backgrounds and suggest something of their meanings for our time and nation.

Sterilization

In July 1973, Mr. and Mrs. Lonnie Relf, of Montgomery, Alabama, complained to the Southern Poverty Law Center, located in that city, that two of their daughters—Mary Alice, twelve years old,

* A good examination of this tactic in the United States today is offered in William Ryan's *Blaming the Victim* (New York, 1971, Pantheon); see the examination of that book by the present writer in *Political Affairs*, April 1971.

** These words are from the blurb on the jacket of Richard Falk's *This Endangered Planet* (New York, 1971, Random House); the book is not nearly as bad as that blurb might indicate.

and Minnie Lee, fourteen years old—had been surgically sterilized without their knowledge or consent. Ensuing investigation uncovered the fact that another daughter of the Relfs—who lived on relief payments totalling \$156 per month for all five people—named Katie, aged seventeen, had escaped such surgery only because she had physically resisted. Several months prior to the operations, it was also discovered, these three children had been injected regularly with an experimental drug called *Depo-provera*, supposed to prevent conception; this had been stopped in the Spring of 1973 upon orders from Washington authorities when it was found that these tests upon laboratory animals linked it with the onset of cancer. The drug no longer being available, the Montgomery authorities had then operated upon the youngsters.

Shortly after news of the Relf case broke, other cases came to light, as that of Mrs. Marietta Williams, also a Black woman, of Aiken, South Carolina, and also on relief. About to have her third child, the white doctor—one Clovis H. Pierce—refused to serve her unless she consented to being sterilized. Dr. Pierce, when interviewed, stated that his policy was to require sterilization after a woman on welfare had had three children; he was doing this, he said, to reduce welfare costs upon tax-paying citizens. It was then discovered that Aiken County hospital records showed that of 34 deliveries paid for by Medicaid in 1972, eighteen included sterilization and that all eighteen were Black women, and that all were performed by this same crusading Dr. Pierce who, in the preceding eighteen months, had been paid by that hospital fees totalling \$60,000 of taxpayers' money!*

After the Williams case became known, Mrs. Carol Brown, a white woman and mother of four children—also on relief, in Aiken—revealed that Dr. Pierce had refused to serve her as the birth of a fifth child approached unless she agreed either to sterilization or to paying his normal \$250 fee. Her child was delivered for her by a physician in Georgia. This case—involving a white person—received especially considerable publicity; it soon became clear, as Anne Braden has written in the cited article “that what had come to light so far was only a small tip of a large iceberg.”

It was soon discovered that within the past year in Montgomery

* For the details of the Relf family case see *Poverty Law Report*, published by the Southern Poverty Law Center, in Montgomery, Alabama, for September 1973 (Vol. I, No. 3). J. Sam Nesbit, administrator of the Aiken County hospital, approved the reasoning and the practice of Dr. Pierce. See Nancy Hicks, report from Aiken in *N. Y. Times*, August 1, 1973. For details concerning similar cases elsewhere in the South, see the essay by Anne Braden in *Southern Patriot*, September 1973.

the Relf children were not alone in their maltreatment; on the contrary eleven girls—all about the ages of the Relf youngsters—had been sterilized and that ten of them were Black. Then it was announced that from around April 1972 to July 1973 other government-sponsored birth control clinics—there are 3,260 in all—had sterilized at least eighty additional children; the racial and regional breakdown was not published but with past experience as a guide there is no doubt that the vast majority of the victims were Black and Southern.

By mid-July 1973 an investigation was under way in the Senate under the direction of Edward M. Kennedy; it was then announced by officials of the Department of Health Education and Welfare (HEW) that in 1972 alone at least 16,000 women and 8,000 men were sterilized by the federal government and that 365 of these were below the age of 21.^o Other realities then came to light; for example, Mrs. Nila Ruth Cox of North Carolina filed a suit in July 1973 for damages against a doctor who had sterilized her surgically back in 1966 and had then told her that this “would wear off” and that it was a “temporary five-year operation.”

With the original disclosures there was briefly some significant response, such as the Kennedy hearings and the publicity these gained. In addition one had within the South such examples as the statement issued by the Black and white Women's Coalition of Jackson, Mississippi, published in the press of that city:

Beyond the fact of forever ending the possibility of these two young [Relf] girls having their own children is the issue of every woman's right to protection under the law to control her own body. In addition, we feel that it is clear that the girls were sterilized not for their own good but for the convenience of the social welfare system.

Other comments went even deeper; thus, Bruce Hilton, director of the national center for Bio-Ethics, located in Ridgefield, New Jersey, said: “We must face the fact there are many whites who, consciously or not, see birth control as a way to save the white race from being overwhelmed.” And Eva Clayton, a veteran battler against racism from eastern North Carolina, put it even more plainly: “Whether by accident or design, family planning as it is now conceived, is directed mainly toward reducing population growth among the poor, and primarily the Black poor. The implication in this direc-

* See especially, the coverage of the Kennedy hearings by Jack Waugh in the *Christian Science Monitor*, July 13, 1973.

tion is genocide."°

The furor raised in the summer due to the exposures detailed in earlier paragraphs resulted in regulations being adopted, in September, by HEW to prevent forced sterilization. Nevertheless, at the end of October 1973, the Health Research Group in Washington, D.C., released a study made by Dr. Bernard Rosenfeld, resident in obstetrics and gynecology at Los Angeles County Hospital and Sidney M. Wolfe, M.D., which stated:

Doctors in some cities are cavalierly subjecting women, most of them poor and Black, to surgical sterilization without explaining either potential hazards or alternate methods of birth control.

Furthermore:°°

Many women were being subjected to sterilization methods that posed a higher degree of medical risks than other methods in use.

"Informed consent" forms demanded of women by some hospitals were a farce in many cases.

Doctors in some hospitals were "selling" irreversible sterilization operations to many women who had few children and who were under psychological stress and might not be making rational decisions.

Meanwhile, fourteen States are in the process of considering proposed legislation that *would require women on welfare to submit to sterilization*; some time ago, Black and white women in Tennessee joined in a successful struggle against the passage of such a law in that State. Ideological justification and preparation for this kind of legislation has been appearing. Thus, Edgar R. Chasteen has devoted a book recently to arguing *The Case for Compulsory Birth Control* (Prentice-Hall, 1971) and Garrett Hardin, a well-known biologist, whose views are Social-Darwinist, argues that if a State supports

* These quotations are given in the essays by Nancy Hicks and Anne Braden, cited earlier. Du Bois was a very early supporter of the birth-control efforts of Margaret Sanger. At the same time, fifty years ago, he warned of the racist perversions that might afflict such a movement—see H. Aptheker, ed., *The Correspondence of W. E. B. Du Bois*, Vol. I, 1877-1934 (University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, 1973, pp. 301-02). When Eva Clayton used the term "genocide" she was speaking accurately. Of the five acts specified as constituting genocide in the UN convention on its prevention (adopted December 9, 1948), the fourth reads: "Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group."

** Richard D. Lyons, dispatch from Washington, in *New York Times*, October 31, 1973, p. 7. Of a dozen surgical operations performed in a Baltimore hospital, seven of the women were under twenty years of age. This report declared that one million women and one million men "were undergoing surgical sterilization every year in the United States."

children, it should have the power to legally divest potential parents of such children of the capacity to reproduce—this in his *Exploring New Ethnics for Survival*, published by Viking in 1972 and by Penguin, in paper, in 1973.*

o o o o

Some awareness of the historical dimension is needed if one is to comprehend the implications of this sterilization revival in the United States. With the beginnings of significant industrial capitalism in Europe and then in the United States, academicians turned their attention to certain threatening mass phenomena—like poverty and so-called criminal activity against property engaged in by the impoverished. Thus something called criminal anthropology appears by the late 1850's in France (B. A. Morel) and by the 1870's into the 1890's in Italy, England and the United States associated with some of the publications of Cesare Lombroso, Havelock Ellis and Richard Dugdale. At about the same time, not only was criminality biologically explained but there appeared the idea that poverty was a reflection of the biological inadequacy of the poor. There developed concepts of the "worthy poor" and the "unworthy poor" and frequently an equating of the "poorer classes" and the "criminal classes." From this it was not a very long step to the view of Marxism and socialism as the ideology of those who "threatened civilization." Hence, the concept of the "criminality" of Marxism, institutionalized in the legislation of Bismarck, the "criminal syndicalism" laws of the United States and its Smith and McCarran Acts and the practices of distinguished statesmen, such as Mussolini, Hitler, Franco and other Excellencies in South Africa, South Vietnam, South Korea, Guatemala, Greece, Iran, Brazil, Paraguay, Chile and other bulwarks of the "Free World."

With imperialism, this elitism and racism become blatant and pervasive.† A mixture of Social Darwinism and eugenism became prominent, as in Henry Martyn Boies'‡‡ *Prisoners and Paupers* (1893) where the suggestion was made that both the impoverished and the imprisoned should be not only segregated but also castrated.

* As part of the Cold-War and McCarthy era, with its Neo-Conservatism, went a revival of Malthusianism. Dean Acheson thought population growth was important in explaining the Chinese Revolution, the Rockefellerera began to pay for 'population studies.' Pressure was applied to the 'foreign aid' especially in Asia to policies of more or less compulsory sterilization; as late as 1968 Paul Ehrlich in his *The Population Bomb* was urging this. See D. Fleming, "Roots of the New Conservation Movement," in *Perspectives in American History* (Harvard University Press, 1972, VI, pp. 7-94); also, Steve Weissman, "The Population Bomb" in *American Report*, October 15, 1973. The ideas and policies were part of the counter-revolutionary essence of U. S. foreign policy.

W. Duncan McKim's *Heredity and Human Progress* (1900), on the basis of similar reasoning, concluded *that instead of segregation and castration*, "a gentle painless death" for the "unfit" would be a "solution." As for castration, magazines as important as *The Outlook*—Theodore Roosevelt's favorite periodical—were advocating this for "criminal Negroes" in the early 20th century (as President Nixon's spiritual adviser, the Reverend Billy Graham, did quite recently while visiting—of all places!—South Africa). Scientists—save the word!—also advocated this in "scientific" journals—thus Jesse Ewell, M.D., in the *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly*, January 11, 1907: "Castrate the criminal, cut off both his ears close to his head and turn him loose to go where he will." ° (Of course, from 1890 to 1910, others were putting "unfit" and "uncooperative" Black people to death through lynching—not exactly "painless"; castration for the male victims was a normal part of this ritual as conducted by the members of the "superior" race.)

The two most distinguished academic sociologists in the United States at this time—Professor William Z. Ripley of M.I.T. and Professor Franklin H. Giddings of Columbia University—were promulgating deeply racist views and favoring racist programs in such books as *The Races of Europe* (1899) and *Democracy and Empire* (1900)°° while the first immigration proposals openly racist in inspiration and content were being introduced into Congress in 1895 by no less a personage than Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts.

It is in this general period that people of lesser academic distinction began to put into operation the logic of such ideas and books. Thus, in the 1890's a supervisor of state institutions in Indiana began castration and sterilization operations though no statutory authorization therefor existed. After a few years word of this got out; the

‡ The present writer first documented this relationship in an essay published in *Jewish Life* in July 1950; in more developed form, most recently in a paper delivered at a University Conference Against Racism, held in Amherst, Massachusetts, in April 1973 and published in *Political Affairs*, July 1973. Material offered in the text above is not in these already published sources.

‡‡ Boies was a millionaire Pennsylvania industrialist, affiliated with Du Pont and prominent in antilabor activities in Pennsylvania. He was a colonel in the National Guard.

* On the "contributions" of Boies, McKim and Ewell, see Frank W. Haller, *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought* (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1963, Rutgers University Press, pp. 42, 46, 209).

** Almost as distinguished as Ripley and Giddings in sociology was Edward A. Ross, a professor at the University of Wisconsin. His *The Old World in the New* (1912) was fiercely racist and deeply anti-Jewish.

operations ceased, the official was neither punished nor removed but rather gently chided for his zealotry—to use a Nixonism.

The first act providing for the enforced sterilization of certain alleged defectives and “unfit” people was passed by Pennsylvania in 1905 but it was vetoed, with a notable message, by Governor Samuel W. Pennypacker. The Governor warned that the act “would be the beginning of experimentation upon living human beings, leading logically to results which can be readily forecast.” Governor Pennypacker went on to cite some views from recent partisans of such legislation to the effect that ancient practices of eliminating the unfit demonstrated really extraordinary “wisdom.” The first law passed in the United States for the sterilization of the “unfit” on the basis of allegedly eugenic principles came from Indiana in 1907. Two years later, that State was joined by California, Connecticut and Washington; the Connecticut law specifically included among those to be sterilized people showing an “inherited tendency to crime”!

From this period until the early 1920's twenty-one states—including almost all in the South—passed sterilization legislation. Another wave of such legislation occurred from 1927 through 1932, when Mississippi, West Virginia, Arizona, Oklahoma and Vermont passed similar laws. By the end of 1931 there had been recorded over 12,000 sterilization operations performed in accordance with the laws, while by the end of 1958 the total had climbed to over 61,000. California has the “honor” of leading all other States in the total of such operations, but three Southern states—North Carolina, Georgia and Virginia—led all others in terms of operations per inhabitant.*

As of 1948 there were twenty-seven states which still had such sterilization laws; all included “feeble-mindedness” as cause, while nine also included a category defined as “habitual criminals”; seven had a category labeled “moral degenerates” and “sexual perverts”; two included those suffering from syphilis; and one specified people suffering from “inheritable physical defects.” “Feeble-mindedness” was defined as scoring 70 or below on an I.Q. test. All data for all periods and all areas show that the greatest proportion of those sterilized were women and that a much higher percentage were Black rather than white people.

In the past, the presence of what one judge called “Negro blood” helped ensure sterilization of a man; in another the feeble-mindedness

* For data and quotations prior to 1922, see Harry H. Laughlin, *Eugenical Sterilization in the United States* (published by the Psychopathic Laboratory of the Municipal Court of Chicago, 1922); for the later period, M. W. Haller, *op. cit.* and also, Moya Woodside, *Sterilization in North Carolina* (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1950).

of a white woman was confirmed because "this patient did not possess the normal aversions of a white girl to a colored man who was perhaps nice to her." Governor Pennypacker of Pennsylvania has not been alone among officials calling attention to the dangers involved in this kind of legislation. Thus, a New Jersey court ruled in 1913 against the constitutionality of relevant State law by declaring that the logic of Malthusianism was the destruction of unwanted people and that, in addition: "Racial differences, for instance, might afford a basis for such an opinion in communities where that question is unfortunately a permanent and paramount issue." Again, in 1921, Governor William Sproul of Pennsylvania vetoed another effort by its legislature to enact sterilization requirements for "undesirable" people and remarked: "Besides those afflicted with physical or mental diseases, many other persons might be undesirable citizens in the opinion of a majority of the Legislature." *

The funding for the first major "scientific" institution devoted to sterilization in the name of eugenics came from Mrs. E. H. Harri-man, the widow of the railroad tycoon, who explained her interest in the subject by remarking that she was an enthusiastic horsewoman and so naturally was concerned about "bloodlines." This was the Cold Spring Harbor, New York, Eugenics Record Office, opened in 1910 and then in 1918 taken over as one of the enterprises of the Carnegie Institution in Washington.

Dr. Harry H. Laughlin was the man in charge of the Cold Spring Harbor effort; he served also as what was called the Eugenics Associate of the Psychopathic Laboratory of the Municipal Court of Chicago—whose chief justice, Harry Olson, was a fanatical racist and supporter of Lothrop Stoddard, the latter a Harvard Ph.D. and author of the notorious and very influential *The Rising Tide of Color*.

It was Laughlin's book, cited earlier, which was published by the Municipal Court itself and which served as a text for the eugenics movement between the two World Wars and as a source for much of the legislation in this field passed during that era.

It is in this book that one finds what is called a model eugenical state law. It is lengthy but requires quotation for it was decisive to the history and thinking in this field in the United States and in Europe—especially in Germany—and it defines certain basic assumptions which still underlay elitist and racist thinking whether articulated by Schockley, Eysenck, Jensen or Banfield. The model

* This case occurred in New Jersey in 1912—see Laughlin, *op. cit.*, p. 296. For the court's decision and the Governor's veto, see Laughlin, pp. 39, 175. The Laughlin book calls attention to the great interest in sterilization being displayed in Germany in the early 1920's—see p. 120.

commences with an overall target: "A socially inadequate person is one who by his or her own effort, regardless of etiology or prognosis, fails chronically in comparison with normal persons, to maintain himself or herself as a useful member of the organized social life of the state."

It then details the particulars of the target:

The socially inadequate classes, regardless of etiology or prognosis, are the following: 1) feeble-minded; 2) insane; 3) criminalistic (including the delinquent and wayward); 4) epileptic; 5) inebriate . . . ; 6) diseased (including the tuberculous, the syphilitic, the leprous, and others with chronic, infectious and legally segregable diseases); 7) blind (including those with seriously impaired vision); 8) deaf (including those with seriously impaired hearing); 9) deformed (including the crippled); and 10) dependent (including orphans, ne'er-do-wells, the homeless, tramps and paupers).

Dr. Laughlin's list of the socially inadequate who should be sterilized included people like John Milton, Beethoven, Robert Louis Stevenson, Helen Keller, Thomas Edison, O'Henry, Toulouse-Lautrec and Jesus Christ; one would think that was sufficient. But one would be wrong, for the law must encompass not only the "socially inadequate" but also "a potential parent of socially inadequate offspring" and obviously in a scientific work all terms must be defined; therefore Dr. Laughlin does not fail to define the potential parent of a socially inadequate offspring. Here is his definition, as stated in his model law, as to who was to be sterilized if the problems of the world were to be solved. Take a deep breath—or adjust your glasses and read on:*

A potential parent of socially inadequate offspring is a person who regardless of his or her own physical, physiological or psychological personality, and of the nature of the germ-plasm of such person's co-parent, is a potential parent of at least one-fourth of whose possible offspring, because of the certain inheritance from said parent of one or more inferior or degenerate physical, physiological or psychological qualities would, on the average, according to the demonstrated laws of heredity, most probably function as socially inadequate persons; or at least one-half of whose possible offspring would receive from said parent, and would carry in the germ-plasm but would not necessarily show in the personality, the genes or genes-complex for one or more inferior or degenerate physical, physiological or psychological

* Laughlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 446-47.

qualities, the appearance of which quality or qualities in the personality would cause the possessor thereof to function as a socially inadequate person under the normal environment of the state.

One could laugh, if he did not discern behind the verbal monstrosity the stench of the crematoria.

It is sobering to recall that the only ruling on the constitutionality of laws inspired by this kind of thinking that has yet come from the United States Supreme Court was pronounced by no less a person than Oliver Wendell Holmes. Holding Virginia's law to be constitutional, Justice Holmes said (*Buck v. Bell*, 1927) that "It is better for all the world if instead of waiting for their imbecility society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind."

Professor J. H. Landman correctly pointed out that this decision "definitely committed the United States to a policy of human sterilization for good or for bad as a means of coping with the socially undesirable in our midst"; the decision was followed by a flood of similar legislation in other states, avowedly aimed, as Professor Landman wrote at the time, against "the acute current crime wave"—and that was published over forty years ago.

Of course, as the late J. B. S. Haldane remarked, the problem with Justice Holmes' decision—who may have known something about the law but was not known to be an expert in biology or sociology—was that both the law and his decision left somewhat vague the "manifestly unfit" (unless one went back to Laughlin) and also the question of who continued what kind. Professor Landman cogently noted of Holmes' finding: "The opinion is astoundingly brief and unusually platitudinous. The jurist is disconcerted by the absence of citations to support its legal principles and the psychiatrist and sociologist are equally surprised by the lack of a thorough understanding of the field of eugenics." °

With the flood of legislation after Holmes' decision, came also a new boldness in expression. Thus, Dr. Paul Popenoe, in the *Journal of Heredity* in 1928, suggested that ten million people in the United States should be sterilized, while a best-selling writer of the time Professor Walter B. Pitkin, in his *Twilight of the American Mind* (New York, 1928, Simon & Schuster) urged in his preface: "Exterminate the feebleminded and the morons! Multiply the superior stocks." †

* J. H. Landman, *Human Sterilization: The History of the Sexual Sterilization Movement* (New York, 1932, Macmillan, pp. 97-99, 104, 113); J. B. S. Haldane, *Heredity and Politics* (New York, 1938, Norton, p. 15); Haldane's quotation of Holmes is not fully accurate.

Shortly, Hitler enacted what was called the Hereditary Health Law (July 13, 1933); during its first year of operation, over 56,000 people were sterilized. Ultimately, under Hitler, about 250,000 people were so treated; this was explicitly the inspiration for so-called euthanasia under Hitler (by decree in 1939 and by law in 1941), pursuant to which 50,000 people were put to death—all this useful experimentation, of course, for the eventual mass murder of millions of “socially inadequate” people—Jews, Communists, socialists and other chronic malcontents and aliens. Books were published in the United States, after Hitler’s “experimentations” had begun, which openly defended his policies and did so in terms of laws, ideas and practices which had been common in the United States.*

The United States, being the main spawning ground in the world for racism, with its dominant ideology immersed in elitism, with the historical background briefly sketched and with the current practices to which attention has been called, is now a society whose ruling class is in profound crisis and whose more astute political servants—like Senator Fulbright—describe it as being “sick.”

It is within that context also that the proliferation of chemical and surgical experimentation upon human beings in the United States is to be weighed. Data concerning this phenomenon are accumulating and it will be helpful to present this evidence and then to suggest general conclusions and a program for positive action. As in the case of sterilization practices, so, too, in the field of human experimentation, national attention was focused upon it because of what had been done to Black people. But just as was true in sterilization, this was not a danger to Black people alone, for as U.S. history in particular proves, the special victimization of one people threatens the well-being of all people.

(For reasons of space, the conclusion of this essay will appear in the next issue.)

‡ Popenoe later was an ardent defender of Nazi racist practice and theory. Harry Laughlin, whose 1922 book we have cited earlier, was awarded an honorary doctorate in medicine by the University of Heidelberg in 1936—see, Kenneth M. Lumerer, *Genetics and American Society: An Historical Appraisal* (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1972, p. 118).

* Thus, Leon F. Whitney, *The Case for Sterilization* (New York, 1934, Stokes) and Lothrop Stoddard, *Into the Darkness: Nazi Germany Today* (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, New York, 1940). Of course, Hitler found the racist laws in the United States as useful precedents for his own legislation of that type. Similar defenses of Hitler’s practices appeared in Britain; especially advocated was “compulsory sterilization as a punishment for parents who have to resort to public assistance in order to support their children”—this from Professor MacBride in *Nature* (1936), quoted by Haldane, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

COMMUNICATIONS

JOHN VAGO

A Comment on Skinner and Pragmatism

I found Joseph Reynolds' review, in the May 1973 issue, of *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* by B.F. Skinner, to be highly illuminating and interesting. In this brief but penetrating critique of Skinner, Reynolds analyzes an area of science—psychology—which most of us (myself included) know all too little about. He showed the use of this science for reactionary purposes, and indicated the need for much more Marxist work in this area. With the increased use of psychology in recent years as part of the ideological offensive of capitalism, his point is well taken.

A number of thoughts come to mind from reading Reynolds' review regarding aspects of the question which are not dealt with in the review, but might be worth further analysis. Skinner's theory of behavior engineering, with its emphasis on programmed results, suggests a relationship to the ideology of pragmatism. Further, it also carries an implication, with its rejection of volition, conscious decisions, etc., of a concept that in order to achieve "desired" behavior, people must be conditioned to conform to such behavior without considering their own thought processes. The most obvious questions here is, who and by what measure is to determine what con-

stitutes "desired" behavior? This concept also smacks of an "end justifies the means" principle—which Communists are always falsely accused of advocating, but here it is set out fairly directly by an open defender of capitalism. The social elitist essence of this theory is self-evident, as Reynolds pointed out. The rejection, along with it, of concepts of morality and justice would seem to provide logical basis for the recent promotion of psycho-surgery as a solution to social conflict. When one considers the political implications of all these factors, and the uses to which these concepts are being put in our society, a clear racist direction becomes evident. There is a striking parallel also to the theories of social "misbehavior" of the Jensen-Banfield variety. In its overall outlook, the Skinner "behavior modification" concept strikes me as a psychological rationale for fascism. The genocidal drugging of school children to "control behavior," with official approval, is an apparent result of the application of this kind of approach.

Some additional comments by Reynolds, on the above questions, would be useful to many, I am sure, in bringing further clarity on the misuse of psychology for reactionary purposes.

Author's Reply

John Vago's perceptive letter adds several important points to a Marxist-Leninist analysis of Skinner's views and skillfully ties together a number of other psychological theories and techniques into a neat package of imperialist ideology and practice. Some added comments may be helpful.

1. Although, to my knowledge, there is no direct influence of pragmatism on Skinner's behavioral engineering (i.e., programming people's behavior),* both theories are currents in the bourgeois ideological stream which denies the importance of thought, consciousness, reason and theory. Pragmatism stakes its all on successful results, on action which achieves the goal of the individual, on "the cash-value of ideas." Thus, William James states flatly: "The true,' to put it briefly, is only the expedient in the way of our thinking . . ." (*Pragmatism*, New York, 1907, p. 222). Hence, whatever is expedient at the moment and may work is true for each individual. Dialectical materialism, by contrast, holds that truth is the correspondence of an idea or theory to reality; therefore, theory must serve as a guide for practice.

* Skinner refers to but does not accept pragmatist William James' theory of emotions (the famous James-Lange theory), *Science and Human Behavior*, The Free Press, N.Y., 1953, p. 160.

Skinner likewise throws out thought, reason and theory and puts all his psychological money on behavior and its control through reinforcement. Here, brother Vago shows keen insight in concluding that acceptance by the masses of Skinner's behavioral engineering would lead to their conditioned performance of "desired behavior" without relying on their own volitions, thought processes and conscious decisions. This, naturally, would lead to theory-less practice or behavior.

The seeping of both Skinnerism and pragmatism into the minds of the masses can only retard the development of socialist class consciousness; as Lenin put it: "Without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement."

2. Pragmatism and Skinnerism equally reject any objective criterion for morality and justice. They both would lead to an acceptance of Establishment morality: pragmatic success within the status quo or behavior desired by Skinner and the capitalist system. William James puts it: ". . . 'the right' is only the expedient in the way of our behavior (*ibid.*)." Expediency, for the pragmatist, is anything that works in a given situation. Hence, any means is justified to achieve a practical end—all that matters is success.

For Skinner, "desired behavior" is the end to be achieved—

any reinforcement to achieve such behavior should be used. Marxism-Leninism, on the other hand, requires practice to flow from theory while theory itself is the generalization of social and scientific experience and practice. Brother Vago correctly states that the very charge of any-means-to-an-end falsely levelled at Communists is full applicable to the monopolists and their Watergate gang. Even *New York Times* columnist William V. Shannon characterizes "the constitutional and moral crisis" of the Nixon Administration with these searing words: "After four years of ruthless war, secret bombings and false reports, of shameless deceit of ordinary citizens and open contempt of the constitutional authority of Congress, of crafty manipulation of the press and wiretapping of his own staff, after all these brutalities and deceptions, Mr. Nixon now suggests that he had found a new Secretary of State (Kissinger) who will conduct a foreign policy founded upon democratic candor and Congressional cooperation." (*N.Y. Times*, August 28, 1973.) One can see Mr. Shannon justly shaking with rage at this new any-means-to-an-end chicanery of Nixon.

3. The social elitism of Skinner and the use of his behavioral engineering plan by reaction and fascism should be more fully exposed. Skinner himself readily admits such possible use: "A very common comment on my book is that it might be basically fascist—that it gives aid and comfort to fascism. Maybe it does in a

sense, but whether it gives advantage to fascism depends entirely on whether other ways of life are able to take advantage of what we are learning about human behavior." (*N.Y. Times*, April 2, 1972.) At the very same panel where Skinner stated this, the poet Stephen Spender used a brilliant phrase when he called Skinner's ideas "fascism without tears." For, of course, behavioral engineering would be a cold-blooded totalitarian enforcement of behavior by the top behavioral engineer.

The reactionary use of Skinner's "behavior modification" (*i.e.*, changing behavior by positive reinforcement or nonreinforcement) is vividly demonstrated in the savage "Brownie Point Welfare Plan" approved last year by Nixon's Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This Plan specifically called for "behavior modification" of welfare families. Specifically, the welfare grant of, for instance, a family of four in New York City would be reduced from \$3763 to \$2400 with the family "being given the opportunity" of earning back the difference of \$1363 by winning behavior points worth \$12.50 each. Among such behavior points were the following:

- a. Participation of the children in the Boy Scouts, 4-H, etc.
- b. Cooperation of parents with school authorities.
- c. Participation in the establishment of the paternity of out-of-wedlock children.
- d. Attendance of adults at family life education programs.

Only the mass fight-back by angered welfare recipients and their community supporters has thus far prevented the implementation of this Skinnerian-based plan to achieve "desired behavior" through violating the most elementary rights of the individual and the family. It might be added that Skinner himself is a notorious conservative in the political sphere and "brownie point engineering" under his aegis would please the monopolists no end.

4. The Watergate mentality and practices of the Nixonites are being carried into the psychological-psychiatric field by a resurgence of the use of psychosurgery, drugs, electroshock and hypnosis. In a finely-honed scientific analysis of psychosurgery (introduced into the *Congressional Record* of February 24, 1972, by Congressman Cornelius Gallagher of New Jersey), Dr. Peter R. Breggin exposed the growing menace of the use of psychosurgery on Blacks, women and dissidents. This discredited technique (outlawed in the Soviet Union), which mutilates the brain in order to achieve a specific behavior, is being actively used to control anti-Establishment activity. As Dr. Breggin warned: "We are in danger of creating a society in which everyone who deviates from the norm will be in danger of surgical mutilation."

That such a warning is called for is shown by the report in the *Daily World* (June 12, 1973) that a bus-load of chained and caged prisoners, mostly Black, were being sent from Jackson State Peni-

tentiary to an intensive treatment program in Marquette, Michigan: "The treatment ranges from isolation, drugs and hypnosis, to lobotomies, electrode brain implants, electroshock and other brain surgery. After receiving this, many of them will probably be vegetables for the rest of their lives."

Gov. Reagan has sponsored a similar treatment center at the Neuropsychiatric Institute of U.C.L.A. to do research on "violence-prone" individuals, especially "violent slum-dwellers" who differ from their "peaceful neighbors," (*Daily World*, June 15, 1973).

Strong opposition to these brutal activities has come from the Prisoners Labor Union of Jackson State Penitentiary and from members of the Science for the People organization, as well as from Dr. Breggin who declared passionately in the *Village Voice* (November 23, 1972): "You can't destroy parts of the human brain which control emotions without committing a partial murder!"

5. Racism, the strongest prop of U.S. monopoly, has produced its bastard theories in psychology and sociology. Arthur Jensen has won his racist spurs with his theory of genetic inferiority in intelligence of Blacks (and workers). Daniel Moynihan, then domestic advisor to Nixon, admits to briefing Nixon and his cabinet on Jensen's theory—result, of course, was the butchering of the Headstart program of compensatory education.

Working the sociological side

of the racist street is Edward C. Banfield, who puts forth a program for fascist-like control of Blacks and "the lower class." This program flows from his view that the cause for poverty and ghettos is psychological, that it is the personality and character traits. Banfield concludes that no matter what is done for them "the performance of pupils at the lower end of the class-cultural scale will always fall short not only of pupils at the upper end of the scale, but also of what is necessary to make them educated workers." (*The Unheavenly City*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1970, p. 142.) At the time he wrote his unheavenly book which proposes hell for Blacks and workers, Ban-

field was Professor at Harvard University and Chairman of President Nixon's Model Cities Program. It might be added that Banfield has great respect for Jensen's theory.

Psychology and sociology are behavioral sciences. As such, they are not neutral and objective in a monopoly-dominated society. The noxious growths in psychology and sociology poison the healthy flowers of working class consciousness. Marxists and progressives must first understand and analyze these unscientific theories and practices, then expose them, and, most important, fight their political and economic consequences.

DAVID ENGLESTEIN

Political Economy and Alienation

Alienation is discussed in psychological terms, in sociological studies, in the cultural sphere and, of course, in the field of philosophy. All too rarely is it discussed adequately in terms of political economy as such. In the proliferation of books on alienation in general there is an occasional reference to the economic aspects—or origin—of alienation. In texts and studies of Marxist political economy in the English language (in the original or in translation) there is a poverty of material on alienation as a concept of Marxist political economy.

At the outset, let me state that

I reject the view of some Marxists and non-Marxists alike that alienation is at the very core of Marxism, and that consequently all else in Marxism fades into secondary importance *vis-a-vis* the "philosophical" implications of alienation. In not accepting these conclusions about the centrality and weight of alienation in the totality of Marxism, I am not passing judgment on specific socio-psychological or philosophical findings as such.

To the legitimate question as to where I stand in the decades-long debate concerning the "young" Marx *versus* the "ma-

ture" Marx I need but add: since in this paper I am interested primarily in economic alienation I will not participate in the "larger" debate on the philosophical implications of alienation beyond my statement in the previous paragraph, and I am of the opinion that there is a continuity in the treatment of economic alienation from 1844 on and with refinements in its evolution it is subordinated to the theory of surplus value (more on this later). Since the ultimate roots of all alienation are economic, economic alienation does not take second place to other interpretations of estrangement even though many writers are attempting to make it do just that.

My objective, then, is to present the case for the necessity of including extended discussion on alienation in its political economic manifestations in Marxist works on political economy.

If texts—or general volumes—on Marxist political economy originating in English up to about 15 years ago did not concern themselves with the question of alienation the reasons are more or less understandable: (1) Marx's *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* had not yet been widely read in English and evaluated; (2) his *Grundrisse* (written in 1857-58 but until recently unavailable in full in English translation) had similarly not had its full and deserved impact; and (3) so many texts had traditionally based themselves almost exclusively on *Capital*, particularly Volume 1, and on Lenin's *Imperialism*.

For those books originating in other languages and eventually translated into English this explanation will not hold, as translations of the works dealing with alienation have been available in Russian, in the original German, and in French in some cases for decades.

But it is another matter entirely when through 1972 we still find that volumes written in the last decade or so on Marxist political economy make no reference to alienation, with the exception, of course, of a discussion on the fetishism of commodities (based on the reference to the subject in Volume 1 of *Capital*).

I consider it imperative that economic alienation be presented as a separate and distinct topic in any general work dealing with the basic concepts of Marxist political economy, and that furthermore it be integrated into the work as a whole. I now proceed to delineate this position in the context of four interrelated questions:

1. What is meant by alienation in the Marxist political economic sense?

2. What is the relation of alienation to the theory of surplus value, of exploitation, and to the concept of the fetishism of commodities?

3. Why should alienation be treated as an integral part of Marxist political economy?

4. What practical implications are involved in the inclusion of alienation in political economy—in particular for workers in the U.S.A.?

"Political economy conceals the

estrangement inherent in the nature of labor by not considering the direct relationship between the worker and production" says Marx in *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*. (International Publishers, New York, 1964, pp. 109-110. Emphasis in original.) Marx, of course, meant classical political economy. It follows therefore that just as wages obscure exploitation, and it is the task of Marxist political economy to uncover the process of how wages mask exploitation, similarly Marxist political economy lays bare the alienation inherent in the capitalist production relations.

Marx asks and answers the question "What, then, constitutes the alienation of labor?" In order to avoid lengthy quotes from his *Manuscripts*, I will limit myself to the briefest of his replies.

(1) The worker in his work "does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content but unhappy, does not develop his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and ruins his mind." (P. 110.) (2) "The object which labor produces—labor's product—confronts it as *something alien*, as a *power independent of the producer*." (P. 108.) (3) Since man is estranged from the product of his labor and from labor itself the phenomenon of "*the estrangement of man from man*" follows. And, finally, Marx notes (4) man's estrangement from nature.

In simpler terms economic alienation (as distinct but not unrelated to the larger sociological alienation) is a working

condition, where the worker feels as if he were a cog in a machine, where he controls neither his labor nor the *product of his labor*. He operates in a factory environment where he resents the monotony and hates his job. He is not at home with his work, with himself or his fellow workers.

Without using the word "alienation" Marx aptly described it in 1847 in a lecture to the German Workingmen's Club of Brussels:

But the putting of labor-power into action, *i.e.*, the work is the active expression of the laborer's own life, and this life activity he sells to another person in order to secure the necessary means of life. His life-activity, therefore, is but a means of securing his own existence. He works that he may keep alive. He does not count the labour itself as a part of his life; it is rather a sacrifice of his life. It is a commodity that he has auctioned off to another. The product of his activity, therefore is not the aim of his activity. What he produces for himself is not the silk that he weaves, not the gold that he draws up the mining shaft, not the palace that he builds. What he produces for himself is wages; and the silk, the gold, and the palace are resolved for him into a certain quantity of necessities of life, perhaps into a cotton jacket, into copper coins, and into a basement dwelling. And the laborer who for twelve hours long, weaves, spins, bores, turns, builds, shovels, breaks stone, carries hods, and so on—is this twelve hours' weaving, spinning, boring, turning, building, shoveling, stone-breaking regarded by him as a manifestation of life, as

life? Quite the contrary. Life for him begins where this activity ceases, at the table, at the tavern seat, in bed. The twelve hours' work, on the other hand, has no meaning for him as weaving, spinning, boring, and so on, but only as earnings, which enable him to sit down at a table, to take his seat in the tavern, and to lie down in a bed. If the silk-worm's object in spinning were to prolong its existence as caterpillar, it would be a perfect example of a wage-worker. (*Wage Labor and Capital*, International Publishers, New York, 1933, p. 19.)

Thus economic alienation is a work condition that is closely tied to the system of exploitation. It is not, as some would have it, the human condition—unrelated to capitalist production relations and its law of exploitation. As the worker produces hourly and daily a surplus above the value of his labor power this surplus is alienated by the capitalists. This physical alienation of the product by the ruling class is not only accompanied by speedup, but the worker's spirit is crushed by the deadly routine of a task that he repeats hundreds of times in one day. He is dehumanized.

Given the primacy of exploitation the worker's estrangement from his work is ever present though the degree of alienation may vary from time to time and from factory to factory, and from office to office. Bad working conditions such as inadequate lighting or poor ventilation may be directly linked to higher profits. Similarly are repetitive tasks and speedup tied in with maxi-

mizing profits. Alienation is inherent in the capitalist private ownership of the means of production and these working conditions—among others—just enhance the worker's sense of not belonging. It is a demeaning, oppressive condition of work.

While alienation is not a condition limited to capitalism it is not within the scope of this paper to investigate its manifestations under other socio-economic systems. Limiting it to capitalism, one should note that "fetishism" and "alienation" are not synonymous. Fetishism of commodities is a narrower term referring to commodities, to things, that magic-like seem to take on personal characteristics, and appear to have social qualities. The basic relation between people in commodity production takes on the form of a relation between things. Alienation is the larger concept referring to economic, political, cultural, philosophical expressions of estrangement. I am concerned in this paper primarily with economic alienation, which embraces commodity fetishism and goes beyond it.

The phenomenon of economic alienation in no way detracts from the surplus value-creating process inherent in capitalism. In fact another dimension of oppression is added to the exploitation of the worker. To the struggle against exploitation is added the fight against alienation. Absenteeism, talking back to the foreman, moving from one employer to another are individual ways of expressing frustrations on the job. Wildcat strikes are

rank and file actions against speedup and accumulated unsolved grievances—the dehumanization that goes on. As they fight the monopolists the workers begin to find a human bond with other workers and are thus also fighting aspects of alienation. The very origin of trade unions can be traced to resistance to exploitation and alienation.

Some workers may not know the precise meaning of exploitation and alienation but young workers, above all, express enormous dissatisfaction with their jobs. Says a worker in Detroit, he is “nothing but a tool.” A sewage treatment worker in New York City puts it this way: “You keep pounding your head against the wall and you don’t get anywhere. It’s not the nature of the work. It’s just what we call the system today.” (Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz, *“The Unions,”* series in the *Washington Post*.)

If these conditions of work—alongside of exploitation—obtain for the white worker, particularly the young white worker, how much more intense, how much more degrading are they for the Black worker and other super-exploited national minorities. Young or old they face institutionalized racism at the dirtiest and poorest paid jobs. To the degree that resistance and militancy has helped overcome some of the worst work conditions the Black man and Black woman and workers of other oppressed minorities have found a national identity with their brothers and sisters, and a class identity with Black, Brown and white workers as the

latter join the fight against racism. Thus alienation is partially overcome in joint struggle as workers identify with their class.

Discrimination against women, their low pay, occupational sex-typing and the division of labor that ensues, conditions of the work place, and a built in system of male supremacy—all combined result in the superexploitation of women. Simultaneously many women manifest deep dissatisfaction with their jobs and express an economic alienation that is not unrelated to other cultural forms of estrangement. To the degree that the trade unions fight for special demands of the working woman, to the extent that the women’s liberation movement identifies with the working woman’s economic and social problems can a common struggle be launched against an alienation that divides men and women workers to their mutual harm.

The economic alienation of scientific and technical workers (now numbering in the hundreds of thousands) directly involved in the production process is similar to that of the industrial worker, since their labor power, their research and the commodities they help to produce are alienated by the capitalist class. Outwardly it may appear that these intellectuals experience primarily other aspects of estrangement, such as “an extraordinary sense of *irrelevance which is the alienation of labor in its most acute form.*” (Bettina Aptheker, *The Academic Rebellion in the United States*, Citadel, Seacaucus, N.J., 1972, p. 148.)

Some 50 years ago, unacquainted with the works of young Marx, George Lukacs in his *History and Class Consciousness* drew some amazingly creative conclusions from Marx's fetishism of commodities. "Amazing" because they frequently parallel the alienation concept of Marx. For example: "In the commodity the worker recognizes himself and his own relations with capital." (MIT Press, Cambridge, 1971, p. 68.) Or, "the specific nature of this kind of commodity [labor-power] had consisted in the fact that beneath the cloak of the thing lay a relation between men, that beneath the quantifying crust there was a qualitative, living core. Now that this core is revealed it becomes possible to recognize the fetish character of every commodity based on the commodity character of labor power; in every case we find its core, the relation between men, entering into the evolution of society." (*Ibid.*, p. 169.)

If Marx had not introduced alienation as a concept of political economy Marxists today would have to invent it.

The form of wages, the commodity-producing pattern of capitalism, the economic alienation process all tend to disguise the true class nature of capitalism and Marxist political economy has as its central responsibility tearing this veil away and laying bare the relations of capitalism not in one or the other but in all three of these basic phenomena.

Thus as a topic alienation deserves a chapter in a general work on Marxist political economy in

the same way as commodity production, capitalist exploitation, imperialism and other subjects do. But if the subject of exploitation is naturally not limited to one chapter but referred to again and again throughout such a book, similarly must economic alienation be integrated into the teaching of political economy.

While alienation is inherent in capitalism its concrete manifestations today in the United States deserve special study. Research and scholarly works on the questions abound and Marxists should read them critically and with advantage.* In one of these the dimensions of alienation are listed as powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, self-evaluative involvement and instrumental work orientation. Various factory and office workers were interviewed to discover comparative levels of alienation. It is not within the scope of this paper to evaluate this study. But the reader may be interested in a brief description of the dimensions of alienation as listed. Powerlessness and meaninglessness are self-explanatory as work attitudes. "Items in the Normlessness Scale were designed to measure the perceived extent to which upward mobility in the company required illegitimate tactics as opposed to

* Some recent books on the subject include: Robert Blauner, *Alienation and Freedom*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964, and *Automation, Alienation and Anomie*, Harper & Row, New York, 1970; William A. Faunce, *Problems of an Industrial Society*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968.

achievement on the basis of merit. . . ." (Jon M. Shepard, *Automation and Alienation*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1971, p. 15.)

"Self-evaluative involvement in work is concerned with the degree to which one evaluates oneself with regard to the work role" (*ibid.*, p. 17); for example: is your work (or occupation) only a small part of who you are?

Self-evaluative involvement is related to Marx's term of "self-alienation." "Work is valued primarily as a means to non-work ends rather than valued for its intrinsic rewards." (*Ibid.*, p. 16.) (The quote from Marx's *Wage-Labor and Capital* given above is a good description of self-alienation, but Shepard does not use it even though admittedly he has difficulty in describing self-estrangement.)

The grievances related to alienation may well loom larger in trade union and working-class struggles as workers' consciousness about the nature of the capitalist system grows. Marxist political economy can make a unique contribution to this consciousness and to these class battles.

May I be permitted a personal note. After teaching political economy for many years, four years ago I experimented, with a group of young workers, by introducing the subject of alienation after discussing exploitation.

The response and involvement of the students were highly encouraging. One commented: "How much Eaton's book on political economy would have been improved with a chapter on economic alienation."

Marx's "self-clarification" on economic alienation can be traced without great difficulty by the writer, teacher and student of political economy. Starting with the *Manuscripts*, followed by material in *The German Ideology* and *Wage-Labor and Capital*, one then finds relevant passages in the *Grundrisse*. In addition to the fetishism of commodities in Volume I of *Capital* there are other helpful allusions in Volumes I, II and IV (*Theories of Surplus Value*).

This approach to the inclusion of economic alienation in the teaching and study of political economy, with examples from daily life in factory and office, can only enhance the science and add to our understanding of the oppressive and moribund nature of capitalism today. It further will arm workers—in particular young workers—in the ideological battle against the system. Spontaneous struggles against conditions in the work place—"blue collar blues" and "white collar woes"—can thus become informed mass struggles directed against exploitation and alienation.

Exploitation and Alienation

We believe that Comrade Englestein's communication raises an important question. It is indeed necessary to deal explicitly with alienation as an aspect of capitalist exploitation. This all the more urgent today in view of the intensified efforts of modern revisionists and exponents of "post-industrial society" to counterpose the two. The exploitation of wage labor and the class struggle, we are told, are no longer central features of capitalism but are being replaced by the emergence of a body of technologists, engineers, scientists and other professionals who are now the key factors in the process of production, and who suffer not exploitation but alienation. That is, they are denied a voice in the control of production in keeping with their specialized knowledge. In the words of Alain Touraine, "We are leaving a society of exploitation and entering a society of alienation." (*The Post-Industrial Society*, Random House, New York, 1971, p. 61)

In this context the proposal that alienation receive more adequate treatment in works on political economy is to be welcomed. But what is involved is not the mere inclusion of something that has been omitted. It is essential to combat the false separation of alienation from exploitation, to make clear the intimate interconnection of the two, the fact that alienation is not something added to exploitation but is part of the exploitative process itself.

On this score we feel that Englestein's presentation suffers in places from a tendency to separate the two. That is evident, for example, in such statements as the following: "Given the primacy of exploitation the worker's estrangement from his work is ever present. . . ." Or: ". . . another dimension of oppression is added to the exploitation of the worker. To the struggle against exploitation is added the fight against alienation."

But the examples he gives—speedup, bad working conditions, the repetitive and dehumanizing character of labor—are part and parcel of the process of exploitation of labor, of the efforts of the capitalists to maximize the extraction of surplus value. The fight of workers against speedup, for instance, is a fight against intensification of exploitation.

Secondly, the communication fails to note that the essence of the alienation of the worker's labor and its product lies in the fact that what he produces is not use-values to satisfy his own needs but *capital*. The result of his labor is the accumulation of capital. It is, as Marx puts it, the increasing domination of dead labor over living labor. This fact and its consequences form the heart of Volume I of *Capital*, even though the term "alienation" is not used there.

Finally, it seems questionable whether the economic and social aspects of alienation, and in particular of the concept of fetishism

of commodities can so readily be separated. Marx repeatedly stresses the emergence of capital as a *social* force, based on socialized production rather than on the isolated labor of individuals. It appears as an alienated, independent social power, and it is this which is expressed in the fetishism of commodities. But this creates social and ideological illu-

sions, which must also be taken taken into account. It is not possible to confine oneself entirely to "economic alienation."

These brief critical comments are intended to point to the need for a more probing examination of the concept of alienation in relation to political economy. We invite comments from our readers on this question.

BOOK REVIEWS

HYMER LUMER

Our Unstable Economy

In the United States, competent Marxist works in the field of political economy are all too rare. Hence the appearance of a major work such as Victor Perlo's latest book is greatly to be welcomed.* In it he combines statistical analysis with theory to present a highly illuminating picture of the ups and downs of the U.S. economy since World War II and of the underlying rise in economic instability which characterize this period.

The relative mildness and shortness of duration of postwar economic downturns, coupled with an unprecedented eight-year period of uninterrupted upswing, led

many in bourgeois economic circles to conclude that economic cycles were becoming a thing of the past. To these the crisis of 1969-71 came as a rude jolt, a reminder that the cycle remains an inherent feature of capitalist production.

With this introduction Perlo proceeds to discuss the question "Why Cycles?" He presents as the only consistent and realistic explanation the Marxist theory that cyclical crises are crises of overproduction, arising from the contradiction between production and consumption inherent in capitalist exploitation. He then shows, using the ratio of wages to value added in manufacturing as a rough measure, that the rate of surplus value—a prime factor in relation to cyclical crises—has risen greatly during the postwar

* Victor Perlo, *The Unstable Economy: Booms and Recessions in the U.S. Since 1945*, International Publishers, New York, 1973, cloth \$10.00, paper \$4.25.

years, and that correspondingly real take-home pay per unit of production has fallen off considerably. In short, the contradiction between production and consumption has become progressively sharper. At the same time, Perlo notes, there are offsets to the effect of rising exploitation, among them a growth in the proportion of investment and government expenditures, expansion of the financial and service industries, and the skyrocketing of consumer credit.

A chapter is devoted to the profit cycle, a crucial factor in the economic cycle as a whole. It is a decline in the rate of profit, due to changing supply-demand relations, that leads capitalists to curtail investment and production. Perlo shows that: "Since World War II, the turn in profits led the turn in total activity eight out of nine times and at every peak." (P. 57.) He refers to Marx's law of the falling tendency of the rate of profit, arising from the growing ratio of constant to variable capital; however, he does not attempt to analyze the longer-range effects of this tendency on the economic cycle.

Perlo depicts the mounting financial contradictions since World War II—in particular, the growing strains in the credit system and the rise of indebtedness in relation to the volume of production as factors in the generation of crises. He points to the rise of corporate and other indebtedness and to the recent skyrocketing of interest rates as illustrative of the increasing financial difficulties of U.S. monopoly

capital.

Of special interest is Perlo's treatment of inflation as a factor in the postwar economic cycles. Since 1940, he notes, rising prices—and especially rising retail prices—have become a built-in feature of the U.S. and other capitalist economies. The source of this, he shows, is inflation in its precise meaning, that is, "the depreciation of paper money, the issuance of currency beyond a normal ratio to the production and circulation of commodities." (Pp. 88-89.) This has become a conscious policy of monopoly capital and the agencies of capitalist government, designed to stimulate economic growth, to serve as a substitute for wage cuts in increasing capital's share of the product, and as a means of draining increased profits from the developing countries.

Bourgeois economics seeks to hide this by equating inflation with rising prices, whatever the cause. It develops a theory of "cost-push inflation" which attempts to assign the cause of rising prices to the "excessive" wage demands of labor. This, as Perlo notes, is but another version of the hoary myth that wage increases cause price increases.

He deals briefly with accelerated monopolization and the consequent increase of price-fixing as a factor in the pattern of unending inflation, and with the permanent militarization of the economy as an "engine of inflation." He describes the growing divorce-ment of currency from gold as a built-in feature of the economy, and he concludes by pointing to

the evil economic and social effects of chronic inflation and its centrality as "a target of struggle around which the overwhelming majority of the population can unite. . . ." (P. 113.)

A substantial portion of the book is devoted to the rise of state monopoly capitalism since World War II and in particular to the development of government regulation of the economy. Perlo presents a critique of Keynesian economic theory, which he describes as "the theoretical basis of present-day capitalist government regulation." (P. 114.) From this he proceeds to an examination of the forms and purposes of government economic regulation. The aims of such government policy, he states, are to minimize and if possible to eliminate economic downturns, to prevent or contain rising costs and prices, and to raise the long-term economic growth rate. The methods employed have been fiscal—utilization of the government's taxing and spending powers, or monetary—regulation of the availability of credit and control of interest rates.

There have been differences over the relative weight to be given to these two methods, but the need for government regulation in some form has become generally accepted. The regulatory actions of the federal government have not been ineffective in moderating the economic cycle; however, they have not been carried out in the interests of the masses of working people but in those of monopoly capital. They have been designed to stimulate the

economy and promote economic growth primarily by tax and other concessions to the big corporations aimed at "stimulating investment." This has been accompanied by the imposition of wage controls in the name of "fighting inflation." In addition, on the false grounds that full employment and stable prices are incompatible, the bourgeois economists have proceeded to define "full employment" as a rate of joblessness of 4-5 per cent, arguing that anything less than this would lead to unacceptable inflation. Government intervention, Perlo shows, has also been used by the monopolists to bolster racial discrimination and the extra profits derived from it.

How effective has such regulation been? The cycles of the past 25 years, Perlo notes, have been less severe than those of the preceding quarter of a century, but not less severe than those of the period of 1895-1920. The improvement has, to be sure, involved a number of factors, among them the period of postwar reconstruction and the manipulation of military expenditures. But Perlo concludes that "when all is said and done, a definite degree of effectiveness must be attributed to this regulation. Considering the depth of the contradictions within the U.S. economy, in the absence of government regulation, economic crises of catastrophic proportions would be likely." (P. 151.)

However, what success has been achieved has been at the expense of sharpening the contradiction between production and consump-

tion, increasing inflation and intensifying financial problems. Moreover, in view of the anarchy of capitalist production, the possibilities of regulating the economy are at best limited; indeed, economists have proven unable even to forecast the course of the economy with any substantial degree of accuracy. And the conditions for such regulation are becoming increasingly unfavorable.

During the past three decades, U.S. monopoly capital has relied heavily on military spending as an offset to economic decline. But its effectiveness, Perlo shows, has become increasingly dubious. He notes that large-scale devotion of national resources to military purposes, besides being inflationary, is offset by reduction of consumer purchasing power, that it deforms the economy, and that it leads to lower growth rates and contributes to unemployment. These negative effects became sharply evident in the 1969-71 crisis, the first to occur in a period of large-scale warfare.

Two chapters are devoted to developments in capitalist economy on a world scale: one on uneven development and the world monetary crisis and the second on world trends in business cycles. Here he deals with the roots of the dollar crisis and with the changed pattern of the economic cycle throughout the world. He points to the mounting contradictions in capitalist countries generally, to the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and the rise in class struggles.

The book concludes with an outline of a people's economic pro-

gram, which takes as a starting point Franklin D. Roosevelt's Bill of Rights. It calls for a series of radical reforms within the framework of the people's struggle against the power of monopoly capital. Among these are "jobs or income" legislation, nationalization of major economic units, minimization of unemployment, drastic improvements in social welfare legislation, measures for achievement of genuine racial and national economic equality, government control over prices and investments, and a non-imperialist foreign policy.

Such is the broad sweep of Perlo's analysis. His book constitutes a most valuable contribution to our understanding of the present-day U.S. economy and a basis for further elaboration. It is to be hoped that it will stimulate additional studies of these subjects by others.

There are, however, in this reviewer's opinion, some inadequacies which require brief comment. First, underconsumptionist theories of crisis merit more than the brief treatment they receive. For one thing, underconsumptionist explanations of crises are rampant in the trade union movement and appear often in trade union publications, together with the conclusion that if workers got a "fair" share of the product there would be no crises. They also crop up in Party ranks in the form of the thesis that the cause of crisis is the fact that workers do not receive the full product of their labor.

Secondly, the chapter on Keynesian theory deals with the

political development of the application of his ideas but omits the *theoretical* evolution of Keynesism—that is, the rise of post-Keynesian economics, which include a number of sophistications and refinements. A case in point is the “new economics” school, which reached its greatest prominence during the Johnson Administration. Its ideas played a part in the determination of fiscal policy and to an extent still do so. It would have been of value to include this.

Finally, there is a statement on deficit financing which I think is questionable. On p. 93, Perlo asserts that “deficit financing of military spending . . . which translates directly into monetary inflation.” This appears to imply that deficit financing is *per se* inflationary, which is not the case.

If the deficit is financed by borrowing from the existing money supply (by selling bonds to individuals, corporations, etc.), no new money is created and the process is not inflationary. Only when the debt is financed by the creation of new money (by selling bonds to commercial banks) does it lead to inflation in the strict meaning of the term. Of course, military spending leads to rising prices for other reasons also, and there are, as Perlo notes, other causes of inflation operative, even in the absence of government deficits.

But this does not detract from the basic merit of the book, which covers a complex and extensive area of economics within a comparatively short space and it does so in simple, readable language. It will well repay study.

NEW PAMPHLETS

THE SAKHAROV-SOLZHENITSYN FRAUD

What's Behind the Hue and Cry for "Intellectual Freedom"

Gus Hall

Exposes Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn as enemies of peace, supporters of imperialism, defenders of racism, slanderers of socialism. Class nature of freedom and reality of socialist democracy.

32 pages—40¢

ISRAEL: IMAGE AND REALITY

A Journalist's First-Hand Report

Carl Bloice

Extensive factual material on brutal racist oppression of Arabs in Israel and the occupied territories, aggressive colonial policy of Meir-Dayan government, discrimination against Sephardic Jews, use of immigrants as pawns for conquest.

48 pages—65¢

WOMEN ON THE JOB: The Communist View

Judy Edelman

Problems of women's liberation as they affect working and nationally-oppressed women. Statement of Communist Party's National Women's Commission. Factual material on discrimination against women. Analysis of Equal Rights Amendment; CPUSA's program for struggle.

56 pages—70¢

A MARXIST-LENINIST CRITIQUE OF ROY INNIS ON COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION AND MARTIN KILSON ON EDUCATION

Henry Winston

Shows how the separatist nationalism of Innis and the attack on Black students by Kilson help the racist oppressors of Black people.

64 pages—75¢

HIGH PRICES AND HIGH PROFITS

How They Affect Your Wages and Living Costs

Victor Perlo

Analyzes and demolishes the false argument that wage increases cause price increases. Shows that higher profits cause higher prices, discusses all the factors causing inflation. Presents Communist Party's program to fight inflation and win wage increases.

32 pages—55¢

THE EFFECT OF EDUCATION ON RACISM

The Two German States and the USA

Claude M. Lightfoot

Anti-racist education and elimination of racism in the German Democratic Republic. Perpetuation of racist propaganda in the schools in the German Federal Republic. Racism in U.S. school textbooks.

48 pages—70¢

AFRICA CALLING: "ISOLATE THE RACISTS!"

The Liberation Struggle in South Africa

John Pittman

Information on the liberation struggles in South Africa, Zimbabwe, Namibia, Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands. Appeals for U. S. support for the boycott of South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal.

32 pages—60¢

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

205 West 19 Street

9th Floor

New York, N. Y. 10011

Include 20¢ postage on orders under \$2.00.

All orders must be prepaid.