

DECEMBER, 1973

# political affairs

**Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis**

**EDUCATION: NOT BACKWARD TO BOOKER  
T. WASHINGTON BUT FORWARD TO  
BLACK LIBERATION**

**Henry Winston**

**MIDDLE EAST PEACE: A NEW STAGE  
IN THE STRUGGLE**

**Hyman Lumer**

**TO THE PEOPLE OF CHILE**

**Communist Party of Chile**

**ARGENTINA: AGAINST DEPENDENCY,  
FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION**

**Communist Party of Argentina**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <i>Henry Winston</i>   |    |
| Education: Not Backward to Booker T.<br>Washington but Forward to Black Liberation | 1  |
| <i>Hyman Lumer</i>   |    |
| Middle East Peace: A New Stage in the Struggle                                     | 23 |
| <i>Communist Party of Chile</i>  |    |
| To the People of Chile   | 40 |
| <i>Communist Party of Argentina</i>  |    |
| Argentina: Against Dependency, For National<br>Liberation                          | 49 |
| COMMUNICATIONS   |    |
| <i>Naside Henderson</i>  |    |
| A Party of Black and White   | 58 |
| <i>James West</i>  |    |
| Author's Reply   | 62 |
| <i>James Dolsen</i>  |    |
| Response to Henderson  | 62 |
| Index 1973   | 64 |

# Education: Not Backward to Booker T. Washington but Forward to Black Liberation

"The Black Experience at Harvard," an article by Martin Kilson, a Black professor of government at Harvard (*New York Times Magazine*, September 2, 1973, adapted from a two-part series in *The Harvard Bulletin*) is clearly ominous in relation to its most immediate target, Black college students. It serves as a signal to non-Black colleges throughout the country to open up on Black students: to see that they "stay in their place" on campus—while making it tougher for them to get there at all and tougher in every way to remain there.

The impact of this article goes far beyond the student sector and is, in fact, directed against Black people as a whole. It followed a publication route similar to that of the notorious Jensen article—the ruling class's up-to-date version of the age-old racist myth of Black "inferiority"—which appeared first in the *Harvard Educational Review* and then in the *New York Times Magazine*. Coming at a time when the monopolists have made a transition from "benign neglect" to malign attack, Kilson's article, key point by key point, parallels their strategy against the Black liberation movement at home and the liberation movements in Africa. For instance:

At a time when the monopolists are trying to make the ghetto an ever-more impenetrable prison for Black people, Kilson demands an end to the admission of ghetto youth to "elite" universities—and advocates limiting Black admissions to middle-class youth. At a time when the monopolists have used all available means to destroy the growing solidarity of Black people—from the assassination of Martin Luther King and Malcolm X and the imprisonment of Angela Davis to ideological diversions disseminated on a mass scale, Kilson applauds what he calls "cracks" in "the black-solidarity wall" on campuses, in an article that will be read by virtually every college administrator in the country.

At a time when the monopolists intensify their drive against Black political power as part of their offensive against the formation of

a people's anti-monopoly coalition, Kilson attacks the "politization" of Black students. At a time when the Nixon administration, in order to facilitate its cut-back on funds for anti-poverty programs, has revived on a super-scale the ancient stereotype of "lazy Blacks" who enjoy being on welfare, Kilson decries the "serious waste of scarce university resources" on "ill-suited Negro students." And at a time when the mass media have created an identification of Black militance with crime and drugs, Kilson tells us that "the most zealous militants" on campus have established "bizarre standards of 'blackness' (including drug culture and crime)." Furthermore, at a time when Black colleges should be expanded—but instead must fight for their very existence because the monopolists are trying to undermine them—Kilson in effect dismisses them, stating that "70 per cent of all blacks now in college attend white institutions. . . ."

Kilson's article, in short, parallels the master class's master strategy against the Black liberation movement—and calls for close analysis.

### *Behind the "Crisis"*

At "most major white colleges," writes Kilson, "black students have reached a crisis, one that has coincided with their rising enrollments and one that has been created in large measure by black separatism and militancy."

In other words, Black students face a "crisis" not because there are too few of them (and too few Black administrators and faculty members) but because there are too many of them. And the problems they ceaselessly encounter stem not from institutionalized racism but from their attempts to deal with it. Nor is the crisis caused by racism. Instead, the students' *reaction* is designated the *cause*, and described as "black militancy and separatism"—terms which Kilson equates (just, as we shall see, he uses "black solidarity" and "separatism" interchangeably).

The "gnawing ambivalence of loyalty experienced by Negro students," continues Kilson, "forced to choose between their subcommunity and the university in general and the resulting black-white tension have all combined to have a nearly disastrous impact on the academic achievement and intellectual growth of Negro students. While the all-black behavioral paradigm may have its strategic value in the inner city, it is a failure on campus."

Perhaps Kilson feels a "gnawing ambivalence of loyalty" in identifying with the interests of the white monopolists instead of the Black masses. But the Black students he attacks have no such

problem! They have clearly demonstrated that their choice is not "the university in general"—which reflects the interests of the racist ruling class—but Black solidarity. The Black students' refusal to give in to university pressures for conformity to patterns of "integrationism"—i.e., tokenism—has, according to Kilson, created a "nearly disastrous impact on their own achievement and intellectual growth," which would apparently flourish if pursued in harmony with the racist status quo!

Kilson also tries to keep Black solidarity "in its place" when he states that "it may have its strategic value in the inner city," but "is a failure on campus." In asserting that what may be good for "the inner city" is bad for "the campus," Kilson reveals a disdain for the Black masses.

The Black students, in their attempt to create Black solidarity—even when this mistakenly assumes a separatist form—are seeking to maintain their ties with the Black masses. Their aim is to use their university education to advance Black liberation instead of pursuing the individual "success solution" that monopoly capital—trying to contain the pressure from the Black masses—permits for token Blacks.

Kilson, striving to make Black university students regard themselves as an elite, does not take a negative view of separatism when it involves separation of Black students and intellectuals from the Black masses. On the contrary, he advocates it. And there are other forms of "separatism" which Kilson pursues.

For instance, he separates "black-white tension" from racism and links it instead with Black people's rejection of racism. He separates the problems Black students face in attaining "academic achievement" from the inferior elementary and high school education they received. He separates "academic achievement" from the racism that confronts them in the form of administrators, professors and students. He separates it from the difficulties they encounter in finding housing and establishing a social life on campus. He separates it from the economic pressures they face.

For Kilson, "academic achievement" is unrelated to the contradiction that Black students see between the university curriculum (except for isolated and limited Black studies departments) and their deep desire to contribute to Black liberation. They are determined not to go the route of some Black intellectuals and professionals of the past who returned from universities separated from their people.

At the same time, Black students are well aware that they can graduate from Harvard or some other "elite university" and proceed to a future of low-paying dead-end jobs—or unemployment. This is

the crisis Black students face, but Kilson directs his fire at their attempts to *solve* these multiple problems, while *ignoring* the problems themselves.

That these problems have changed little from those faced by Black graduates of years past is confirmed in a recent article in the *New York Times* (September 10, 1973) by Paul Delaney on a Department of Labor-sponsored study of Black professionals—majors in science, business administration, engineering and law.

Described as “the first attempt to investigate what happened to black male college graduates after they joined a white company” with 100 or more employees, the study first of all reveals that a total of *only* 5,000 Blacks are with such companies in a “professional” capacity.

“The survey,” relates Delaney, “found that while blacks were confident of their ability to perform as well as their white colleagues, they nevertheless exhibited a marked pessimism about their opportunities. They felt [the positions] they already occupied were quite poor,” the report stated.”

That this feeling is only too well founded, is “confirmed by . . . the tendency of salaries to reach a plateau at about the ninth year of service, and the very small number of respondents in supervisory and managerial positions.” In addition, “there is an effective ceiling on black advancement in business, together with a limit on the kinds of jobs for which they are accepted.” Using average salaries as the gauge for advancement, the survey found they were approximately the same for men with 15 years or more of employment as for those with only nine or ten years.

*“Dispersal . . . Throughout the Nooks and Crannies”*

Kilson looks back with nostalgia to the days when “there were seldom more than 50 Negroes” at Harvard. While “individual Negroes participated in all-black relationships, like Greek-letter Negro fraternities” (he doesn’t mention all-white fraternities and what they did to stay that way!), there was “a *dispersal* of the small number of Negro students throughout the nooks and crannies of Harvard College.”

*“Dispersal”*—this is what Kilson counterposes to Black solidarity! But Black students, like the masses of Black people, are sick and tired of being “dispersed” in the “nooks and crannies” of a racist society. And Black solidarity—as part of a broad multi-racial, anti-monopoly coalition—is what will bring Black people out of the “nooks and crannies” of the ghettos, the “nooks and crannies” of dirty, low-

paid jobs, the "nooks and crannies" of prisons and dilapidated housing in which racism has confined them.

During the years when there was a "dispersal" of the few Black students at Harvard, Kilson continues, "their academic and intellectual patterns were not markedly different from their white peers." Kilson's evaluation of the Black students of yesterday is no more accurate than his views on Black students today. Of course, there were some in the past who shared his views and no doubt there are still a few today. But the majority of yesterday's Black students were also seeking ways to end oppression, which made their "intellectual patterns" markedly different from most of their "white peers" at Harvard. How, for example, can the "academic and intellectual patterns" of such an outstanding Black Harvard graduate as Benjamin J. Davis Jr., who was a national leader of the Communist Party and a New York City councilman, be compared with his "white peers" at Harvard—the sons of monopolists who conformed to the status quo?

Today's militant Black students, whether or not they share his Marxist-Leninist outlook, do share the legacy of Ben Davis' rejection of Harvard's "academic and intellectual patterns" and his conviction that conformity to such "patterns" leads not to liberation from racist oppression but to its perpetuation!

Kilson's nostalgia for a past Harvard becomes even more questionable when he admits, for instance, that the Black students who began to enter that university in the late sixties had to overcome "nearly a century of racial and sociological barriers to a sizable black presence at Harvard." Since Harvard was founded in 1636 the barriers have been up for somewhat longer than "nearly a century." Although these barriers are still up (according to Kilson there are 600 Black students at Harvard—but he doesn't mention that the total student body is 22,000), one might imagine that Kilson would find something admirable in a generation of Black students who have made an impact on these barriers. But such is not the case.

#### *"Militancy and Political Threats"*

"Militancy and political threats perpetrated by Negro students," declares Kilson, speaking about Black people in the language of the racist mass media, "paved the way for major alterations in Harvard's recruiting and admission policies."

Certainly the "militancy" of Black students (which Kilson equates with "threats") was a vital factor in winning the admission of larger—though still token—numbers of Blacks to "major white colleges." Nevertheless, these gains did not come about as a result of isolated

student activity. The context for these advances was the historic struggles of the Civil Rights Decade, the mass anti-war movement, and student protest activity as a whole—particularly, of course, where white students joined in Black-initiated actions against racist admissions policies.

Kilson's distorted conception of the way in which increased Black student admissions came about quite logically carries over to his view of the present phase of the campus crisis: "Although a five-fold increase in black enrollment" was attained, "the politization surrounding this development plagued virtually all aspects of black-white relationships, dividing blacks and whites into mutually exclusive communities."

What plagues "black-white relationships" is, of course, racism. In evading this fact, Kilson sounds like the mayor of a Southern town speaking of how fine "race relations" were before "those trouble-makers from the North stirred things up."

Struggles by Black students against Harvard's centuries-old racist barriers have not by any stretch of the imagination divided "blacks and whites into mutually exclusive communities." Quite the contrary! As Kilson admits, before the actions of "militant," "politized" Blacks "there were seldom more than 50 Negroes at the college." What could be more "mutually exclusive" than a community of white students attending Harvard, while the community of Black students was almost totally barred? "Militancy" and "politization," in other words, lead in the direction of ending of "mutually exclusive communities"—that is, of lily-white universities and other all-white institutions.

Now that Blacks are present at Harvard and other "major white universities" in larger—but still far from representative—numbers, Kilson would have them "disperse" as they were forced to do in the past—and "integrate" into the status quo by ones and twos.

The Black student struggles to break down racist barriers are not a thrust for such "integration" but for *equality*. Black students do not intend to "disperse," to dissolve the solidarity that made it possible for them to enter these universities in the first place. They want to strengthen this solidarity, keep up the drive to bring more Blacks onto the campuses, and maintain their ties with the masses of Black people in the "inner city."

Black solidarity, unlike Kilson's conception of it, by no means implies separatism. On the contrary, Black solidarity, properly based, is indispensable to the struggle to open up every phase of this nation's life, including all activities of the universities, to the par-



ticipation on an equal basis of Black people.

*"Militant Students . . . Constantly Politicizing"*

Instances of "black-white tensions" on campus, says Kilson, are legion. To illustrate his view of what causes this "tension," Kilson turns to the sports arena: "Militant Negro students, often academically marginal, supply a cheering entourage for black basketball players at Harvard, separating themselves in a section of the stands, denying white students access to this section and constantly politicizing basketball games—including an occasional brawl with white students."

In this statement Kilson most unfortunately parallels the latest racist stereotypes: "Militant" students are not only "academically marginal" but are also responsible for the violence marring the otherwise peaceful sports scene across the nation. In reading this, the proverbial visitor from Mars would never guess that a Black ball player currently on the verge of beating the decades-old home-run record of a deceased white ball player has received so many threats to his life that he now requires the protection of a body-guard.

(In *The New York Times Magazine* of September 16, 1973—two weeks after its publication of Kilson's article—there is a story about this white ball player, Babe Ruth, by *Times'* sports columnist Red Smith. In it Smith relates, "All redcaps at railroad stations were [called] Stinkweed" by Ruth. Smith does not comment on the meaning of Ruth's calling Black men "Stinkweed," but instead treats this racist epithet as if it were a humorous nickname. Such "humor," Smith's attitude toward it and the *Times'* promotion of it are all part of the heritage and perpetuation of racism in sports and throughout this society that produce today's threats against Hank Aaron.)

Although certain actions taken by Black students influenced by separatist ideas are self-defeating, one must look beyond the actions themselves to their underlying causes. *When, for example, Black students try to establish claim to an area of their own, they are reacting against the pervasive racism that keeps innumerable places "off limits" to them. And while white students must certainly demonstrate their concern for everyone's right to sit—as well as live, eat, study and work—wherever he or she wishes, they must carry on this fight where racist exclusion exists: in the white areas of the nation.*

One might think that Kilson would find something to admire in the Black students' aim at Harvard which, he admits, is "to translate

their unity into greater leverage with which to influence a variety of Harvard operations such as admissions, hiring, curriculum, faculty, and so on." But no. "Negro students who assert their individuality within this situation are reprimanded," states Kilson. To "assert one's individuality" in a matter of this kind means, of course, to stay aloof from the common effort to "influence a variety of Harvard operations" and instead leave them to the discretion of a Harvard administration whose old school traditions include the exclusion of Blacks and sons and daughters of workers for over 300 years.

Comment must be made, however, on the concept of "leverage" presented here. Because most white students have not yet lived up to their responsibilities in the fight against racism, Black students are forced to the conclusion that "leverage" in the anti-racism struggle will come only from them. But when Black students are supported by the majority of white students, there will be enough "leverage" to begin to change the entire anti-democratic character of the universities.

Kilson, who expresses such concern when students who break the Black solidarity front are "reprimanded," is scathing in his criticism of students who support it. Nor does he hesitate when it comes to sharply "reprimanding" faculty members who back student aims, and he also resorts to one of monopoly's key weapons, anti-Communism, in doing so:

. . . white liberals and leftists in the faculty, seeking to expiate guilt accumulated from a century of white-supremacist treatment of Negro Americans, reinforce this situation in a variety of ways. Black students programs, initiated by militant pressures from black students, are established with slight concern for the academic standards that prevail at Harvard generally.

It is ironic that Kilson slurs the motives of whites who support Black demands, while not questioning those of the white monopolists who will do anything to block them. And in attacking "white liberals and leftists in the faculty," Kilson is helping the monopolists revive the on-and-off campus witch hunts of the fifties that now merge with Nixon's Watergate tactics of the seventies.

It is gratifying to learn that Harvard's Afro-American Studies Department reflects "slight concern for the academic standards that prevail at Harvard generally" and at universities throughout the country—since these "academic standards" typically include: history departments that omit or distort the role of Black people; government departments that downgrade or exclude the question of Black

representation; sociology departments that slander Black people; economics departments that serve capitalism at home and neo-colonialism in Africa, Asia and Latin America; literature departments that exclude the work of almost all Black poets, novelists and essayists; theater departments that ignore the plays of Black writers; and faculties that, save for an occasional token here and there, have Black professors only in the Black studies department, *if* they have one.

Each of these departments has a role to play in disseminating bourgeois class and racist ideology. Thus a major product of these university intellectual assembly lines is a massive outpouring of anti-Communism, monopoly's twin weapon to racism. With the emergence of the socialist countries, headed by the Soviet Union, as the most decisive force within the world revolutionary process, a force which is always in the front line of support to the liberation struggles in Africa, Asia and Latin America, imperialist neo-colonialist strategy has become increasingly based on the concept that perpetuation of racist oppression is more and more bound up with anti-Communism at home and internationally.

Kilson blames the problems which Black studies departments face on "black militants" and "white liberals and leftists." In doing this, he is conceding to the heavy pressures of anti-Communism and racism focused on these departments.

The very real problems that Black studies departments face—understaffing, underfinancing, over-supervision, interference in curriculum—can all be traced to anti-Communist, racist-oriented administrations. Further, so long as the rest of the curriculum, faculty and administration of the universities do not fully reflect the role and participation of Black people, Black studies departments will be *segregated* departments—and segregation is one of the ruling class's oldest methods for walling in Black people and restricting their achievements.

Continuing his assault on Harvard's "highly politicized" Afro-American Studies Department as "the main base of operations of the black-solidarity forces," Kilson returns to a question which obsesses him: "To whom do Negro students owe primary loyalty? The demands of the black-solidarity forces or the academic and intellectual process of Harvard College?"

To all but the tiny fraction who identify with the Black bourgeois elite, the answer is clear: Black students feel a solidarity and loyalty to the interests of the Black masses that is growing ever stronger. *What loyalty should they feel to "academic and intellectual processes" designed to keep Black masses in the ghetto and a Black elite in the service of the U.S. monopolists at home and in Africa?*

These "academic and intellectual processes" have dominated the universities of this country since their founding. Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois wrote his classic study, *Black Reconstruction in America*, published in 1935, to set history straight, to counter the racist version taught Black and white university students. (Certainly Kilson is aware that to this day no picture of Harvard graduate Du Bois hangs in Harvard's Widener Memorial Library—kept out by the "academic and intellectual processes" of the administration.) In *Black Reconstruction in America* (World Publishing Co., Cleveland, 1935), Du Bois stated:

The chief witness in Reconstruction, the emancipated slave himself, has been almost barred from the court. His written Reconstruction record has been largely destroyed and nearly always neglected. Only three or four states have preserved the debates in the Reconstruction conventions; there are few biographies of black leaders . . . The result is that most unfair caricatures of Negroes have been carefully preserved; but serious speeches, successful administration and upright character are almost universally ignored and forgotten. Wherever a black head rises to historic view, it is promptly slain by an adjective—"shrewd," "notorious," "cunning"—or pilloried by a sneer; or put out of view by some quite unproven charge of bad moral character. In other words, every effort has been made to treat the Negroes' part in Reconstruction with silence and contempt. (P. 721.)

At the same time, every effort has been made to hide and distort the role of whites who supported Black freedom:

Not a single great leader of the nation during the Civil War and Reconstruction has escaped attack and libel. The magnificent figures of Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens have been besmirched almost beyond recognition. (*Ibid.*, p. 723.)

The monopolists are fearful of the potential Afro-American studies departments have for helping develop a generation of Black and white students who, together, could play a major role in the struggle to make the universities function as institutions with a respect for truth. Instead of assisting the struggle to bring this about, Kilson assists the monopolists in promoting division between Black students and the Black masses, between Black and white students and white allies in general (e.g., his attitude toward "liberals" and "leftists"). In other words, Kilson's role parallels the racist, anti-Communist role played by George Meany and others in the labor movement. Never-

theless, it must be emphasized that such divisiveness can make itself felt only because the great majority of white students and the masses of white workers have not yet recognized why they must reject and fight against the racism poisoning the life of this entire nation.

### *"Achievement Orientation"*

"Black-solidarity forces," states Kilson, "are distinctly anti-intellectual and anti-achievement in orientation . . . black students at Harvard celebrate black peers who display 'relevance' by participating in community affairs, adopting lower-class black life-styles in place of middle-class ones and posturing Black Power in relation to political issues like Harvard's Gulf Oil investments in Africa. But, alas, this is sheer fantasy. No ethnic group in American society has ever advanced its standard of living and status without accepting achievement-orientation as a desirable life-style."

How strange that Kilson would consider student opposition to Harvard's neo-colonialist "Gulf Oil investments in Africa" as "anti-intellectual"! In this opposition—as Kilson should know—Black students are following in the footsteps of the intellectual giant who blazed the path to African-Afro-American solidarity against imperialism's plunder of Africa—Harvard graduate W. E. B. Du Bois.

In their refusal to adopt elitist "life-styles" and "by participating in community affairs," Black students reveal that their "achievement-orientation" is very high indeed: to be deeply identified with the Black masses in the fight to achieve Black liberation.

So far as Kilson is concerned, however, Black university students should have but one goal: to become part of a Black elite functioning either in Black-owned businesses or in varied situations on behalf of the monopolists. "Before the nineteen-sixties"—a time which apparently brings back only happy memories to Kilson—the "relatively small number of blacks who attended elite white colleges" grasped "the significance of broad interaction with the success-oriented influences in these colleges. They also recognized that these colleges play a disproportionately large role in training those Negroes who compete for leading national roles in business, science, scholarship, law. . . ."

To make proper use of their college careers today, Kilson continues, Black students must have "the capacity to shun peer-group constraints to penetrate the multilayered academic, cultural and success-oriented life-styles of elite colleges like Harvard." Most Black students, however, do not want to "shun" their "peer group" in order

to emulate the "success-oriented life-styles" of white upper-class students—which, translated into "life-styles" for Blacks, means acceptance of the status quo and pursuit of tokenism. For most Black students, success means advancing Black liberation. And this requires solidarity with their "peer group"—which is in reality the Black people as a whole.

### "The Tree of Blackness"

To back up his own views toward Black students and Black studies programs, Kilson refers to opinions allegedly expressed by Jack Daniel, Associate Professor of Black Studies and of Speech, and Chairman of the Department of Black Community Education, Research and Development, University of Pittsburgh, in an article entitled "Black Academic Activism" (*The Black Scholar*, January 1973).

Through partial quotes and unsubstantiated assertions, Kilson makes it appear that Daniel's views are in harmony with his own. But one need not agree with everything in Daniel's article (and we disagree with him on many points) to recognize that his direction is very different from Kilson's.

Kilson states, for instance, that Daniel "deplores" the "politicizing of Black studies. . . ." No such attitude is expressed in Daniel's article either explicitly or by implication. In fact, Daniel's views point in an opposite direction. He states, for example, "DuBois didn't just investigate, create, and write. Du Bois took his information to the people as all true, revolutionary scholars must." While Kilson deplores "politization" and the solidarity of Black students with the Black masses, it is clear from this statement, as well as many others, that Daniel welcomes both.

Kilson then goes on to attribute the following quote to Daniel: "They [Black students] can see the Songhai and Mali empires, but are blind to the totality of history. They can't see the forest of universal knowledge for the tree of blackness." Kilson does not even supply dots at the end of the sentence to indicate that something followed in the original. But something *did* follow. This is the sentence in its entirety: "They can't see the forest of universal knowledge for the tree of blackness *even though the tree of blackness is first priority.*" (Emphasis added.)

The "tree of blackness" does indeed have "first priority" because for centuries the U.S. ruling class has presented students on every educational level a "forest of universal knowledge" without a "tree of blackness" and Africa as a continent without a history. At a time when pressure from the Black liberation movement has forced some

universities finally to reveal at least a few of the branches on the vast "tree of blackness," it is more than understandable that Black students would be deeply absorbed in what has been denied them and the entire country for so long. Why they—and Black people generally—have such intense feelings in this matter is beautifully expressed in a poem called "My Song Is For All Men,"\* by a Barbadian poet, Peter Blackman, who went to West Africa in 1937.

Blackman concludes the first section of his poem—in which he speaks, with bitter irony, as an African who "accepts" the caricature of Africans created by the colonialists who came to loot that continent, exploit and oppress its peoples—by stating:

I am the subman  
My footprints are nowhere in history.

Then in the second part, Blackman assumes his true identity:

This is your statement, remember, this is your assessment  
I merely repeat you  
Remember this too, I do not ask you to pity me  
Remember this always you cannot be condescent to me  
There are many other things I remember and would have you  
remember as well  
I smelted iron in Nubia when your generations still ploughed with  
hardwood  
I cast in bronze at Benin when London was marshland  
I built Timbuctoo and made it a refuge for learning  
When in the choirs of Oxford unlettered monks shivered unwashed  
My faith in the living mounts like a flame in my story  
I am Khama the Great  
I helped Bolivar enfranchise the Americas  
I am Omar and his thousands who brought Spain the light of the  
Prophet  
I stood with my spear among the ranks of the Prempehs  
And drove you far from Kumasi for more than a century  
I kept you out of my coasts and not the mosquitoes  
I have won bitter battles against you and shall win them again  
I am Toussaint who taught France there was no limit to liberty  
I am Harriet Tubman flouting your torture to assert my faith in  
man's freedom  
I am Nat Turner whose daring and strength always defied you  
I have my yesterdays and shall open the future widely before me.

---

\* In *You Better Believe It, Black Verse in English*, Paul Breman, ed., Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1973.

*Whose Standards for "Scholarly Attainment"?*

As part of his broadside against the Department of Afro-American Studies, Kilson claims its chairman "had no scholarly attainment to his credit." But whose standards of "scholarly attainment" does Kilson accept when he is "blind to" the historic role of the Songhai and Mali empires, when he cannot see the "tree of blackness" in the "totality of history"—even though darker-skinned people have been and remain the majority.

Kilson's assault on this department and its chairman does not, however, end at this point. He goes on to endorse the "removal of students from participation in the department's academic affairs," and their replacement by an "interdepartmental faculty committee—*exclusive of the Afro-American Studies Department*—to select several new scholars for permanent appointments jointly in Afro-American Studies and an established department and to arrange for a successor to its present chairman." (Emphasis added.)

At a moment in history when the Black people's demand for representation in every area has reached a new peak, Kilson views as progress the fact that policy and determination have been taken away from a predominantly Black faculty-student group and turned over to an overwhelmingly white faculty group outside the department—whose first act, following the racist take over, was to "arrange" to get rid of the Black chairman. Precisely what is the "scholarly attainment" of the members of this faculty group in the field of Black studies? Are they familiar, for instance, with the role of white overseers in the history of Black oppression?

While the great mass of Black Americans seek ways to advance solidarity and self-organization, Kilson is constantly on the lookout for what he calls "cracks" in the "black-solidarity wall." One of the "cracks" he welcomes is, according to him, "the fact that only a few of the 600 Negro students are participating in the ideological and political programs of the Harvard Afro-American Cultural Center."

Although one must take Kilson's assertions with several large grains of salt, it is unmistakably clear that the Afro-American Cultural Center along with the Afro-American Studies Department face the most severe racist and anti-Communist pressures, which Kilson's article reflects and parallels. How can such a center flourish in an atmosphere aimed at destroying it?

Kilson does not stop even at this point in his drive against the Black students' every effort toward self-organization. He goes on to demand "the cessation of financing of black separatist behavior by



white colleges"—meaning, at Harvard, the Afro-American Cultural Center. Blacks, he continues, must be required "to find the resources from their own community to support this behavior. . . . For blacks to ask the very group held responsible for black degradation to finance black solidarity is a most profound and disorienting contradiction. It is precisely this situation that distorts the perception of reality by black students at white colleges. They extrapolate from this situation to the rest of life, believing that real power will also be forthcoming without costs and sacrifice."

It is not the students whose "perception of reality" is distorted. Only pressure from Black students and the Black people as a whole has forced such concessions as Black studies programs and Afro-American Cultural Centers from the monopolists' representatives who administer the universities. The struggle for such centers is on the increase. At this writing, for example, Black and non-Black students at the University of Wisconsin are carrying on a mass protest against the administration's decision to close the Afro-American and Native American Cultural Centers for "budgetary reasons." The protests began with sit-ins and a march by almost 2,000 students—over half of them white—behind the slogan "They say 'cutbacks'—We say 'fight back!'"

In demanding a subsidy for an Afro-American Cultural Center, the students are only laying claim to what is rightfully theirs. In asserting that Black students must "find the resources from their own community," Kilson seems to have overlooked the glaring fact that the "resources from their own community" have been stolen from Black people for centuries, first by the slaveowners and then the monopolists. Only one who identifies his interest with the white monopolists—whether he realizes this or not—could object to their getting even a minuscule share of it back. And who but the monopolists or someone unfortunately echoing their views could demand *more* "costs and sacrifices" from Black people!

The fight for Black studies departments and cultural centers is part of the struggle to break down racist exclusion of Black intellectual and cultural contributions from this country's educational institutions. It is a fight that has not yet run its full course, but has forced concessions from the monopolists, concessions which they attempt to use to blunt further advance. But from the standpoint of Black students, these concessions are nevertheless a partial victory, to be used to continue and enlarge the struggle against racism. Yes, there are sometimes weaknesses in the way the students carry on the struggle. The problem is how to correct the weaknesses and advance the struggle.

*"The Value of Academic and Intellectual Achievement"*

Further policy changes at Harvard, declares Kilson, must include "a serious effort . . . to restore a belief among Negro students in the value of academic and intellectual achievement." Since his article has already written off "the tree of blackness" as unimportant to the "forest of universal knowledge," classified anti-imperialist activity in solidarity with African liberation movements as "anti-intellectual," and lauded the racist takeover of the Afro-American Studies Department, it is only too clear that his concept of "academic and intellectual achievement" coincides with the university administration.

However, restoring this "belief" is, according to Kilson, a problem with "two aspects: one relating to bright Negro students"—defined by him as those who score well on the Scholastic Aptitude Test—"the other to those who enter white colleges with academic deficiencies."

By accepting S. A. T. scores as the criterion for who is and who is not "bright," Kilson falls into the racist trap set years ago by "educators" who use I.Q. tests, which are a test not of intelligence but of information most readily acquired in a white bourgeois environment, to stamp Black children as inferior and therefore unworthy of receiving an equal education and other equal opportunities. (The Jensen article, titled "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" catapulted the racist myth of Black "inferiority" out of the past right into the center of current educational "theories.") If some Black students arrive at the college level with "academic deficiencies," it is a reflection not on their intelligence but on the system which deliberately deprived them of a decent preparatory education.

As another step in the program to make it harder for Black students to get into universities, Kilson states that "admissions practices developed for black students over the past five years need rethinking." The "admissions practices" Kilson selects for "rethinking" are those of the *only* period in Harvard's almost 330-year history when its "racial and social barriers" were forced to give way in at least some degree to anti-racist pressures. Nevertheless, it is true that these practices *do* need rethinking: *all* racist and class barriers to admission must be removed. But this is not the way Kilson sees it.

"First of all," he continues, "these practices must be depoliticized." Why? "At nearly all elite white colleges new black admissions officials, appointed under the pressure of militant Negro students, have been allowed to politicize admissions criteria as applied to Negro applications."

Surely admissions practices were "politicized" when Black students

were barred from universities, in the North as well as in the South. They reflected the racist politics of the monopolists—and they still do although pressure has brought about some changes. But Kilson, who applauds “cracks” in the “black-solidarity wall,” seems to lament “cracks” in the white supremacy wall—through which a larger but still very small number of Blacks enter college. The monopolists are trying to seal up these “cracks,” and Kilson, whether or not he realizes it, is assisting them instead of joining the struggle to batter down the walls.

If S.A.T. scores are not used as the sole criterion for admissions of Black students to “white colleges” (Kilson displays no interest in admissions criteria at *Black* colleges), he declares that a “rigorous evaluation” must be made of these students: “They should display attitudes and habits that are conducive to high academic and intellectual achievement. They should be interested in reading, art, theater, museums, poetry or music.”

Although I have already discussed Kilson’s concept of “academic and intellectual achievement,” there is yet another dimension to this matter: that is, wouldn’t it be more to the point to demand that university administrations “display attitudes and habits that are conducive to high academic and intellectual achievement”—in other words, eliminate every trace of racism in their policies and practices?

As for Kilson’s demand that Black students be required to demonstrate an interest in the arts, one must ask: Can he be unaware of the vast upsurge in theater, painting, poetry, music, dance and all the other arts by Black people? What is lacking is not Black “interest,” but schools that will train Black artists, theaters that will produce their plays, museums that will display their paintings, publishers for their books, and jobs and all-round opportunities for all their performing artists. All this is overlooked by Kilson!

### *“Misplaced Sentimentalism”*

As another part of his comprehensive program for raising the admissions barriers against Black students, Kilson asserts, “Perhaps the most important problem to surmount in admissions is the misplaced sentimentalism that is widespread among liberal white admissions officials (and black ones, too) at elite white colleges.” (Again, the problem is the “liberals,” the “leftists,” *not* the racists!)

Despite the fact that virtually any cutback in funds hits Black students and faculty first, Kilson calls for a special one directed against them, stating that “the bad admissions choices stemming from this sentimentalism have resulted in a serious waste of scarce uni-

versity resources."

To "back up" his claim that scholarship funds are being wasted on Black students, Kilson goes even further than most white university officials dare go in public. That is, he echoes what many administrators say about Black students in private meetings—and what the media say about them on television, radio, in newspapers and books: ". . . ill-suited Negro students at elite colleges usually end up among the most zealous militants. . . ." Such students, continues Kilson, "become the arbiters of black separatism at white colleges, establishing bizarre standards of 'blackness' (including drug culture and criminal acts) that the more talented Negro students are expected to follow"—thus completing a media caricature of "militant" but not-very-bright Blacks with a gun in one hand and heroin in the other. Kilson seems not to know that the white monopolists made drugs easily available to Black and white troops in Vietnam and continue to do so in the ghettos in order to *drain off militance!*

"One tragic instance," writes Kilson, "occurred at Cornell University in 1971. A highly talented 16-year old Negro student . . . had been transformed within less than two years from a high academic achiever to a zealous separatist and criminal. As the judge observed in his report when handing down a five-year probation sentence: 'As soon as defendant became involved with the residents of the university-owned black men's co-op, he became easily led by the wrong people. . . .'"

Clearly, the danger to Blacks, according to this, comes not from racism but from other Blacks—who, it would appear according to Kilson, are also obviously a danger to the entire university. It also follows, therefore, that there should not be more of them on campus but fewer. And Kilson abets the monopolists' strategy for decreasing their numbers by proposing a quota.

Kilson advocates the use of quotas, he says, "in order to overcome past racist restrictions . . . on the growth of the American Negro elites." With this statement, Kilson not only relegates racism in these institutions to the past; he also alleges that the sole purpose of racist restrictions was to keep out *elite* Blacks. But their purpose was revealed in their accomplishment: they kept out *all* Blacks. Now Kilson advocates a quota that will, in his opinion, keep out "ghetto types," while allowing admission to members of the elite.

"Unqualified or ill-suited black applicants," says Kilson, "have often been accepted at top-rank white colleges in order to broaden the representation of what some admissions officials call 'ghetto types.' This reduces the number of middle-class Negroes in the black student body. . . . The blacks most likely to succeed in the competition at

top-rank colleges must be encouraged, and if most of them happen to be middle-class (which, after all, is the case for whites, too), then so be it."

Despite Kilson's allegations, it is obvious that administration officials don't want "ghetto types"—*i.e.*, working class youth—in the universities. Only mass pressure has forced the admission of some. And these officials don't want too many middle-class Blacks either. By portraying ghetto youth as "ill-suited," by writing off their abilities, Kilson helps the administration limit the number of middle-class Blacks to be accepted as well—because the great mass of Black youth removed from consideration would leave the middle-class isolated, without ties or backing.

Behind Kilson's facade of words about assisting the "growth of the American Negro elites" (Kilson's language, not mine—H.W.), lies the unfortunate fact that the quota system he proposes is equivalent to the one the racist monopolists have used for so many decades to restrict admission of Black and other minority youth. Kilson's quota would not only affect working-class Black youth adversely but middle-class youth as well, because it would limit admissions to those conforming to a policy of tokenism, which flows from racism and would be used to blunt struggles for equality.

(Kilson's quota proposal brings to mind a little-known fact in the racist history of education: Dartmouth College was founded to train Indians. Who is aware of that now? Instead of helping to open the universities today to Blacks, Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos and other minorities, Kilson's views are of assistance to the corporate monopolists, who would like to bring about their forced disappearance from Harvard and all other universities, just as Native Americans were forced out of an institution supposedly founded for them.)

As for those Kilson refers to as "ill-suited" Black youths (*i.e.*, those who do not score well on the S.A.T.), either they would be kept out of college altogether or would, as revealed by Kilson in the following statement, be sent to Black colleges. "Some 70 percent of all blacks now in college attend white institutions, and the brightest black students are in top-rank colleges." This remark not only downgrades Black colleges, but also amounts to an attempt to return them to the Booker T. Washington concept of Black colleges, offering a strictly limited education.

Kilson's views toward Black colleges lead in a twofold direction: to accommodation to racism within predominantly white colleges, and to surrender to monopoly pressure to undermine Black colleges. Because of his elitist attitude toward the masses, Kilson has no confi-

dence in struggle. This is why he despaired of change and has apparently opted for a contemporary Booker T. Washington role. On the other hand, the confidence that Du Bois, who opposed Washington's ideas, had in masses continued to deepen, leading him to a Marxist-Leninist outlook and membership in the Communist Party.

The fight to transform the "academic and intellectual processes" calls for joint struggle of Black and white students and faculty members, and must be pressed on two fronts: as a fight for truth in education and for equality for Blacks in the white majority colleges, and as a struggle for full and equal support to Black colleges.

Every white person concerned about the nation's most dangerous pollutant—racism—must realize that a real perspective for the transformation of education must advance the struggle for unrestricted admissions of Blacks into the majority colleges and for saving and expanding Black colleges. Black colleges not only have a role to play in educating Black people, as they have done for generations. They must also be seen as exceptionally vital institutions for educating whites. Since these colleges are not permeated with racism, the white students' education would already be off to a head start over that offered at the majority colleges.

Dr. Du Bois vividly illustrated this fact in the following passage contrasting his educational experience at Fisk University with that at Harvard:

At Fisk, the problem of race was faced openly and essential racial equality asserted and natural inferiority strenuously denied. In some cases the teachers expressed this theory; in most cases the student opinion naturally forced it. At Harvard, on the other hand, I began to face scientific race dogma: first of all, evolution and the "Survival of the Fittest." It was continually stressed in the community and in classes that there was a vast difference in the development of the whites and the "lower" races; that this could be seen in the physical development of the Negro. I remember once in a museum, coming face to face with a demonstration: a series of skeletons arranged from a little monkey to a tall well-developed white man, with a Negro barely outranking a chimpanzee. (*Dusk of Dawn*, Schocken Books, New York, 1968, pp. 97-98.)

In his graduate studies Du Bois encountered a variation of racism in education, identical at Harvard and in Germany, where it prepared the ground for Nazi ideology:

In the graduate school at Harvard and again in Germany, the

emphasis again was altered, and race became a matter of culture and cultural history. The history of the world was paraded before the observation of students. Which was the superior race? Manifestly that which had a history, the white race; there was some mention of Asiatic culture, but no course in Chinese or Indian history or culture was offered at Harvard, and quite unanimously in America and Germany, Africa was left without culture and without history. (*Ibid.*, p. 98.)

*Proud of "Maladjustment" to Monopoly's Plans*

What is needed is not quotas which are an "effective ceiling" on university admissions, but a *ground floor*. There must be a truly representative minimum enrollment for Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Asian-Americans and Native Americans—but *no* ceiling. The mass united struggle of white, Black, Brown, Yellow and Red peoples required to bring about this democratization of the universities would simultaneously open up new opportunities for university education to white working-class youth.

In urging that the universities limit Black admissions to an elite, Kilson objectively assists the monopolists in their aim of producing a "crack" in the wall of solidarity between Black students and the Black masses. It is no accident that the *New York Times* publishes this article at a time when Black students, Black workers and Black people generally are reaching a new high in understanding that solidarity with their American brothers and sisters against neo-colonialism is bound up with the struggle for Black liberation in the heartland of world imperialism. And despite what Kilson's own intentions may have been, it must be recognized that his article is of assistance to the monopolists' strategy of dispersing the Black liberation movement at home, while it aims at pushing the African peoples back into the "nooks and crannies" of colonial oppression from which they are struggling to emerge.

In his final paragraph, Kilson states that "it is imperative that the maladjustment of Negro students to the achievement and success-oriented life-styles of white colleges be corrected." But the Black students are rightly proud of their "maladjustment" to the monopolists' plans to allow a token number of them to "integrate" into this racist system in order to help perpetuate it.

Black students owe no loyalty to the "university in general" and what it stands for. Their loyalty belongs to their people, to the fight to change the present-day standards of "academic and intellectual achievement" to conform to the needs of thirty million Black people as a vital part of the struggle for democratic advance for *all* the peo-

ple of this country. This struggle for democratic advance also calls for the loyalty and support of all white students who want to transform the quality of life on and off the campuses of the nation.

# WATERGATE

## CRIME IN THE SUITES

By MICHAEL MYERSON



"Missing from the daily news accounts of the Watergate scandal is the relationship between the attempts by Nixon to create a presidential dictatorship and the growing repression of movements of Black, Brown, Indian and Asian peoples. This book gives us—with devastating accuracy—what the newspapers and television summaries can't and won't."  
—Angela Davis

A searing analysis of the meaning of Watergate, exposing the roots of the criminal conspiracy of the Nixon administration and its corporate masters against the American people. The author places Watergate within the wider context of U.S. history—particularly in the wake of the Indochina war—revealing the desperate attempts of the government to counter losses to U.S. hegemony internationally, and the rising tide of protest domestically.

A widely-acclaimed feature of this book (the first printing of which has been sold out in only one month), is the unique roster of "The Watergate 110," presenting telling biographical material on White House, government and corporate figures involved in the Watergate crimes. Paperback \$1.95

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 Park Avenue, South, New York, N.Y. 10016

THE

## *African Communist*

Published quarterly

in the interests of African

solidarity, and as a forum for

Marxist-Leninist thought throughout

Africa by the South African Communist

Party — 50 cents a copy; \$2 for one year

subscription; \$5.50 via airmail.

IN THE U.S.A.:

Imported Publications, 1730 W. Arcade Place,

Chicago, Illinois 60612



# Middle East Peace: A New Stage in the Struggle

The war which broke out on October 6 between the Israeli military forces and those of Egypt and Syria, and which culminated in the cease-fire voted by the UN Security Council in its resolutions of October 22 and 23, has profoundly altered the balance of forces in the Middle East and has created new and more favorable conditions in the struggle for a just and durable peace.

To understand the meaning of these changes and the consequences which flow from them it is necessary first of all to understand clearly the nature of the war itself, about which the forces of reaction have done their utmost to spread confusion and misunderstanding. The Zionist rulers of Israel would have us believe that this was a war of aggression by Egypt and Syria. In this they are faithfully parroted by the degenerate Mikunis-Sneh group (MAKI) in Israel, which says in a statement issued on October 7: "The Political Bureau . . . strongly condemns the aggressive war acts of the Egyptian and Syrian governments against the State of Israel. We, together with the whole nation, are sure that Zahal (the Army) will succeed in repelling the aggressors and defend the security and peace of the nation." This notion was widely propagated in the United States, among others by the *Morning Freiheit*, MAKI's faithful ally in this country, which wrote: "Egypt and Syria have begun a new war, following a series of attacks by the terrorists whose professed aim is to destroy the State of Israel as quickly as possible." (October 14, 1973.)

This notion that Egypt and Syria attacked Israel with the aim of annihilating it gained considerable credence among the U.S. people; it is, however, totally false. And it is based on completely erroneous criteria for judging the character of a war. This cannot be determined on the basis of who fired the first shot, of the flow of events immediately preceding the fighting or of the self-serving statements of this or that government spokesman. On the contrary, the basis of judgment, as V. I. Lenin repeatedly stressed, is that contained in the famous maxim of Clausewitz that "war is the continuation of politics by other means" (that is, by violent means). To understand correctly the character of a war waged by a particular state, therefore,

it is necessary to examine the political line pursued by its ruling circles over an extended period of time preceding the outbreak of war. The war itself does not change this line; it changes only the methods used to achieve it.

### *A Long-Range Policy of Aggression*

In this light, let us survey briefly the politics of the Israel ruling circles.\* To begin with it is essential to recognize that the central conflict in the Middle East is that between the forces of imperialism and those of national liberation, and that in this conflict Israel's rulers have been found almost at all times on the side of imperialism. Motivated by the Zionist goal of a Jewish state embracing all of Palestine—a goal attainable only at the expense of the Palestinian Arabs—they have pursued from the very birth of Israel a policy of aggression and annexation, in league with the forces of imperialism and especially U.S. imperialism.

When the UN partitioned Palestine into Jewish and Arab states in 1947 the Zionist leaders accepted the partition, but they were opposed from the outset to the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state, and in the 1948 war they seized more than half the territory allotted to that state and incorporated it into Israel. A large part of the Arab refugees came from these areas, whose population was almost totally Arab before the war and is now almost wholly Jewish.

In the early fifties there developed an alliance with French imperialism which supplied the Israeli government with arms in return for the latter's support in the UN to the imperialist moves against Algerian liberation. By 1956 this grew into a full-blown collusion with both British and French imperialism to invade Egypt with the aim of overthrowing the Nasser government (which had committed the unpardonable crime of nationalizing the Suez Canal) and, in the case of Israel, of annexing the Sinai Peninsula. But the aggression failed and they were forced to disgorge their booty.

They thereupon entered into alliance with U.S. imperialism, which had by now become the most potent imperialist force in the Middle East and which likewise sought the overthrow of the anti-imperialist Arab regimes and the defeat of the national liberation movements. This new collusion culminated eventually in the June 1967 war—a war of aggression aimed at toppling the governments of Egypt and

---

\* For a more detailed account of these policies see Chapter II of the writer's book *Zionism: Its Role in World Policies* (International Publishers, New York, 1973), also his article "The Fight for Peace in the Middle East," *Political Affairs*, March 1973.

Syria on the one hand and at territorial conquest on the other. The transparent fiction that this, too, was a war of national defense has now been completely exploded by the admissions of leading Israeli army officers themselves that in 1967 Israel was in no danger whatever of attack by the Arab states.

The effort to bring about the overthrow of the Egyptian and Syrian governments failed, but Israel emerged from the war with a considerable body of conquered territory—the Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza Strip, the West Bank of Jordan and the Golan Heights. The policy pursued by the Israeli ruling circles since June 1967 has had as its aim *the incorporation of these territories in their entirety into the State of Israel.*

But the policy of aggression and expansion goes even beyond these acts. Under the pretext of retaliation for terrorist acts by Arab guerrillas, Israeli armed forces have conducted repeated large-scale raids into Arab territories, making use of napalm and taking a considerable toll of civilian lives and property. For these raids the Israeli government has been again and again condemned by the UN Security Council.

Such were the politics of Israel's ruling class from 1948 up to the eve of October 6. Clearly the war launched on that date was on the Israeli side a war of "continuation of [these] politics by other means." It was a war whose purpose was *to maintain and expand Israel's military conquests*, a war to retain by force territories to which Israel has no legal or moral right. It was a war whose roots lay in Israeli aggression, in the persistent refusal of the Israeli government to return the occupied territories to the countries to which they rightfully belong.

### *The Victims of Aggression*

The Israeli ruling clique has from the outset sought to justify its policy of military force and expansionism on the spurious grounds that this was necessary to safeguard Israel's security. Indeed, it has been endlessly reiterated, there is no other choice since the Arabs flatly refuse to recognize the right of Israel to exist and are motivated only by an irrational urge to bring about its annihilation. As Golda Meir expressed it in a recent interview concerning the recent war, Israel must win "because to lose is to be annihilated." (*Jerusalem Post Weekly*, October 16, 1973.)

This, it can readily be shown, has never been true. To be sure, Arab spokesmen have all too often engaged in bloodthirsty calls to "drive the Jews into the sea" and the Israeli leaders have used such

utterances to their advantage. But the fact is that since 1948 no Arab state has attacked Israel or sought to seize any part of its territory. On the contrary, it is Israel which has more than once invaded the territory of its neighbors and now holds sections of their lands by force. Moreover, it is Israel which now holds most of the land inhabited by the Palestinian Arabs and which denies to more than a million Palestinian Arab refugees the right to return to their homes.

The purpose of the war which Egypt and Syria have been waging is to regain the territories taken from them. To call this a war of aggression is as absurd as it would be to call the struggles of the people of Mozambique to drive out the Portuguese colonial oppressors a war of aggression. In short, the war of Egypt and Syria is a *just* war, a war *against* aggression, a part of the struggle for liberation, against the forces of imperialism whose interests Israel's rulers serve. Such is the "continuation of politics" on the Arab side.

The story that their purpose is the destruction of Israel can only be characterized as an outright lie. First of all, Arab spokesmen have made their aims crystal clear. On October 9, Ashraf Ghorbal, adviser to President Sadat, stated on Cairo television that all that Egypt wanted was recovery of the Sinai Peninsula and recognition of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs. And shortly afterward, speaking to the National Assembly and the Central Committee of the Arab Socialist League, Sadat himself stated: "We wish to tell the Israelis that we do not call for their annihilation, as has been claimed." And in return for Israeli withdrawal to the borders preceding the 1967 war, he offered a lasting peace with internationally guaranteed borders.

Moreover, this position is not something new. It was expressed already some years ago when Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon declared their acceptance *in toto* of UN Security Council Resolution 242 soon after its adoption in November 1967. And they were later joined in this action by Syria. Under the terms of the resolution, Nasser repeatedly stated, and after him Sadat, that in return for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories Egypt was prepared to agree to "termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force." More than that, in response to a memorandum of Gunnar Jarring in February 1971, the Egyptian government explicitly stated that in return for withdrawal it was

prepared to sign a peace treaty with Israel—an act which the Israeli leaders had for more than two decades declared to be their fondest desire.

All this has been common knowledge for some years; yet the Israeli ruling clique has persistently behaved as though none of these things had ever occurred. In fact Golda Meir, in a lengthy article entitled "Israel in Search of Lasting Peace" (*Foreign Affairs*, April 1973) performs the remarkable feat of never once mentioning the stand of the Arab states, even to reject it, and confines herself to the lament that peace is impossible until the Arabs give up their mad desire to exterminate Israel. And this absurd fiction is maintained to this very moment even though, as President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia notes, all Arab countries now accept the existence of Israel. (*New York Times*, October 14, 1973.)

The truth of the situation was expressed in no uncertain terms at the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, whose 3,200 delegates in their overwhelming majority expressed their wholehearted support to the Arab peoples in their just struggles. The Report of the Commission on the Middle East states: "The Commission displayed near unanimity in its appraisal of the basic causes of the renewal of hostilities: the continuing Israeli occupation of Arab territories in defiance of repeated UN resolutions and the denial of the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people."

### *The Palestinian Arab Question*

At the very heart of the Israeli-Arab hostilities over the past 25 years lies the grave injustice done to the Palestinian Arab people, who have been deprived of their land and reduced in great part to the status of refugees who, since 1948, have been denied the right to return to their homes. Throughout these years they have waged an ongoing struggle for their national rights—a struggle which, since 1967, has assumed major proportions and has emphasized increasingly the right to self-determination. This is today a pivotal issue, without whose resolution there can be no stable peace in the Middle East.

Especially glaring, however, has been the refusal of Israel's Zionist leaders to face reality on this specific question. In 1948 the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution affirming the right of the refugees either to be repatriated or to receive compensation for their property. This resolution has been reaffirmed every year since then. On every occasion the Israeli delegation has voted against it and the Israeli government has at all times flatly refused to honor it. Had it been willing to do so, the conflict could long ago have

been peacefully resolved. Thus the Bandung Conference in 1956 adopted a resolution, signed by all the key Arab states, calling for the peaceful solution of the Palestine problem on the basis of the UN resolution. But the Zionist leaders of Israel, motivated by their racist concept of an exclusively Jewish state, wanted as few Arabs within the borders of Israel as possible.

In 1967 Israeli armed forces occupied the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, territories inhabited entirely by Palestinian Arabs. In the process an added mass of refugees was created and in the years since 1967 the population of these territories has suffered severe repression at the hands of the occupying forces.

Israel's rulers deny not only the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people but even its existence. There is, says Golda Meir, no such thing as a Palestinian Arab people and the proposal of a Palestinian Arab state is nothing more than a plot for the destruction of Israel. Besides, the Arabs already have fourteen states; why do they need a fifteenth? As for the refugees, why should they want to live in Israel? Would they not be happier among their own people? As reported in the *British Morning Star* (October 29, 1973), she rejects any idea of negotiations with the Palestinian Arabs, saying: "There is room for the refugees in Jordan, it is the natural place for Palestinians."

Thus does Mrs. Meir graciously perform the act of self-determination on behalf of the Palestinian Arabs. Her cohort Moshe Dayan carries it even a step further. "After the Jews established Israel in their part of Palestine," he says, "the Arabs preferred to join the Jordanian Hashemite Kingdom and give up their distinctive Palestinian status—thus putting an end to political Palestine." (*The Israel Digest*, July 6, 1973.)

Such is the warped chauvinist mentality of the Meirs, Dayans and their ilk, who are utterly insensitive to national distinctions and sensibilities among Arabs and to whom all are simply "Arabs." But unfortunately for their schemes the Palestinian Arabs think otherwise. A militant movement for liberation and self-determination has developed, whose chief organized expression is the Palestine Liberation Organization headed by Yassir Arafat. The Israeli spokesmen have sought to brand this organization as a gang of irresponsible terrorists and to hold it responsible for certain senseless acts of terror committed by isolated groupings. But such a characterization is today utterly groundless. The PLO has not only disassociated itself from such acts but has come to be widely recognized as a responsible and accepted spokesman for the Palestinian Arab people.

The World Peace Congress was warmly endorsed by Arafat, and though he himself could not attend, the PLO was well represented and took an active part in the deliberations, both in the plenary sessions and in the Commission on the Middle East. They fully associated themselves, as did the other Arab delegates, with the Commission's Report, which states: "Nearly all of those participating called for implementing Resolution 242 and all who did so linked it with the just achievement of their national rights by the Palestinian Arab people." They associated themselves also with the Congress's call for implementation of the UN Security Council cease-fire resolutions. These are hardly the actions of a gang of "terrorists" seeking the extermination of Israel.

This is not to say that the PLO has abandoned its idea of a single secular Palestinian state within which the State of Israel would be absorbed and cease to exist as an independent political entity. However, this was now raised not as an inflexible demand but as a proposal for discussion in negotiations along with alternative proposals for Palestinian Arab self-determination. What is demanded—and with justice—is the inclusion of this question in any negotiations growing out of the cease-fire resolutions.

The Israeli government will be compelled to come to terms with the just demands of the Palestinian Arabs no less than with the growing world-wide insistence that it relinquish the occupied territories. Indeed, these demands are closely interlinked with the implementation of Resolution 242, for the exercise of the right of self-determination is inconceivable without ending the occupation and without assuring the right of the refugees to return to their homeland. "In any endeavor to decide their future," says the Report, "the Palestinian Arab people must take part; and it was pointed out that the Palestine Liberation Organization has been recognized as its spokesman in the present circumstances by international bodies such as the Non-Aligned Conference and the Arab League, as well as numerous countries."

### *The Road to Disaster*

The cornerstone of Israeli foreign policy has been the use of force. "The Arabs," Moshe Dayan has always been fond of saying, "understand only force." The foundation of Israeli security has been sought in the maintenance of overwhelming military superiority achieved with the aid of the imperialist powers and especially of U.S. imperialism. It has been sought in the acquisition of Arab territory in the name of establishing "secure borders." Israeli foreign policy has been based

also on the racist concept of Arab inferiority, on the belief that the Arabs were incapable, at least for a considerable time to come, of mastering modern science and technology and the use of modern weaponry. They would therefore be compelled to swallow the Israeli expansionism and in time learn to live with it.

But despite seeming initial successes, despite overwhelming military victories, such policies, the Israeli leaders have been repeatedly warned, could in the end lead only to disaster for the Israeli people. On more than one occasion we noted that these policies could result only in perpetuating and deepening hostilities with an endless, costly arms race and the ever-present danger of new flareups of full-scale warfare. We pointed out that Israeli military invincibility would not be eternal, that the Arab states would sooner or later master modern methods of warfare and that they would not endlessly sit by while their territories were swallowed up by the Israeli forces. Any new war, even if Israel should win, would not be a mere repetition of 1967. Moreover, with modern military techniques the idea that security of borders is a matter of geography is an illusion. And we warned that any policy founded on racist concepts of the inferiority of other peoples was doomed to defeat since in actuality there are no superior or inferior peoples.

These and similar warnings proved to be only too well founded. The rising tensions stemming from the Israeli government's increasingly brazen acts of aggression finally led to the military explosion of October 6. And the leading Israeli and other Zionist circles promptly proceeded to draw the wrong conclusions. The Arabs, they said, had apparently failed to learn their lesson; it would now be necessary to teach them one they would never forget. The Israelis, said Dayan, must "bloody their noses" and march on Damascus. Other leading Israeli officers placed the goal as nothing less than the complete destruction of the Egyptian and Syrian armies as effective fighting forces. And all this was to be accomplished, as before, in a matter of days.

Moreover, it was said, the war proved the correctness of holding on to the conquered territories, for otherwise the attack would have been launched against the territory of Israel itself. Typical of such thinking is the statement of the well-known U.S. Zionist Jacob Neusner: "By the Arabs' own actions, they have vindicated their foes and have shown the annexationists wise and prudent. I personally hope the Israelis take Cairo and Damascus and sit there until peace comes." (*New York Times*, October 11, 1973.) What the Neusners fail to understand, however, is that if the occupied territories had



been returned there would have been no war in the first place. Furthermore, if there is any lesson to be learned from this war it is first of all that the notion that conquest of still more territory will force the Arabs to bend to the Israeli will is an illusion. Egypt and Syria have demonstrated that they are prepared to continue to fight, again and again, until the invaders are driven from their soil.

The second and far more devastating lesson of the war is the shattering of the myth of Israeli military invincibility and with it the demonstration of the total bankruptcy of any policy based on the idea of such invincibility. It came as a tremendous shock to the Israeli generals to discover that they were confronted by an adversary capable of meeting them on their own terms and to realize that even though they might still be capable of defeating the Arab forces they could do so only at enormous cost in men and materiel.

In the first few days of fighting alone more than one-fifth of the planes supplied to Israel by the United States had been shot down. (*New York Times*, October 10, 1973.) The highly touted Bar-Lev Line was overrun almost in a matter of hours. As of November 6, according to the official figures from Tel Aviv, the war had cost the lives of 1,854 Israeli soldiers, with some additional thousands wounded. Moreover, the cost of the war has been estimated at some \$7 billion, an astronomical sum for such a small country. Clearly Israel, with a population of some three million, could not sustain a prolonged war of attrition or even a succession of wars, even though it might maintain an appreciable degree of military superiority and continue to win military victories. It would soon be drained of manpower, its economy would be paralyzed, and the economic and social costs would become intolerable.

Thus, in the new balance of forces the policy of aggression based on a capacity for lightning strikes and speedy annihilation of the enemy forces has become completely untenable. To continue such a policy would be, to put it mildly, the height of folly.

Added to the changed balance of military forces is the rapidly mounting isolation of Israel among the nations of the world—an isolation which is becoming well-nigh total. To begin with, Israel's rulers have gained few friends by their racist contempt for Arab lives, displayed in their bombings of civilian targets in Damascus, Homs, Cairo and other cities and in their use of napalm and delayed action bombs in such raids.

A growing succession of states, particularly in Africa, have reacted to Israel's racist, aggressive actions by severing diplomatic relations. Last May, the 10th Assembly of heads of state of member countries

of the Organization of African Unity, held in Addis Ababa, warned Israel that its actions might compel OAU members to take economic and political measures against it. Later the Conference of Non-Aligned Nations in Algiers called for cutting diplomatic and other ties with Israel. As of November 8, no less than 28 of the 35 African states formerly maintaining relations with Israel had broken them off. Retaining ties are chiefly South Africa and its satellites.

This is a blow to Israel's status in Africa whose magnitude can scarcely be overestimated. The Israeli ruling circles had long bragged about Israel's extensive ties with African states, posing as their benefactor and at the same time profiting substantially from Israel's investments in and trade with them. In reality, of course, they played the role of a prop to neocolonialism and a base of support to U.S. imperialism in Africa.\* This whole edifice now lies in ruins—a serious setback for the ambitions of Israel's ruling class, and for U.S. imperialism as well.

Israel's relations with the Western European countries have also deteriorated. Today, apart from the U.S. government, its ruling class counts among its closest friends such exponents of reaction as the apartheid regime of South Africa, the corrupt puppet Thieu regime in Saigon, and now the bloodstained fascist junta in Chile.

The isolation of Israel among nations stands out most glaringly in the UN. A dramatic demonstration of this took place in the Security Council on October 9 when the Israeli representative Yosef Tekoah rose to offer condolences for the civilian victims of the bombing of Damascus. Thereupon Yakov A. Malik of the Soviet delegation walked out, saying: "I am unwilling to hear condolences from murderers and international gangsters." On this, the *New York Times* of October 10 reports, "The Council chamber, packed with diplomats who are not members of the Security Council, resounded with applause as Mr. Malik left the table." There was, in fact, an ovation.

To such a sorry pass has Israel been brought by its rulers in the eyes of the world.

Yet another devastating blow has been dealt to the hopes of the Israeli warmongers by the greatly enhanced unity among the Arab states. The process had already begun before the war, when Egypt and Syria effected a reconciliation with Jordan. And when the war broke out the Egyptian and Syrian forces were joined by units of at least token level from Iraq, Jordan, Morocco, Saudia Arabia and Kuwait. Algeria sent aircraft, Tunisia certain subunits and Lebanon

---

\* See *Zionism: Its Role in World Affairs*, p. 44-54.

medical personnel. The oil-producing countries also gave substantial financial aid. And Saudi Arabia took yet another step: for the first time in its history it sent greetings to the USSR on the anniversary of the October Revolution.

Of special significance is the resort of the oil-producing countries to the withholding of oil as a weapon in support of the Arab cause. These countries, and in particular Saudi Arabia and Kuwait have adopted a policy of progressively reducing oil production and correspondingly the volume of shipments to Western Europe and Japan, and of completely cutting off shipments to the United States and the Netherlands (which has been aiding Israel). Since 80 per cent of Western Europe's oil comes from the Middle East and 90 per cent of Japan's, these cuts are bound to have an increasingly serious impact on the economies of these countries. For the Netherlands the effects are already severe. In the case of the United States, oil imports from the Middle East will account for little more than 6 per cent of total consumption in 1973, but dependence on such imports is rising and is expected to exceed 25 per cent by 1980. King Faisal insists that the policy of restriction will continue until complete Israeli withdrawal and speaks not only of boycott, but also of possible nationalization. Meanwhile, Iran has refused to increase its own oil output to counteract the boycott. These pressures, as part of the united struggles of the Arab countries, are obviously not without effect.

All told, the developments since October 6 represent a tremendous setback for the aggressive foreign policy of the Israeli ruling circles. And they represent no less a setback for their chief supporter, U.S. imperialism.

### *The U.S. Role in the Middle East*

U.S. policy in the Middle East is designed basically to defend the interests of the oil monopolies and other sectors of finance capital. But within this framework the policy has assumed an ambivalent character.

Its predominant feature has been all-out support to Israel as an instrument against the anti-imperialist Arab forces. It is this support, as is well known, which has made possible the whole aggressive policy of the Israeli government. The U.S. policy has been enunciated by Nixon as one of "maintaining the balance of power" in the Middle East, by which is meant maintaining Israeli military superiority at all costs. This policy has never been modified or repudiated and remains in force to this day.

At the same time, however, the U.S. ruling circles have sought, under pressure of the leading oil companies, to maintain amicable ties with the oil-producing Arab states, particularly with such a state as Saudi Arabia, which leads in oil output and capacity and is governed by a reactionary feudal regime. This aspect of U.S. policy has received increased emphasis during the past few years, thanks largely to the struggles waged by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (a group of eight Middle Eastern countries plus Nigeria and Venezuela) for better prices and terms of production, also to the growing nationalization and threats of nationalization of oil properties. The problem of oil shortages has added to these pressures. An indication of this shifting emphasis in Middle Eastern policy was given by Nixon in September when he said: "Both sides are at fault. Both sides need to start negotiations. That is our position. We are not pro-Israel and we are not pro-Arab. . . . We are pro-peace." (Quoted in *New Republic*, October 20, 1973.)

The war came as a shock to the Nixon Administration. As one observer put it: "The war is a great big firecracker that has exploded in Nixon's face." The response was two-sided. On the one hand there were calls for a cease-fire based on return to the 1967 cease-fire lines. On the other hand, as soon as Israel's military plight became clear, a military airlift was instituted. In Congress, demands for large-scale supply of arms to replace Israeli losses were made, spearheaded by such "friends of Israel" as Senators Henry Jackson and James L. Buckley. And Nixon himself leaped to the rescue with a proposal for a \$2.2 billion grant for military aid to Israel.

All this was done in the name of countering alleged large-scale Soviet aid to the Arab states. Secretary of State Kissinger spoke of a threat to the détente which, he declared, "cannot survive irresponsibility." But Mr. Kissinger placed the shoe on the wrong foot. The burden of "irresponsibility" lay not in Moscow but in Washington, which was providing arms to an aggressor in defiance of international law and UN decisions. It was this policy which threatened the détente, not the assistance given by the Soviet Union to the victims of aggression—assistance such as it has freely given to the people of Vietnam and to all others fighting for their freedom.

As in the case of Israel, the U.S. policy has led also to its growing isolation. In the UN Security Council the U.S. spokesmen found few takers for their plea for a cease-fire based on the 1967 lines. Ten of the Council's fifteen member states made it clear that they would support no cease-fire proposal not based on Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories. Moreover, the U.S. found itself increasingly

at odds with its NATO allies. Britain placed an embargo on arms shipments. The position of the French government was epitomized in the question asked by Foreign Minister Michel Jobert: "Is it necessarily unforeseen aggression to try to go home?" The West German government sharply protested the shipment of U.S. military materiel to Israel from its ports. Only fascist Portugal allowed the U.S. airlift to operate from its bases.

In the end the U.S. government was impelled to accede to the Soviet initiative and to join in introducing the cease-fire resolution adopted by the Security Council on October 22 (Resolution 338), which provides for a) a cease-fire on the lines as of that date, b) full implementation of Resolution 242, and c) opening of negotiations leading toward a just and stable peace. The resolution was immediately accepted by Egypt and Israel and soon after by Syria. The terms of this resolution represent a major political victory for the forces of peace and anti-imperialism, since they embody the one truly valid basis for a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

However, the cease-fire has only opened the door to placing the struggle for peace on a new plane. The struggle itself is far from won and it is by no means precluded that fresh outbursts of war may occur.

To begin with, the Israeli leaders have as yet refused to accept the realities of the changed balance of forces and seem determined in one way or another to continue on their former course. Having agreed to the cease-fire they promptly proceeded, in their characteristically treacherous fashion, to violate it and to occupy additional areas exceeding in magnitude those taken before the ceasefire. On October 23 the Security Council adopted a second resolution confirming the previous one, demanding that troops be pulled back to the positions held at the moment the cease-fire came into force, and calling for sending UN observers to check compliance. And on October 25 a further resolution was adopted calling for the sending of UN emergency forces into the area to enforce the cease-fire.

The fighting finally was brought to an end and a six-point plan facilitating the implementation of the cease-fire was accepted by both sides. But Israeli obstructionism has continued. The Israeli authorities have flatly refused to retire to the October 22 lines, citing the phony argument that "no one knows where those lines were." Instead, they propose a return to the post-1967 war lines—the proposal originally rejected by the Security Council. They have hindered UN forces in carrying out their responsibilities and are building a concrete causeway across the Suez Canal. The Egyptian government has

repeatedly warned that it will not forever tolerate Israel's refusal to honor the October 22 lines and that it may be compelled to resume warfare.

In this situation the U.S. government has lent encouragement to the Israeli violations, pretty much as it did in 1967. Added to this was the insane, inflammatory action by Nixon in ordering a military alert, including the Strategic Air Command which is equipped with nuclear weapons. The reasons given for this irresponsible action include such specious ones as "ambiguities in messages received concerning Soviet actions" or the halting of a Soviet weapons airlift from which it was concluded that the planes might be about to be used to transport troops.

The Israeli violation of the cease-fire and the U.S. actions have served to further isolate both. The NATO countries were furious at the failure of the U.S. government even to notify them of the alert, which involved bases situated on their territories. Relations, according to most observers, have reached a new low.

On November 6 the nine Common Market nations met and urged immediate return to the October 22 positions. They made it clear that they stood for complete withdrawal from the occupied territories and for respect for the rights of every state in the area as well as of the Palestinian Arab people. This clear-cut stand only serves to widen still further the gap between these countries on the one hand and the United States and Israel on the other. Nor is it dictated merely by the pressures of the Arab-oil producing countries; it is no less a reaction to the mounting pressures of public opinion.

Of no small assistance to the Israeli aggressors has been the role of the Chinese representatives in the UN. Space permits us only to touch on it briefly here. The fact is that China has given no real support to Resolution 242 at any time. Thus, in 1971 and 1972, when the General Assembly adopted resolutions reaffirming 242, the Chinese delegation abstained. Later, when the Security Council acted in a resolution condemning Israel for failing to surrender the occupied territories, there were 13 votes in favor. The U.S. veto of the resolution was accompanied by a Chinese abstention. In the cease-fire votes in the Security Council on October 22 and 23, the Chinese again abstained while all other member states voted favorably. And on October 23 the Chinese delegate even sought to obstruct action on the resolution.

The Maoists' aim in all this has been to encourage war and to aggravate tensions, seeking in particular to drive a wedge between the Arab states and the USSR as well as to provoke a confrontation

between the United States and the Soviet Union. The joint actions of the two for achievement of a cease-fire were attacked as "connivance of the superpowers." Indeed, on one occasion the Chinese spokesman in the General Assembly called on the Arab countries to reject Soviet military aid and to fight with their own resources, just as Mao had once called on the Vietnamese similarly to reject outside aid.

Peking has made no official declaration of its position on the war and there have been no public actions of any kind in China against the Israeli aggression. Furthermore, the Chinese rulers have given no assistance whatever to the Arab countries. Indeed, their actions are only too reminiscent of their betrayals of the peoples of Bangladesh and Chile.

### *The Road to Peace*

The acceptance by the U.S. and Israel, as well as by the Arab countries and others, of Resolution 242 as the basis for peace negotiations is a significant advance. But it is only a beginning and leaves the most basic questions still unanswered. In accepting the resolution the Israeli ruling clique has by no means changed its basic position. It still interprets the resolution in its own distorted fashion, as calling merely for the "negotiation of secure and defensible borders." Nor has it abandoned its annexationist plans, as expressed in the "Galili Plan" adapted by the Labor Party. Least of all is it prepared, even remotely, to consider evacuating the conquered territories. On the contrary, it hopes to use the negotiations as a basis for maneuver and an opportunity to rebuild its military strength. Dayan brags that Israel's power will soon be greater than on October 6. Of this trend Meir Vilner, general secretary of the Communist Party of Israel stated in a speech to the Knesset on October 23:

. . . As far as the extreme Right circles—the Likud and those who sympathize with their policy within the Alignment—are concerned, the conclusion they draw from the war of the last weeks is to accumulate still more weapons, to extend the frontiers still more, and to sponsor wars still oftener, in order not to give the Arab peoples time to recover.

In all this the Israeli warmongers apparently count on the continued support of U.S. imperialism, and it is evidently with this in mind that Golda Meir paid her recent visit to Nixon.

But they remain blind to the changed realities and are prepared

in their madness to lead the Israeli people to total catastrophe.

The warmongers and aggressors reckon also without the Israeli people themselves, who are coming to learn that the present policies offer no real security for them. Writes Daniel Bloch in *Davar* (October 10, 1973): "It has not been shown in the present war that the ceasefire lines are any easier to defend than the former lines. Our large cities are now indeed farther from the firing lines, but weapons are becoming increasingly modernized and the factor of geographical distance is losing its defensive significance. . . ." He adds: "Nothing in Israel will be the same when this is over. There is likely to be a reexamination of everything—of how to achieve a real peace, of our policies toward the occupied territories, of how to deal with the Arabs."

An upheaval is taking place in the thinking of many Israelis who are coming to reject the outlook of incessant hostilities and repeated bloodshed, who are beginning to recognize that they have been misled and lied to. There is growing understanding that the true friend of Israel is not U.S. imperialism but the Soviet Union, whose peace policy serves the interests of Jews and Arabs alike. That policy was clearly expressed in these words of Brezhnev at the Congress of World Peace Forces: "Our firm stand is that all the states and peoples in the Middle East—I repeat, all of them—must be assured of peace, security and inviolability of borders. The Soviet Union is prepared to take part in the relevant guarantees." (*For a Just, Democratic Peace, for the Security of Nations and International Cooperation*, Novosti, Moscow, 1973, p. 17.)

It is the Meirs and the Dayans and their cohorts of the ultra-Right who are placed on the defensive and will have to answer to the voters in the coming elections. Divisions have already emerged in government circles, as witnessed by the recent resignation of Yakov Shapiro, Minister of Justice, upon Golda Meir's refusal to dismiss Dayan. And questions are being posed with regard to the coming elections, scheduled for December 31, among them whether Golda Meir will succeed in retaining the premiership.

There is a long, difficult fight ahead to place Israel on the one true road to peace and security—through fulfillment of the conditions of the cease-fire resolutions and the guarantee of the right of self-determination to all nations. But it is a fight in which the prospects of victory have been greatly improved.

In the United States the outbreak of the war brought with it a wave of emotionalism, hysteria and frantic raising of funds within the Jewish community, reminiscent of 1967. But here, too, a



sobering-up process has been taking place. Here, too, many people, Jews among them, are taking a fresh look at the policies of the Meir government and its ties to U.S. imperialism. Here, too, the recognition is growing that the road to peace lies in a different direction.

Signs of such developments began to appear even before the outbreak of the war. They were manifested in the expressions of anger and indignation at such actions of the Israeli authorities as the downing of the Libyan passenger plane, the assassinations of Palestinian Arab leaders or the hijacking of a Lebanese plane. And they were evident in the initial reactions to the Appeal of the Bologna Conference. Today there is a large and growing sentiment for fulfillment of all the terms of the cease-fire agreements. It is this sentiment to which the Congress of World Peace Forces appeals in its Call for the Implementation of the UN Security Council Resolutions of October 22 and 23. The Call reads:

The events in the Middle East of October 1973 have sharply underlined the great danger which any conflict in this area constitutes for world peace.

The World Congress of Peace Forces, meeting in Moscow from October 25 to 31, 1973, calls on all the peace forces, on all political parties, mass movements and public organizations in all countries to mobilize public opinion on the biggest possible scale, to ensure the immediate implementation of the Security Council resolutions of October 22 and 23, 1973.

The situation today demands swift and effective action, and it is the duty of all peace forces, national and international, to participate actively in this work, which is so necessary for the peoples of the Middle East and for the cause of world peace.

The doors are open to a mass campaign of immense proportions in support of this Call. Such a campaign in the United States is of decisive importance in view of the special responsibility of U.S. imperialism for the Middle East crisis. The demand must be raised on all sides that the U.S. government, having joined with the USSR in sponsoring the cease-fire resolutions, now fulfill its responsibility for guaranteeing that they are carried out. Such a mass movement can compel U.S. imperialism to retreat from its aggressive policy in the Middle East as it was compelled to retreat in Vietnam. The conditions for this are now more favorable than ever before. And with this a great new victory for world peace can be won.

# COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHILE

## To the People of Chile\*

The military coup of September 11 plunged the country into a state of terror and savagery such as history has never known before. The brutality and vindictiveness with which all democratic movements, especially the working-class movement, are being suppressed have no precedent either in our country or elsewhere in Latin America. The present bloodbath is comparable only to that which followed the coup in Indonesia.

The military junta's every act is a complete negation of what the forces in opposition to the people's government professed to support. They talked about democracy, yet are imposing a dictatorship on the nation. They talked about freedom, yet are setting up concentration camps. They talked about respect for the individual, yet people are being summarily shot daily. They said they stood for pluralism and autonomy of the universities, yet they have placed them under the control of the military.

The real situation is this:

A fascist dictatorship with all its attributes of criminal actions and abuses has been established in the country.

The plan for the coup, the tactics employed to carry it out and the savage methods bear the stamp of foreign origin. The coup was conceived in the backrooms of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency with the direct participation of the International Telephone and Telegraph and Kennecott concerns.

A special group was set up at the Pentagon and the White House to give effect to this plan.

The fascist junta represents no national or patriotic movement. It is anti-patriotic in essence and acts against the interests of Chile as an independent state. The junta is a fascist instrument of imperialism and the internal reaction.

On the day the coup took place, *Exercise Unitas*, with U.S. navy ships and aircraft taking part, was being held off the Chilean coast.

A few hours after the coup the military junta declared martial law, trampling on the Constitution and the National Congress.

Immediately after this the proceedings of the National Congress

---

\* On October 11, one month after the military coup in Chile, the Communist Party of that country issued an Appeal to the Chilean people giving an appraisal of the present situation and analyzing the prospects of the struggle for freedom, democracy and socialism. The following is the full text of the Appeal: Reprinted from *New Times*, No. 44, 1973.

were suspended until "further notice." This was soon followed by an edict dissolving both Chambers of Congress and declaring the credentials of the senators and deputies invalid. Those who only yesterday had gone out of their way vociferously to proclaim at every opportunity their support of the legislative authority now were silent. We are referring to the President of the Senate, Señor Frei, and the Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies, Señor Pareto, who obediently submitted to this lawlessness.

On September 24 the junta announced the dissolution of the municipal councils, which, like Parliament, had been chosen by free election. Today these bodies of local government are appointed by the military junta.

After this the junta decided to appoint only military men as rectors of universities, to remove from them all Marxist instructors and to ban the teaching of Marxism. An end was put to university autonomy. Manhunts are staged and people hounded in an openly fascist manner.

All civil liberties have been abolished. Freedom of assembly and association and freedom of speech and of the press have been completely done away with.

Punitive operations reached an incredibly brutal pitch. The civilian population, especially people living in people's settlements and outlying districts of towns are the victims of repressions of all kinds, which have evoked general indignation. The immunity of the home is violated. Massacres are staged. Books are being burned as was done in Germany at the height of Hitlerism. The number of the summarily shot runs into the hundreds.

Martial law has been supplemented with a decree under which death sentences are being handed down.

The working people's right to present economic demands and to strike has been abolished. What is happening now shows that the military junta's promises not to have recourse to repressions were worth nothing. Members of all the Left parties are being persecuted, as are trade union leaders and workers, many of whom belong to no political party. Thousands of Chilean patriots, from ordinary workers to such prominent men as the 1973 National Science Prize winner Dr. Asenjo, have been dismissed from factories and scientific institutions for no other "offence" than subscribing to progressive views or sympathizing with the Left forces. The witch hunt is in full swing. More than 10,000 Chileans have been thrown into prison or the concentration camps opened at the National Stadium and on distant islands.

A complete reversal has taken place in the sphere of foreign

policy, following such actions, unprecedented in Chilean history, as the armed attack on the building of the Cuban Embassy, and provocations against Soviet, Cuban and G.D.R. merchant ships and their crews, against engineers and other specialists from socialist countries and the service personnel of their diplomatic missions. Moreover, a chauvinistic frenzy was whipped up against foreign nationals, many of whom were highly skilled specialists who had helped Chile to resolve problems facing the country, while others had been granted asylum in Chile in accordance with our laws and traditions.

. . .

In view of all these facts, which testify to the establishment of a fascist-type dictatorship, one must ask: what do the Christian Democrats say about all this? What has happened to their former opposition to any variety of anti-democratic development? What has happened to their favorable attitude towards ideological and political pluralism?

We know that a group of Christian Democratic Party leaders and parliamentarians headed by men like Radomiro Tomic, Bernardo Leighton, Renan Fuentealba and others have taken a dissenting stand. They have remained true to their principles and have publicly condemned the military coup and its consequences. This is to their credit and we believe that they express the views of the absolute majority of Christian Democrat rank and file so outrageously betrayed by their official leaders, who were involved in the conspiracy.

Mustering all the reactionary information media, the military junta launched a foul campaign to vilify the memory of President Salvador Allende. Like carrion crows they threw themselves at the body of the dead President. But they are mistaken if they think they can drive from the hearts of the people the memory of a man such as Salvador Allende, who loved his country more than anything else in the world, who fought for decades for the emancipation of the exploited and the oppressed, and who died like a hero in battle. The dark days will pass and the name of Salvador Allende, the President who returned to Chile her copper, who rose against imperialism and the oligarchy, who succumbed to neither praise nor the enemy's threats and who remained loyal to the people to the last moment of his life, will be inscribed in the history of our country and of all Latin America alongside the names of O'Higgins, Balmaceda, Recabarren, Aguirre Cerda and other Chileans who gave their all to their native land and their people. As for those who vilify them now, they will leave no trace of themselves.

All that the junta has done was planned in cold blood in advance. The putschists began with the bombing and destruction of the *La Moneda* palace—an act of barbarism for which they will never be forgiven. The totally unjustified bombing of President Allende's residence, the military operations conducted at factories and workers' settlements, the decrees of the junta and the arrest of thousands of citizens—this was all carefully thought out beforehand. As the newspaper *El Mercurio* has admitted, the junta employed the fascist blitzkrieg tactic, the tactic of a lightning blow delivered simultaneously everywhere in order, apart from everything else, to sow panic among the civilian population.

The whole world knows that our country's economic and financial difficulties were due not only to the government's mistakes, although these too played their part, but also to the fact that it inherited from previous governments a huge external debt, a backward agriculture, a weak infrastructure, and also to the decline of copper prices in the course of two years, the devaluation of the dollar, the ending of U.S. credits, economic sabotage, the enormous losses caused by transport strikes, and the adoption of budget laws and increase of wages without adequate financial measures to back them up.

Imperialism and the oligarchy did not forgive President Allende and the Popular Unity bloc for nationalizing the extractive industries, carrying forward the agrarian reform, nationalizing the banks, and creating a state sector of the economy.

It is because of this that they decided to overthrow the people's government at all costs. This no one can deny. Time and again they declared that this was their intention, and they carried out their intention. To achieve their ends, they did not stop at causing enormous damage to Chile's economy.

In a vain attempt to vindicate themselves before Chilean and world public opinion, they concocted the fantastic lie that the armed forces were faced with the alternative of either taking action or allowing themselves to be attacked and, above all, beheaded by militarized detachments the Popular Unity bloc had allegedly set up.

According to this fabrication, the Popular Unity bloc allegedly was preparing to carry out this scheme on Monday, September 17. Imperialism and its fascist servitors within the country resorted to this crude concoction to counteract the feeling of outrage their foul crimes have evoked throughout the world. The lie was so incredible that the head of the military junta, General Pinochet, said, as was reported by the press on September 18: "It is quite possible

that they really were preparing a coup. There were so many rumors, so many people who sought to spread doubt and alarm among the population.”

\*     \*     \*

The present state of affairs will not last forever. Lies cannot prevail over the truth, oppression over freedom, or fascism over democracy. Sooner or later—and most likely sooner rather than later—the country will emerge from the state of obscurantism and regression. There is not, nor can there be, any force capable of fettering our people for long, of suppressing the progressive trends in our society.

The new rulers fear the people. And so they institute a state of emergency and a curfew, unleash a reign of terror, bring television and radio broadcasting under their complete control, ban the Left press, abolish the rights of the trade unions, persecute dissenters and outlaw the Marxist parties. All this with the approval and the participation of many pseudodemocrats.

The working people, the masses in general, will recover from this blow and there is not the slightest doubt that they will once again order the destinies of their homeland.

As always, we shall place the emphasis on the organization, the unity and the struggle of the masses, on the growth of their political consciousness. The confusion and despondency which may now be observed among certain sections of the people are obviously of a transient nature. The working class and the entire people will emerge from the trials and battles ahead stronger than ever.

The military coup destroyed all state institutions with the exception of the old and obedient judiciary and the puppet Office of the Controller\*. The state ceased to be founded on law. Chile was turned into a police state where the constitution and laws have been scrapped and replaced with military decrees. The people's blood continues to be spilled, and there is practically no family that has not lost someone near and dear or is not anxious for his fate.

But the people will once again return to power, and when they do, they will, of course, be under no obligation to restore all the institutions that existed previously. The people will adopt a new constitution, draw up new codes and laws, issue new decrees, establish new state bodies and institutions, build a legally-constituted state of a higher type than that which was strangled by the military coup. It will be a legally-constituted state in which freedom of conscience and opinion will be respected, all norms of humanity observed, but

---

\* Official appointed by Parliament to see to it that government decisions do not violate existing legislation,

in which there will be no place for laws providing cover for fascism, economic sabotage or subversive actions.

After what has happened the people of Chile are entitled to make it their aim to create armed forces and a police of a new type, or at least cleanse the army, the police and the judiciary of fascist elements and thereby rule out any repetition of the tragedy that has befallen our people today.

The ordeals that are now the lot of the Chileans will not be in vain. Some of the institutions in which many sincerely believed have today proved themselves to be rotten to the core. Who would think of supporting the existing judicial system or a parliament that condemned itself by becoming a party to the anti-government conspiracy?

There are also other questions that have to be reconsidered by the revolutionary and democratic forces in order to work out a common position.

Of course, the nearly three years of Popular Unity government must also be subjected to a critical and self-critical analysis. Important reforms were effected in this time, but serious mistakes too were committed. Grave damage was caused by the activities of the Leftist elements and reformist tendencies, which at times made themselves felt in the work of the Popular Unity government. The Communist Party is absolutely convinced that its policy of unconditional support of the Popular Unity government, its work to achieve mutual understanding with other democratic forces, especially at grassroots level, its striving to inspire confidence in the middle strata of the population, its efforts to direct the main blow against the principal enemies—imperialism and internal reaction—its persistent labors to strengthen the alliance of the Communists and the Socialists, the unity of the working class and understanding among the Popular Unity parties, its efforts to increase production and raise the productivity of labor, to heighten the profitability of enterprises of the state sector and to ensure strict observance of labor discipline were all components of a correct general policy.

On the other hand, the Communist Party feels that this is not the time to engage in debates about the mistakes committed by the government and the Popular Unity bloc as a whole and each of its political parties in particular. There is a time for everything. To concentrate now on such a discussion would jeopardize the unity of the people's parties at a time when unity is the main condition of success in their struggle against the military dictatorship, and in jointly resolving the new tasks facing the working class and the people.

In these new conditions the Communist Party and the Young Communist League of Chile will fulfill their duty.

The military junta has outlawed Marxism, our Party and all other parties that are guided in their activities by the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. More, it is seeking to make it appear as if the interests of the Chilean nation are alien to us.

Our Party has been in existence for 53 years. It traces its origins to the period preceding the first world war when, in 1912, the great Chilean revolutionary and patriot Luis Recabarren founded the Socialist Workers' Party.

Those who know something about the development of Chilean society know that each class in the country has had one or more political parties representing its aspirations and interests.

The Communist Party defends the interests of the working class. Marxism is the scientific ideology of the working class. Hence the Communist Party can never be destroyed. It will live on so long as class struggle in any of its forms exists. Marxism as an ideological weapon, as the method of scientific perception, explanation and transformation of the world, will live forever!

Many of the members and leaders of our Party have become the victims of persecution by the military junta. But despite this the Communist Party and the splendid Young Communist League of Chile will courageously carry forward their battle standards. Our Party will be steeled still more in the difficult conditions ahead. It will emerge stronger and more prestigious than ever from the struggle.

We represent above all the interests of the working class, to whose cause we always were loyal, are loyal today and will remain loyal to the end of our lives. We at the same time represent the interests of the entire people of Chile, the interests of our native land, which are inseparable from the interests of the working people.

We have suffered heavy losses but we shall regain our strength.

In these difficult days Pablo Neruda died. His death was unquestionably hastened by the crimes now being committed in Chile. Pablo Neruda was not only one of the greatest poets of our time, he was a true Communist, a member of the Central Committee of our Party. He wrote inspired poems about the exploits of the Araucanian heroes, the heroes of the struggle for independence, and the heroes of the working-class struggle—Recabarren and Lafferte; he sang of our fields, the sea and our endless rocky coastline. A man of great culture, keen mind and broad vision, he dedicated his poetry to the great cause of peace and socialism the world



over. His heart was open to people of all latitudes, all races and all languages. But deepest of all was his love for his own people and country, for his native land, for the austere nature of Northern Chile, the rain-swept Andes, for Valparaiso, for its people and its hills.

Like all Communists, Pablo Neruda was a patriot. But not all of us can speak of our patriotism as eloquently as he.

Patriotism and internationalism are equally the attributes of Communists. O'Higgins too was a patriot and internationalist. Inspired by the progressive ideas of his epoch, he had close ties of friendship and co-operation in the struggle for independence of the continent with the patriots and revolutionaries of other American countries.

A few days after the death of Pablo Neruda, Luis Corvalan, the General Secretary of our Party, was arrested by the usurpers of power.

Luis Corvalan is a true revolutionary, fighter and patriot, who time and again in the course of his life has staunchly withstood torture and has been subjected to ruthless persecution.

We consider it our revolutionary duty to come out in defense of his life and to work for his release from the junta's dungeons. It is imperative to mobilize all democratic forces to prevent the physical destruction of Luis Corvalan and to win his release. And not only his release, but the release of the thousands of other revolutionaries and democrats who have been thrown into concentration camps by the junta.

It is necessary by mobilizing the masses to put an end to the criminal repressions. There must be no place on Chilean soil for the killing of honest-minded people.

Put an end to the bloodshed! Stop the killings of men like Victor Jara, the outstanding Chilean artist, and others whose names are still unknown!

Luis Corvalan's life must be saved. The people must secure his immediate release.

Despite the strict censorship introduced by the military junta, our people have learned of the protest voiced throughout the world against the fascist military coup.

All the peoples of the world condemn the crimes of the Chilean fascists. Humanity demands an end to the bloodshed and terror. This world-wide campaign of solidarity, with few precedents in history, inspires us to carry on the fight, reminds us that the people of Chile are not alone.

We must put an end to the terror against our people and pave

the way to a new upswing of the revolution.

The slogan for achieving this objective is the broadest possible unity of our people.

Unity in defense of the right to life and to stop the repressions and killings.

Unity to defend the right to work, to end the mass dismissals and repressions.

Unity to defend the gains of the working class, to win wage increases that would ensure the living standard that existed under the Popular Unity government.

Unity to preserve the trade union organizations; unity to prevent the former owners from returning to the nationalized enterprises.

Unity to restore civil liberties.

Unity in order once again to take the road of revolutionary reform.

In the ranks of the fighters for unity there is a place for every man and woman, young and old, in our country, even those who yesterday, under the influence of reactionary propaganda, were in the opposition.

Millions of Chileans have seen the face of fascism with their own eyes and are prepared to fight it.

The entire people is with us. Chile will triumph!

"The world does not cease its movement even at night," our comrade, the Communist writer Volodia Teitelboim, said in one of his books. By night he meant the sinister darkness of nazism. But these words are applicable to the present as well.

The struggle will end in the final victory of Chile. Our people will once again resume their creative constructive labors, the young people will return to the university auditoriums to debate and to learn, and peace and tranquility will be restored to Chilean homes.

Santiago

October 11, 1973

## COMMUNIST PARTY OF ARGENTINA

# Argentina: Against Dependency, For National Liberation

On March 11, with the defeat of monopolist dictatorship at the polls, there closed a stage in the country's life. We are now witnessing another contradictory stage in which there will be alternating advances and defeats, but in which the result, given the high level of consciousness of the masses and the high political content of their demands, will be advances by the forces that struggle against dependency, for national liberation.

The significant changes that have been produced in the national situation were won by the great struggles that took place against the dictatorship by the working class and the people. In the last months of life of the Lanusse government there was ignited among the masses the slogan "Unite our arms for an Argentinian blow." The dictatorship, in order to save itself, and to avoid the general and national uprising that was incubating, played its dirty cards of the "Great National Accord" (GAN), calling for conditioned elections. That way it avoided the "Argentinian blow," but it couldn't avoid categorical defeat at the polls in the March 11 elections. The reactionary forces found themselves forced to retreat; they retreated while waiting for a new opportunity.

The new in the national situation has not been determined so much by the changes that have taken place at the top, in the sphere of the government, which we don't underestimate, but rather fundamentally by the changes that have taken place in the consciousness of the masses, whose state of militancy is different from that of 1946 when Peron won electorally for the first time.

The masses have become tempered in the course of great struggles, they have acquired great experience, their political stature has grown considerably.

---

\* The Communist Party of Argentina held its fourteenth Congress in Buenos Aires, August 20-24, 1973. The Congress, meeting amidst important political upheavals and big strike struggles, adopted the following Political Resolution. Translation for *Political Affairs* by José Ristorucci.

The present stage of the Justicialist government cannot be considered the mechanical repetition of the previous one.

In the country there has taken place a change in the relationship of forces between reaction and the progressive and patriotic sectors in favor of the latter. There have been created better conditions to continue advancing towards the national and social liberation of the Argentine people. The Left currents have been strengthened. In turn the Right was forced to retreat in order to regroup its forces; a part of it camouflaged itself in the Frejuli and even within the Justicialist Party itself, where it plays the role of fifth column.

• • •

In the new stage initiated on March 25 the national bourgeoisie had the major weight in the public arena. This is what allows one to characterize the Justicialist government, in essence, as a bourgeois reformist government. Its economic plan reflects the aspirations of the national bourgeoisie to have a larger participation in directing the economy, without affecting, fundamentally, the economic power of the landowning oligarchy and of the monopolies. It contains some positive aspects that affect the interests of the oligarchy and the monopolies, which opens the possibility of deepening the fundamental contradiction between the immense majority of the Argentine people and imperialism, the landowning oligarchy and big capital.

The economic plan of the Justicialist government is of a conjunctural character, with an evident anti-recession intention; however the Argentine crisis is not conjunctural but rather structural and consequently requires basic measures that will attempt to create a corresponding socio-economic structure, in step with the productive forces that that structure blocks. It isn't a matter of reconstructing the national economy, but rather of restructuring it on another basis.

• • •

The Communist Party is not interested in the fall of the present government. If it should push the program of national and social liberation espoused in the "Programmatic Platform" that served as the basis of Justicialism's electoral campaign, the Communists will be found in the first ranks of battle of the people fighting for a liberated nation, marching towards socialism.

In the stage begun on May 25 some effective gains have been won in the areas of democratic liberties and foreign policy. Those gains unleashed the anger of the Yanqui (U.S.) ambassador and have been the object of a warning by the Department of Commerce of the

United States, which practically threatens to establish an economic blockade against our country. They have also unleashed the anger of the Rural Society, tool of the beef producing oligarchy.

In relation to the government's progressive measures, and despite their weaknesses, the Communist Party organizes popular support for them, which doesn't mean that it renounces its inalienable right to constructive criticism. Its political attitudes are formed based on deeds and not words. Frankly, it recognizes the deeds favorable to the cause of the struggle against dependency, for liberation. With equal frankness, free of preconceptions, it points out absences, vacillations and backsliding.

Either the government puts an end to its vacillations and strengthens itself by going to the masses to carry the process to the end, or political and social instability will grow.

\* \* \*

The Justicialist government is under two pressures: one comes from the reactionary gorilla camp with its ramifications in the Frejuli. They try to prevent the crystallization of the tendency to form a broad coalition of democratic and anti-imperialist forces, and to prevent the consolidation of the democratic surges that were demonstrated with vitality in the actions of May 25 and following days. If it can succeed in its objective it will have created conditions suitable to a counter-revolutionary coup.

The other pressure is that of the labor and people's movements, that of the progressive, anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist democratic movement. If the government takes heed of the pressure from the depths of the people, unquestionably the revolutionary process will be deepened.

Two pressures, two perspectives on growth. The result in the end depends on the breadth and depth of the struggles, on the unity and coordination of the forces in favor of progressive change.

\* \* \*

The Justicialist movement has in its midst various contradictory tendencies. Within it there exist side by side reactionary currents of the extreme Right and revolutionary currents of the Left. It is a multi-class movement.

One cannot ignore its base in the masses, its influence in the working class, the positive evolution of the political consciousness of its bases, notably the political growth of the Peronist youth, which is developing consciousness of its role during this process.

As is inevitable in all multiclass movements, the confrontation of Right-Left deepens in measure with the deepening general crisis in the country and as, consequently, the solutions go from the area of postulation to the area of realization.

The varied and contradictory tendencies can be changed at the first level without negating the fundamental direction of the process already set in motion.

In the almost three months of this second stage of Judicialist government the country did not reach political, economic and social stability.

The open institutional crisis with the forced resignation of Dr. Campora and some of his immediate aides, his pre-planned replacement by Lastiri, was developed on two levels. One: the satisfaction of an evident wish of an important part of the country that voted for Justicialism of seeing Peron in the first administration. The other: the aim of the Right sections of the Frejuli of arresting or paralyzing the desire for democratization and changes expressed through the vote of March 11 in the voting booths and expressed on May 25 in the streets.

Justicialism is at a crossroads, facing an immense historical responsibility. Either it fulfils the planks in its electoral program promised to the people, or events can flow into a chaotic situation fruitful to putschist adventures.



The road that leads to national liberation is not a straight line. The process will not take place spontaneously in an inexorable manner, or as the fruit of individual action by heroic groups.

The forging of the most broad and solid democratic anti-imperialist unity over all ideological, political and religious differences is the task of tasks at the present hour.

The Communist Party will continue to give its main attention to the fight for uniting the working class, the people, and the advanced democratic sectors in a broad front that will permit taking to the end the struggle against dependency and for national liberation. Today the truth that the Communist Party has proclaimed for many years is evident to many: national liberation cannot be the work of only one party, no matter how big it is or believes it is.

The call for unity rises constantly in the factories and other places of work, in the farms, in the cities, in the university, in all areas. The unity in action from below grows without stopping. Some telling examples of this are those of the Political Youth and the Declaration

of Political Women.

In the young generation there exists and deepens a great anti-imperialist sentiment; one finds in them an intense echo to socialist ideas and among them the tendency to unity of action is accented.

If we examine the programs and platforms of the major political parties (Justicialist Party, Radical Civic Union, those composing the Popular Revolutionary Alliance, ourselves among them), as well as those of important social and trade union forces, it can be proven that within all these there exist notable coincidences.

If there exist progressive programmatic agreements it is possible to have secondary differences. With regard to differences it is possible, and should be, to continue fraternal interchanges of opinions, as between fighters for the same cause, that of the national and social liberation of the Argentinian people.

\*     \*     \*

The national unity must have a democratic, anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist content. This content should be reflected in a program of minimum agreements whose application will permit purging the country of the survivals of the past in its economic-social structure and in its political superstructure.

The Communist Party, at the same time that it reaffirms its disposition to examine the projects of cooperation that might be proposed by other political forces, submits for the consideration of others the following propositions:

#### I. *Democratic Liberties*

— Put an end to the vices of the policy of the "internal front." Maintain and broaden democratic liberties. Abolition of the statute on political parties sanctioned by the dictatorship and of the regressive legislation which remains. Dismantling of the repressive apparatus of the dictatorship, of the parapolice and of paramilitary groups.

— Establishment of democratic norms in the trade union movement.

— Passing a law that guarantees to the university autonomy, tripartite administration and a humanist and scientific education.

#### II. *Improvement of the Standard of Living of the Working Class and the People.*

— General increase in salaries and wages to compensate for the rising cost of living, without passing it on in prices. Living, minimum and mobile salaries.

— Articulation in the best way the campaign for reduction of prices on basic necessities, and above all in the sphere of control of prices at all stages of production and distribution. Working class and

people's participation in the commissions charged with controlling prices.

- Ordering of retirements and pensions according to the cost of living index.

- Amount of rents not to exceed 15 per cent of workers' and employees' pay.

- Defending of jobs and creation of new ones.

- Reduction of the land rents and redistribution, cheap credit for the poor and middle farmers, subsidization of prices for the products of farm-workers.

### III. *Tax Reform*

- Reform of the tax system on the basis of the principle: whoever makes the most must pay the most. Raising of the nontaxable minimum.

- Establishing of a special tax on the great fortunes, in one lump sum, to resolve the grave financial problems.

### IV. *Defense of the National Heritage*

- Nationalization of foreign trade in grain and beef. Control of imports. Control of the financial system (banks, insurance companies, etc.).

- Nationalization of petroleum, of natural gas; its exportation, refining, distribution and sale to be in the charge of YPF. Nationalization of coal, uranium, electricity. Nationalization of the ITT and Siemens enterprises.

- Protection for national industries. Prohibit foreign enterprises from getting internal credit for the purpose of investment.

- Development of cooperatives in production and consumer and credit cooperatives.

- Defense of the state enterprises.

### V. *Foreign Policy*

- Realization of a foreign policy independent from imperialism, based on respect for national sovereignty, of self-determination and in defense of peaceful coexistence.

- Inter-American solidarity. Solidarity with all countries struggling for their national liberation. Denounce the Inter-American Treaty for Reciprocal Assistance, (Rio de Janeiro, 1947) and all agreements harmful to the national interests.

- Withdraw from OAS and propose the formation of a new organization of Latin American states to strengthen continental solidarity and the anti-imperialist struggle.

- Diplomatic, commercial and cultural relations with all countries



of the world, without exception. Strengthening relations with the countries of the world socialist camp, who practice trade on the basis of mutual benefits.

We consider, also, that it would be helpful to exchange views on the need and the proper moment for the convocation of a Constituent Assembly to reform the Constitution, on the basis of a system of proportional representation. It is evident that Argentina needs a new constitution that uses the best of those enacted in 1853, in 1949 and in 1957, in the realm of democratic liberties, social rights, the nationalization of energy resources, and that would introduce other necessary measures related to agrarian reforms, the nationalization of the key elements of the economy and the structure of the future democratic state.

The Constitution that rules us has become antiquated. It is not in tune with the present epoch. It is necessary to modernize it with the goal of constitutionalizing the aspirations and needs of the country and its political superstructure.

The dividing line today runs between national liberation and dependency. As a consequence, the national unity cannot include anti-national sectors, defenders of the latifundist system and of the monopolies.

The national unity for liberation should, of necessity, be based on a program and on the elementary principle that all sectors should have active participation in the adoption of the resolutions: equality of rights and duties of the participants.

The formation of a front for national unity of all the democratic and patriotic forces will accelerate if the existing ties between the Left movements are strengthened and if the already existing united structures are maintained and broadened, such as the National Encounter of Argentines (ENA) and the Popular Revolutionary Alliance (APR). The Communist Party commits its maximum contribution to the realization of this basic task.

.            .            .

The National Liberation Front will be solid and meaningful to the degree that the working class is its backbone.

In order to assure that the working class exerts a predominant force in the liberation processes, it is necessary to intensify the struggle against the class collaborationist top-controlled trade unionism, for the democratization of CGT, of the federations and the unions. The defense of the vital interests of the working class and the development of the process of national liberation demand it urgently.

We don't fight the present leaders of CGT for being Peronists, but

rather for their anti-democratic practices, which are so harmful to the labor movement and to the national liberation movement.

There are Peronist leaders loyal to the cause of the working class, with whom Communists have worked for many years and with whom we are willing to continue working in common—united with other currents in the labor movement—in defense of the interests of the workers and of the nation.

The situation in the country is very grave: the Right though defeated is not totally beaten. They agitate hysterically about the supposed danger of “national dissolution,” and they seek a route adapted to the situation obtaining after May 25 in order to introduce the pernicious spirit of the GAN in a possible government of “national conciliation.”

Argentine reaction counts on the backing of U.S. imperialism, of the CIA. U.S. imperialism will not easily abandon the Argentine market. It has put to work a really operative “Southern Cone,” appointing the dictatorial governments of Paraguay, Bolivia, Uruguay and, principally, that of Brazil, to serve as its lance against the liberation movements of Latin America.

It stimulates also counter-revolutionary subversion in Chile, with which it tries to construct around our country a wall with the aim of pressuring the Justicialist government, to try to stop the progressive process, to discredit it, and finally, to topple it.

It is indispensable to confront the great conspiracy that is being promoted against our nation. We must be prepared ideologically and practically to confront the sudden changes that can occur in this situation and to stop, in all areas, the arm of the reactionary plot.

•     •     •

In Argentina, the basic contradiction is the one between the great majority of the population and the whole nation and U.S. imperialism and its agents within the country: the landowning oligarchy and big capital.

The struggle against dependency, for national liberation corresponds to reality and to the needs of the nation. It is the basic slogan of the present hour.

Today in Argentina, the objective conditions are favorable for realizing successfully basic reforms, up to the culmination of the democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution.

It is necessary, consequently, to build a pole of attraction, a coordinating center, between all of the democratic and progressive, anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist forces, that would serve as a base

of support for an anti-imperialist government of a broad democratic coalition. If the democratic forces that pronounce themselves against dependency, for national liberation, don't reach agreement on the immediate and partial objectives to be achieved, this could frustrate the process initiated on May 25.

The strength of the Communist Party lies in that even under a dictatorship it knew how to prevent its isolation from the masses; it understood that the move to the Left of the masses was irreversible and that nothing or no one could stop it.

Argentine reaction, whose main ideological arm is anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, pretended to have destroyed the Communist Party. It failed to reach its goal. The Communist Party has become an important factor in the national life.

Today more than yesterday, the main Party task is: multiply work among the masses, above all in the labor movement; organization of the masses; putting the masses into motion. At the same time, it is necessary to guarantee the constant numerical growth of the Party, to reach 200,000 members, an important step towards a mass Communist Party.

It is necessary to systematically distribute the Party's Program, which is the program of the democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution, with the goal of socialism.

It is necessary to systematically distribute the Party's press and literature and to raise even further the political-ideological level, the degree of Marxist-Leninist understanding of the Communist militants.

• • •

Argentina is not isolated from the world. It participates in the varied world revolutionary movement; it receives its influences and gives its contribution to it. It is not possible to understand the national events without this historical surrounding. It is not possible to understand the perspective that opens up for our people and for our motherland, without determining exactly the historic epoch in which we live: of the downfall of the colonial system; of the national independence of the peoples oppressed by imperialism; of the strengthening of the world socialist camp, lead by the Soviet Union; of the transition from capitalism to socialism in the world order.

In the present national situation, within the world framework indicated: Forward, in the struggle for a liberated motherland marching toward socialism!

# COMMUNICATIONS

NASIDE HENDERSON

## A Party of Black and White

The August 1973 issue of *Political Affairs* was, as usual, a theoretical contribution to the overall struggle for socialism. It presented the reader with clarity on a number of timely and important subjects. This is also true in regard to the articles written by Comrade James Dolsen on "The Role of the Soviet Union Today" and by Comrade Jim West, "A False Picture."

However, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on both of the above mentioned articles, beginning with Mr. Dolsen's.

Mr. Dolsen, in his short (three pages) and to the point article discusses the current role of the Soviet Union as it relates to domestic and foreign policy. Comrade Dolsen points out that the Soviet Union has continuously through the years striven to elevate the standard of living of its people. He further indicates that this has been done simultaneously with a foreign policy supportive of the national liberation movements against imperialism, neo-colonialism and apartheid.

Despite this, in contrasting socialism to capitalism, Comrade Dolsen makes the mistake of appealing not to the overall class but to the narrow self interests

of trades workers as expressed in the following:

A vivid contrast of housing under socialism and under capitalism in this period (especially well illustrated and authoritatively reported) should wake up many American workers, particularly if circulated among the building trades, for it would provide tens of thousands of jobs for them.

That is not, unfortunately, the only shortcoming indicated here, for the building and construction trades have been historically the backbone of racism within the trade union and labor movements. The tendency towards chauvinism is apparent when trades workers too often assume that skill is synonymous with superiority. The fact that these chauvinist concepts are promoted by the labor aristocracy in no way minimizes their objective effect.

Thus, such a proposal should have been promoted in the context of securing the democratic rights of Black and other nationally oppressed peoples. This particularly generates concern when one considers the outstanding achievements of the Soviet Union in regards to the solving of the nationalities question. The solution obviously rests on proletarian in-

ternationalism, in the United States meaning unity of Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano, Asian, Native American and white workers.

Comrade Dolsen's article is certainly an assistance in further developing our understanding of the revolutionary process. However, he makes another very important and fundamental mistake. He writes:

Whether there is a revolutionary situation in a given country at a particular time depends on a great variety of circumstances and such a judgment requires political knowledge and judgment of the highest type involving long experience under the most trying and varying conditions. Not all revolutionary leaders are Lenins!

This concept of "long experience under the most trying and varying conditions" in the final analysis minimizes the contributions that young Communists have and will make in the future. Such outstanding leaders I would not hesitate to suggest are comrades Jarvis Tyner, Mike Zagarell, Antony Monteiro, Judy Edelman, etc.

We understand that all "revolutionary leaders are not Lenins." This is somewhat reminiscent of Carl Reeve's assertion that there were no Lenins in the United States, an assertion which he attributed to William Z. Foster and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. Indeed, the question is not whether or not there are new Lenins but whether there are Leninists, those who are struggling to master the science

of Marxism-Leninism and apply it creatively to the conditions in the U.S.

Lastly, comrade Dolsen makes no mention of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as relates to that party's leadership in the construction of the new society. The C.P.S.U. is objectively the leading Marxist-Leninist Party in the world today. Of course this is not based on some abstract notion but on the concrete leadership the C.P.S.U. has bestowed upon the Soviet government, the Soviet people, the world Communist movement and the struggle for peace, freedom and national independence.

Failure to mention the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is in the final analysis a nonrecognition of this party's outstanding achievements. Clearly, the C.P.S.U. was and is the party of the great Lenin. To attack the "leftists, Trotskyites and Maoists" and not to bring forth ideologically the leading opponent of their theoretical deviations, is not to see clearly the significance of the party in question.

M. Suslov, Politburo member and secretary of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee, states:

Leadership by the Marxist-Leninist Party is essential to the successful solution of all the problems of a communist construction. Great attention is therefore being paid to furthering this leading role and to elaborating questions of Party development. The CPSU decisively opposes the revisionist attempts to belittle the role of the Party and the Leninist organizational

principles. The consistent struggle of the CPSU for the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the role of the working-class Party, according to the admission of the fraternal Parties, is of great international importance. (M. Suslov, *The CPSU—the Party of Creative Marxism*, pp. 19-20.)

Thus, the most important and fundamental role to be played in socialist, i.e., communist construction is obviously played by the Communist Party. The achievements of the Soviet Union are the achievements of the CPSU, the Soviet government, and the Soviet people. \*

In his review of George Power's "Cradle of Steel Unionism—Monongahela Valley Pa.," Comrade James West made a number of important observations concerning Mr. Power's book.

Comrade West pointed out with authority the unfortunate shortcomings and crimes committed by Mr. Power's analysis of the organization of the United Steelworkers Union. Comrade West lists ten points beginning with, "1. The Communist Party is never mentioned in the book." West further points out that when Communists are mentioned they are not identified as Communists. This ironically included such outstanding Communists as William Z. Foster and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. Comrade West, whose own contributions to the Communist Party have been numerous, unaccountably fails to point out the inherent racism in George Power's book. In fact, the period of history with which the book con-

cerns itself was a period of sharp struggle against racism. This is the most important, fundamental shortcoming for a Communist leader. George Powers, a nationally known ex-Communist, failed to mention that, which we can understand. But Comrade West, whose membership in the Communist Party dates back to this all-significant point in history, is guilty of similar omissions to those of Mr. Powers.

For example, Ben Careathers, leading Communist of the Pittsburgh area, was not identified by Comrade West as a Black Communist. Thus, if one is not familiar with the late Ben Careathers, one could easily assume that he was a white Communist.

"It is characteristic that the history of the Communist Party, U.S.A. is intertwined with the life and work of two of its outstanding leaders who had particularly close connection with steelworkers. William Z. Foster, for many years Chairman of the Communist Party, was the leader of the great 1919 Steel Strike, and Gus Hall follows with leadership in the Little Steel Strike of 1937. It is also characteristic of our history that the Communist Party represents that unity of Black and white workers which is the strength of the Steel Union. Ben Careather, a Black Communist leader in Pittsburgh, was another leader in organizing steel workers at the same time that Gus Hall was organizing in the Mahoning Valley. And more to the present time, Henry Winston, a Black leader of the unemployed during

his youth in Kansas City, is the National Chairman of the Communist Party today, along with Gus Hall, the General Secretary—thus, a working class Party with Black and white workers in the top positions of leadership.” (Gus Hall, *It Takes A Fight To Win*, About the Author, p. 3.)

No honest person can belittle the significant role that the Communist Party has played in the history of our country since 1919. In fact, when labor struggles are mentioned, so too, the Communist Party must be mentioned. When struggles of the unemployed are mentioned, so too, the Communist Party must be mentioned. When the struggles against war, racism and repression are mentioned, so too, the Communist Party must be mentioned. In short, the Communist Party has historically established itself as the foremost fighter in the interests of the working class and the great mass of American people. Thus, failure to mention the outstanding role of the National Chairman of the CPUSA, Comrade Henry M. Winston in the organization of the unemployed is *almost* as sinful as on Mr. Power's part.

Jim West writes, “But without the Communist Party, without its initiatives, without its leadership of strike struggles and of unemployed struggles the reformist leaders would not have moved off their status quo.” (P. 64.) In contrast, Betty Gannett wrote:

Because the Communist Party was intolerant to every expression of chauvinism, it was able in the

days of the depression in the thirties to organize Negro and white—in the North and the South—to battle together for relief, against eviction, for unemployment insurance. It succeeded in rallying considerable white support against the frameup of the Scottboro youth and Angelo Herndon and against lynching, the poll tax, and for the right to vote. It was the Communists that set the example in the organization of Negro and white in the mass production industries into the CIO. (Betty Gannett, *Political Affairs*, February 1968, “Wipe Out the Stench of Racism.”)

This is certainly true and without the Party's initiatives in struggles against racism and for Black liberation, the achievements of the Afro-American people would have been ten times as difficult. Our Party is not a Party of white with Black in it (or Black with white in it for that matter), it is a Party of the working people, Black, Brown, Red, Yellow and white. It's a Party of Black and white unity and that unity is based on the struggle against racism. Our Party is an antimonopoly party, an anti-imperialist party which sees correctly that the antagonisms that exist as a result of class society cannot be smothered under capitalism and the final achievement of Black liberation rests in the emancipation of labor, *i.e.*, socialism.

Failure to mention the leading role of Black and white Communists alike undermines the struggle to achieve a united working class. Further, it contributes to incorrect ideas fostered and fed

by the class enemy about our Party. Ideas such as that ours is a Party of chauvinists and Uncle Toms can only be rebuffed by proclaiming, in the words of Henry

Winston, "Black and white, one class, one fight." Indeed, the CPUSA is the vanguard of revolution—the Party of the *working people*.

**JAMES WEST**

## Author's Reply

Naside Henderson's criticism is correct and well-taken. I thank

him for it.

**JAMES DOLSEN**

## Response to Henderson

Comrade Henderson considers that pointing out to American workers, "*particularly to the building trades,*" that a housing program here similar in scale to that in the Soviet Union, "would provide tens of thousands of jobs for them" is "an appeal to the narrow self-interests of trades workers." He seems to consider that I was undertaking to analyze the "shortcomings of the building and construction trades," for he then cites that I should have appealed to their "overall (class interests)," which require the elimination of their historic "racism."

The comrade then declares that the housing "proposal" should have been promoted in the context

of securing the democratic rights of Black and other nationally oppressed peoples. Any CP program for such housing would, of course, involve the emphasis on opening such jobs to the Blacks and other minority workers. Such struggles are the most effective areas for breaking down racist prejudices.

Comrade Henderson thinks I made "another very important and fundamental mistake" in emphasizing the high requirements for accurate assessment by a revolutionary leader as to whether a "revolutionary situation" exists in a particular country. He declares that such requirements "in the final analysis minimizes the contributions that young Commu-



nists have and will make in the future." He names some of these comrades.

I believe if he were to ask such comrades if they now feel they consider themselves already fit to meet such situations they would all give a negative reply. If he will check a list of the 20 or 30 top leaders of the Communist parties of leading countries, I am sure he will realize that I was not exaggerating. He could also check what Lenin said on this matter.

Regarding the third criticism: that I had not mentioned that it was—and continues to be—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which is responsible for the

policies, tactics and strategies that have made that country the leader of the worldwide struggle against capitalism and the exemplar of what socialism means as a social system—here I concede comrade Henderson has a point. I did not think it necessary to bring this out since certainly all readers of *Political Affairs* are quite aware of this fact and our enemies everywhere hammer away on the same point.

While thus replying to the YWLL comrade, I am happy that a YWLLer takes such careful note of what appears in our theoretical organ and hope it may lead others to contribute likewise.

# Index 1973

- Apthecker, Herbert**—"Insider, Outsider" and Science, Jan., 53; Vietnam Cease Fire: Historic Turning Point, Mar., 41; Toward Counter-Revolution: The Slaveholders and Secession, April, 53; Education, Money and Democracy, June, 55; U.S. Imperialism and Racism: A History, July, 75; John Brown and the Writing of History, Sept., 48.
- Bart, Phil**—Czechoslovakia: Five Years Later, Aug., 50.
- Bassett, Grace**—The Seminar of Latin American Women, Mar., 30.
- Berto, E.S.**—On Women's Liberation, Feb., 55.
- Buxbaum, Alva**—Women's Rights and the Class Struggle, May, 12; The Status of Women Workers, Nov., 31.
- Cohen, Barry**—Changes in the Composition of the Working Class, Nov. 21.
- Communist Party of Argentina**—Argentina: Against Dependency, For National Liberation, Dec., 49.
- Communist Party of Chile**—To the People of Chile, Dec., 40.
- Communist Party of Phillipines**—The Phillipines Under Martial Law, Jan., 1.
- Communist Party, U.S.A.**—An Historic Victory Against Imperialism, Feb., 7.
- Dennis, Peggy**—Return to Moscow, Feb., 50.
- Dennis, Thomas**—The Coming Negotiations in Auto, June, 30.
- Dolsen, James**—On the Role of the Soviet Union Today, Aug., 58; A Response to Henderson, Dec., 62.
- Editorial Comment**—Vietnam: A Time for Vigilance, Feb., 1; The Struggle for Women's Rights, Mar., 1; Paul Robeson's 75th Birthday, April, 1; Defeat the Monopoly Offensive, May, 1; Welcome, Comrade Brezhnev!, June, 1; Recognize Cuba, Aug., 1; The CPUSA: 54 Years Old, Sept., 1; "Motive Force of Modern History," Nov., 1.
- Englestein, David**—A Rejoinder, Jan., 60.
- Giboyeaux, Benigno**—Puerto Ricans at Peekskill, Sept., 54.
- Golden, Lily**—The Liberation Movement Between World Wars, July, 47.
- Hall, Gus**—The 1972 Elections: A Turning Point, Jan., 1; The Conspiracy That Led to Watergate, June, 4; Watergate and the Fascist Danger, Aug., 5; The Struggle for Working Class Unity, Nov., 118.
- Harkness, Joan**—I.Q. Interpretation, Feb., 59.
- Henderson, Naside**—A Party of Black and White, Dec., 58.
- Hincher, Francois**—After the Parliamentary Elections in France, June, 45.
- Inman, Mary**—Maternity as a Social Function, Jan., 55.
- Jackson, James**—Greetings to the Communist Party of France, Feb., 47.
- Komorowski, Conrad**—The European Security Conference, May, 38.
- La Guma, Alex**—South Africa: Threat to World Peace, Feb., 22.
- Lenin, V. I.**—On International Working Women's Day, Mar., 4.
- Lightfoot, Claude**—Racism in U.S. School Textbooks, June, 17.
- Lumer, Hyman**—On "Post-Industrial Society," Jan., 25; A Black Working Class Leader, Feb., 61; The Fight for Peace in the Middle East, Mar., 5; Nixon's Economic Policies, April, 5; A Subjective View of the Left, May, 51; U.S. Imperialism in Southern Africa, July, 20; What Is the Working Class?, Nov., 9; Middle East Peace: A New Stage in the Struggle, Dec., 23.
- Lumer, Robert**—Racism and Human Survival, Jan., 62; August, 1914, Mar., 59.
- Mason, Daniel**—Zionism: A Marxist View, June, 71.
- Meyers, George**—The 1973 Electrical Negotiations, May, 4; Features

- of the Working-Class Struggle, Nov., 108.
- Monteiro, Tony**—James Forman's Pseudo-Marxism, July, 86.
- Olesevich, Y. (V. Shukov and V. Sikora)**—New Left Revisionist Distortions of Socialism, Aug., 31
- Osadchaya, Irina** — Neo-Keynesian Doctrine: Essence and Contradictions, April, 17.
- Patterson, William L.**—My Political Education Continues, Sept., 25; "Revolutionary Suicide," Sept., 59.
- Perlo, Victor**—Superexploitation in Mississippi, Feb., 32; U.S.-Soviet Trade Relations, May, 24; Economic Conditions of Black Workers, Nov., 61.
- Pittman, John**—Arena of Class Struggle: The United Nations, Mar., 18; Arena of Class Struggle: The United Nations, April, 31; Wounded Knee and the Indian Future, July, 66; A Guiding Ideology for Anti-Racist, Anti-Monopoly Struggle, Aug., 18.
- Proctor, Roscoe**—The Superexploitation of Black Workers, Nov., 75.
- Reeve, Carl**—On Weinstone's Review, June, 66.
- Reynolds, Joseph**—Beyond Skinner: To Freedom and Dignity, May, 58.
- Ristorucci, Donna**—The Changing Status of Intellectuals and Professionals, Nov., 52.
- Ristorucci, José** — Puerto Rican Workers, Nov., 100.
- Robeson, Paul**—The Time is Now, April, 41.
- Rogers, Harold**—The African Liberation Movement, July, 35.
- Shields, Art**—What the Communist Party Means to Me, Sept., 10.
- Shukov, V. (Y. Olesevich and V. Sikora)**—New Left Revisionist Distortions of Socialism, Aug., 31.
- Sikora, V. (V. Shukov, Y. Olesevich and)**—New Left Revisionist Distortions of Socialism, Aug., 31.
- Torres, Lorenzo**—Short History of Chicano Workers, Nov., 88.
- Tyner, Jarvis**—Youth and the Working Class, Nov., 43.
- Walker, Lee**—Racism and Speedup in an Auto Plant, June, 41.
- Weinstone, William**—The Life and Times of Daniel De Leon, April, 58; A Reply to Reeve, June, 69.
- West, James**—Imperialism Today: A Marxist-Leninist Assessment, Mar., 53; A False Picture, Aug., 61; The Gathering Storm in Steel, Sept., 29; Author's Reply, Dec., 62.
- Winston, Henry**—A Letter to My Brothers and Sisters, Feb., 13; The Example of Peekskill, April, 4; Padmore, the "Father" of Neo-Pan-Africanism, July, 1; Opening Speech, Nov., 1; Education: Not Backward to Booker T. Washington but Forward to Black Liberation, Dec., 1.
- Zayadine, Y.**—Thirty Years of the Jordanian Communist Party, Sept., 41.
- Zayyad, Tawfik**—Israel's Setbacks in Africa, July, 55.
- Zitron, Celia**—A Racist Book on Education, Sept., 55.

## 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.