

PARTY AFFAIRS

A PUBLICATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.
23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 3, No. 5

Price 25c



April 4, 1969

ON INDUSTRIAL CONCENTRATION

By George Meyers

The fundamental purpose of our policy of industrial concentration is to win the workers in the basic industries - the industrial proletariat - to the ideology of socialism. This policy, more than any other we may pursue, brings us into sharpest clash with the giant monopolies that rule America, for it is the most effective challenge to their power. Without the industrial proletariat, no meaningful reforms can be won, let alone the socialist revolution to which we are dedicated.

For our industrial concentration policy to be effective, the commitment of the whole Party is essential. This is not yet the case, although we are beginning to pick up steam. In this article, I would like to approach several problems which I think act as a roadblock to the total and enthusiastic participation of all of us in this dramatic struggle.

The U.S. monopolies have a conscious, vigorous, insidious ideological offensive going against the working class. There is a never-ending campaign in their press, in their class rooms, to develop an attitude of contempt and/or confusion toward our class - to keep it on the defensive - to destroy its self-confidence. The workers in basic industry are the chief recipients of this capitalist spleen and slander. They are declared greedy and uncultured, looking out solely for themselves, interested only in TV, sports and beer.

On the one hand, they are scorned as the most "hawkish" segment of society, grasping after war jobs. On the other, they are said to be only interested in "pork chops" when they go out on strike in the middle of a war. Many who think straight on most issues, see them at least partially to blame for the inflationary price spiral that is robbing our pockets.

Why are these workers - steel workers, auto workers, coal and hard rock miners, rubber workers, those in electronics, textile and other mass production industries on the receiving end of special attention, both from the U.S. ruling class and the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

I think we have to begin with the proposition that workers in basic industry - the industrial proletariat - are the main productive force in society. They are capitalism's prime producers of surplus value, its major source of profits. They are the most exploited section of the working class in relation to the wealth they produce.

These basic workers are massed in the big mills and factories of our country, and in the mining areas. They work in the most thoroughly monopolized industries. They quickly lose any illusions of being able to escape from the working class, and know they have to stand and fight if they are to survive. They have consolidated their great economic strength through trade union organization.

Intense exploitation combined with this strength give them a tremendous revolutionary potential. It makes them the most powerful fighters for the reforms that can lead to revolutionary change.

The organized workers in basic industry have given stability to the whole trade union movement. Before they were organized, the movement had been crushed time after time, to be painfully rebuilt after each disaster. It's easy to understand why Big Business stopped at literally nothing to prevent their unionization. When the history of the struggle to organize the industrial workers is truly written, it will be written in blood.

Now, in spite of the tremendous growth of the monopolies, anti-labor laws and stepped-up government intervention, all efforts to break the back of organized labor have failed. Not that there haven't been serious setbacks. The class struggle isn't a one-way street decorated only with victories of the workers, especially when the struggle is conducted under rules laid down by the capitalist class.

One of the most poisonous weapons in the ideological arsenal used against the working class is the allegation that the fight for higher wages has corrupted the class. This has been widely spread by Marcuse and numerous other conscious or befuddled ideologists of petty-bourgeois radicalism.

Wage increases have been used as a yardstick to "prove" industrial workers have lost their revolutionary potential, if they ever had it. Some claim they are no longer a meaningful force in U.S. society, and hypocritically mourn their demise.

These well-heeled pundits are unable to grasp the idea that the fight for wages is a fight to keep from being shoved into degradation. It is the struggle for a decent place to live, decent food and clothing, an education for the children. The fight for "bread and butter" demands has been smeared as "opportunism," when actually, the wage struggle is fundamental to the struggle against exploitation - the starting point of the class struggle.

Belittlers of economic struggles give little or no thought to the problems workers have of holding on to the wage raises they have won. Listen to what George Meany, AFL-CIO president and foremost apologist for capitalism in the labor movement, was forced to tell a GE-Westinghouse

collective bargaining conference, preparing to enter negotiations with these two corporations:

"Since September, 1966, living costs have gone up nearly 9%. At the present rate of increase, they will have risen between 11 and 12% by the time the contract expires (September 1, 1969). That means the net gain in real earnings in the past three years will be about 1%.

"...from 1960 to 1966, there was practically no gain in real wages - in buying power - you have had nine years of economic vacuum. It was not a vacuum for GE and Westinghouse. It wasn't a profit vacuum. It wasn't a productivity vacuum. It wasn't a sales vacuum. It was just a vacuum in spendable wages for workers."

Mr. Meany went on to point out that while GE reported a record-breaking sales figure of \$8 billion for 1968, a survey among skilled GE workers showed they were falling behind the annual income figure considered "moderate" by the federal government by as much as \$2,800 a year. You can imagine what is happening to the less skilled.**

Since the organization of the CIO, workers in basic industry have improved the conditions of life for themselves and their families. In the process, they have raised the standards of the whole working class.

But among some in the "New Left," it has become fashionable to see even such limited and temporary economic victories as the source of corruption in the working class. As a reward for their often epic struggles and heroic self-sacrifice, auto, steel and other basic workers have been placed in the category of the corrupted - the rotten core of the working class that breeds the dreaded "aristocracy of labor." (It's hard to square the concept of "corrupted" and "bought off" with the thousands of rank-and-file and official union strikes that have taken place in just the last few years.

Big Business ideologists work hard to prove that higher wages in basic industry have eliminated exploitation. Here they have gotten away with murder. This fallacy has won acceptance in sections of the Left who see only the "poor" as exploited and therefore revolutionary. Trade union leaders also refer only to low-paid workers as being exploited, blurring the very nature of capitalist exploitation. Big Business, of course, claims their "reasonable" profits come out of "good management."

I think clarity in relation to the question of the rate of exploitation of basic industrial workers is one key to the success of our industrial concentration policy. I would like to use the auto industry to demonstrate the existence and extent of this exploitation among higher-paid basic industrial workers who make a "living" though inadequate wage, particularly when they get in some overtime. The following facts and figures were prepared by the United Auto Workers, Direct quotes are from U.A.W. documents.

Let's start with General Motors, since it has been impressed upon us that what is good for General Motors is good for the country.

"In 1960 and 1961, GM's profit per hourly paid worker in its U.S. operations was \$5,001 and \$4,825 respectively. This was well over twice the U.S. average for the manufacturing industry.

"In 1962, GM's profit per U.S. worker rose to \$7,680; in 1963 to \$8,018 per worker. In 1965, it reached a record \$8,807 per worker, or almost three times the national average. Even in 1966, when profits were slightly down, profit per worker reached \$6,969.

"GM's profit is so phenomenal that its magnitude is difficult to comprehend. If one were paid \$1 per minute for every minute of the year, one would have to start working 5,815 B.C. to earn as much as GM in 1965."

GM's revenues in 1965 alone were greater than the entire revenues of France, Germany, Japan or Canada. All this with a total of 490,000 hourly paid workers.

The U.A.W. continues:

"In 1947, an average GM worker would have earned \$3,009 if he had worked full-time all year. A GM stockholder with 1,003 shares of GM stock would have received dividends of \$3,009, the same as the average worker. But from then on, the stockholders gains were much more.

"If this average worker had worked full-time for the entire twenty year period between 1947 and 1966, he would have earned \$110,636. In contrast, the stockholder whose income was the same as the worker's in 1947, would have received \$227,831 in cash dividends by the end of 1966, and the market value of his stock would have increased by \$377,718. Thus, the stockholder's benefits from his GM stock would have amounted to \$622,549, or 5.6 times as much."

A coupon clipper who bought 179 shares of GM stock for a little over \$9,000 in 1947, could have sat back for the next twenty years and collected as much as a worker breaking his back on the production line for the same period.

Ford Motor Company's profits per U.S. worker closely parallel the General Motors figures - but get this:

"At the beginning of 1947, the total net worth of the Ford Motor Company was \$771 million. By the end of 1966, net worth had increased to \$4.8 billion. Of this fantastic growth, only 0.7% was paid for through the sale of new stock; the remaining 99.3% was financed out of earnings."

"If a Ford worker had worked full time from 1946 to 1966, he would have earned \$105,477. In contrast, a stockholder whose income was the same as a worker's in 1949 would have had a total take of \$783,904 by the end of 1966." Nearly 7-1/2 times as much as the worker made in 20 years slaving for Ford!

Now we turn to Chrysler:

"In 1961, the owner of 2.4 shares of Chrysler stock received \$2.40 in dividends, a little less than the average Chrysler worker's gross hourly earnings of \$2.90. But by 1966 (5 years later) through stock splits, his shares had increased to 10, and the dividends on his stock had risen to \$20.00. This was a fantastic increase of 733% while the average Chrysler worker's gross hourly pay, including overtime, had risen by only 21% to \$3.51 per hour.

The Big Three (GM, Ford and Chrysler) have taken some of the bloated profits sweated out of the hides of their workers and expanded their operations into the capitalist countries of Europe, and into Asia, Africa and South America. They now constitute a world-wide monopoly in the auto industry, and seek to play auto workers in one country against those in another.

I don't have the latest available figures, but all profits showed a marked rise in 1968. For instance, the Daily World of March 12 carries the following item from its Detroit correspondent, William Allan:

"...as previously noted, Chrysler profits rose 45% in 1968, and executives' incomes went up even faster, reaching an average increase of 55.6%. Chrysler workers, however, fared badly, with the 20 cents per hour won in 1967 being wiped out by war-fed inflation. (Our readers should please note Chrysler is doing much better since the Rockefeller family moved in.)

"It is no secret how the auto monopolies achieved this drastic increase in the rate of exploitation, with fewer workers now than they had in 1947. Automation and the brutal, scientifically applied speed-up of workers, topped off with spiralling price rises blamed on "increased labor costs."

The vast profits of the auto industry and of its huge superstructure of sales and distribution come primarily from the sweat and muscle of the basic auto workers at the point of production. This is the real truth about basic industrial workers the ruling class tries to hide.

I offer just one other set of figures from a basic industry, coal, to demonstrate the rate of exploitation among the industrial proletariat. In 1946 there were 650,000 coal miners in the U.S. Automation and speed-up have reduced this number to not much over 120,000, while coal production

is almost as high as the 1946 peak. But the profits of the coal operators have shot up:

Consolidation Coal Co.	
1955	\$19,420,000
1964	44,860,000
Peabody Coal Co.	
1955	9,430,000
1964	30,470,000
Ayshire Collieries	
1955	2,520,000
1964	13,720,000
Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	
1955	6,840,000
1964	13,720,000
Pittston Coal Co.	
1955	2,190,000
1964	13,720,000
Glen Alden Corp.	
1954	40,000
1964	6,000,000

Since 1964, most of the big coal companies have been incorporated into even bigger conglomerates. Consolidation has gone in with Continental Oil and Peabody is now part of Kennecott Copper.

How is that for exploitation? The only thing the miners have gotten out of it (those not on relief) is a few wage increases accompanied by the killing speedup and a tremendous rise in the "black lung" disease. They have just captured the imagination of the whole working class with their dramatic political strike for safer working conditions. (Statistics prove the "black lung" takes 10 years off a miner's life, and makes him an invalid for 10 years before he dies.)

Ever-present ruling class schemes to divide the working class are particularly aimed at the basic workers. Within the ranks of the industrial proletariat, special efforts are made to inject concentrated doses of racist poison among white workers. The tactics of the George Wallace Presidential campaign are the most recent example. But the intense class struggle against the giant monopolies tends to re-unite workers - sometimes the hard way, after serious defeats and reverses.

Although there is a greater degree of black-white working-class unity among basic workers, racism among white workers, discrimination in the trade unions and racist attitudes of far too many trade union leaders are a serious threat to this unity and to the vital need to extend it.

Black workers are letting both the industries and recalcitrant union leaders know "they have had it." In their militant struggle for full equality in industry and in the labor movement, they are leading the fight for better working conditions and union democracy in the interest of all workers. The job now is to mobilize a struggle against racism by and among the white workers. Here we Communists have a grave responsibility as the vanguard of the working class.

An all-out campaign against racism among white workers is an inseparable part of industrial concentration. Racism can and must be fought as a social disease of capitalism - clearly against the self-interest of white workers, and the working-class as a whole. This is the path to our goal of the black-white-working class unity essential to Socialism.

Rejection of the false assertion that steel, auto and other industrial workers, black and white, are part of the corrupted "labor aristocracy" does not mean that corruption is not a serious problem in the working-class movement. But if we intend to do anything about it (and we should) we have to reject the irresponsible "scatter-gun" approach that has been used, particularly against the organized workers, by sections of the Left.

Anyone at all active in the labor movement knows the ruling class has a conscious policy of trying to win over (bribe, if you will) any worker who begins to show the least sign of leadership. If that fails, then it tries to neutralize, discredit, defeat, or, if possible, fire that worker. Anyone familiar with in-plant organization of a non-union shop knows the way the boss tries to head off the union. How many low-paid workers have been temporarily detoured from unionizing by just a little judiciously placed overtime?

The effects of this conscious ruling-class policy of corruption up to the highest levels of organized labor can be measured by the present bankrupt leadership of the AFL-CIO.

Another aspect of the question of opportunism and corruption that requires deeper examination is the role of lawyers, economists, educational directors, and other professionals hired by the trade unions. Many have insidiously edged their way into non-elected policy-making positions and become an entrenched bureaucracy. By training, most are committed to collaboration with the company, or have a social-democratic, anti-Communist and reformist background. They exert a greatly disproportionate influence on trade union leadership and trade union policy. (I know of numerous cases where law firms fight over a local union as if it were their property, putting up very substantial sums to elect union officials whom they can influence.)

Often overlooked is the role of foremen and other staff members who are in direct contact with the workers. Talk about peddling bourgeois ideology! They not only preach capitalism and anti-Communism, but most often, racism and anti-Semitism as well. They are a part of the working class almost totally at the mercy of the boss.

Finally, it has always been my experience that the corporations make sure they place a full quota of their stooges in all departments. These rats not only spy for the company, but are active disseminators of anti-unionism and racism. They are always the most vociferous anti-Communists. (A close examination of plant workers supporting Wallace shows a great many were just such anti-union elements with strong company ties.)

Like racism, corruption is an instrument of the ruling class, imposed on the working class by capitalism. The starting point in the fight against corruption - and its twin, opportunism - in the trade unions, is the organization of labor's rank and file around a concrete program of struggle at the point of production and around the problems of the working-class communities.

The final question I want to touch on is the charge that while the U.S. working class may be one of the world's most militant, it has a very low level of class consciousness and Socialist consciousness.

Truer words were never spoken. But when we Communists say it, we have to do so self-critically, taking into consideration objective conditions. Who else but the Communist Party has the responsibility of making the workers class conscious? Isn't it a basic tenet of Marxism that while the class struggle spontaneously develops a high level of militancy and radicalism among workers, class consciousness does not come spontaneously. It has to be brought to them. That's where we come in. If we don't do it, who will?

That is the meaning of industrial concentration. Its reaffirmation comes at a most propitious time. The working class is on the offensive. Rank and file movements spring up everywhere. There is a higher level of demands in relation to automation and health and safety conditions. Attempts to impose wage "guidelines" were smashed. Young workers are taking the lead in demanding higher living standards. Black workers are taking the fighting spirit of the freedom movement into the factories and giving a militant lead to the struggles of all workers, North and South. The fight against the speed-up intensifies. The strike struggles continue. The heroic rank-and-file strike of the coal miners for "black lung" legislation was an historic political strike of high quality.

All ingredients for a successful drive to organize the South are present except leadership. Workers in the basic mass industries have to put the pressure on their unions to get on with this job in the economic

and political interests of the whole class. They have the money and muscle. The freedom movement has publicly stated its eagerness to make it a joint effort.

Unionization of low-paid workers in other parts of the country cannot and will not wait. But an organizing drive in the South has a special quality that will spur a national organizing drive. It will raise the economic standards of all workers. It will revitalize the labor movement as nothing else can and will smash the political base of the anti-labor, racist, Dixiecrat warmongers.

Industrial concentration means that we immerse ourselves in these working class struggles in the mines, mills and factories, and in the working-class communities. That's how to elevate the sights of the workers to higher goals, to surface and organize their inherent yearning for peace.

It is in struggle that we will take the militant, radical trend particularly evident among the industrial proletariat and move it into the channel of socialist consciousness.

This is the way to build the shop and industrial clubs that will strengthen the working-class base of our Party.

To consolidate our policy of industrial concentration among workers in basic industry is to lengthen and quicken the strides toward a socialist America.

* * * * *

- * In 1966, 11 unions in these two chains united in coordinating bargaining. They won a 10% wage increase over three years and a 2.75% cost of living clause. The coordinated bargaining setup continues.
- ** The front page of the New York Times (March 17, 1969), carries Bureau of Labor Statistics findings that it costs a New York family of four \$6,021 to maintain a low standard of living. A moderate living standard would cost \$9,977 a year. Back on page 55 was this report from the department of Commerce: "Corporate profits reached record levels in the fourth quarter of 1968, both before and after taxes."

THE FIGHT FOR INDIAN SURVIVAL

A Special Form of the National Question in the United States

Burt Nelson

All peoples, languages, cultures, economics, nations and states are the result of a process of historical evolution. Prior to the coming of the white man from Western Europe to what is now the United States, the Indian peoples had lived here for thousands of years. Very recent archeological discoveries, in the Columbia River Basin area of the Pacific Northwest, quite adequately establish that man has resided there continuously for over 13,000 years. Clearly, this preceded the appearance of written language and written history on earth. It therefore is not surprising that as yet little is known of the origin of the Redman of this continent. However, from the scientific viewpoint, very little is known of the origin of West European white man other than what he has recorded himself since he learned to write. Therefore, it is entirely possible that at some future time science will irrefutably establish that the Redman is senior to the white man. While the time and place of the origin of the several distinctive peoples of the earth are important from a scientific viewpoint, this exact knowledge is not key to the nature and character of the fight for Indian survival within the United States today.

The keys to both the understanding and winning of this fight are to be found within the more recent period of written history in general and of the development of property relations and commodity production in particular. Before the coming of the white man, the Indians unquestionably had lived within what is now the United States for thousands of years, far longer than any of the West European nations and states had existed as such. In the period predating the arrival of the white man, the Indian peoples had developed a continuity of language, territory, property relations, culture, psychological make-up and a name for themselves which was uniquely different from that of the West Europeans. Each of the several Indian peoples, while having many things in common in respect to property relations, social organization, psychological make-up and the name they used for themselves, they also had as many, or perhaps more, distinctions among themselves than did West Europeans of the same period. In respect to language, linguistic authorities disagree as to the exact number of root languages. There were most likely seven clearly distinctive languages. Developing from these distinctive languages arose a great many localized languages. Again, linguistic authorities disagree as to the exact number. Some contend that there were no more than one hundred distinct variants. Others argue that there were a couple of thousand offshoots from the original root.

Unique, and widely spread enough to be most extensively understood, was a hand sign language. Again, science will in time accurately determine this. And while it is important from the scientific point of view, the extent of such divergencies is not the decisive question. Far more important is that from all of the root and all of the derivative languages, the respective

Indian peoples' name for themselves translates into English as the People of some distinctive geographic or other feature, much like we use the term "Englishman" to identify those from England or "Frenchman" for those from France. Never, never does it translate into those of India. The name "Indian" is a monument to the white man's lack of knowledge of the world and is closely related to his not too distant abandonment of the fixation that the world was flat. Believing he was in the East Indies, adjacent to Asia, he quite reasonably considered the local inhabitants to be those of India or Indians. This is, of course, not the only or even the most important aspect of his inability to understand the Indians in other than the restrictive framework of his own society, its economy, language and culture.

At that time, roughly 400 years ago, white society in Europe was undergoing a drastic change. Capitalism was emerging from the, by then, archaic and obsolete feudalism. This, the most greedy, ruthless form of society known to man was avidly in search of profitable raw materials and of markets for commodity production. It knew no legal or moral restraints which it was bound to observe in dealing with the peoples of the world. Colonialism, the forerunner, companion-piece and tool of present-day imperialism, was in birth.

Colonies in India, Southeast Asia, Africa and North and South America were in the process of being formed. Without exception, the motivation of the creation of the colonies was profit from the exploitation of the land, the national resources, the market and the labor of the indigenous inhabitants of those vast areas. In the beginning, colonialism, as a method of exploitation, was virtually identical in form and impact upon the exploited, irrespective of where it was used or from which West European country it came from. The general form was through a commercial company under charter from one or another of the ruling monarchs of Europe. Each of these chartered companies was given absolute title to and authority over vast territories. In addition, they were given the power to create their own military establishment to enforce both title and authority. This was the beginning of the colonial police and of such police methods. Anything which enhanced exploitation and profits was good. Anything which lessened or interfered was bad. Where and when necessary, colonial police effectiveness was established by the use of the regular armed forces of the colonizing parent country. From the very beginning, forts, naval bases and other military strong points were established upon the colonized territory. The practice of "showing the flat" of gunboat diplomacy was introduced in the name of exploitation of the desired territory.

Subsequently, each of the colonizing national capitalisms pragmatically evolved its own special forms and divergencies. With the general pattern determined by the character and needs of world colonialism, the divergencies reflected the special requirements of a particular national capitalism and the specific conditions of a given colonized territory. All of this was influenced by the constant contradictions, competitions,

rivalries and wars among the capitalist states for market and natural resources control.

The original thirteen colonies which eventually became the United States were formed by that process and were greatly influenced in all things by the special needs of the capitalist class of the dominant colonizing country, England, which was then laying the foundations for the world-wide British Empire.

The beginning colonial treatment of the Indians was in the main determined by both the needs of British capitalism and of its early experiences in oppressing other peoples. The precise British experience and form of property relations was transplanted to its American colonies in general and to the thirteen which were to become the United States in particular.

England's experience with Scotland in general and in regard to the Calvin Case of 1609 in particular, to a high degree, became guide lines for the early treatment of the American Indians. Briefly, Calvin, a Scot, after the English conquest of Scotland, sued in a British court for the return of his property. After an extended period of litigation, the court, in 1609, held in effect that national sovereignty could be extended by war and treaty among nations but that title to private property, especially land, could not be transferred in this manner. From this focal point, the practices of war, treaty and purchase of Indian lands was institutionalized in the thirteen original colonies, subsequently recognized and incorporated into the Articles of Confederation. This became an institutionalized practice which was to continue until the United States Congress in 1871 resolved that it would recognize no more treaties with Indians, a clear indication that United States capitalism was entering its final continental expansion and opening the door to its intended final solution of the Indian question.

However, capitalism reached this point by successive stages, evolving its colonial treatment of the Indians in paralleling stages. The exploitation of the land, natural resources and Indian peoples by the original thirteen colonizing companies required a tremendous volume of cheap labor which, if not found here, had to be imported at substantial cost. Therefore, the colonizers sought the use of Indian slavery and when that failed, of Indian wage labor. Each of these efforts failed primarily because the Indian was on his native soil. At most, he was a day or two away from what was home to him but a strange and forbidding wilderness to his exploiters.

The colonizers of that day, understanding mankind from the viewpoint of their own narrow experience rather than from generalized world-wide human experience, failed miserably even elementarily to understand the Indian, whose territorial sovereignty, economy, culture and psychological make-up posed no need for him to accept wage labor. Slavery was no less repulsive to him than it was to those who were carried far from their native lands in Africa and elsewhere. The Indian's centuries old experience and mobility had prepared him for extended military resistance

to emerging colonialism, a military resistance in which he engaged with great skill and heroic bravery for nearly 400 years.

In the beginning the Indian, in general, was willing to share his lands with the first white men. Most likely there were two reasons. First, for countless centuries Indians had been traders. They understood and were experts at trade by barter. There are numerous historic Indian trading sites, well-documented by early white men. Perhaps the best known is Celilo Falls, now obliterated by the Dallas Dam of the Columbia River near the city of The Dalles, Oregon. The Coeur D'Alenes Indians of Northern Idaho were so named by very early Hudson Bay Co. traders of French extraction who found the Indians, then living on the shores of the large lakes in the area, to be very sharp businessmen. Hence, the white man's name for them, which literally means heart of an owl. Not only were they willing to enter into trade relations with the newcomers, but also to employ those trade goods which were new to them to change their own lives in their own way and in their own time. The quick adaptation of the Indian to firearms and the steel trap as game-taking implements is a historically recorded indication of this. The Plains Indians' mastery of the horse, in a single generation, is another well-documented indication.

Far more important, however, was the essential democratic character of Indian society as a whole. They knew no hereditary kings or leaders. For centuries they had elected their leaders, of peace and of war. They reserved to the Indian people the right to removal for cause of all leaders from the lowest to the highest. Contrary to popular white myth, there was no prohibition upon the election of women to many leading positions other than war leaders. Such leaders were universally chosen from among experienced warriors.

In the marriage relationship, no Indian woman was obligated to enter marriage except by her choice; or to continue that relationship a day longer than pleased her. Women desiring to end the marriage relationship simply put the man's personal property, weapons, tools etc. outside the residence. The relationship was thereby ended. When this was unsatisfactory to the man, he was obligated to make representation to his former wife's family for restoration of the marriage. He might or might not negotiate his way back into her good graces. To both early white male arrivals here, and to a substantial number of current white males, who regard the marriage relationship as a property relationship, the Indian method of divorce was a savage, ungodly practice. Only slightly less objectionable than the Indian concept of land ownership.

To him, the land belonged to all of his people. It could be occupied and used, it could not be sold, traded or otherwise passed to individual ownership. From the beginning to the present, part of white and Indian relationships have been an effort to force Indian acceptance of the white man's concept of land ownership. This became a major factor because the entire concept of capitalism is based upon private property ownership in general and upon private ownership of land in particular, which is a primary requirement in the process of extracting profit by the exploitation of labor in commodity production.

In the beginning, the land belonged to the Indians, who had no concept of the sale or private ownership of that land. This relates to some of the special features of early colonial and present-day treatment of the Indian, one of the most brutally deprived and genocidal colonial treatments of any people on earth. By war, military force and enforcement of treaties, white sovereignty over the land could be established. But there remained the question of actual title to the land, as individual private property. Without this, there could be no capitalism. As long as the Indian lived; as long as he survived as a people, actual, legal title to the land for the whites was in jeopardy.

The fact that today there are countless Indian legal claims to land, tied up in the courts, is a monument to both the cause of and the fact of centuries of effort to exterminate the Indian. To the capitalist, as long as there is a single survivor of the original owners of the land, whether it be in the heart of Manhattan or the far reaches of Alaska, there is a piece of land to which some white capitalist or capitalist institution has a cloudy title.

The statement of U. S. Senate Interior Committee Chairman Henry M. Jackson, on February 19, 1969, to the Associated Press, in regard to his proposal of settlement of Indian title claims to between 4 and 7 million acres of oil-rich Alaskan land for one billion dollars, is all the proof of questionable land title which needs to be submitted.

The Senator's problem arises not in the beginning or the middle days of colonialism, but in its dying days, in the world historic period of colonial liberation, in the epoch in which the balance of the world relationship of forces has tipped against capitalism and its instrument, colonialism. His problem is substantially different from that of his presidential namesake Andrew Jackson in 1830. That Jackson, confronted with a United States Supreme Court decision written by John Marshall, sustaining the Cherokee Indian land claims, refused to enforce the Court order and prompted Congress to enact the Indian Removal Bill of May 28, 1830, and the appropriation of money to enable the army to remove Indians from the South Atlantic seaboard. Thus began the most despicable period of the colonial treatment of the Indians, under the leadership of a racist, slave-owning president, commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the United States, in defiance of an order of the U. S. Supreme Court. Clearly, there were no moral or legal restraints which capitalism, in alliance with the slave-owning aristocracy, was bound to observe. Genocide by dictatorial fiat was institutionalized. Congress, exposing itself as the complete tool of capitalism, violating the constitutional protection of due process of law, provided the money. The president issued the order. The military executed it. Capitalism here conceived the idea; Hitler, one hundred and ten years later, conceived a faster method - the gas oven.

In the ensuing 41 years, emerging U. S. capitalism consolidated and expanded, developing its domestic colonialism, laying the basis for its entry into imperialism, becoming, among other things, the principal policeman of the final stage of world colonialism.

In 1871 the United States Congress had objectively abandoned all pretensions to government of, by and for the people and was the pliant tool of the white capitalist ruling class. In that year Congress, opening the intended final stage of the capitalist solution to the Indian question, decreed that henceforth it would recognize "no treaty with the Indian Nations". Constitutionally, the Senate ratifies treaties and jealously guards this prerogative. But in this instance, both houses of Congress were used, a clear indication of the importance which was attached to the subject by capitalism. Additionally, it enacted another most dastardly law - the subsidizing of the killing of buffalo for their hides. If that had been the case, the normal effect of capitalist laws of supply and demand would have been sufficient. It was intended to and did cause the historically unprecedented slaughter of one of this continent's great natural resources. The buffalo, in less than a decade, were slaughtered for the cash value of the subsidy and not for the use of hides.

The militant, highly mobile, horse-mounted Plains Indians could not be readily exterminated by purely military means. They were mainly dependent upon the buffalo for food. If their food supply was destroyed, strategically they were destroyed. The act of appropriating money to subsidize the killing of buffalo was, in fact, a subsidizing of genocide.

After the great slaughter of buffalo in the spring of 1873 in Western Kansas and Eastern Colorado, objectively the buffalo was gone. Gone was the Indian food supply. He could fight on, as he did, for survival, for there could be no more treaties. It was war of a people to the death, either on the battlefield, by starvation, or by attrition in the then version of the concentration camp-the reservation. By the end of the summer of 1876, the Plains Indian was forced to surrender himself to the "concentration camp," not by military means alone. Custer's defeat on the Little Big Horn in June 1876 proved that. But against starvation, he had no weapons; Congress had taken care of that with a piece of paper and some money.

The most brutal final part of the genocide was, in effect, the stripping of a people of their language, their culture, their pride, their identity, their Indianness.

In the beginning, the Indian peoples who owned what was to become the United States, from a scientific viewpoint, constituted a number of historically evolved prenationhood peoples. These may or may not, in the very distant past, have related to each other. That question, while important in its own right, really is not the issue here. What is important is that they were, at the time of the coming of the white peoples, in the process of historical evolution. They might or might not have eventually evolved into one people with a common territory, a common language, a common culture, a common psychological make-up, a common economy, a common nation and a common state. Conceivably, they might have become the United Indian States of America. Or they might have become a number of somewhat similar yet distinctively different nations and states, as did the peoples of Western Europe. Speculation on what might have happened is more academic than real.

While in the beginning they were, in popular practice and legal form, recognized as separate sovereign nations, with no distinction being made between nations as such and states, the reality of what happened is that, beginning almost 500 years ago, their historic evolvement from a status of pre-nation to nation statehood was interrupted by a greedy, avaricious white capitalist society. These newcomers, upon the territory of the then pre-nationhood peoples, established their own society, nation and culture in a manner not dissimilar to what was done in South Africa or in Rhodesia. The exactness of comparison is not the most vital here, but rather the general similarity and the fact that these interruptions of the historical evolvements occurred over approximately the same historical period. They are related, though not by any means identical. Their origins flow from the same sources. They are historically evolved, institutionalized racism of the colonial variety. It is closely related to racism in general within the United States and is a deliberately created instrument of capitalism.

Despite this extended period of the most brutal, extreme oppression and exploitation, today's Indian survives and fights for survival. The past 500 years is a part of his historical evolvement, whatever course that evolvement might have taken had it not been interrupted. The important factor is that today's Indian in large numbers militantly asserts his Indianness and his rights to Indian identity. To a large degree he is molded by the struggle for survival. He seeks to develop into one Indian People, an Indian People which strives for one identity, one culture, one literature, yes, even one language which expresses his experience, his life, his fight for survival, his dignity, his humanity, his pride, his inherent right to manhood. It strives to realize the right of a people to defend itself, to determine its own destiny, to be Indian. There are moods, trends of unity and divergency which are products of the 500 years of oppression and of today's struggle. Unquestionably, there are a multitude of internal problems within Indian society which hold back acceleration of the continuing historical evolvement of the Indian peoples, difficulties which some whites find most enticing.

The real question, however, is not the strictly internal problems of continuing evolvement. To the contrary, it is the fact that all the great wealth, all the natural resources, all the land of this vast country was stolen from the Indian people in one of the most gigantic robberies of all history.

White capitalism has the obligation to restore to the Indian from the accumulated wealth stolen from him, the economic, territorial, educational and sovereign ability to be Indian. A Congress, whose predecessors did, in defiance of an order of the Supreme Court, order the removal of the South Atlantic Seaboard Indians, a Congress which did decree that henceforth it would recognize no more Indian treaties, could, by legislative action, declare the Indian people of the United States to be autonomous people within this country. If they can arrange the payment of one billion dollars over a ten-year period, so the oil companies can get for all time the huge Alaskan oil reserves, they can quite readily arrange, in each of the states with an

Indian population, land, money and political authority for the creating and functioning of autonomous Indian communities. These would be communities which exercise ruling power over all their internal affairs, communities which have the authority and the material, educational and cultural means of exercising the inherent right of the peoples of the earth to choose the form of society, the status of nationhood they find decisive to their continued development.

Unquestionably, the achievement of such an Indian status requires an alliance of the Indians with the working class, black and white -- an alliance that can only come into being as the result of an intensified struggle against racism. A significant part of how we can get from the here to there is a broad white working-class understanding of how we got from the beginning there to the present here.

Another significant aspect of the how is an equally broad understanding of the essential character of the Indian struggle for survival. The strategic and tactical objectives of the struggle will become more readily apparent as understanding of the problem is developed.

No pretensions are made in this article to knowing the full dimensions of either the problem or its solution; no effort is made to present a rounded-out, all sided history of the role of oppressors and the oppressed. It is intended only to be a working-class treatment of a portion of United States history in opening our Party's discussion on the fight for Indian survival, a special form of anti-colonialism within the United States.

* * * * *

THE "THEORY GAP"

By the North End Club, Detroit

Discussion about "working class," "work force," "unemployed," "super-exploitation" now, as in the discussions of previous draft programs, seem to float about for lack of Marxist equipment to deal with questions pertinent to our time.

In short, there seems to be a "theory gap."

At the time Marx developed his theory and his definitions of top priority requirement of socialism was to develop the productive capacity of a nation. And this was valid for the USSR following the overthrow of capitalism there.

However, in the United States today the problem is different. Productive capacity is being held back while people are wanting. Large numbers of people are not in the work force and have little hope of ever being in it. On the other hand, due to advanced technology, workers in the work force are producing fantastic amounts of surplus value in relation to what they receive.

In the absence of up-to-date Marxist theory and concise Marxist terminology, other theories are coming up which confuse our analyses. For instance, the notion that the working class is no longer the most exploited class -- or that workers are on the other side and through their trade unions they oppress the unemployed, the black, the youth.

"Changing Nature of the Working Class" doesn't quite fill the bill. Something more throughgoing is needed.

* * * * *

NOTES ON RADICALIZATION

By Bettina Aptheker

Our analysis of the radicalization process in the United States is key to the work of the Party. To grasp the dynamic of this process, its new features, and its lasting quality is to grasp the laws of motion of the system of state monopoly capitalism and imperialism in the post World War II era. It is this system, and its particular characteristics which are the source of contemporary radicalization. There has been a tendency in the Party, first to ignore the new radicals, then to harp on the negative features of their theories and actions, and now to view the upsurge in the same context as the upheavals of thirty years ago. All of these tendencies have gravely damaged our ability to respond to and give leadership to the radical movements.

It is not possible here to develop fully all of the qualitative changes resulting from the transformation of monopoly capitalism to state monopoly capitalism. But the essence of that transformation consists of a uniting of the power of the monopolies with that of the state. In this process, the state comes under the direct control of the largest corporations. The central cause of this transformation is the intensity of the contradiction between the socialization and specialization of productive processes, at the same time that the private ownership of the means of production is maintained.

State monopoly capitalism is not a demonstration of strength on the part of the ruling class. On the contrary, it is an expression of weakness which violates and distorts the norms of bourgeois society established by the bourgeoisie itself.

The system of state monopoly capitalism greatly intensifies the basic class contradictions, including those at the point of production (witness speed-up, automation, underemployment, permanent unemployment, etc.). It also creates new class contradictions away from the point of production (witness the changes in the character of the University,

or that the nature of taxation has been qualitatively transformed into a new form of exploitation).

The United States today is gripped by internal decay on an unprecedented scale. The country is literally falling apart at the seams. Manifestations of this abound: housing, education, health, public transportation, air and water pollution, the deterioration of all public services. These are all social crises resultant from the great process of socialization in the country while private ownership of production is maintained, intensified by the fusion of monopoly and the state.

This crisis has most sharply affected nationally oppressed peoples in the country, especially the black and brown communities. Even the Presidential Commission on Civil Rights has reported year after year that the conditions of black people in all areas of life has deteriorated both in absolute and relative terms. The white, racist police occupation of the ghetto has made the issue of police brutality a central one.

Another important feature of deterioration is what H. Aptheker has called the "eclipse of reason." He writes, "The truth has a way not only of enduring, but of growing; as its time for fulfillment nears it becomes more and more mighty, while the lies become more and more transparent, more and more outrageous, more and more obscene. Finally, reality has departed so far from the assumptions of the liars that they themselves begin to sense the crumbling foundations and hysterically thrash about, absolutely lost to reason, lost to all decency, lost to humanity..." (American Foreign Policy and the Cold War, pp. 291-292). There is then an intense moral and intellectual deterioration. This has especially affected the students, and the younger faculty in the colleges and universities.

The crisis in the country has reached a qualitatively new level of intensity, and it is increasingly apparent to tens of thousands that the crises are insoluble (at least within the structure of the society as it is presently constituted). Moreover, the rate of deterioration has accelerated.

Absolutely fundamental to this process of deterioration is that it occurs in the context of a New Epoch--i.e., the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism. In this decade the sharpest struggle internationally has been between the movements for national liberation against imperialism, and these struggles take place in the context of a shift in the balance of world forces, for the first time making victory attainable. And the primary opponent of the world revolution is U.S. imperialism.

Thus, we have an explosive interpenetration of objective factors: The intensity of decay; the accelerated rate of deterioration, the new class contradictions resultant of the system of state monopoly capitalism,

and the new epoch. It is this combination of forces as they operate independently, and as they interpenetrate, which produces an unprecedented (in numbers and in depth) and permanent process of radicalization.

This radicalization affects all sections of the population, albeit in different ways and on different levels of political consciousness. It affects the working class -- organized and unorganized, the black and brown peoples, the students, etc.

Careful observation of the movement's development will attest to the fact that at a particular moment a secondary contradiction of the system can be the sharpest point of struggle, and the catalyst for radicalization. This does not deny the basic contention of the primary class contradiction at the point of production. Neither does it deny the primary role of the industrial proletariat in the revolutionary transformation of the society. It is to argue the absolute necessity of political astuteness: to know which issue may be the "link to move the chain." It does mean that to cling to preconceived theories, in a dogmatic and sectarian framework, is disastrous for a revolutionary party.

We can see this for example, in the radicalization process which has taken place among students. One of the characteristics of the campuses today is the mass discontent with the content of education. For a time some in the Party insisted that you could only organize students on economic issues of tuition, high-rent costs, high costs of text books, etc. This was a form of economism transposed to the student movement. Certainly those are issues, but the mass discontent with the education itself has been the catalyst. It was one of the key factors in the mass response to the Berkeley Free Speech Movement in 1964. It is one of the key sources of the current student demands for black studies programs and colleges of ethnic studies, put forth by the black and brown students. The mass discontent is expressed in the oft-heard complaint that the education received is not relevant. What is meant is that the courses prescribed do not swing with the revolutionary epoch in which we live. On the contrary, the colleges and universities through their racist, pro-imperialist curriculum, and their massive research programs, are primary centers of counter-revolution! This contradiction obviously becomes especially sharp for black and brown students, in the throes of a great movement for black liberation at home, and witnesses of the greatest movements for national liberation the world has ever known.

Up until this juncture and this pre-convention discussion the Party as an organization has failed to appreciate the growth and lasting quality of the radical upsurge. Conservatism and Right opportunism have dominated in the implementation of our policies. We lagged on every single issue and movement -- black liberation, electoral politics, the anti-imperialist consciousness developing in the peace movement, even the development of radical caucuses inside the organized labor movement among black and white workers. We are experts at seeking the "lowest common denominator" of the movement to forge the "grand coalition,"

to the exclusion of our ability to exercise our class role as the vanguard. We have countered the breadth of a movement to its depth on the issues emphasizing breadth at the expense of depth. The draft resolution (p. 57) warns against Communists who have submerged themselves uncritically in petty-bourgeois radical movements. The resolution would do well to be sharply critical of the central weakness of many, which has been to submerge themselves uncritically in the movements of bourgeois liberalism.

The seriousness of this Right opportunism in the Party has been exaggerated precisely because it has occurred at a moment of growing radicalization. Thus, Left-moving young people, of whom, there is no question but that many are of petty-bourgeois origin, by-passed the Party because its policies created a vacuum, filled by ultra-Left sects. There is, after all, nothing to the Left of a correct Communist position.

Lest we go overboard on a "radicalization kick," we must be extremely careful to define the term. The operative key to radicalization is consciousness. Radicalization is the process of developing political consciousness moving in the direction of class and revolutionary consciousness. We must not confuse a democratic movement with a radical one. There is, of course a relationship, -- namely that the democratic upsurge lays the basis for radicalization (i.e. radicals are borne of the democratic movement). But the two are distinct. If we confuse the two we will so dilute the content of radicalization as to render the term meaningless. Militancy does not de facto constitute radicalization. The radical character of an act is not determined by the degree of militancy in tactics. It is determined by the class content of the demands, and the mass political consciousness of the participants.

Finally, there is the dialectics of radicalization: i.e., that which occurs when movements converge. In particular, there is in the San Francisco Bay Area a nascent student-worker alliance.

Since November 6, 1968 the students of San Francisco State College led by the Black Students Union and the Third World Liberation Front have been on strike. Their demands center around the proposal to create an Ethnic Studies College. The students have been subjected to vicious police assaults daily and many have sustained severe injuries.

Among the many important aspects of this struggle is that the students consciously sought working-class allies. When the hospital workers struck the Kaiser Foundation Hospitals in San Francisco and the East Bay in January, students joined their picketlines. The police attacked the strikers. The next day, Timothy Toomey of the Hospital Workers Union denounced the police, and indicated a new sympathy for the students. A month later oil workers at Standard Oil in Richmond and Martinez went out on strike. Their demands were straight trade union, bread-and-butter issues.

Again San Francisco State students joined the picketlines. Again the police attacked. This time, the unionists publicly welcomed the student support and a joint formal pact of mutual assistance was announced by the third world students and the oil workers. Both, of course, in a very direct sense, were confronting the same monopoly enemy.

The students deeply affected the consciousness of the workers, and the workers taught a few things to the students. In other words, each furthered the political and class consciousness of the other. For Communists this experience is of enormous consequence because the students will never understand class issues until they join the working class in their struggles. Likewise, without introducing new, outside forces into strictly economic class struggle you cannot develop class political consciousness among workers. Lenin writes:

"However much we may try to 'lend the economic struggle itself a political character' we shall never be able to develop the political consciousness of the workers . . . by keeping within the framework of the economic struggle, for that framework is too narrow.

"Class political consciousness can be brought to the workers only from without, that is, only from outside of the economic struggle, from outside the sphere of relations between workers and employers. The sphere from which alone it is possible to obtain this knowledge is the sphere of relations between all the classes and strata and the state and government. The sphere is the interrelations of all the classes." (What Is To Be Done? Collected Works, Vol. 5 p. 421)

The worker-student experience is, as we said, very new. But it is the kind of convergence that Communists must facilitate in order to be not simply observers of radicalization, but proponents and catalysts of it. Our ability to do this -- to build political, class and revolutionary consciousness -- is the key to our role as the vanguard. It must be done through agitation and demonstrative action. Our success in this is directly proportional to our ability to analyze and comprehend the objective process of radicalization.

* * * * *

29

WORLD REVOLUTIONARY STRENGTH AND THE NATURE
OF OUR EPOCH

By James E. Jackson

The modern relevance, the viability of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy of social development, the validity of its scientific, ideological system and the practical significance of its revolutionary strategy and tactics have been confirmed by the triumphant achievements of the pioneer of all socialist countries over the course of the past 50 years, the USSR. Great successes have been registered by the new world socialist system of states, in its own behalf, on its own territory, as well as in the leverage of its influence and the great power which it exerts on the course of world events.

Already the socialist world embraces a third of mankind and this victorious socialist world has given such leverage to the peoples in bondage that now a billion people, organized in some 70 formerly unfree countries, have smashed through the walls of colonialism.

Furthermore, Marxism-Leninism in power (not merely in the realm of ideas!) has been a great force in arresting, on several specific occasions, the threat of the outbreak of thermonuclear war, and has forced retreat on the part of desperate imperialism at one or another point around the globe.

Marxism-Leninism is the most revolutionary social science and the only verified science of social revolution, with practice as the verifier. It is the one revolutionary, political, philosophical, methodological force whose strategy and tactics have proven victorious, which is in power anywhere in the world, under the banner of Communism.

What is the main thing to know about the revolutionary movement now? It is the answer to be given to the question: is it developing or declining? And on the foundation of the answer given, is it meeting the challenge, giving correct leads to the solution of a host of new questions and new phenomena, of the new problems posed by the advancement and extension of the world revolutionary process -- problems of growth of the new forces in the world? Is it marked by clarity of strategic concept and confidence in its leadership of the new global revolutionary developments? Or is it sinking into a state of frustration and confusion and crisis as some allege?

* * * * *

Here are the essential facts about the state of the world revolutionary movement currently:

As compared to 1939 the number of members in the Communist parties in the capitalist countries of the world has increased five times to 2.5 million.

In the non-socialist countries of Asia, there has been an increase since 1939 of 190 times: from 20,000 in 1940 to 3.8 million today.

In the Americas, in our hemisphere, there has been an increase from 180,000 members in 1940 to 343,000 today.

In Africa, there has been an increase in membership 12 times from 5,000 to 60,000 since 1940. The year 1940 is the year of comparison.

This growth has occurred notwithstanding the fact that Communist parties are banned in 40 countries and consequently Communists must work in the underground in those countries.

Not only quantitatively, as we have seen, has the Communist movement grown to its present world strength of about 50 million members. Not only quantitatively, but qualitatively, the Communist parties continue to grow absolutely and comparatively with the socialist opposition, so to speak (or competition, not always opposition).

In comparison with the sum of all brands of Social-Democratic parties and all 57 varieties of "Socialism," the Communists are three times more numerous in the world.

In 1928, the Social-Democratic parties could report 6,600,000 members to only 1,600,000 Communists in the world. Today the total number of Communists exceeds 50 million as against 15 million in Social-Democratic parties. The Communist party members of the world are four times more numerous than all brands of non-Communist revolutionary party members put together. This, notwithstanding the fact -- and it is an important fact to note -- that in many areas of the world, especially Western Europe, working-class people are voting for Social-Democratic parties. As a matter of fact some 70 million votes are cast for non-Communist socialist parties of various kinds in the elections.

The main tendency, however, is seen in such facts as these I wish to give. In France the CP of France now has 73 deputies in the National Assembly, 14 in the Senate, 280 Communist consular generals. The Communists are the heads, the governors of two departments comparable to our states. There are 1,041 Communist mayors and 19,567 city councilmen. Nothing in France can move politically without taking as a point of reference "the first party of France," which the C.P. of France is indeed from the standpoint of size and authority

among the working people. In the last 9 months of 1967, 42,000 people joined the C.P. of France and 912 new clubs or sections were set up.

Or take the situation in Italy. 251 Communists have been elected to Parliament. There are Communist mayors of 805 towns and villages. Communists are governors of 8 provincial councils and on the executives of 1,500 boards. Altogether, 25,759 Communists are in the legislative bodies and other organs of state power short of authority in the head of the state in Italy.

Notwithstanding the contemporary heritage of the China crisis and the Indonesian tragedy, notwithstanding the agonizing problems posed by defection from the general line of the whole Marxist movement and the norms of Marxist-Leninist principles on the part of the Communist Party of China, notwithstanding other lesser defections and certain centrifugal pressures and forces operating within the family and fraternity of the Communist world movement, the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, commemorating the event that gave birth to the new epoch, witnessed the ingathering, the pilgrimage to the launching site of our epoch, representatives of the Communist, Workers and national democratic parties from 95 countries!

Therefore, real revolutionaries know where it's at -- the birth-site of our epoch. Real revolutionaries take pride and confidence in the vast extent to which the word is being passed, that Lenin's works have, according to UNESCO's statistics, now become first in the world in terms of translations. Peoples speaking, reading, studying in all countries of the globe are now reading Lenin's works in 116 languages.

Not only is the revolutionary movement growing in numbers; from this statistical reference to the distribution and translation of Lenin's works, one can see that the theoretical level in practice is keeping pace with the escalation in numbers of the world Marxist-Leninist, Communist movement.

It is also developing its internal unity. The strengthening of cohesion is a process and creative unity that will be greatly advanced in the forthcoming months by virtue of the deliberations and conscious preparations for work for greater unity which Budapest at once represents and will at the same time be a point of departure and initiation into a new phase of greater cohesion and unity of the world revolutionary forces.

It is clear, therefore, that those who whimper that "the revolutionary movements throughout the world are in a state of confusion and crisis" are really ignorant of our world movement and are actually projecting before us a reflection of the state of disarray of their own thoughts and the limitations of their own experience and commitment. What they expose is not the status of the world revolutionary movement but the state of a piece of their own mind.

Therein is the conclusion, therein is the fallacy. The confident and successful vanguard of the world revolutionary process is the system of Communist parties who utilize, defend and add to the revolutionary science of Marxism-Leninism.

We're in an age which is not only the age in which all roads of social development lead to and converge on a point -- not too far in time -- that leads to communism. We are also in the atomic age, in the cosmic age, in the age where all kinds of new phases have opened up with unheard-of problems confronting mankind and confronting those concerned with the welfare and the progress of mankind.

With the tools of Marxism, with the scientific lead of Marxist methodology, standing on the already substantial achievements of socialism in being in the world, it is possible to advance into an age where Man can really be Man! Coping with real, new staggering problems, not only problems of hunger, of racism, of division of man from man, of alienation, of cultural retardation, of frustration, Man will be able to face toward the cosmos and solve problems yet unchronicled!

The rapid and continuing growth and consolidation of the Marxist-Leninist parties, vanguard of the world revolutionary process, occurs because the world revolutionary process is continuing its development. Are we in a condition of stagnation? Are things slipping backwards? Or is the revolutionary process still developing? Clearly, from the facts given, the statistics cited, the process continues to unfold -- and to unfold at an accelerated pace.

The main tendency of the world revolutionary process is that of a continuing expansion, growth, development. But the main tendency of world capitalism's course, on the other hand, is that of retrogression, decay, defeat, despair, confusion, the desperation of bloody forays and of delaying actions. Its course is one of further descent into the quagmire of its general crisis.

The main thing determining developments is the new strength of influence of the world working class in the economic sphere, in the political sphere, in the ideological sphere, in the sphere of science, in the cultural sphere, in the spiritual sphere --and so long as it's necessary for people to defend themselves against wanton aggression, in the sphere of military science! All these are spheres related to general world phenomena and all of these are elements which reflect the general crisis of capitalism. In all of these spheres capitalism is falling behind in its competition with the creative followers of Marxism-Leninism.

* * * * *

The main thing determining developments of our epoch is the consequence and influence of the ascendancy of the world working-class power. And

when I speak of world working-class power, I speak of it in at least three specific areas. I speak not only of statistics of membership of the vanguard, of the Communist parties of the world, but also of the vast revolutionary forces unleashed by the collapse of colonialism, by the breakup of colonialism which is a first prime achievement of world socialism. Thanks to the leverage given, the door opened by world socialism, the slaves of colonialism have gained opportunity and help to throw off their chains, and by leaps and bounds to advance into modern times. They have gained the perspective of arriving, in the not too distant future, shoulder to shoulder, up front, tight with the more advanced capitalist countries, both in terms of creature comforts -- material things -- and in terms of a way-of-life with the most advanced humanist achievements of socialist society.

The general crisis of capitalism has deepened and enters its final stage as a result of this unstoppable revolutionary advance of the world working class and is the basis of coming victories of the proletarian-led peoples over imperialism. Therefore I speak not only of the numerical and qualitative factor, of the growing unity and expansion in numbers of the vanguard of the working class, but also of the working class in power in the socialist world which continues to grow, to conquer formerly unconquerable problems. And I speak also of the impact and influence of this on the operations of capitalism itself, propelling and compelling the growth in various forms of Keynesian devices for making capitalism a little less grating on the nerves of its own working class in capitalist countries. Thus new and favorable opportunities are opened up for the working class in the capitalist countries to enlarge their numbers, to elevate and expand their consciousness of the world that is in the power of the working class to make over into a world of socialism.

The general crisis of capitalism has deepened and entered its final stage as a result of this unstoppable revolutionary advance of the world working class and on the basis of its great victories over imperialism, on the basis of such power as is represented by the Soviet Union and the entire fraternity of socialist states. With them stand as allies increasingly larger and larger sections of the so-called third world of another billion people who have broken their enslavement to imperialism, but have not yet gone through those stages of development which precisely define the internal orientation of their national development toward socialism.

* * * * *

The main features of our epoch favor the victorious development of the world working-class revolutionary process. It is marked by the attainment of a relation of forces which is favorable to the complete eradication of colonialism and to the realization of the national liberation of all oppressed peoples. It is favorable to the defeat of reactionary anti-democratic and fascist counter-revolutionary forces and to the material and political advance of the working class

in the capitalist countries. And it is favorable to the prevention of thermo-nuclear war and to the frustration and ultimate defeat of the aggressive wars which U.S. imperialism wages -- directly in Vietnam and through its client state Israel in the Middle East. The U.S. desperately seeks to change the world relationship of forces but its efforts have been in vain so far. The world situation grows even more favorable to the victory of new socialist revolutions in a number of additional countries.

All this is not to say that all this process will take place automatically. Nothing in the world in this period of favorable circumstances for the world working class revolutionary process to develop and advance from victory to victory is automatic. Nothing is guaranteed or cannot experience detours local defeats and setbacks. Nothing will advance favorably without a skilled and resolute struggle, without maximum unity of working class and the organization and commitment of broad popular forces.

In his report to the 18th Convention of our Party, and particularly in his summary, Comrade Gus Hall stated the position on the character of the epoch about which the Party Convention and the National Committee made a policy judgment by their vote. In the ensuing period, what has unfolded since -- and much has unfolded -- has in general confirmed the main line of this assessment. Much that is new is being encountered. Challenging new problems of execution of a correct tactical line and certain strategic concepts arise; but our definition of the main features of the epoch, the main character and tendency of the epoch, our general position as contained in that guiding document from the 18th Convention of our Party, has been tested by experience and has proven viable and basically sound.

* * * * *

On a world scale, materially and spiritually, capitalism is in the throes of crisis, of deepening crisis. It is seized by a crisis that is not limited to the fear of the system's economic base. It is political and ideological as well. It is diplomatic and military as well. Indeed it is an all-pervading, all-sided condition of deterioration. In no area has world capitalism achieved stability. Much less has it advanced. On the contrary, the general crisis of capitalism -- which the Great October Revolution ushered in in 1917 -- has continued to deepen and at an accelerated rate. And as has been said before, that does not preclude temporary and local reversals of pitch, but in general the boat moves forward.

Still imperialism continues to resist the advancing revolutionary process to aggressively seek to recoup losses, to maneuver, to inflict casualties, to delay its displacement by the new revolutionary working class and progressive strata of the population. They seek further to alter the balance of world forces to the detriment of imperialism and reaction.

All world politics pivots around the primary contradiction of our epoch:

the struggle between socialism and imperialism.

Imperialism no longer dominates the world. Capitalism no longer has a monopoly control of our planet. Yet the general crisis of capitalism, aggravating the inequality and distribution of necessary resources, goods, services for the minimum satisfaction of the needs of the world's peoples and perpetuating obscurantism and racism, seeks to regenerate fascist coups.

World economy could undergo the kind of rate of development that we've witnessed in the Soviet Union in the past years -- phenomenal, unheard-of, a development which remains so essential for the solution of many of the present problems of mankind. Were it not for capitalism, hunger could be abolished. Racism could be abolished as an overnight phenomenon in its gross aspects.

Capitalism has shows itself incapable of running the economy of the world. The future of mankind is linked to further victories of the world socialist revolution, to the development of revolutionary struggle in all its forms.

* * * * *

In summary, we conclude that:

The particular prospects and tempo of development of the revolutionary process in our country are favored or retarded by the general tendency in the world situation. In respect to the significance of the general world setting for the fortunes of the struggle of the working class of a particular country, Lenin wrote that "only a knowledge of the main features of the given epoch can serve as a basis for assessing the more detailed features of a particular country."

Our epoch is characterized by the fact that the mainspring of progress is the power of the world working class. In our epoch the determining weight, the hands on the lever of history are those of the working class. It is the influence and effect of the already favorable and constantly developing relation of class forces on the side of the world working class and the community of socialist states.

It is the impact of the working class, the pivotal factor, the main thing, which is determining the basic content and the distinguishing characteristic of our period of history.

The main developmental tendency of the epoch is progress toward victories for peace, democracy and national liberation, for socialism and communism.

The correlation of the social forces has changed in favor of the working class which stands at the head of the epoch.

* * * * *

WHERE WE SHOULD CONCENTRATE

By T. Dennis

Those comrades who are fighting for our Party to make its concentration, its central focus, the unorganized workers and the unorganized poor should think more deeply on the subject. The arguments usually made in support of this position run something like this: The unorganized are the most exploited and therefore the most revolutionary. Black workers who are mainly in the unorganized sectors of the economy and Black people generally are the most politically advanced, the most revolutionary section of the American people. There is great ferment and dissatisfaction among the poor and unorganized in contrast to the calm and complacency among organized workers especially in basic industry. If we do not recognize this "new" ferment, this "new" revolutionary current, and are not ready to go all out to develop this "new wave of the future," then we are out of touch with what is new and therefore "irrelevant". The final clincher in the argument is to raise the question of organizing the unorganized IN THE SOUTH as the central focus of our work. What is being raised here is the question not of what is important, but of what is central -- what is decisive -- for making qualitative advances today and tomorrow and, therefore what is decisive for winning the struggle for socialism.

What is particularly pathetic about this point of view is that it is based on an "estimate" of organized labor made some three to five years ago. It wasn't a true estimate even then. It bears no relation to the reality of the situation in the unions and shops in basic industry today. If one does not even recognize that there have been major changes in the age and racial composition in the largest plants of monopoly capital, that there is a new union membership, then one is truly out of it - out of it for the present and for the future.

What is the situation in auto and steel, for instance? Over half of the union members are young workers with hardly more than five or six years seniority. These young workers reflect the militancy, the political ferment and maturity that have characterized the youth for the past decade. Equally important is that in many of the largest local unions, in auto for instance, 40% to 60% of the work force is Black. The overwhelming percentage of these are youth. They bring into the unions a qualitatively new character of militancy, political maturity, a better class understanding, and probably the widest current of revolutionary ideology that has ever existed in these unions. These changes are bringing a new quality to the labor movement - to the organized workers in this country.

We are talking not only about what is new and developing but of a development that can bring about a qualitative change in the decisive sections of the working class, that can bring about a decisive change in

the people's struggle. Everything that is new and developing is not of equal importance.

Another thing that has to be taken into account is that young Black workers are emerging as the leaders in this newest upsurge, that Black workers are among the prime movers for more militant action by the unions against the company. Just think what it would mean if these working-class forces - these organized working-class forces - also became the leaders of the Black Liberation struggle. Think what it would mean if the power of organized labor is joined with Black Power as partners in the struggles to change the status quo. It would mean the dawn of a new day, a giant stride on the road to freedom and socialism.

Four of the largest locals in the UAW in Detroit now have a majority of Black workers. Most of the white workers in these plants are young. People who constantly laud the radicalization, the revolutionary character of the unorganized workers, should take a good hard look at the radicalization that is taking place among the organized workers. These are the workers who daily confront the giant monopolies. When they stop work, production stops. That is economic power. It is economic power in basic industry, not just in hotels, laundries or hospitals. These unions have the political power to fight and defeat the establishment.

Some argue that the unions are under the control of entrenched, corrupt or conservative leaderships that won't move, therefore there isn't much chance that labor will get in the thick of the fight. These new workers now constitute a majority of the membership in unions like UAW and Steel. The ferment is tremendous and the situation explosive. Very few leaders are secure in their office. Major leadership changes are going to take place in the next few months.

If these militant young workers can win control of four of the largest local unions in the UAW, this could start a snowballing process that could spread to Flint, the heart of the GM empire, then throughout the UAW, a process that could really revitalize the UAW. Think what this could mean to the whole labor movement. With such a change one can seriously talk about organizing the South and organizing the unorganized. Because then you would have the economic power, the political power, the manpower, etc., to do the job. With such potential, don't you think that it makes a lot more sense for the Party to place work among organized workers in basic industry at the center of its work, as the concentration. After all, we do want to win this struggle for socialism.

* * * * *

NO LESSER EVIL ? by Building Trades Worker

With the elections behind us and with the overwhelming facts before us the Daily World should in all honesty begin to reexamine its "neither lesser nor greater evil" approach toward the 1968 elections. I see that George Morris and Mike Davidow are beginning to do so. But in answer to Gil Green's letter (DW, Nov. 26) on this very subject, I would appreciate it if you would permit me to quote to the readers a few paragraphs from an article by him in the March 1964 issue of Political Affairs:

Page 30. "... If say, Richard Nixon and the Republicans had won in 1960, would that have helped people realize the need to go to the left of the liberals, or would it only have made them even more intent on a return of the liberals? Experience has shown that the latter is the more likely development.

"Least supportable of all is the notion that it makes little difference which side wins, for even if Goldwater won, once confronted with the practical responsibilities of office--or so the argument runs--his policies would be little different from those of the more moderate elements. This premise bases itself on the over-simplified assumption that there are no differences of importance to the people within the ranks of the ruling class; that what passes for differences in public is nothing more than demagogy. It is demagogy, but it is also more than that.

"Granted that a Goldwater victory under present conditions would still not mean fascism. But would it be devoid of meaning for the issue of war and peace, for the issue of civil rights and democratic liberties? One would indeed be rash to assert this. At a time when the world has all too frequently looked over the brink, even a little (emphasis BW) difference could prove to be terribly big difference."

Gil then warns the "radical intellectuals" who "...divorced from the masses and their daily struggles become impatient with the slowness of things and either resign...to passivity or...telescope events." He concludes this thought with the following:

"...in certain intellectual circles finding concrete expression in a complete negation of the working class and labor movements and a nearly complete dependence on the intellectual who, David-like, is to slay the corporate Goliath."

Could it be that for the sake of not deserting the David-like intellectuals that Gil Green and the Daily World have embraced some unscientific theories and in reality deserted the masses of working people and black people?

#