

# political affairs

JOURNAL OF MARXIST THOUGHT

MARCH 1977

RACISM AND MALE  
SUPREMACY

Angela Y. Davis

BOSTON'S LEGACY: THE  
ANTI-RACIST AND FEMINIST  
TRADITION

Bettina Aptheker

SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY IN  
CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Margrit Pittman

FORD IS ORGANIZED!  
FOR THE ADVANCE OF  
DETENTE AND THE  
CONSOLIDATION OF  
SECURITY AND  
COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Lou Saperstein

Warsaw Pact Nations

\$1.00

# Racism and Male Supremacy

ANGELA Y. DAVIS

When the original impetus for the women's rights movement in the United States was created by the campaign to abolish slavery, this was by no means a fortuitous occurrence. More than a decade before the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention, which placed the issue of women's emancipation on the historical agenda, white working-class women in the cotton mills of New England were comparing their predicament to that of their Black sisters and brothers in chains. Horrendous working conditions, inordinately long hours (sun-up to sun-down) and slave-like wages practically forced these women, who were the country's first factory workers, to conclude that the enslavement of Black people had established a pattern of oppression which also claimed them as victims. As the women in Lowell, Massachusetts were participating in one of the earliest recorded organized strikes, they paraded through the town singing:

Oh isn't it a pity, such a pretty girl as I  
Should be sent into the factory to pine away  
and die?  
Oh, I cannot be a slave,  
I will not be a slave  
For I'm so fond of liberty  
That I cannot be a slave.

These working-class women must have recognized that as long as slavery was a reality, the precedent for their own miserable lives would continue to exist. And, indeed, they did not stop at drawing this parallel through their slogans; they made tangible contributions to the anti-slavery struggle. Among other things, the Lowell women organized annual fairs to raise money for the Abolitionist movement.<sup>2</sup>

Through their solidarity actions, the mill women were acknowledging the fact that the enslavement of Black people had established general standards of oppression, which were extended, in moderation of course, to white workers, and, in an especially pronounced fashion, to women and children factory workers. This was the significance of Marx's contention that labor in a white skin would never be free as long as labor in a black skin was branded.

\* \* \*

It is impossible to envision the liberation of Black people as a people without situating the struggle for economic equality—and eventually the abolition of capitalism—at the core of the liberation movement. It is equally futile to dream that women as a sex can attain full equality if the economic roots of women's oppression under capitalism are not vigorously attacked. There is thus a common nucleus around which the two webs of oppression have been spun. Racism, however, is the more pernicious of the two, as the history of this country so clearly reveals. Since the era of slavery, the level of racism has dictated, in very real ways, the level of women's oppression.

White women are not free of [racism's] effects: the slaveholder's power over Black women's lives and his vicious use of that power established a way of treating all women and a pattern of behavior toward females which Southern women suffer from to this day. The treatment of Black or Puerto Rican and other minority women in factories sets the standard for the treatment of all women; if the boss can get by with it (speed-up, lack of safety features, health hazards, etc.) among one group, you can bet he will try to extend it.<sup>3</sup>

Not only has racism determined, in many important ways, the level and intensity of women's oppression, the organized challenge to racism and, in particular, the struggle for Black liberation, has dictated the goals and strategies of the movement to achieve equality for women. It was not an accident that the first man to publicly join the ranks of the women's movement was a Black man—the great Abolitionist leader, Frederick Douglass. Moreover, the Achilles' heel of the woman suffrage movement was its betrayal of the legacy which had been forged by its own origins: the inseparability of the fight for Black liberation and the fight for women's emancipation. After the vote was won for women, it was clear that the capitulation to racism, and, in some instances, the open advocacy of white supremacy, had almost led the suffrage movement to defeat. Many of the Southern states voted against woman suffrage because they feared it would double the Black vote. This proved that the equally racist

argument that had been proposed by suffrage leaders had not, after all, been very convincing. It had been their contention that once women were given the vote, the enormous number of white women voters would easily cancel the power of the Black vote.

Some day the North will be compelled to look to the South for redemption from (the) evils (of foreigners with their imported customs, greed of monopolistic wealth and the unrest among the working classes). Just as the North will be forced to turn to the South for the nation's salvation, just so surely will the South be compelled to look to its Anglo-Saxon women as the medium through which to retain the supremacy of the white race over the African.<sup>4</sup>

These outrageous remarks were made at a major convention of the National American Woman Suffrage Association held in New Orleans in 1903.

When the suffrage movement dismissed the fight for Black liberation as either tangential or even detrimental to their cause, this was not the first time the women's movement had been infected with racism. During the earliest days of the movement, when Sojourner Truth delivered her "Ain't I a Woman" speech, she did so over the objections of many of the women present at the Ohio convention. These women did not want their movement associated with "abolition and niggers,"<sup>5</sup> because they felt it would jeopardize their cause.

It is significant that the more the woman suffrage movement alienated itself from the Black liberation movement, the more it failed to represent the needs and interests of white working women. Just as Black women—like Sojourner Truth, Frances E.W. Harper, Sarah Remond and later Ida B. Wells—could not isolate the fight for political rights for women from the liberation of Black people, so many white working-class women criticized the suffrage leaders for portraying the female vote as a panacea.

Women workers, who toiled fourteen to sixteen hours for less than subsistence wages, were more interested in a shorter workday and higher wages than suffrage and property laws.<sup>6</sup>

When the first national Black labor organization came into being, as a reaction to the exclusion of Black workers from the existing trade unions, its leaders recognized the need to join the struggles

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Angela Y. Davis</i> Racism and Male Supremacy	2
<i>Bettina Aptheker</i> Boston's Legacy: The Anti-Racist and Feminist Tradition	9
<i>Magrit Pittman</i> Socialist Democracy in Czechoslovakia	13
<i>Lou Saperstein</i> Ford Is Organized!	19

DOCUMENTS

For the Advance of Detente and the Consolidation of Security and Cooperation in Europe	26
--	----

COMMUNICATIONS

<i>Bill Whitney</i> On the Leninist Conception of Mind and Matter	35
<i>Hyman Cohen</i> On the Colman-Reynolds Exchange	37
<i>Marc J. Cohen and Erwin Marquit</i> Upper Midwest Conference on Marxism and the New-Left Ideology	38



Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party, USA

EDITOR: HYMAN LUMER

ASST. EDITOR: BARRY COHEN

*Political Affairs* is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, New York 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$10 for one year; \$5 for six months; foreign subscriptions, including Canada, \$11 for one year; single issues, \$1. Second class postage paid at the post office in New York, New York.



against racism and male supremacy. In 1869, at a time when the white labor unions were adamant in their refusal to accept women, women were readily admitted to the founding convention of the Colored National Labor Union. Moreover, the delegates elected Mrs. Mary A.S. Carey to their executive committee<sup>7</sup> and the Committee on Women's Labor recommended: "profiting by the mistakes heretofore made by our white fellow citizens in omitting women. . . that women be cordially included in the invitation to further and organize cooperative societies."<sup>8</sup> This pronouncement itself was a recognition of the impossibility of effectively defending Black workers without a simultaneous defense of the rights of women workers—women workers of all colors.

It was not necessary to be either Black or a woman to recognize that in a system dominated by capital's fierce drive for profits, racism and male supremacy, especially when they are taken together, are powerful weapons in the hands of employers. The brutal economic exploitation of Black people justifies and facilitates the over-exploitation of women workers—and the two, in combination, push the capitalists into high gear insofar as their ability to exploit white male workers is concerned.

William Sylvis was a white man. He founded the Ironmolders Union, one of the very first national labor unions and later, in 1867, he established the National Labor Union. According to the authors of *Labor's Untold Story*, "among the principles to which he devoted his life and energy were Negro-Labor solidarity and equal pay for equal work for women."<sup>9</sup>

Although Sylvis was not so successful as to have the delegates of the National Labor Union actually admit Black workers and women workers (this became a reality only after his death), he argued forcefully at the 1867 founding convention for equality irrespective of race and sex:

Negroes are four million strong and a greater proportion of them labor with their hands than can be counted from the same number of any people on earth. Can we afford to reject their proffered co-operation and make them enemies? By committing such an act of folly we would inflict greater injury upon the cause of labor reform than the combined efforts of capital could furnish. . . . So capitalists north and south would foment discord between the whites and blacks and hurl one against the other as interest and occasion

might require to maintain their ascendancy and continue their reign of oppression.<sup>10</sup>

When he addressed himself to the question of women workers, Sylvis said:

As men struggling to maintain an equitable standard of wages and to dignify labor, we owe it to consistency if not to humanity to guard and protect the rights of female labor as well as our own. How can we hope to reach the social elevation for which we all aim without making women the companion of our advancement?<sup>11</sup>

The double grip of racism and male supremacy was so strong in this country that such appeals to the organized labor movement would not be acted upon, in any substantial way, until the organization, many decades later, of the CIO. It is ironic that racist and male supremacist attitudes prevented workers from understanding that the very arguments that were used to justify the exclusion of Black workers and women from the union movement were problems which could only be solved by a strong labor movement, representing the interests of all workers, regardless of color or sex. If the reason for barring Black people and women from the unions was that the employers used these two groups to depress wages, then how better to solve this problem than to fight for equal rights for all?

\* \* \*

It was not an accident of the moment that white women and Black people—women and men—were to occupy a special place in the early history of labor. Both groups exhibited an unparalleled class-consciousness and the militancy that was required to defend their class interests. Some of the very first strikes in labor's history were carried out by New England factory women in the 1820s and 1830s.<sup>12</sup> And in 1845, 5,000 women struck the cotton mills of Pittsburg and Allegheny City. These women broke down the factory gates and evicted the scabs themselves.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, women developed the first trade union press when they began to publish *The Lowell Offering* and *The Factory Girl*.<sup>14</sup>

Black workers, as soon as they emerged from slavery, began immediately to organize. Despite the fact that at the end of the Civil War most Black people were farm workers, there were, for example, 10,000 Black mechanics in the South, as compared to

20,000 white mechanics. Black people were also brickmakers, ship-caulkers, railroad workers, house-builders, dock workers and tobacco workers.<sup>15</sup> According to Gil Green,

In 1867 a strike on the Mobile levee spread rapidly, resulting in some of the most stirring mass demonstrations in Southern history. In Charleston, the Black longshoremen formed their own Protective Union and won a strike for higher wages. The dockworkers of Savannah, Georgia, nearly all Black, won a strike to repeal a city tax of \$19 on all persons employed on the wharves.<sup>16</sup>

Women workers and Black workers fought on the very front lines of the battle between labor and capital, because they were, by far, capital's worst victims. They suffered more, their wages were lower, their working conditions were more appalling and their jobs were the first to go and the last to be found. Certainly there existed, and continues to exist, a natural basis for an alliance between the struggle for women's equality and the struggle for Black liberation because the two forms of oppression are so closely tied to economic inequality. The fact that this alliance has not yet been solidly established can only be attributed to the ideological poison of racism.

\* \* \*

"When the lie of male supremacy and the lie of white supremacy are combined, it is a deadly combination."<sup>17</sup> The targets of this double lie are women of color—Black, Native American, Puerto Rican, Asian and Chicano women. The role of Black women in uniting the fightback against racism and the fightback against male supremacy deserves special attention.

Sojourner Truth's "Ain't I a Woman" speech, in which she eloquently describes this double lie, was the most powerful challenge of the period to those who refused to take the women's struggle seriously. Her speech established a militant tone of resistance for the entire women's movement. She was responding to a man who had maliciously mocked the women's demand for the vote, because they were presumably weak and helpless:

The man over there says women need to be helped into carriages and lifted over ditches, and to have the best places everywhere. Nobody ever helps me into carriages or over puddles, or gives me the best place—and ain't I a woman?

Look at my arm! I have ploughed and planted and gathered into barns! And no man could head me—and ain't I a woman?

I could work as much and eat as much as a man—when I could get it—and bear the lash as well! And ain't I a woman?

I have born thirteen children and seen most of them sold into slavery, and when I cried out with my mother's grief, none but Jesus heard me—and ain't I a woman?<sup>18</sup>

After Sojourner Truth had concluded her appeal at this convention in 1851, these were the feelings of Frances Dana Gage, the woman who was presiding:

She had taken us up in her strong arms and carried us safely over the slough of difficulty, turning the whole tide in our favor. I have never in my life seen anything like the magical influence that subdued the snobbish spirit of the day and turned the sneers and jeers of an excited crowd into notes of respect and admiration.<sup>19</sup>

Sojourner Truth was not alone, among Black women, in her advocacy of women's liberation. Women like Frances E.W. Harper and Sarah Remond were leading figures in the early women's movement. And they were all in agreement when they insisted that male supremacy could not be treated or effectively challenged as an isolated instance of oppression. They understood that without the emancipation of Black people, women themselves—and certainly Black women—could not move forward in a progressive direction.

In their protests against the attacks of white rapists, Black women such as Ida B. Wells placed themselves once more on the very front lines of the battle against male supremacy. Today, of course, the anti-rape movement has risen in prominence and has been embraced by large numbers of women. But it is often forgotten that the struggles of Black women during and after slavery against the most sustained sexual violence ever committed against women in this country foreshadowed and set the stage for today's movement.

The most significant feature of Black women's anti-rape activities was the natural way they combined these activities with their defense of Black men who were made victims of racist frame-ups on rape charges. This is a lesson which has yet to be learned by many white anti-rape activists.

One of the most revealing symptoms of the oppression of women is their exclusion from social production. When women are prevented from holding jobs outside the home, this reinforces male supremacist patterns by making women economically dependent on their husbands.

As a result of the intense pressures brought about by racism, Black women have seldom known economic dependence on their men on such a large scale as white women. Before World War I, back in 1910, as W.E.B. DuBois points out in his essay, "The Damnation of Women,"

there were two and a half million Negro homes in the United States. Out of these homes walked daily to work two million women and girls over ten years of age—over half of the colored female population as against a fifth in the case of white women. These, then, are a group of workers, fighting for their daily bread like men; independent and approaching economic freedom. They furnished a million farm laborers, 80,000 farmers, 22,000 teachers, 600,000 servants and washerwomen, 50,000 in trades and merchandizing.<sup>20</sup>

Today, there continues to be a larger proportion of Black women in the labor force than of their white counterparts. It is especially revealing that, due to economic necessity, there are proportionately far more Black working mothers who have small children to care for. It was—and still is—no privilege to work the exhausting, stultifying jobs that are reserved for Black women and other women of color. Yet the very fact that Black women have always been compelled to seek work for their own survival and for the survival of their families has placed them one step ahead of white women in the struggle for economic independence. This is why DuBois said that

In the great rank and file of our five million women, we have the up-working of new revolutionary ideals, which must in time have vast influence on the thought and action of this land.<sup>21</sup>

In order to guarantee their own subsistence, Black women have been compelled to militantly challenge male supremacy as they have simultaneously fought racism. Trade union leaders like Miranda Smith have provided dramatic proof of the ability of Black women to carry out this double fight. But could it indeed have been any other way? Black women simply are not in a position to mechanically separate

the special forms of oppression they suffer as women and the special forms of oppression they and their men suffer in common.

Racist ideology justifies the racist differential in wages, the horrendous working conditions, the hard, dirty, uncreative jobs that are reserved for Black people and it justifies the permanently high unemployment levels among people of color. A similar dynamic keeps women's wages down; it defines certain jobs as "female" and it excludes women in very large numbers from social production altogether.

For workers of color—male and female—racism exaggerates, complicates and adds a new, more oppressive dimension to class exploitation. Male supremacy adds another dimension of oppression for women workers. When the workers are both Black and female, a three-sided dynamic is at work.

However, to attempt to mechanically separate the three dimensions of this oppression is to violate the complexity of the capitalist system. For Black women are not oppressed in some ways as workers, in other separate and distinct ways as Black people, and yet other distinct and isolated ways as women. On the contrary, these various elements act and react upon one another.

To be Black means that one's status as a worker is more outrageous than the status of a white worker. To be a worker—and the overwhelming majority of Black people are workers—means that one's status as a Black person is rendered more unbearable. To be a woman places one close to the bottom of the working class scale. To be a Black woman or a Chicano woman or any other woman of color is a virtual guarantee of poverty-level wages.

\* \* \*

A frequently neglected aspect of racism is its impact on white workers. When racist criteria can be used to severely depress the wages of Black workers, white workers will inevitably suffer a proportional loss. Nowhere is this so clear as in the South, where Black workers' wages lag far behind the national average for Black workers. What is equally important is that white workers' wages also lag far behind their national average—and no force other than racism can be blamed for this.

A special version of this dynamic ties the plight of

white women workers to that of women of color. That is to say, a relationship between racism and male supremacy exists over and above the combined pressure they exert on Black, Latino, Asian and Native American women.

In his recent book, *Economics of Racism, USA*, Victor Perlo points to a very dramatic illustration of this relationship. In explaining the rapid increase in Black women clerical workers during the past decade of the sixties, he observes that

For the most part, the increasing employment of Black women in clerical jobs took place under conditions motivated more by the corporations' drive for high profits than out of compliance with equal opportunity rules. Faced with a soaring requirement for white collar workers, employers took advantage of the historic discrimination against women and against Blacks simultaneously to hold down salaries in these occupations as much as possible. Thus in 1959, the median earnings of male clerical workers was \$4,785. Ten years later, the median earnings of female clerical workers was \$4,232, and of Black female clerical workers, \$4,152.<sup>22</sup>

Perlo concludes:

In a period of rapidly expanding demand for clerical labor, the availability of Black female workers without alternative job possibilities was important to employers in enabling them to hold down the going wage for all female clerical workers.<sup>23</sup>

Considering the fact that an enormous proportion of white female workers are employed in clerical occupations, this linking of white women's ability to earn decent wages to the predicament of women of color should furnish adequate evidence of the necessity for white women workers to take important initiatives in the struggle against racism. Recent statistics indicate, in fact, that the seemingly impressive rise in Black women's earnings in relationship to white women's earnings (56 per cent to 86 per cent between 1955 and 1973) has resulted, in part, from a severe decline in white women's income. In 1973 white female earnings had fallen from 61 per cent to 56 per cent of white male earnings.<sup>24</sup> Racism is undoubtedly the culprit.

This is not the only way in which white women are affected in very concrete ways by the racism which claims their sisters of color as its first victims. Racist

propaganda directed against Black mothers is used to justify the preservation of a sorely inadequate and appallingly degrading welfare system. Moreover, the historical relegation of Black women workers to domestic work as the only guaranteed job they could find has served to reinforce the ideological debasement of all women who are forced to perform household work—whether for wages or in their own homes.

It is not only in . . . material, tangible ways that white women suffer from racism—there is a moral decay as well. It robs the spirit to deny a full life for others. Insensitivity does not stay within neat boundaries, but seeps through and immunizes us to all human suffering, deadens us to all human need and leaves us unable to enjoy the warmth of human relationships. When white women attack Black men, stone Black children, and scream out filth in the streets, then they destroy part of their own character. It is dehumanizing and morally degrading—this racism we have been taught. It is a false basis for self-esteem, and a shabby substitute for a real sense of self-worth.<sup>25</sup>

\* \* \*

When we examine the feminist movement today, we discover that in confining itself to narrowly defined "women's issues," it has not only ignored the campaign against racism, it has succumbed, in many instances, to efforts to recruit it to the side of racism. Theorists such as Shulamith Firestone and Susan Brownmiller have gone so far as to say that Black men are objectively more male supremacist than are white men.

A widely read anthology entitled *Radical Feminism* contains exactly one four page article which purportedly deals with Black women. The anthology, which, incidentally, is 424 pages long, contains no essays on any other women of color. The article on Black women, written by Cellestine Ware, is entitled "Black Feminism." It begins this way:

The rejection of Black women by Black men is a phenomenon best explained by the Black man's hatred of Blackness and by the need to dominate that underlies male-female relationships. As such, this rejection is an excellent study for feminists. . . . The Black male's reaction is the fore-runner of what all feminists will face as they grown in strength. As women begin to assume positions

of equality with men, they will meet virulent abuse, much like that endured by Black women now.<sup>26</sup>

Such ideas as this can hasten the spread of racist hysteria, particularly when they are buttressed by contentions that Black men are more likely to commit rape than white men. This blatantly false assumption has already entered into the mainstream of theories regarding rape.

These developments are extremely dangerous. However, our present situation is not beyond remedy. In fact, if women activists—and particularly white women workers—pay closer attention to the

mistakes which caused the women's movement in the past to drastically veer off course, then they will understand that they must insist that the women's movement in this country pursue the fight against racism with just as much seriousness and dedication as the struggle for women's liberation is being pursued. In fact they will understand that no definitive victory for women is possible without definitive victories for their sisters and brothers of color. And understanding that the common root of our oppression lies in the workings of monopoly capitalism, we should all plant our feet firmly on the path to socialism. □

#### REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup>Lyn Wells, "American Women—Their Use and Abuse," New England Press, Boston, 1969, p.5.

<sup>2</sup>Joyce Maupin, *Working Women and their Organizations—150 Years of Struggle*, Union WAGE Educational Committee, Berkeley, 1974, p.3.

<sup>3</sup>Keynote Address, Women for Racial and Economic Equality National Organizing Conference, March 13-14, 1976.

<sup>4</sup>Aileen Kraditor, *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920*, Doubleday Anchor, New York, 1971, p. 160.

<sup>5</sup>Pamela Allen, "Woman Suffrage: Feminism and White Supremacy," in Robert Allen, ed., *Reluctant Reformers*, Howard University Press, Washington D.C., 1974, p. 134.

<sup>6</sup>Maupin, p. 3.

<sup>7</sup>Philip Foner, *Organized Labor and the Black Worker, 1619-1973*, International Publishers, New York, 1976, p. 34.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 34n.

<sup>9</sup>Richard O. Boyer and Herbert Morais, *Labor's Untold Story*, United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, New York, 1971, p. 23.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 33n.

<sup>12</sup>Maupin, p. 2.

<sup>13</sup>Boyer and Morais, p. 33n.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup>Gil Green, *What's Happening to Labor?*, International Publishers, New York, 1976, p. 217.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup>Keynote Address, WREE.

<sup>18</sup>Eleanor Flexner, *Century of Struggle*, Atheneum Press, New York, 1974, pp. 90-91.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 91.

<sup>20</sup>W.E.B. DuBois, *Darkwater*, Harcourt, Brace and Howe, New York, 1920, pp. 179-180.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 185.

<sup>22</sup>Victor Perlo, *Economics of Racism, USA*, International Publishers, New York, 1975, pp. 74-75.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 75.

<sup>24</sup>Lester C. Thurow, "The Economic Status of Minorities and Women," *Civil Rights Digest*, Winter-Spring, 1976.

<sup>25</sup>Keynote Address, WREE.

<sup>26</sup>Anne Koedt, Ellen Levine and Anita Rapone, ed., *Radical Feminism*, Quadrangle Books, New York Times Book Company, New York, 1973, p. 81.



# Boston's Legacy: The Anti-Racist and Feminist Tradition\*

BETTINA APTHEKER

The ultimate bastardization of the American Bicentennial was symbolized by a photograph which appeared on the front pages of every newspaper in the country early last September. A mob of white Bostonians had seized a Black businessman at the City Hall. The picture showed members of the mob ramming the American flag, its eagle point thrust forward, into the stomach of their victim.

One hundred and forty one years ago, almost to the moment—the date was October 24th, 1835—a mob of two thousand white men, described by the *Boston Commercial Gazette* as “an assemblage. . . of gentlemen of property and standing from all parts of the City”<sup>1</sup> attacked the meeting hall of the Female Anti-Slavery Society in Boston.

The Black and white members of the Female Anti-Slavery Society had scheduled a public lecture by the well-known British abolitionist, George Thompson. Handbills, distributed by leaders of the mob the morning of the lecture, had called attention to the meeting and declared that this would be “a fair opportunity for the friends of the Union to snake Thompson out.”<sup>2</sup>

George Thompson was unable to come to Boston as scheduled, and William Lloyd Garrison, militant abolitionist, and editor of the *Liberator*, appeared in his stead. The historian Eleanor Flexner described what happened:

. . . a mob swarmed into the building. . . and stormed up the stairs to the door of the very room in which the women were meeting. Garrison was whisked out a back door (he was later dragged through the streets at the end of a rope), and the Mayor himself came to beg the women to leave in order to avoid physical harm. At the direction of Maria Weston Chapman [president of the Society] each white lady present took a colored “sister” by the hand, and two by two, they walked calmly

down the stairs and out of the building, “their hands folded in their cotton gloves, their eyes busily identifying the genteel leaders of the mob.”<sup>3</sup>

Two months prior to this attack the leading white citizens of Boston had gathered at Faneuil Hall to denounce the anti-slavery men and women as traitors “who seek the dissolution of the union and the desecration of all those landmarks and boundaries of society which can render life desirable. . . .”<sup>4</sup>

The meeting had been called to petition the Massachusetts state legislature to outlaw the anti-slavery movement. The mayor of Boston, Theodore Lyman, Jr., presided. All the leading newspapers of Boston supported it, and lauded its purpose. Speakers included Harrison Gray Otis, a leading statesman and the former mayor of Boston, Municipal Court Judge Peter O. Thacher, and James T. Austin, the Attorney General of Massachusetts.

Attorney General Austin was “one of the city’s most virulent racists. He stated unequivocally his preference for the perpetuation of slavery, if the other choice were social ‘amalgamation.’”<sup>5</sup> In 1837, when the abolitionist newspaper editor Elijah P. Lovejoy was murdered by a racist mob in Alton, Illinois, and his presses destroyed and dumped into the river, Attorney General Austin compared the murderers of Lovejoy to the Boston Tea Party patriots!<sup>6</sup>

Austin was not alone in his vehement opposition to the anti-slavery cause. On the contrary; “anti-abolitionism was both a pervasive and an intensive component of Northern life.”<sup>7</sup> The main opposition to the anti-slavery movement came from the propertied classes, who quickly and instinctively understood its revolutionary implications.

Herbert Aptheker explained the revolutionary character of that movement this way: “Abolitionism sought the elimination of that form of property ownership which was basic to the power of the slaveholding class, and it was that class which effectively dominated the government of the United States during the pre-Civil War generation.”<sup>8</sup> It was

\*Speech presented to the Community Church of Boston, January 9, 1977.

precisely that challenge to the ownership of property that so agitated the Boston elite.

Indeed, Austin and other leading Bostonians insisted that the Constitutional provisions protecting slavery were "the highest political contract."<sup>9</sup> The purpose of the Constitution was to protect the ownership of private property. If there was to be a successful challenge to one form of private property—i.e. the ownership of slaves—why not to another? As one historian put it:

The rich saw that abolitionism threatened the status quo in ways far beyond the freeing of slaves. [The abolitionist] creed had certain "disorganizing tendencies" which boded ill for the stability of society and for the continued preeminence of the wealthy.<sup>10</sup>

### Abolitionism and Women's Rights

Moreover, and as a significant aspect of its revolutionary quality, the abolitionist movement allowed, and eventually encouraged, the participation of women in public life. This presented a basic challenge to the accepted sexual norms of the nineteenth century. As one anti-abolitionist newspaper delicately said: "The members of the Female Anti-Slavery Society should return to their proper sphere—the domestic fireside."

Despite political opposition, ecclesiastical denunciation and physical violence, Black and white women and men of Boston persevered in forging a magnificent heritage of struggle against slavery, the oppression of women, and many manifestations of racial discrimination and prejudice. Here then, and in brief detail, is a small part of that story.

Slavery was abolished in the state of Massachusetts in 1783, by constitutional amendment. However, the successful legal challenge to slavery was made two years earlier by a Black woman named Elizabeth Freeman. Born into slavery, she was owned by one Colonel John Ashley. She was severely beaten, and fled his custody in 1780. She was then approximately forty years old. Colonel Ashley sought her return. She refused, and obtained the assistance of a well-known attorney, Theodore Sedgwick.

Elizabeth Freeman sued Colonel Ashley for her freedom, arguing that the Bill of Rights of the state's constitution outlawed slavery. The case was heard in Great Barrington, and the jury ruled, in 1781, in her

favor. It not only affirmed her freedom, but ordered the Colonel to pay her thirty shillings as damages. The Elizabeth Freeman case marked the judicial ending of slavery in Massachusetts.<sup>11</sup>

It is more or less well-known that the first to fall in the American Revolution—during the Boston Massacre on March 5, 1770—was a runaway slave named Crispus Attucks. Perhaps less well-known is the fact that of the estimated four to six thousand Black soldiers who fought on the side of the colonists in the American Revolution was a Black woman named Deborah Gannett.

Gannett served as a regular soldier under the name of Robert Shurtliff, in the Fourth Massachusetts Regiment of the Continental Army for seventeen months, from May 20, 1782 to October 23, 1783. Her true identity became known only when she was wounded in battle. "The State of Massachusetts granted this remarkable woman a reward of £34 on January 20, 1792, and declared on doing this that 'the said Deborah exhibited an extraordinary instance of female heroism.'"<sup>12</sup>

The first native-born American woman to speak publicly in the United States was Black. Her name was Maria W. Stewart. She delivered four lectures at the African Masonic Hall in Boston in 1832 and 1833. Urging both the abolition of slavery and equality for women, she was subjected to much abuse, and chose to abandon her public career and return to teaching.

Addressing herself to the position of woman in society, and especially to the position of the Black woman, Maria Stewart said:

What if I am a woman; is not the God of ancient times the God of these modern days? Did he not raise up Deborah to be a mother and a judge in Israel? Did not Queen Esther save the lives of the Jews? And Mary Magdalene first declare the resurrection of Christ from the dead? . . .

Among the Greeks women delivered the oracles. The respect the Romans paid to the Sybils is well-known. . . .

If such women as are here described have once existed, be no longer astonished, then, my brethren and friends, that God at this eventful period should raise up our own females to strive by their example, both in public and private, to assist those who are endeavoring to stop the strong current of prejudice that flows so profusely against [our race] at present. . . . Brilliant wit will shine, come from whence it will; and genius and talent will not hide the brightness of its lustre.<sup>13</sup>

Shortly after Maria Stewart's pioneering efforts, the Southern white abolitionist, Angelina Grimké, took up the cause of woman's right to speak in public. In February 1838 Angelina Grimké became the first woman ever to address a committee of a state legislature. For two hours she spoke to Massachusetts lawmakers on the subject of slavery. When some male abolitionists questioned the propriety of female orators, Angelina Grimké replied to them:

*We cannot push Abolitionism forward with all our might until we take the stumbling block out of the road. . . . You may depend upon it, tho' to meet this question may appear to be turning out of our road, that it is not. IT IS NOT: we must meet it and meet it now. . . . Why, my dear brothers can you not see the deep laid scheme of the clergy against us as lecturers? . . . If we surrender the right to speak in public this year, we must surrender the right to petition next year, and the right to write the year after, and so on. What then can woman do for the slave, when she herself is under the feet of man and shamed into silence?"*<sup>14</sup>

On September 29, 1829, there was published in Boston an *Appeal, in four articles, together with a Preamble, to the Coloured Citizens of the World, But in particular and very especially to those of the United States of America*. Written by David Walker, the son of a slave from Wilmington, North Carolina, this *Appeal* was "the first sustained written assault upon slavery and racism to come from a black man in the United States."<sup>15</sup> Professor Dwight L. Dumond, in his classic study of the anti-slavery movement, described Walker's *Appeal* as "one of the greatest pieces of anti-slavery literature. . . . It was precisely what would have come from a million throats could they have been articulate and have been heard."<sup>16</sup>

Printed in three editions, passed surreptitiously from one hand to the next, the *Appeal* was denounced in frenzied assaults by the slave-holders, rejected by even so progressive of men as the Quaker abolitionist Benjamin Lundy and William Lloyd Garrison, yet embraced by Black men and women everywhere. It portended the future political and ethical contours of the abolitionist movement. David Walker died in Boston shortly after the publication of the third edition of his *Appeal*, at the early age of 44, and under mysterious circumstances. Not a few of his associates contended that he had been the victim of murder.

## Marriage Laws

Women in the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society initiated a heroic campaign for the repeal of the Massachusetts State Marriage Laws of 1705 and 1786 which prohibited marriage and fornication between Negroes or mulattoes and whites, and provided severe penalties for violators. Denounced in the Boston press as "politicians in petticoats," and worse, the women "were accused of a desire to marry black men, a lack of modesty for venturing into public affairs, and a want of virtue for interfering in so delicate an arena as sexual relations."<sup>17</sup>

Led by the famed Lydia Maria Child, the women withstood the abuse. Through the streets they trudged, door-to-door, to get signatures on a petition urging repeal of the laws.

In 1839 the Boston women presented a petition to the state legislature containing 1,300 signatures from women in Lynn, Brookfield, Dorchester and Plymouth. The legislature declined to act.

In 1840 the women returned with almost 9,000 signatures on their petitions. 3,674 of the signatures were men, and 5,032 were women. The struggle continued until the legislature repealed the marriage laws on the tenth of March, 1843. Writing on the significance of this effort, historian Louis Ruchames concluded:

The victory against the marriage law had an important effect upon the anti-slavery movement and the history of Massachusetts. It gave the abolitionists a sense of their potential power and capacity for future success. It brought them new adherents in all sections of the population. It stimulated them to renewed efforts against other forms of discrimination and segregation—on the railroad, as well as in the churches, the schools and the militia. . . ."<sup>18</sup>

## Desegregation in Boston Schools

Given the events of the past several years I think it is not inappropriate to conclude these remarks with some comments on the very long struggle to desegregate the Boston public schools. For Black efforts to obtain equal educational rights have their origin in the eighteenth century, and one of the first evidences of this comes from Boston. On October 17, 1787, Black citizens of this city petitioned the state legislature to open the public schools to their children.

The petitioners, led by the pioneer civil rights advocate Prince Hall, noted that while they shared the tax burden equally with whites, they did not enjoy equal privileges, and in particular

... the education of our children which now receive no benefit from the free schools in the town of Boston, which we think is a great grievance. We... must fear for our rising offspring to see them in ignorance in a land of gospel light and for no other reason [than that] they are black.<sup>19</sup>

It is ironic indeed that this petition was denied at the same moment that others among Boston's citizenry were vociferously condemning the British for the colonialist policy of taxation without representation! The petition having been denied, that Black community established and financed its own school in the basement of the African Meeting House. In 1820, the city's school committee took over what became known as the Smith Grammar School, and thereby institutionalized a segregated public school system.

The Black community, aided by the newly-founded Anti-Slavery Society in the 1830s, struggled unceasingly for the desegregation of Boston's public schools. The first legal challenge was made in 1849 by Benjamin F. Roberts, the father of a five-year-old colored child, Sarah.

Each day Sarah Roberts walked from her home past five elementary schools for white children on her way to the Smith Grammar School. Busing seems not to have been an issue! An evaluation committee had reported to the city that the Smith School was badly run-down—"the school rooms are too small, the paint much defaced," and the equipment "has been so shattered and neglected that it cannot be used until it has been thoroughly repaired." Sarah Roberts' father tried repeatedly to place her in one of the nearby schools available to white children.

Failing in this effort, Benjamin Roberts retained an attorney, Charles Sumner, who was soon to become a United States senator, and a renowned and eloquent spokesman for the abolitionist cause. The *Roberts* case was heard before the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. Sumner made many of the arguments that were to form the basis for the United States Supreme Court decision a century later. But the Massachusetts court in 1849 was not impressed. The *Roberts* case was lost.<sup>20</sup>

Political efforts, however, continued. And the long struggle against Jim Crow schooling in Boston was

finally won on September 3, 1855, when, as the leader of that movement, William C. Nell put it, "the colored children of Boston went up to occupy the long-promised land."<sup>21</sup>

Those who struggled so valiantly more than a century ago would no doubt find it difficult to believe that the citizens of Boston were still battling over the issue of school desegregation, and that to this day a Black person has yet to sit on Boston's school committee, and that a lawsuit argued recently in the Massachusetts courts to remedy that situation was denied on the most frivolous and contemptible grounds. These ancestral fighters would no doubt be stunned by the racism and violence which pervades the land. They would be appalled to discover that the unemployment rate in Boston today exceeds 20 per cent, that among Black workers it is 35 per cent, and that 38 per cent of the young people in South Boston are without jobs. One is reminded of the passage from W.E.B. Du Bois' *Black Reconstruction*, depicting the ways in which the rich use the shibboleth of race hatred to divide the working people:

Before the wide eyes of the mob is ever the Shape of Fear. Back of the writhing, yelling, cruel-eyed demons who break, destroy, maim and lynch and burn at the stake, is a knot, large or small, of normal human beings, and these human beings at heart are desperately afraid of something. Of what? Of many things, but usually of losing their jobs, being declassified, degraded, or actually disgraced; of losing their hopes, their savings, their plans for their children; of the actual pangs of hunger, of dirt, of crime. And of all this, most ubiquitous in modern industrial society is that fear of unemployment.<sup>22</sup>

It was the propertied gentlemen, the men of wealth and standing, who opposed the abolitionist cause, and it is their descendants today, from Daniel Patrick Moynihan to Henry Cabot Lodge, who organize and foment racist violence. It is they who, with their profit and plunder, oppose quality education and universal child care, decent low-cost housing and adequate health care, an inexpensive, modernized public transportation system and full employment, equality for women and the extirpation of racism.

Among the working people the abolitionists found their greatest support, and it is from among the working people today—Black, Brown, Asian, Native American and white—that the most basic impulse for progressive social change comes.

Revolutionaries of the mid-nineteenth century sought the elimination of one form of private ownership of property—i.e. the ownership of slaves. Revolutionaries of the twentieth century seek the elimi-

nation of *all* exploitative forms of private ownership of property—i.e. socialism, thus to commence the first truly human era in history. □

#### REFERENCE NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Theodore H. Hammett, "Two Mobs of Jacksonian Boston: Ideology and Interest," *Journal of American History*, March 1976, p. 846.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 847.

<sup>3</sup>Eleanor Flexner, *Century of Struggle, The Women's Rights in the United States*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1976, p. 43.

<sup>4</sup>Hammett, *op. cit.*, p. 862.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 857.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 857 and Lorman Ratner, *Powder Keg, Northern Opposition to the Antislavery Movement, 1831-1840*, Basic Books, New York, 1968, p. 24.

<sup>7</sup>Leonard L. Richards, "Gentlemen of Property and Standing," *Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1970, p. 3.

<sup>8</sup>Herbert Aptheker, *The American Civil War*, International Publishers, New York, 1961, p. 10.

<sup>9</sup>Hammett, *op. cit.*, p. 859.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 861.

<sup>11</sup>Herbert Aptheker, *Early Years of the Republic*, International Publishers, New York, 1976, pp. 154-155. Further details are in Sidney Kaplan, *The Black Presence in the Era of the American Revolution*, New York Graphic Society, Greenwich, Connecticut, 1976, pp. 216-217.

<sup>12</sup>Herbert Aptheker, *Essays in the History of the American Negro*, International Publishers, New York, 1964, p. 105. An additional reference to Deborah Gannett as a Black woman will be found in Mrs. N.F. Mossell, *The Work of the Afro-American Woman*, Books for Libraries Press (reprint edition), Freeport,

New York, 1971, p. 26.

<sup>13</sup>Gerda Lerner, ed., *Black Women in White America, A Documentary History*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1972, pp. 564-65.

<sup>14</sup>Flexner, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>15</sup>Herbert Aptheker, "One Continual Cry," *David Walker's Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the World (1829-1830)*, Humanities Press, New York, 1965, p. 54.

<sup>16</sup>Dwight Lowell Dumond, *The Crusade for Freedom in America*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1961, p. 329, cited by Aptheker, "One Continual Cry," *op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>17</sup>Louis Ruchames, "Race, Marriage and Abolition in Massachusetts," *Journal of Negro History*, July 1955, p. 257.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 273.

<sup>19</sup>Herbert Aptheker, ed., *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States*, Vol. I, Citadel Press, New York, 1951, p. 19. Additional information on Prince Hall will be found in the interesting article by James Oliver Horton, "Generations of Protest: Black Families and Social Reform in Ante-Bellum Boston," *New England Quarterly*, June 1976, pp. 242-256.

<sup>20</sup>The account of the Roberts case is from Richard Kluger, *Simple Justice, the History of Brown v. Board of Education and Black America's Struggle for Equality*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1976, pp. 75-76.

<sup>21</sup>Aptheker, *Documentary History, op. cit.*, p. 377. A good account of this struggle is written by Louis Ruchames, "Race and Education in Massachusetts," *The Negro History Bulletin*, December 1949.

<sup>22</sup>W.E. Burghardt DuBois, *Black Reconstruction*, Russell and Russell, New York, 1935, p. 678.

# Democracy in Czechoslovakia

MARGRIT PITTMAN

Comments in the capitalist press about Czechoslovakia are generally invidious and anti-socialist. "The leadership of the Czechoslovak Communist Party evidently sees the future improvement in the population's living standard as a prerequisite for its policy of stabilization," goes a typical comment, this one by the Bavarian radio on April 13, 1976, about the Fifteenth Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party (CPCz). It went on to say that, since no ideological changes could be expected, the CPCz "will at least win sympathies with a sort of 'goulash communism.'"

## The "Prague Spring" Counter-revolution

The other type of attack, which crested early this year with the publication of "Charter 77," alleges a lack of democracy in Czechoslovakia and is based on testimony by a small but vocal group of "dissidents" with close ties to Czechoslovak emigrant groups. "Charter 77"—signed by 241 people, prominent among whom are supporters of the 1968 "Prague Spring," charges abrogation of civil liberties caused by the "subordination of all state institutions and organizations under the political directive of the

governing party and the decisions of powerful and influential individuals.”

Inevitably, Western commentaries harken back to the failure of the attempt in 1968 to detach Czechoslovakia from the socialist camp and in this way accomplish a step in the “containment of communism.”

To gain a realistic perspective on the situation in Czechoslovakia today one must therefore probe two interconnected areas: the welfare of the country's 15 million citizens and the extent of the democracy they enjoy.

To properly answer the charges made and appreciate the vast publicity aroused by “Charter 77”—an interest quite out of proportion at a time when hundreds and thousands are murdered in cold blood in Chile, Ireland and South Africa—one must recall the events of 1968 which led to the intervention of the Warsaw Pact countries in August of that year.

Czechoslovakia is an industrialized country located so centrally that it has common borders with Poland, the German Democratic Republic (GDR), the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), Austria, Hungary and the Soviet Union. This means that it is of great strategic importance. To alienate this country from the socialist camp would have been an enormous success in imperialist plans of “rolling back” communism.

An opportunity to make this effort was created by weaknesses in the country's leadership which, in the late 'sixties, led to economic stagnation and an anti-democratic, bureaucratic situation within the Communist Party. This situation opened the way for two distinct anti-socialist lines of attack, described by Milos Marko in an analysis of the events. One attack was “against the leading role of the working class, against their ideology, against party and state power, for a revision of Marxism-Leninism.” The second line of attack was “for a step-by step reorientation of the CSSR's foreign policy through pseudopatriotic—actually bourgeois—nationalist slogans, aiming at a separation from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.” (Milos Marko, *Psychological Warfare and the Czechoslovak Experiment*, Orbis, 1972, p. 141, translated from German.)

These efforts and the imperialist role in the “Prague Spring” were freely acknowledged by Western ideologues. For example, futurologist Herman Kahn wrote in *Fortune*, November 1968: “In Czechoslovakia an experiment was near completion to show if it were possible to alienate the CSSR from the

socialist camp and how the other members of the Warsaw Pact would react to it.” (Retranslated from the German.)

The struggle for power in Czechoslovakia in 1968 was decided in favor of socialism and against imperialist hopes. Discussing these events, Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, USA observed in 1969: “The Czechoslovak events are an important milestone in the struggle against imperialism. What came to a head there was the most ambitious effort by imperialism to fulfill [John Foster] Dulles' policy of rolling back the borders of socialism.” (Gus Hall, *Imperialism Today*, International Publishers, 1972, p. 170.)

### Guarantees of Economic Rights

What the Bavarian radio jeeringly refers to as “goulash communism” is at the very basis of socialist democracy.

“In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations which are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production,” Marx writes. “The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life processes in general.” (Karl Marx, Preface to *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.)

The CSSR constitution affirms adherence to this view. In its preamble, which traces the transformation of the country from 1948, when the building of socialism began, to 1960, it says: “In our country all the main tasks of the transition from capitalist to socialist society have already been solved. Emancipated labor has become the basic factor throughout our society.” It continues to outline the future path: “While developing socialist statehood we shall perfect our socialist democracy by increasing the direct participation of the working people in the administration of the state and in the management of the economy, consolidating the political and moral unity of our society. . . and provide conditions for the development of creative abilities.”

Recent concrete details of this program's implementation were furnished at the CPCz's Fif-

teenth Congress in April 1976. Reports by the President of Czechoslovakia and CPCz General Secretary Dr. Gustav Husak and by Prime Minister Lubomir Strougal outlined achievements during the Fifth Five Year Plan (1971-76) and projected development to 1980 and beyond.

Besides full employment and stable prices the socialist government had the following to offer:

□ The national income increased by 32 per cent in the 1971-76 period, though the plan had called only for a 28 per cent rise.

□ Wages and other cash incomes of the population rose 29 per cent.

□ Food consumption rose by 23 per cent and sales of industrial consumer goods by 37 per cent.

□ 614,000 new housing units were built, 114,000 above the plan.

In addition, pensions were raised by almost 30 per cent and state subsidies to families increased in many ways—advantageous loans for newlyweds with substantial write-offs when children are born, extended maternity leave with pay. These and similar measures caused the birth-rate to increase 22 per cent over the previous five-year plan period. The ratio of physicians to inhabitants increased from 1 to 432 to 1 to 372, and places in nurseries for children aged 3-6 increased to accommodate 67 per cent of all children of that age.

### **New Five Year Plan**

These developments are to continue. The 1976-80 Five Year Plan calls for an increase in real income of 23-25 per cent.

An additional 640,000 housing units are to be built during the Sixth Five Year Plan and health, educational and child care facilities further increased.

Special attention will be paid to improvement in working conditions. Unions and management are called upon to help develop programs to improve the work environment (which takes in everything from noise and lighting to plants or music at the work place) as well as rest facilities, cafeterias, buffets, etc.

All these improvements are expected by the population with certainty. The past—particularly the accomplishments of the 1971-76 Five Year Plan—has shown that the people can have confidence in the Communist Party's promises.

There is, of course, nothing automatic about the continued increase in the material well-being of the population even after the means of production have

been socialized and the exploitation of man by man outlawed. Since a country can only consume what it produces, realization of consumption goals in the economic plan is contingent on increasing production.

Industrial production is planned to increase by 32-34 per cent by 1980 as compared with 1975, production of building materials by 40-42 per cent and the total agricultural output by 14-15 per cent. This requires a steep increase in labor productivity, since labor shortage is a chronic problem. The guidelines for the 1976-80 Plan project that the increases in production will be achieved by higher labor productivity, "which is to account for almost 90 per cent of the output increase." This does not mean speedup and increased exploitation, but rather greater efficiency and a constant improvement in technology. The development of workers' initiatives is of prime importance in achieving this.

Increases in labor productivity are stimulated on the one hand by material incentives and on the other hand by the growing awareness that improvements in all social sectors of life are dependent on production, since only wealth produced can be consumed. This growing socialist consciousness was one of the factors in the success of the 1971-76 period.

Presenting the economic report to the Fifteenth Congress, Prime Minister and CPCz Presidium Member Lubomir Strougal said, "In contrast to the 1960s, when reality greatly differed from the outlined plans, in the course of the past five years we have worked according to the approved guidelines and reached the goals that we set. This success is all the greater as we entered the Fifth Five Year Plan in a complicated situation and, in addition, had to cope over the last two years with the consequences of unexpected and greater complicated external economic influences.

"Restoration of stability and the dynamic rate of economic development have made it possible to strengthen purposefully the security of life of our people and their confidence in the future, i.e. values which are in sharp contrast to the consequences of the present crisis-ridden development in capitalist states."

Another factor of great importance to economic advance is the increasing involvement with the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA). Trade activities within CMEA guarantee Czechoslovakia—as all CMEA member countries—assured sources of raw materials at prices well below the

world market prices, assured markets and the opportunity to specialize in certain types of production, which makes possible large scale production and long-range full employment.

Altogether Czechoslovakia has concluded more than 60 multi-national and 90 bilateral agreements within CMEA on specialization and cooperation on industrial projects. The exchange of goods with the Soviet Union, for example, will increase by 48 per cent in the 1976-80 period. Capital investments are increasingly made in integrated projects such as the natural gas pipeline from Orenburg, USSR, a joint hydroelectric power plant on the Danube with Hungary, joint petrochemical production with the GDR and participation in the construction of a nickel production plant in Cuba. The 17 most important projects of this type will account for 13 per cent of the increase in investments, foreign and domestic.

This gives a thumbnail sketch of the advances made in the economic field and how they are reflected in the material quality of life of the Czechoslovak people. It is the foundation on which socialist democracy arises as the "legal and political superstructure."

### **Affirmative Action**

The most important example of the relation between socialist economic base and democratic superstructure is furnished by the affirmative action taken in relation to the Slovak people who were exploited and culturally deprived by the country's rulers—foreign and domestic—for centuries.

Until the building of socialism began in 1948, the Slovak nation was estimated to be 50 years behind Bohemia and Moravia, the Czech lands. In 1937—the year before Hitler invaded the country and set up a fascist Slovak puppet state—Slovaks accounted for 24.5 per cent of the population, 12 per cent of the national income and only 7.8 per cent of industrial production. By 1974 the gap had closed to the extent that the Slovak Socialist Republic (SSR) accounted for 32 per cent of the population and 25.5 per cent of industrial production. During the 1971-76 Five Year Plan gross national production in Slovakia increased 40 per cent compared with 25 per cent in the Czech Socialist Republic (CSR).

The guidelines for economic and social development for 1976-80, adopted at the Fifteenth Congress, directed a further balancing of the economies of the

two states, for which a "faster economic growth must be ensured in the Slovak Socialist Republic, whose share in the formation of nationwide resources must be increased." In practical terms this means that in the 1977 economic plan production in the SSR will increase 6.6 per cent compared with 4.8 per cent in the CSR, increases predicted on investments.

This is the economic basis for development of the two equal federated states, and on this basis exists a superstructure also based on equality. Each state has its own state structure with a National Council as the state government and each participates in the National Assembly, the highest legislative body of the CSSR.

Equality in cultural matters is also stressed. In the SSR, Slovak is taught in the schools; books and newspapers are published in that language. (This is also true for national minorities, Hungarians, Germans, Poles and Ukrainians, who, however, together make up less than 6 per cent of the total population.) The Czech and Slovak languages are closely related and can be mutually understood. Radio and television programs nationally use them interchangeably, depending on where programs originate. Use of both languages is also stressed at ceremonial occasions. Dr. Husak, who is Slovak, delivered the report to the Fifteenth Congress in Czech and his closing remarks in Slovak.

### **Women's Rights**

Another area of conspicuous affirmative action is women's liberation. This, too, is anchored in the constitution. Article 20, Sec. 3, says: "Men and women shall have equal status in the family, at work and in public activity." And Article 27 reads: "The equal status of women in the family, at work and in public life shall be secured by special adjustment of working conditions and special health care during pregnancy and maternity, as well as by the development of facilities and services which will enable women fully to participate in the life of society."

There has been a steep increase in child care facilities and many improvements in maternity care and length of maternity leave, so that the prerequisites for women's employment have vastly improved.

At the same time, women's emancipation is also expressed in changing job patterns. Women's share of total employment increased by 5 per cent, from 42.8 per cent in 1960 to 47.8 per cent in 1974.



Just as significant is the changing nature of women's employment. In the 1960-74 period women's share of employment in services, office work, etc. decreased from 79.1 to 65.8 per cent and increased in industry from 37.1 to 44.7 per cent. In science and research women's employment rose from 29.3 to 36.2 per cent and in administration and law from 42.6 to 54.7 per cent of the total.

Further affirmative action on women came during the May 1976 elections at the initiative of the CPCz. At the Congress Dr. Husak had spoken of the need "to create better conditions for the appointment of women to responsible posts." As a consequence of CPCz initiative, the National Front, in discussing slates for the nearly 200,000 elected offices ranging from local committees to the Federal Assembly, saw to it that about 30 per cent of all nominations went to women. Women had previously held 25 per cent of the local and district posts and 26 per cent in the Federal Assembly.

### Expanding Socialist Democracy

There is much evidence in Czechoslovak life of new forms of social consciousness, which grow from the new economic structure of society. A most important vehicle for forming this consciousness is the Revolutionary Trade Union Movement, with its 5.5 million members. Of this membership around 900,000—roughly every sixth person—is involved in some voluntary leadership activity attending to the practical task of administering the broad scope of working conditions, health and welfare. *As the largest mass organizations of the ruling class in a socialist state*, trade unions have great influence on all economic and political development because they form the link between the economic structure and social consciousness.

One expression of this new consciousness in the entire population was the great interest in the elections held last May, in which nearly 200,000 public officials were chosen for all levels of government, from the Federal Assembly to local councils. The significance of such elections was pointed out by Dr. Husak in his report. "National Committees, as territorial authorities of state power and administration, are an important link in our socialist system," he said. "Through them, the rule of the people is implemented in every community, in every district and region. Two hundred thousand deputies are working in them. Hundreds of thousands of citizens,

workers, cooperative farmers, members of the intelligentsia, women, youth and pensioners work in different commissions, and groups of activists take part voluntarily in the administration of public affairs. This is a school of socialist democracy in practice."

Growing consciousness was also expressed by the voluntary activities of citizens who, in 1971-76, under the auspices of the National Front, constructed public facilities, such as playgrounds, parks, sports fields, club houses and nursery schools with a value of 25 billion crowns, almost four times as much as during the previous Five Year Plan. These efforts will continue during the current plan period.

These activities are part of the process Lenin predicted in *State and Revolution*, written before the October revolution in 1917. "Under socialism," he wrote, "for the first time in the history of civilized society, the mass of the population will rise to take an *independent* part, not only in voting and elections, *but also in the everyday administration of the state.*" (Emphasis in original.)

Charter 77 and similar "human rights" efforts must be evaluated in this context of growing socialist democracy and of the consensus of the overwhelming majority of the population in favor of socialist development.

An important point, though it does not get to the crux of the matter, is that accusations of violations of civil rights as alleged by Charter 77 are often scurrilous. For example, the charge that "many young people are prevented from pursuing higher education because of their views or even because of their parents' views," is a plain lie. Children of such well know "dissidents" as Alexander Dubcek, Joseph Smrkovsky, Jiri Hanselka, a former editor of the youth paper *Mlada Fronta* (*Young Front*) and others have studied or are studying at Czechoslovak universities.

### Class Nature of Democracy

What does go to the crux of the matter is that the initiators and chief spokesmen of Charter 77 were active advocates of the "Prague Spring" and still pursue the same anti-socialist objectives. Some of them are people deprived of special privileges by socialism because of their bourgeois backgrounds. Others are sworn and open enemies of socialism who already opposed a socialist development in 1948. Then there are those whose careers were launched as part of the "softening up" effort in 1968. Thus, Pavel

Kohout was unknown until his work "Diary of a Counter-revolutionary" was published in the West.

In Charter 77 these people call for the right to a free development of anti-socialist propaganda and activity, and base their demands on the myth that the state is a neutral, supra-class instrument and that there is such a thing as "pure" democracy. This is by no means a new invention. Marx, Engels and Lenin already had to refute this idea. Polemizing against the German Social Democrat Karl Kautsky, Lenin wrote: "If we are not to mock at common sense and history, it is obvious that we cannot speak of 'pure democracy' as long as different *classes* exist; we can only speak of *class* democracy. . . 'Pure democracy' is the mendacious phrase of a liberal who wants to fool the workers. History knows of bourgeois democracy, which takes the place of feudalism, and of proletarian democracy which takes the place of bourgeois democracy.

"Bourgeois democracy, although a great historical advance in comparison with medievalism, always remains, and under capitalism is bound to remain, restricted, truncated, false and hypocritical, a paradise for the rich and a snare and deception for the exploited, for the poor." (Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*.)

When the "Prague Spring" had been defeated, some of its advocates quite openly discussed the class aspect of their venture, and expressed no naivete about the class nature of society. For example, Ivan Svitak, a "Prague Spring" ideologue and author of the book *The Czechoslovak Experiment, 1968-69*, wrote: "The Communist power elite will not accept a pluralist system unless under conditions that exclude all possibilities of a free movement of political forces, that is, under conditions in which *they do not have to give up power*." (Marko, *op. cit.*, pp. 182-83, translated from German, emphasis added.)

If the term "pluralist system" is used to indicate the

presence of different political parties, Czechoslovakia has a pluralist system. In addition to the CPCz, four other political parties are represented in parliament. These represent sections of the population who are not Communists but whose long range interests coincide with those of the socialist state. But, as Svitak notes, working class power is secured. The constitution, as noted earlier, is quite explicit on the class nature of socialist democracy. In Article 28 it states: "Freedom of expression in all fields of public life, in particular freedom of speech and freedom of the press, *consistent with the interests of the working people*, shall enable citizens to further the development of their personalities and their creative efforts, *and to take an active part in the administration of their state and in the economic and cultural development of the country*. For this purpose freedom of assembly and freedom to hold public parades and demonstrations shall be guaranteed." (Emphasis added.)

This is the basis on which the Czechoslovak people are building their secure present and laying the basis for their better future. "Our state, as the instrument of the power of the working class and other working people, is a really democratic state," Dr. Husak told the CPCz Congress. "It is the decisive means of building up a new society based on the liberation of labor, on social and national justice. The main content of socialist democracy is active participation by the working people in the administration of the state and the economy, and in solving the problems of the life of society. . . . Through democratic institutions and organization, the broad strata of the people not only take an active part in seeking and forming the most expedient ways of developing society, but are also the main force in implementing set targets. They are an active factor in the creation, materialization and control of our policy. Herein lies the principle advantage of socialist democracy." □

# Ford Is Organized!

LOU SAPERSTEIN

In the spring of 1941, the United Auto Workers finally accomplished the task of organizing the giant Ford Motor Company, the number two auto monopoly. To unionize Ford, the UAW had to overcome the most repressive, fascistic monopolist in American life. Henry Ford I was a tyrant who mobilized a giant anti-union repressive apparatus of violence and intimidation at the huge River Rouge complex in his semiprivate domain of Dearborn. When the union drive neared success, Ford attempted to provoke a race riot to split and destroy the union. The UAW overcame Ford's racism and all other divisive tactics and shut down the giant River Rouge complex employing over 80,000 workers for eleven days. In doing what for so long they had been told could not be done, Ford workers achieved a new sense of their humanity and of their collective power.

The Communist Party played a leading role in the campaign to organize Ford. Far from being only workhorses who carried out other people's policies, as recent critics allege, the Communist's active leadership and mass influence put a decisive stamp on the whole organizing campaign. Black and white unity, the anti-fascist character of the campaign, mass picketing, the shop steward system, the alliance with the community, especially the Black community, the mobilization of women and youth—all reflected Communist influence and leadership. The Party led a broad Left-wing trend of class conscious and socialist-minded workers and community activists. While comprising several thousand Detroiters, the Left-wing trend was not large enough and did not have the resources to organize Ford and other giant monopolies by itself. To accomplish this monumental task, there had to be an alliance between Left-wing and progressive forces around the concrete program of a militant mass fight to meet the needs of the workers, Black and white, and provide them the benefits of democratic trade union organization. A united front of Left and Center—and through the united front, a mobilization of the entire membership of the UAW—this was the only way Ford could be organized.

## The Company

A giant monopoly firm, wholly owned by Henry Ford I and his family in 1941, the Ford Motor

Company employed 125,000 workers, two thirds of them at the River Rouge complex in Dearborn. The firm was enormously profitable and became a billion-dollar corporation a short time after its founding. Henry Ford was a different type of billionaire, according to Ford public relations and the capitalist media. Ford was an example of the triumph of the old middle class virtues of hard work, individualism and ingenuity. As originator of the mass production assembly line technique and of the low-priced "Model T," Ford supposedly served the public. By paying the unusually high wage of five dollars a day in 1914, Ford was said to be a friend of the working man. Ford's public relations experts successfully played on populist, anti-Wall Street sentiments to create the image of the auto magnate as a common man, folk hero, enemy of the unproductive bankers.

Henry Ford did indeed fear the bankers: He saw these rival businessmen as part of a Jewish conspiracy to take over the world. In the 1920's he published the anti-Semitic hoax, the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. In the 1930s he put on his payroll Fritz Kuhn, the leading Nazi in the United States. In 1938, Ford was personally decorated by Hitler. In 1940, Ford was one of the sponsors of the fascistic America First Committee. To progressives, Ford was a symbol, too—a symbol of the open shop and of fascism.

The Ford Motor Company's vaunted productivity was based on the most brutal speedup in industry and incredibly repressive working conditions. Talking, sitting and smoking were out. There was no relief time. To get or keep a job, workers often had to pay a bribe. Worst of all, there was Harry Bennett's "Service Men." Bennett, Ford's chief henchman for fighting the union, established ties with the political world and the underworld. Using these contacts, Bennett staffed the so-called Ford Service Department with three thousand thugs and gangsters, getting many notorious criminals paroled directly to him. This goon squad harassed and intimidated workers, aiding the speedup drive. The Service Men beat up and occasionally even arranged the murder of suspected trade unionists and trade union sympathizers. Supplementing this gangster outfit were many stoolpigeons in the ranks of the workers. Over four thousand unionists were fired between 1937 and 1941. As a further guarantee against union contami-

nation, Ford centered his operations in Dearborn, a town small enough for Ford to be assured of a personal anti-union fiefdom.

Ford's employment policy was designed for making maximum production and keeping out the union. Over sixty national groups were employed in the Rouge plant. Ford hoped that national rivalries and language differences would prevent the workers from uniting. Youth were employed at lower wages. Most importantly, Ford learned from the role of racism used in defeating post-World War I strikes. Ford began a policy of employing ten per cent Black workers at his main facility. Since most employers hired few or no Blacks in this period, Ford had a big share (about one quarter) of the total employed Black work force in the Detroit area. Especially unusual at the time was Ford's policy of employing some Blacks on the assembly line and in skilled jobs. This tokenism, of course, did not alter the racist character of Ford's use of Black workers. Most Black workers had the hottest, heaviest, hardest and dirtiest jobs in the foundry and rolling mill. Black workers faced even greater repression than did white workers, both on the job and in the community.

While Ford intervened in all the working-class, national group communities, his interference in and attempt to control the Black community was most blatant. Ford provided financial backing for Black churches. Some Black ministers acted as employment agents, some getting fifty to one hundred dollars from workers they recommended for jobs. While Blacks were not allowed to live in Dearborn, Ford "aided" the adjacent predominantly Black community of Inkster, hard-hit by the Depression, providing it with various community services. Then Ford hired the five hundred men in the community, paying them one dollar a day, with three dollars a day subtracted from the normal four dollar wage to pay Ford back for his "charity."<sup>1</sup>

Ford was able to win a certain amount of middle-class leadership support in the Black community, just as he had supporters in other communities. There were Right-wing national group newspapers supporting Ford and Left-wing national group papers supporting the union. The Black community was Ford's special concentration point, however. Ford expected Black ministers not only to oppose unions but to deliver votes to the Republicans. When this failed to materialize in 1936 and 1938, Ford set up a political machine in the Black community. Many Black workers were forced to join this Ford organization to keep their jobs. The vote of the Black

community for Democrats—and especially for pro-union, Left-progressive candidates—was a sign of what was to come. Key for the union was a real Black and white unity, anti-racist policy, for Black workers would not risk their jobs for a traditional AFL racist policy. Left-wingers saw Ford's attempt to use Black workers as his Achilles heel. The organization of the specially oppressed Black workers could undermine Ford's whole repressive apparatus and give a profound boost to the union drive.

### **Pioneering Role of Communists (1925-1933)**

The Communist Party had long set itself the task of organizing the Ford Motor Company, a concentration point in its goal of organizing all of basic industry. As early as the 1920s, the Party put out its own shop paper to Ford workers, exposing conditions, advocating unionization, and explaining the viewpoint of the Communist Party. Communists played a leading role in the Auto Workers Union (AWU), an industrial union expelled from the American Federation of Labor (AFL) in 1918 for refusing to give up its many thousand members to AFL craft unions. The AWU, an affiliate of the Trade Union Unity League, led important strike struggles in the depths of the Great Depression, including strikes of Ford's supplier plants.

Ford had contracted out a big proportion of his operations to outside shops at very low prices. These shops then implemented the most brutal speedup and wage cutting policies. The AWU-led strikes used tactics of mass picketing, large, representative strike committees and cooperation with the unemployed. Concrete demands were drawn up and some victories were won. The AWU, led by the well-known Communist Phil Raymond, provided important leadership to auto workers at a time when the AFL was pursuing a no strike policy and had no interest in mass production workers. In 1933, one hundred and two Ford workers attended an AWU organizing conference. The leadership cadre for the battles to come was slowly being gathered.<sup>2</sup>

When the economic crisis hit in 1929, only the Communists were prepared to give leadership to the unemployed. One hundred thousand Detroiters turned out on March 6, 1930, to demand "Work or Wages!" in one of many demonstrations around the country called by the CP, the YCL and TUUL. The Communist-led Unemployed Councils which developed out of these actions fought for relief, unemployment insurance and jobs and against evictions. The

Councils pursued a line of militant struggle, unity of Black and white, employed and unemployed.

Detroit was hit hardest of any city in the U.S. by the Depression. Tens of thousands of unemployed Detroiters were Ford workers, but the company paid almost no taxes to the city since its operations were centered in Dearborn. When Ford was criticized for this, he said that any one who really wanted to work could find a job at the Ford plant. In response to this arrogance, the Unemployed Council organized the famous Ford Hunger March. On March 7, 1932, several thousand Detroiters began a peaceful march to Dearborn to present demands to the Ford Motor Company for jobs or relief, the right to organize, an end to speedup, the abolition of the spy system, an end to the job selling practices, a six hour day without reduction in pay and other demands.

The attempt of unemployed Ford workers to march peacefully in Dearborn was greeted with gunfire by Ford Service Men and Dearborn police. Four workers were killed that day, including Young Communist League organizer Joe York. A massive funeral procession, estimated by the police at 30,000, with tens of thousands more lining the streets, expressed the outrage of Detroiters. The struggle for relief and jobs continued to grow.<sup>3</sup>

In the fall of 1933, the Left forces challenged Ford in his personal preserve of Dearborn with the launching of a united front ticket for municipal office. AWU organizer David Jones polled about 4,000 votes for mayor, almost one-third of the total. Repression was a continuing reality. In December 1933, George Marchuk, secretary-treasurer of an AWU local and a Communist, was found lying in a ditch with a bullet in his head. The *Dearborn Ford Worker* pointed to the Knights of Dearborn, a fascist, vigilante outfit run by company elements as the probable murderers. The continuing struggle of the Left forces for elementary democratic rights in Dearborn laid the groundwork for future battles by the UAW.<sup>4</sup>

Communists were active in a large group of fraternal, nationality organizations, most importantly the International Workers Order (IWO). Consistent activity in these mass organizations gave the Party ties with thousands of Ford workers. The Left-led fraternal groups were an important base of support for the Ford organizing drive.

Communists also led a wide array of struggles for peace, equality and democracy. Left-led organizations like the International Labor Defense, the League of Struggle for Negro Rights and the Young Communist League were especially important. These

political struggles, combined with the struggle for the workers' everyday needs educated a large group of Left-wing cadre among Ford workers and in working class communities.

### The New Deal and the Popular Front

In 1933, Franklin Roosevelt replaced Herbert Hoover as President and inaugurated a "New Deal." The early stage of the New Deal was attuned primarily to the interests of big business, but relief appropriations were increased and the federal government now declared that workers had the right to organize. "without outside interference." (Although attempts were made at compulsory organization of workers into company unions under this law, too.) These changes and the beginning of an economic recovery from the Depression's low point brought a mass upsurge among workers. AFL, TUUL, and independent unions all grew tremendously. The year 1933 was also the year of the Nazi seizure of power and the greatly increased danger of war and fascism on a world scale.

These circumstances led to a broadening of the Communist united front tactic into the concept of the popular front of workers, farmers, and other democratic strata against the dangers of war and fascism. This new strategic and tactical orientation was greatly aided by the historic Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935. The Party overcame some sectarian weaknesses and participated in broad new coalitions that involved millions in struggle and brought a big Leftward shift in the New Deal and American politics generally.

While many unions grew in the first two years of the New Deal, workers looked primarily to the AFL as the country's chief trade union center. With masses of unskilled and foreign born workers from basic industry turning to the AFL and demanding action, Communist policy reoriented toward work within the AFL. In 1934-35, the AWU and other TUUL unions dissolved, their members joining AFL unions.

The AWU members at the Ford plant secured a charter from the AFL as Federal Labor Union 19374. Bill McKie was elected President and Dave Miller Vice-President. These and other Leftwingers continued their advocacy of an international, democratic, industrial union of all automobile workers, skilled and unskilled, native-born and foreign born, Black and white, men and women. The Left waged an open fight against the class collaborationist, no-strike, and craft unionist policies of the AFL leadership. The

Communist-led struggle for an autonomous industrial union gained a partial victory in 1935 with the granting of an international union charter to the United Automobile Workers by the AFL. In 1936, the UAW gained autonomy and elected its own officers. Shortly thereafter, the UAW affiliated with the CIO (Committee for Industrial Organization, later the Congress of Industrial Organizations).

Headed by John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers, the CIO was formed by several industrial and semi-industrial unions within the AFL. The leaders of these unions saw that the time was ripe for the organization of basic industry. With the formation of the million-member CIO, the auto workers for the first time had a powerful trade union ally. As Communist leader William Z. Foster wrote: "The very heart of the CIO's greater organizing achievements was precisely the fact that, seizing upon a favorable opportunity, it supported its correct industrial union form with the mass power and driving force of one million already organized workers." Crucial also to the CIO, Foster said, was the "free working relations between progressives and Communists in the movement." The CIO was the most important of the Left-Center coalitions of the New Deal.<sup>5</sup>

The key struggle that sparked the successful CIO organizing campaign of 1936-37 was the Flint General Motors sit-down strike. This "strategic strike produced such a tremendous wave of enthusiasm and fighting spirit among the workers throughout the basic industries that their organization into the CIO unions became largely routine."<sup>6</sup> Even the new economic recession in 1937-38 did not stop the CIO's growth. By November 1938 the CIO had four million members.

Left-progressive coalitions developed in the mid-thirties in many important areas. On Communist initiative, the Communist-led and Socialist-led unemployed organizations merged to form the Workers Alliance. The Alliance's work among the unemployed was supplemented in Detroit and elsewhere by the CIO's organization of Works Projects Administration (WPA) workers. Many of the cadre who organized Ford first gained experience with the UAW-CIO in the WPA.

The struggle for Black equality greatly expanded under the leadership of the National Negro Congress (NNC). The NNC united a significant portion of the Black community in the fight against discrimination, for jobs and unionization through the CIO. The fight for civil liberties and against repression conducted by

the ILD was further expanded in Michigan by the Civil Rights Federation. The Federation especially concentrated on repression by the Ford Motor Company, initiating a Committee for the Protection of Civil Rights in the Auto Industry in 1937. The American Youth Congress united millions of young people in struggle for their needs, embodied in the proposed American Youth Act. The League of Struggle Against War and Fascism and its successor organizations brought together representatives of groups with millions of members. Also of special importance were the Women's Auxiliaries and Labor's Non-Partisan League, organized for political action.

Popular front electoral coalitions were important in Michigan, although they did not reach the stage of a successful mass breakaway from the two party system. Leftwing women's leader Mary Zuk, organizer of an anti-inflation meat boycott in 1935, won election to the Hamtramck city council in April 1936 on a "People's Ticket" affiliated with the embryonic Farmer-Labor Party. In Dearborn, former Ford worker Charles Reagan, a Communist, ran for Mayor in 1937 on a united front ticket. Reagan lost, but two progressives on the slate won election to the City Council. In 1939, Detroit's anti-CIO and red-baiting Mayor and his supporters in the City Council were defeated. Two state senators were elected on the Democratic ticket with the support of grassroots progressive organizations. Charles Diggs, Sr., Black leader, first won election in 1936 from the district covering Hamtramck and Detroit's main Black ghetto. Stanley Nowak, a UAW organizer, won election in 1938 from a district covering the west side of Detroit and Dearborn. Diggs and Nowak were important allies in the fight to organize Ford.

The great struggles of 1936-1939 were united front, Left-progressive campaigns. In these struggles, the Communists played a special leading role. Party Chairman Bill Foster's vast experience as a trade union organizer was a great help. Foster wrote innumerable pamphlets and articles explaining the fundamentals of trade union organization. Communists were the key organizers of the Flint sit-down strike and many other campaigns. The *Daily Worker* was a part of all the workers' struggles, always present on the picket line and welcomed by the workers. *Daily Worker* circulation grew dramatically.

While helping to lead the mass struggles, the Party simultaneously helped to develop a broad Left-wing trend and to strengthen the Party itself. The broad

Left trend was composed of those who learned most from their participation with Communists in the struggles for jobs, union organization, freeing the Scottsboro Boys, support for collective security and Republican Spain, etc. Going well beyond Party members and sympathizers, the broad Left trend grew significantly during the popular front struggles. This Left trend recognized the special character of the Black struggle for equality and the need for Black-white unity; it was anti-imperialist and generally sympathetic to the Soviet Union; it was oriented toward a farmer-labor party; it was anti-capitalist as well as anti-fascist and anti-monopolist; it accepted the Communists as a legitimate, positive working-class force.

At the core of the Left was the Communist Party itself. Michigan Party membership grew from about seven hundred in 1928 to 1,300 in 1936 and 2,600 in 1938. Throughout the country, there were 1,500 auto workers in the Party in 1938, about half of them in Michigan. In the Rouge plant there were about 200 Communists. An indication of the Party's following in Detroit is provided by the vote of 12,000 for Billy Allan, well-known Communist leader, for Detroit City Council in 1939.<sup>7</sup>

### **The Lag in Organizing Ford**

The 1936-37 strike wave, which brought the organization of General Motors, Chrysler and many smaller auto companies, receded before the Ford empire could be successfully tackled. Several thousand Rouge workers joined the UAW during the sit-down period, and one thousand Ford workers marched with masks on in the 1937 Labor Day parade. Strikes occurred in Ford plants in other parts of the country. However, the union did not sufficiently concentrate its resources to accomplish the task of organizing the Rouge.

The principle reason for this failure was the factional strife brought on by the union's first president, Homer Martin, and his group. Martin, a former preacher with oratorical but no organizational or trade union skills, managed to secure the UAW presidency in the complicated situation of the transfer of full autonomy to the UAW by the AFL. In the summer of 1937, Martin came under the direction of Jay Lovestone, the notorious renegade from the Communist movement and government agent. Somewhat later, Martin was exposed as a paid agent of the Ford Motor Company.

Martin put Lovestone agents in key union posi-

tions in place of the experienced organizers who had led the 1936-37 strikes. Under Lovestone's guidance, Martin launched a factional, red-baiting campaign against the progressive forces in the union. While a well-financed Ford drive was begun in November 1937, the staff of the drive was honeycombed with incompetents and company agents. With huge layoffs hitting the auto companies, the union was forced to cut back on expenditures and lay off many organizers. The Ford drive petered out.

The Left-progressive forces tried to keep the drive going. In early 1938, a Dearborn branch of the Workers Alliance was formed to deal with the new unemployment crisis. Fifteen hundred people attended Dearborn mass meetings in public schools. The Alliance signed up hundreds in the UAW. But the sabotage of the Lovestonites and further intensification of the factional fight brought the drive to a complete halt. President Martin stooped so low as to give union membership lists to the company. Most Ford union members lost confidence in the union and stopped paying their dues. The remaining Ford union members, reorganized as UAW Local 600, returned to the process of slowly enlarging their ranks through small underground meetings, the method used since the 1920s by the pioneer union fighters.

Martin's factionalism, red-baiting, suspensions and expulsions of other UAW elected officials almost destroyed the UAW. The civil war inside the union prevented any progress on the real problems of the auto workers. Dues-paying membership declined drastically even in the organized plants. With the aid of the CIO, the Left-progressive forces restored the union at the March 1939 Convention in Cleveland. The Martin group held its own convention and then re-entered the AFL. While the UAW-CIO was many times stronger than the UAW-AFL, the CIO union still had to rebuild its organization and to win NLRB election fights with the UAW-AFL for the right to represent GM and Chrysler workers. By the time of the union's next convention in August 1940, the union had been rebuilt, won most NLRB elections, and was ready to take on Ford Motor Company.

### **The Early Phase of World War II**

Unfortunately, the defeat of Homer Martin did not bring an end to the problems of red-baiting and factionalism. Other factional and red-baiting forces still existed within the CIO. The Trotskyites had backed Martin and could be counted on to play their usual red-baiting, disruptive role. More significant

was the role of the Catholic Church and the social democrats. Once the CIO had shown that it was here to stay, the Catholic Church decided to play an active role of countering Communist influence within the new union movement. One aspect of this policy was the organization of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists (ACTU) which acted as a conservative caucus within the UAW and CIO.

By 1938-39, the Socialist Party and the broader social reformist trend associated with it came to play a right-of-center anti-Communist role within the CIO. The Rightward trend of international affairs—the defeat of the Spanish Republic, the Munich Accord—gave fuel to this Right-wing trend in Social Democracy. Right-wing forces were on the offensive in domestic affairs as well. In 1938 the Dies “Un-American” Committee was set up by Congress. Republicans made gains in elections that year and were able, in coalition with conservative Southern Democrats, to prevent further advances in New Deal social legislation. The decisive shift to the Right came, however, in September 1939, with the start of the imperialist phase of World War II.

The war followed the failure of Britain and France to respond to the Soviet Union's call for collective security against fascist aggression. In self-defense, the Soviet Union signed a Non-Aggression Pact with Germany. France and Britain had hoped that the Nazis would attack the Soviet Union and they still wanted to turn the “wrong war” into the right war against the Soviet Union. The dominant character of the war in this early stage was imperialist, and reactionary domestic policies were the consequence.

The leading circles of U.S. finance capital were closely tied to Britain and France. The Roosevelt Administration began a policy of step-by-step involvement in the war, and a “defense” buildup. The early orientation of the Roosevelt Administration on domestic reform was displaced by its new emphasis on a pro-Allies foreign policy and “defense” preparations.

The war boom brought jobs to many, but it also brought inflation, increased racism, and an anti-Communist, anti-labor drive. Almost none of the new defense jobs were open to Black workers. Racist attacks by the Ku Klux Klan took place in Detroit-area high schools. Detroit's Black population expanded, but the noose around the ghetto was tightened.

In 1940, the anti-Communist, anti-“alien” Smith Act was passed. The Communist Party was kept off the ballot in a dozen states in 1940. Earl Browder, the

Party's General Secretary, was sent to prison for minor passport violations early in 1941. Almost every strike was attacked in the capitalist press as a Communist attempt to sabotage national defense. Restrictive labor laws were passed in several states and were under consideration in the Congress.

The anti-Communist forces within the CIO were strengthened as they took up the bourgeoisie's propaganda line that the Soviet Union and Germany, Communists and Nazis, were allied. Leaders of the CIO were recruited for leading posts in the Roosevelt Administration in order to win the CIO over to the war program. Sidney Hillman, President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and second in command of the CIO, was recruited by Roosevelt to act as Assistant Director of the Office of Production Management. The line that Hillman tried to carry out was sacrifice for the defense effort and political support for FDR and Britain. The AFL was going along, pledging to hold down strikes despite the soaring inflation.

The Communist Party's position was opposition to the imperialist war, continued organization of the unorganized, defense of the workers' standard of living, progressive domestic reforms, independent political action, and support for collective security agreements between the United States, the Soviet Union, and China. The bourgeoisie's hysterical anti-Soviet campaign caused some defections in the ranks of intellectuals, but few Left-wing workers were diverted. The alliance of Left and progressive forces in the trade union movement was disrupted, however. The split came on political issues such as support for “defense” and for Great Britain, endorsing Roosevelt's third term bid in 1940, and anti-Communism. The progressives, however, did not support the Hillman line. Progressives opposed entering the war and still supported defense of the workers' standard of living, organizing the unorganized, and domestic reforms.

Within the UAW, Walter Reuther was the leading representative of the social reformist, social democratic trend and of the anti-Communist forces in the union. Reuther's faction scored a big success at the UAW's 1940 convention. It got passed a resolution condemning communism, fascism, and Nazism. On major political questions before the convention, the Reuther forces triumphed, gaining the support of all the top leaders, including those previously allied with the Left. Several progressives lost seats on the union's executive board at this convention. Following the convention, Reuther came out with his plan for “five



hundred planes a day" and got far more press coverage for this than all other UAW activities received.

Reuther's political priorities were production for the war effort and attacks on the Communists and the Soviet Union. The needs of the Ford workers were not on his list of priorities at all. Reuther's ally, Sidney Hillman, was in the unfortunate position of actually helping to make Ford a top defense contractor. The day after FDR's victory in 1940, Ford was awarded a \$122 million defense contract. UAW members were angry since the union was conducting a major campaign to deny contracts to Ford since the company was a blatant labor law violator. Both Reuther and the ACTU defended Hillman. It was not Hillman's job to organize Ford, said the ACTU paper, the *Michigan Labor Leader*. But as the *Daily Worker* pointed out, the government, through the defense agency in which Hillman was a leading official, was aiding and encouraging Ford in his anti-union stance.

The capitalist media charged that Communists were organizing "politically motivated" strikes to disrupt defense production. In fact, it was anti-Communists in labor's ranks who were "politically motivated" in trying to prevent struggles aimed at getting union recognition and wage increases necessary to keep up with inflation. Left influence was strong enough in the UAW and CIO to prevent the wholesale abandonment of working-class positions, as sought by the Social Democrats and the ACTU. There was sufficient Left-progressive unity for the campaign to unionize Ford's to be organized in a decisive way, with the full resources of the UAW and CIO brought into the battle. □

(The concluding portion of this article will appear in the April Political Affairs.)

#### REFERENCE NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Keith Sward, *The Legend of Henry Ford*, New York, 1948, pp.229-30.

<sup>2</sup>James Robert Prickett, "Communists and the Communist Issue in the American Labor Movement, 1920-1950," Ph.D. thesis, UCLA, 1975, chapter 3.

<sup>3</sup>Sward, *op. cit.*, pp.231-241.

<sup>4</sup>*Detroit Free Press*, October 11, 1933; November 8, 1933; *Dearborn Ford Worker*, June 1, 1936.

<sup>5</sup>Philip Bonosky, *Brother Bill McKie: Building the Union at Ford*, New York, 1953, pp.105-107; Prickett, *op. cit.*; William Z. Foster, "Organizing the Ford Workers: How to Organize the Ford Plant," *Daily Worker*, November 22, 1937; William Z. Foster, *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, New York, 1952, p. 347.

<sup>6</sup>Foster, *History*, pp.351-352.

<sup>7</sup>*Daily Worker*, May 31, 1938, November 12, 1939; Jack Stachel, "Build the Party for Peace, Democracy and Socialism!" *The Communist*, March 1938, 220-241.

# DOCUMENTS

## For the Advance of Detente and the Consolidation of Security and Cooperation in Europe

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Rumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, represented at the meeting of Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states in Bucharest on November 25-26, 1976, have considered topical questions of the further struggle for peace and a deepening of the relaxation of international tensions, for the consolidation of security and the development of cooperation in Europe.

The participants in the meeting note with satisfaction that favorable substantive changes have taken place in international relations in recent years: a process of international detente has begun; peaceful coexistence between states, irrespective of their social order, is being established. Major problems outstanding since the period immediately following World War II have now been peaceably resolved in Europe, and relations between European states are increasingly being restructured on the firm foundations of cooperation between equals.

The Warsaw Treaty member states note that a highly important role in the implementation of these favorable changes was played by their efforts and initiatives, both joint and individual, (notably) the documents adopted by the Political Consultative Committee, including: the Bucharest Declaration of 1966; the Budapest Call of 1969; the Berlin Statement of 1970; the Prague Declaration of 1972, and the Warsaw Communiqué of 1974. They also noted the contribution made by other European states and particularly the role of the masses of the

people, the progressive and democratic forces of the continent. The Warsaw Treaty member states have played an important part in initiating the convocation, and (later) in the proceedings, of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, attended by 33 European states, the USA and Canada, which was an international event of historic significance.

### I.

The Warsaw Treaty member states take as a point of departure that the results of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe have been a common success for all of its participants, a victory for sanity and political realism. The principles and accords adopted in Helsinki constitute a broad and clear-cut platform for the further strengthening of peace. They include a powerful potential for making a long-term favorable impact on relations between states on the continent. Consistent application of these principles and accords is shaping a new Europe—a Europe of security and cooperation.

In the Final Act, the states which participated in the All-European Conference expressed their belief in the necessity of exerting every effort toward making detente both a continuous and an ever more viable and comprehensive process, universal in scope. The Conference reflected the changes that have taken place in Europe, confirmed the territorial and political realities that have taken shape on the continent as a result of the victory of the peoples in the anti-fascist war and of their subsequent development and the assertion of their will to live and cooperate in conditions of peace and security.

The states which participated in the All-Eu-

*From Reprints from the Soviet Press, January 15, 1977.*

ropean Conference undertook it as their responsibility that each of them would build relations with other participating states and with all other states on the basis of the following principles: sovereign equality and respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty; non-use of force or threats of force; inviolability of frontiers; territorial integrity of states; peaceful settlement of disputes; nonintervention in each other's internal affairs; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; equality and the right of the peoples to settle their own destinies; cooperation between states; conscientious fulfillment of obligations under international law. The trends and forms of development of mutually advantageous cooperation were defined and concerted.

The time that has elapsed since the All-European Conference confirms both the constructive nature of its results and the feasibility of their implementation. Many topical questions of realization of the Helsinki accords were considered at bilateral meetings of political leaders and statesmen and also in bilateral or multilateral talks at other levels. The practice of political consultations and contacts, which promote the strengthening of mutual understanding between states, is gaining ground. Important political documents have been signed, agreements have been concluded on the development of economic, scientific-technical and cultural relations, and contacts between individuals are also being established, thus making relations between states ever richer and more varied. In conformity with the agreements reached on steps to strengthen confidence, preliminary notice is now being given of major military exercises, and observers are being invited to attend some of them.

Problems of security and cooperation in Europe are a matter of constant concern to progressive political parties and mass organizations. The Berlin Conference of 29 Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe reaffirmed their resolve to strive for broad cooperation among political and social forces in the struggle for specific steps to deepen detente and lessen the danger of war, for disarmament, for the consolidation of peace on the continent.

On the whole, the political atmosphere in Europe is increasingly being freed of the carryovers of the cold war. At the same time the cause of the consolidation of peace in Europe, just as universal peace and the whole process of detente, is

encountering serious difficulties. There still exist certain strong reactionary, militarist and revanchist forces that seek to create conflict situations, at the same time spurring the arms race, calling in question the sovereignty of states and the inviolability of existing frontiers, calling in question the possibility and even the wisdom of a further relaxation of tensions, and trying to revive the old methods of imperialist policy. These forces deliberately provoke intervention in the domestic affairs of other states; they would like to dictate to the peoples what kind of internal order should exist in this or that country, which parties may or may not take part in government activities. Under their influence, attempts are being made to distort the spirit and letter of the Final Act and to misinterpret the principles and accords adopted in Helsinki; hesitations and inconsistencies emerge in the fulfillment of the provisions of the Final Act and in the implementation of steps leading to a further improvement of the international situation.

Developments show that in our time peace and security in Europe are indivisible, that they cannot be a question of choice. The policy of detente has no sane alternative, it is equally needed by all states, irrespective of their social order. This a firm and unalterable point of departure for the Warsaw Treaty member states in all their foreign policy activity.

With the object of maintaining and consolidating that which has already been achieved, it is necessary to press for making international detente irreversible. One must adopt a careful approach to the international commitments undertaken for the strengthening of security in Europe, permit no distortion of these commitments, constantly make fresh advances in mutual understanding and cooperation, and jointly explore avenues leading to the elimination of the sources of possible friction.

This calls for all states which participated in the All-European Conference to act consistently in the spirit of the principles agreed upon in Helsinki and contribute to the adoption of measures aimed at lessening military confrontation and at disarmament on the continent.

The Warsaw Treaty member states are also convinced that strict observance of the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, and renunciation of all attempts to undermine the special status of West Berlin or to use this city for hostile purposes in regard to the German Demo-

cratic Republic and other socialist countries is an obligatory prerequisite for West Berlin being gradually turned into a constructive factor in European cooperation and for its population enjoying all the fruits of detente and a peaceful life. In this context the Warsaw Treaty member states declare their readiness to maintain and develop diverse ties with West Berlin.

The participants in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee believe that it is necessary to intensify efforts to settle the Cyprus problem on the basis of ensuring the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus. All foreign troops must be withdrawn from the territory of Cyprus and the country's internal problems resolved by the Cypriots themselves, with due consideration for the interests of both the Greek and Turkish communities. If one proceeds from the spirit and letter of the Final Act of the European Conference, all the states of Europe, and not Europe alone, should be interested in the speediest possible settlement of the Cyprus problem on precisely such a basis.

The participants in the meeting will support all steps aimed at establishing all over Europe and in its separate parts such interstate relations of good-neighborliness, friendship and cooperation as are a contribution to the common cause of security on the continent.

The Warsaw Treaty member states reaffirm their determination strictly to abide by and carry out all the provisions of the Final Act, which is a single whole. They appeal to all the other states which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to act likewise.

The forthcoming meeting in Belgrade, scheduled for 1977, of representatives of states that participated in the All-European Conference will make it possible to exchange opinions on the positive experience of cooperation among states in the solution of the tasks set in the Final Act, and to continue the exchange of opinions on a multi-lateral basis regarding future efforts with a view to strengthening security and further developing cooperation in Europe, thus furthering the process of a relaxation of tensions in the future as well.

The participants in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee assess the prospects of a further development of the situation in Europe with optimism and confidence in its solid progress. They are convinced that despite the opposition of

the forces of militarism and reaction, the joint efforts of states in building a peaceable and peace-loving Europe can and will continue in the interests of all European peoples, the interests of creating conditions under which they will be reliably protected from any threat to, or any attempt on, their security.

## II.

To stop the arms race and arrive at disarmament, most especially nuclear disarmament, and to do away once and for all with the threat of a new world war are the most acute and urgent tasks of our time. Unless this is achieved, it will be impossible to make the positive tendencies in the development of international relations truly irreversible, and equally impossible to ensure genuine security in the world.

The Warsaw Treaty member states share the anxiety of all peoples over the fact that the arms race continues unabated and on an ever broader scope. Gigantic resources are being spent on war preparations. The destructive power of weapons of mass annihilation is increasing. The most powerful arsenal of up-to-date arms, including nuclear arms, and equally powerful armed forces have been concentrated on the European continent, and foreign war bases continue to function.

The peoples must be clearly aware that the responsibility for all of this rests squarely with the most aggressive imperialist circles—world reaction—whose policy is to intensify the arms race. And if our own countries too have had to take steps to strengthen their armed forces, diverting vital resources from their national economies, from the constructive purposes of socialist and communist construction, this has been done solely in the interests of ensuring reliable defenses for the peaceful labor of our peoples, as a deterrent to the forces of militarism and war.

Our countries are confirmed opponents of the arms race and herewith express their desire and readiness actively and constructively to cooperate with all states in finding a solution to this important problem confronting mankind. We believe that today certain realistic preconditions do exist for bringing about a reduction in the stockpiling of arms, thus ensuring a transition to disarmament.

These preconditions are: the widespread aspirations of the peoples for peace, for the elimination of

military confrontation and the threat of war from international affairs; the realities themselves of the nuclear age, when any military conflict may grow into a nuclear cataclysm with all its disastrous consequences. Hence the strictest observance of all operating treaties and agreements designed to curb and to limit the arms race is of exceptional importance.

A wide range of questions centering on the struggle for disarmament and the consolidation of security has been defined in the documents of congresses of the fraternal Parties of our countries, notably in the Final Document of the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe. Constructive ideas in this field have also been advanced by other states and by representatives of various public circles. The basic question now is to put the existing initiatives into effect, to advance along the road of achieving mandatory, effective international agreements in the sphere of disarmament.

The states represented at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee wish to remind all participants in the All-European Conference that they have acknowledged an interest in efforts aimed at reducing military confrontation and facilitating disarmament, efforts that are called upon to supplement political detente in Europe and to strengthen security. Guided by their desire to facilitate the realization of this common interest, the Warsaw Treaty countries have of late come out with fresh initiatives aimed at making progress in the Vienna talks on reductions of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. They attach great importance to these talks and are prepared to exert further efforts for the sake of working out generally acceptable accords. They are convinced that achieving such accords is a wholly possible goal provided all parties to the talks apply the agreed upon principle of not prejudicing the security of any of the parties, and if the security interests of all European states are taken into consideration.

The participants in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee advocate that the process of reductions of armed forces and armaments should develop along increasingly positive lines both in Central Europe and throughout the European continent. This refers both to the various countries' national armed forces and forces stationed on alien territory.

The Warsaw Treaty member states advocate an

end to the nuclear arms race, as well as reductions in and (eventual total) liquidation of nuclear arms, and also a complete and general ban on all nuclear tests. They advocate strengthening the conditions of the nonproliferation of nuclear arms with, at the same time, access of all states, without any discrimination, to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy under effective international controls, in conformity with the rules of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Guided by their desire to take another effective step toward averting the threat of nuclear war, they propose that all states which signed the Final Act conclude a treaty designed to attain this aim—a treaty wherein they all agree not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other—and they express the hope that this proposal will be favorably received.

They regard as strictly necessary an international understanding on banning and destroying chemical weapons and on banning the development of new types and new systems of weapons of mass annihilation.

They attach great importance to the conclusion of agreements on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, to the exerting of fresh efforts on an international scale for the dismantling of war bases on alien territories and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other states, for the setting up of peace zones in various regions, and for achieving reductions in the military budgets of states.

The states participating in the Warsaw Treaty confirm their readiness to hold constructive talks on all these questions within the framework of the UN as well as at other international forums. They call for the holding of a special session of the UN General Assembly on questions of disarmament as a stage along the way to a World Disarmament Conference.

The conclusion of a World Treaty on the Non-Use of Force in International Relations could be a major step forward in consolidating the relaxation of world tensions and world peace. The states participating in the Warsaw Treaty consider the draft of such a treaty, which has already been submitted for discussion by the United Nations Organization, a good foundation for the achievement of general accord. They are ready to take part in talks on concrete clauses in the draft treaty and to sign it together with other interested states.

The interests of a far-reaching normalization of international relations require that the division of the world into hostile military blocs should be done away with. The participants in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee confirm their readiness to disband the Warsaw Treaty Organization simultaneously with the disbanding of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and, as the first step, to disband their twin military organizations. They urge all states to refrain from taking any action that might lead to the expansion of existing closed groupings and military-political alliances, or to the establishment of new ones. The simultaneous suspension of Article 9 of the Warsaw Treaty and Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which allow for expanding participation by the admission of new states, could be a practical move in this direction.

The states participating in the Warsaw Treaty are ready to enter into negotiations on this question. They would also give consideration to any other proposals concerning a gradual weakening of the military confrontation in Europe and a lessening of the danger of accidentally created conflict situations.

Nevertheless, while the NATO bloc continues to exist and increase its military potential, the states participating in the Warsaw Treaty will also continue to undertake all necessary measures within the framework of that Treaty, so as constantly to guarantee strong security to their peoples.

### III.

The states participating in the Warsaw Treaty express confidence that the broadening of all-around cooperation between all countries and peoples in Europe is the correct road toward strengthening the foundations of peace on the continent. Much has already been achieved in this direction.

Economic cooperation between states on the European continent, including states with different social systems, has now reached a higher level than ever before. Experience confirms that the development of contacts in trade, industry, science and technology accords with the interests of all states and serves as a considerable stimulus to economic progress and the improvement of living standards for each of the peoples involved.

At the same time, not nearly all opportunities for

mutually profitable cooperation in this area are being used at the present time.

Furthermore, frequent attempts are being made by some states to use economic contacts as instruments for political pressure on other states. This goal is specifically being served by some of the capitalist countries maintaining discriminatory restrictions on trade with the socialist countries, restrictions inherited from the cold war era. These artificial barriers must be discarded and elements of inequality must be wholly done away with, if the development of reciprocally profitable economic relations is to be continued. The Final Act of the All-European Conference expresses recognition by all the states which signed it of the fact that the development of (East-West) trade could be favorably affected by implementation of the most-favored-nation status. The peoples are waiting for such recognition to be translated into practical actions based on reciprocity. It should also be taken into account that the Final Act contains the recognition of specific problems which stem from differences in the European countries' economic development.

The participants in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee express their firm intention to assist the continued development of long-term and large-scale cooperation with all other interested states on both a bilateral and multilateral basis, this to take such forms as production, scientific and technical cooperation and specialization, and compensation contracts. The establishment of equal commercial relations between the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the member states of CMEA on the one hand, and the European Economic Community and the member states of the EEC on the other hand, would accord with their mutual interests.

The states participating in the Warsaw Treaty consider it important to advance the development and concretization, on an all-European scale, of major cooperative measures in environmental protection, transport, and power engineering, all stemming from the Final Act of the All-European Conference. On the basis of past experience in international cooperation, specifically within the framework of the UN Economic Commission for Europe, it seems advisable to discuss these questions from a practical viewpoint in the immediate future, at interstate conferences on a European scale.

The states participating in the Warsaw Treaty welcome the Soviet Union's readiness to ensure the holding of an interstate conference in Moscow on power engineering if the interested states agree to it.

The participants in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee proceed from the fact that the development of economic cooperation in Europe cannot be isolated from economic contacts on a world scale. They urge the restructuring of international economic relations on an equitable democratic foundation, on the basis of equality for all states, large and small, socialist and capitalist, industrialized and developing. In this connection they endorse the highly principled program of international cooperation that was proposed by the developing and non-aligned countries.

Broader cooperation in such areas as culture, science, education, information and contacts between individuals is expected to continue influencing and improving the political climate of Europe, parallel with the development of economic cooperation. During the last few years, some very encouraging results have been achieved in this direction. On the whole, the implementation of relevant accords spelled out in the Final Act of the All-European Conference is proceeding satisfactorily.

But it has also become clear that certain forces are trying to use the development of these contacts for purposes hostile to achieving new understanding and friendship between peoples, and even for interfering in the domestic affairs of states. The states participating in the Warsaw Treaty find it necessary to reaffirm that this is a road without a future, and that they reject it.

The Final Act of the All-European Conference contains numerous accords, on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis, concerning a broad spectrum of cooperation in the humanitarian fields, and sets down conditions for the concretization of such opportunities. The states represented at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee are ready to negotiate ever fuller implementation of these opportunities as well as to improve their effectiveness, so that every country might be able to take part in a broad exchange of genuine spiritual values. For these purposes it would be specifically useful to carry through activities on an all-European level, including festivals, competitions, exhibitions and other artistic and cultural measures.

It is also vitally necessary for the mass media to carry truthful information to the public about events in the world, something that would serve to bring the peoples closer together and would also prevent reaction from using these media against peace and cooperation on the continent.

The participants in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee lay great stress on humanitarian questions, inasmuch as they proceed from the principles of socialist humanitarianism and consider it important to ensure all human beings on the continent decent living and working conditions, an end to unemployment, and free access to the latest achievements of science, technology and culture.

The strengthening of European security cannot be divorced from the desire of the peoples for future generations to live and develop in conditions of peace and cooperation, fully discovering their creative forces and potentialities. This is precisely why the rising generation is called upon directly and actively to take part in the consolidation of peace. The states participating in the Budapest meeting consider it important to pay special attention to the implementation of various programs which might help educate the youth in the spirit of the ideals of humanism, peace and progress.

Much can be done, given good will and an approach based on equality. The Warsaw Treaty member states are ready to respond favorably to all initiatives by other countries that truly promote mutual understanding and friendship between peoples.

#### IV.

The participants in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee note with great satisfaction the development of all-around cooperation among the socialist countries they represent. At the same time the sociopolitical nature, the purposes and content of their relations and their mutual fraternal ties are in no way opposed to relations with other states of Europe. Such cooperation among them, as was confirmed by the experience of the All-European Conference, fully accords with the interests of peace throughout the European continent. It is, in fact, a factor that stimulates all-European cooperation in strengthening peace and security, as well as in advancing the economy and

culture and the spiritual enrichment of the peoples.

The Warsaw Treaty member states, united by their common socialist order, their allegiance to the cause of peace, democracy and national independence, reaffirm their resolve constantly to continue strengthening their mutual cooperation on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and international solidarity, respect for equality and the sovereignty of each state, noninterference in each other's internal affairs and comradely mutual assistance.

The states participating in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee are fully resolved in future:

—to continue, and to expand, effective cooperation in the strengthening of peace in Europe as well as universal peace, which, specifically, will be facilitated by the decision of this meeting to set up a committee of foreign ministers and a joint secretariat of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty;

—to deepen political contacts among the fraternal peoples, including the continued practice of holding consultative meetings of members of Parliament, and also representatives of the public, for the purpose of discussing topical problems of international importance; to expand mutual information and exchanges of experience on socialist and communist construction; to promote the development of contacts between state and public organizations and between labor collectives;

—to develop bilateral and multilateral cooperation in all spheres of the economy, in the application of the achievements of scientific and technological progress for further raising the material and spiritual well-being of their peoples, to promote together with other states members of the CMEA the ever fuller implementation of the Comprehensive Program, the fulfillment of the decisions of the 30th session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance concerning jointly working out and implementing long-term, goal-oriented programs. The joint flights of cosmonauts from socialist countries in Soviet spaceships and stations, planned for 1978-83, will be a striking manifestation of the high level of cooperation in science and technology;

—to cement cultural cooperation, exchanges of literary and artistic values, contacts between professional unions, twin regions and cities, and to encourage broader tourist contacts and communication between individuals.

The participants in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee declare the resolve of each of their countries to strengthen all-around and equal cooperation and friendship with socialist states that are not participants in the Warsaw Treaty. They express their firm belief that solidarity between all the socialist countries accords with the interests of each of them separately and of the world socialist system as a whole, as well as the interests of universal peace and progress.

## V.

The delegations from the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Rumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic have also held an exchange of opinions on other international questions of common interest.

They welcomed the historic victories of the peoples of Indochina. The participants in the meeting express satisfaction over the fact that, together with other fraternal states, united socialist Vietnam is making a significant contribution to the struggle of peoples for freedom and independence on the Asian continent and in the rest of the world. They welcome the birth of the People's Democratic Republic of Laos, which has started building the foundations of socialist society, as well as the establishment of Democratic Kampuchea.

The states represented at the meeting support the course of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the peaceful and democratic unification of the country without any interference from the outside, as well as the demand that all foreign troops be pulled out of South Korea.

The participants in the meeting emphasize the firm intention of their countries to continue developing ramified cooperation and comradely coordination with any emerging states that are socialist-oriented. Regardless of all the possible differences in the choice of form for building a new society, the socialist countries and the socialist-oriented states are natural allies in the struggle for peace and the security of peoples.

It is noted with gratification that the developing Afro-Asian and Latin American countries are playing an ever greater role in world affairs. The fifth nonaligned summit (meeting) in Colombo reaffirmed their positive role in international life. The states represented at the (Bucharest) meeting



have a firm intention to cement cooperation with these countries in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, for strengthening national independence, peace and social progress.

The states represented at the Bucharest meeting confirm their support of the struggle being waged by the Arab states and peoples for a just political settlement of the Middle East conflict. They unanimously consider that such a settlement requires the withdrawal of all Israeli troops from Arab territories occupied in 1967; realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arabs, including their right to establish their own state; guarantees of rights to an independent existence for all states participating in the conflict, including Israel, and finally an end to the state of war between the Arab states concerned and Israel. These questions must make up the agenda of the Geneva Conference on Peace in the Middle East, which should resume in the immediate future with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization. The Middle East conflict can and must be settled. This is an absolute necessity, not only as regards the interests of all peoples in the area, but also the interests of world peace.

The participants in the meeting strongly urge immediate normalization (of the situation) in Lebanon, a peaceful solution of all the internal problems of that country by the Lebanese themselves, without any outside interference, and with due consideration given to the legitimate rights and interests of the Palestine resistance movement, as represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization.

On behalf of their states and peoples, the participants in the meeting confirm their readiness to continue giving aid and support to the Zimbabwe, Namibian and South African peoples in their selfless struggle against the racist regimes, apartheid, and neocolonialist plots, and for putting into practice the UN decisions on the liquidation of colonialism and racism.

Together with all the progressive forces of mankind, the socialist states raise their voice in support of the Chilean people's heroic struggle for the restoration of the legitimate constitutional order in Chile, for the release of that outstanding son of the Chilean people, Luis Corvalan, and other political prisoners.

The participants in the meeting note that the international working-class movement and all public forces are playing an important role in the

struggle for peace and international security. They confirm their readiness to cooperate with all progressive and democratic movements, with all peaceful forces, for the sake of building a durable peace in Europe and the rest of the world.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Rumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic declare the following:

—It is necessary to mount every effort in the struggle to deepen world detente, completely to eliminate all carryovers of the cold war, and to consolidate peace and develop international co-operation.

—Active effort on the part of all states, all political and public forces aware of their responsibility to the present and coming generations, is required to achieve new victories in solving these historic problems.

All those who truly wish to participate in the planning and realization of such actions will find the socialist countries and their peoples to be loyal and reliable allies.

For the People's Republic of Bulgaria,  
TODOR ZHIVKOV,  
First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria

For the Hungarian People's Republic,  
JANOS KADAR,  
First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

For the Polish People's Republic,  
EDWARD GIEREK,  
First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party

For the German Democratic Republic,  
ERICH HONECKER,  
General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic

For the Socialist Republic of Rumania,  
NICOLAE CEAUSESCU,  
General Secretary of the Rumanian Communist Party, President of the Socialist Republic of Rumania

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,  
**LEONID I. BREZHNEV**,  
General Secretary of the Central Committee  
of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

For the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic,  
**GUSTAV HUSAK**,  
General Secretary of the Central Committee  
of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Presi-  
dent of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic

# Proposal by Warsaw Treaty Member States

The leaders of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, meeting for a conference of the Political Consultative Committee in Bucharest on November 25-26, 1976, discussed questions concerning the prevention of war, a deepening of international detente, and the struggle for strengthening security and developing mutually beneficial cooperation in Europe.

They pointed out that the period that followed the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe bears out the great positive significance of the results of the Conference and the commitments undertaken by its participants under the Final Act.

Aware at the same time that political reality dictates the need for stepping up efforts to strengthen peace in Europe and throughout the world, and expressing their determination to act

precisely in this direction—as stated by the member nations of the Warsaw Treaty in the special Conference Declaration—they have come to the conclusion that these aims would best be served if all the states signatories to the Final Act pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons one against another.

By general agreement of the Warsaw Treaty member states—the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Rumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic—the present letter is accompanied by a draft of a relevant agreement for consideration by all other states that participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

## Draft Treaty Proposed at Bucharest Conference

The states, participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, named hereinafter as the High Contracting Parties, inspired by the aims and provisions of the Final Act of the Conference;

desiring to undertake in common a fresh action aimed at strengthening confidence among them, at weakening military confrontation and at assisting disarmament;

expressing their will to act in accordance with the aims and principles of the UN Charter;

determined not to allow the use or threats of use of nuclear weapons against one another;

striving to make their contribution to lessening the danger of nuclear war in Europe and all over the world, have pledged as follows:

### *Article 1*

Not to be the first to use nuclear weapons one

against the other, either on land, on the seas, in the air or in outer space.

### *Article 2*

The commitment established by Article 1 shall apply not only to the national territory of the states, but also to their armed forces in whatever area of the world they may be.

### *Article 3*

This Treaty is for an unlimited period.

### *Article 4*

The Treaty shall be open for signature by any state which signed in the city of Helsinki the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe on August 1, 1975.

### *Article 5*

1. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by the states which signed it. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Govern-

ment of . . . , which shall be named as the depository state.

2. The Treaty shall go into effect for each of the High Contracting Parties from the time of the deposition of its instruments of ratification.

#### Article 6

1. This Treaty, written in the Russian, English,

Spanish, Italian, French and German languages, all texts being equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Government of . . . .

2. The Treaty shall be registered in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations Organization.

## COMMUNICATIONS

### On the Leninist Conception of Mind and Matter

BILL WHITNEY

In connection with the discussion on the philosophical questions of "Non-materiality and Base and Super-structure" in *Political Affairs* (November 1976) I make the following observations:

Reynolds seems so anxious to maintain the primacy of matter over thought, of being over consciousness, that he loses sight of some of the subtleties of consciousness itself and, as a result, misreads Hoffman's quite original analysis of this question. (*Marxism and the Theory of Praxis*, pp. 97-98.) In his reply to Colman, it seems to me, he tends to argue by taking words, phrases and ideas of the context in which both Hoffman and Colman put them. I think an even stronger case for Hoffman's position can be made than Colman succeeded in doing, at least on two questions.

All Marxists agree that knowledge (thought) is ideational and reflects the objective reality (material world) upon which the subject (man, the knower) focuses his attention. It is clear that as between the objective, outside material and the ideal product of mind (thought and knowledge couched in language form, as well as sensation), the latter reflects the former according to the materialist theory of reflection. In this sense, being (the material, outside reality) stands prior to the ideal or "spiritual" outcome. It is in this sense, too, that Lenin conducted his polemic against various forms of idealist philosophy in *Materialism and Empirio-*

*Criticism: materialism in general* vs. all sorts of idealism.

But when we focus on the agent that ultimately "creates" the ideal product we run into some subtleties (that Hoffman was well aware of). First, it is clear that the obvious agent (the brain and nervous system) is material. The question, however, that must be asked and answered is: "What exactly is the consciousness?" Is it the ideal *product* of the functioning of the brain, as Reynolds would seem to maintain (in which case it exists only in the forms of sensations and thoughts, etc.) or is it the peculiar *activity* or process of the brain, i.e. *thinking* (not the chemico-electrical phenomena that occur in the brain) that *molds* the ideational output, as Hoffman proposes?

In Reynolds' view, thought and consciousness are linked together as ideal; in Hoffman's view thought (the ideal outcome) and consciousness, or at least that aspect of consciousness which involves thinking as an active process, are different in that the latter has a material mode. Can any argument be made for this view?

Let us examine more closely the meanings of the terms used in this discussion, and first probe a few questions.

Is it the material brain that directly reflects the outside material world, or is it the human consciousness that does so? "Dialectical materialism proceeds from the fact that consciousness is a property not of any matter

but of *highly organized* matter. Consciousness is *connected* with the activity of the human brain." (*Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 102. Emphasis added.) Thus, the physical and chemical activities in the human brain are a *concomitant* of consciousness but are not themselves the human consciousness. Additional quotations in this chapter of *Fundamentals* show that the *essence* of consciousness lies in the reflection of reality, but that the process of reflection is not a *passive one* but rather an *active one*, even a *selective one*. Hence, consciousness is an activity as well as, at any given time, an already stored "integrated system of diverse but connected cognitive and emotional-volitional elements" (*ibid.*, p. 108), among which we may name sensations, perceptions, representations, imaginings, concepts, judgments, references, etc. that have been previously made. Thus it would appear that consciousness has two aspects: 1) the active part of doing the sensing, thinking, imagining, etc. and 2) the results of these

#### CORRECTION

A printing error in Joseph Reynold's *Response to Colman* in the November 1976 *Political Affairs* changed the meaning of one sentence to its opposite. Instead of "Hoffman precisely (and not incorrectly) . . .", the sentence should read "Hoffman imprecisely (and incorrectly) refers to empiricism as idealist." (Page 56, first paragraph, third sentence.)

activities or processes (mostly couched in language form). Now I think we can safely say, from the point of view of dialectical materialism, that it is not the physico-chemical functioning of the brain per se that produces new thoughts, concepts, etc. but rather the functioning, the activity of the *already developed consciousness* that does this. Colman gave a good account of this process in his article. In this sense, it is really the consciousness that has the capacity to reflect the outside world and it is the consciousness that actively and selectively does so. The brain is the material substratum that must be present before human consciousness can be called into being and can develop but, once being present, then the human consciousness develops according to its own history and experience.

Hoffman and Colman state that consciousness is material (or at least has a material mode) because if it has the specific property of being able to reflect reality, that property must inhere in something that is material. But material in what sense? Certainly not in the sense of matter as we usually refer to it in the physical sciences, as substance, rather as matter that exists in the materialist-dialectical philosophical sense. Let me give an example of this sense by means of a quotation: "Human society is in its essence and nature the most complex form of existence of *matter*." (*Ibid.*, p. 271. Emphasis added.) Now it is quite clear that human *society* is not matter in the sense of substance either, but that does not prevent dialectical materialists from defining it as a form or mode of matter and studying its laws and development via historical materialism. I think that it is in this sense that Hoffman attributed materiality to consciousness. After all, Lenin defined matter philosophically: "Matter is a *philosophical category* denoting the *objective reality* which is given to man by his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 280-281.)

In this sense, *consciousness*, even though it resides in the brain of the

knower, stands "objectified," can generate additional elements of consciousness by operating on its already stored elements, thus reflecting the latter on a higher level. This is in consonance with the statement on p. 112 of *Fundamentals*, "He reproduces in his head objects and phenomena through the prism of the knowledge he has already acquired—his representations and concepts." The question may be asked: If consciousness is to reflect outside reality (materiality) how can new thoughts which are derived from previously developed thoughts (ideal) be said to meet that criterion? Here it must be recalled that we are dealing with authentic knowledge (tested in practice), so that even if the *new* knowledge is derived as a "second generational content" from reality, it is based on authentic first knowledge. Also, it will have to stand the test of practice, even as "first generational" knowledge does. Thus, all authentic knowledge, no matter when or how generated, reflects reality, the materiality of the outside world. What is suggested here is both an explanation (description) of the workings of the consciousness *and* a refutation of the Praxist contention that Marxist counterposing of being and consciousness leads to an irreconcilable and non-dialectical separation of the two, which is the Praxist error that Hoffman was trying to "answer" by his analysis in the first place. If Reynolds insists on taking the position that consciousness is ideal in toto, he must still address himself to the Praxist charge of "dualism" in this question. Unlike Hoffman, he has not attempted to do this.

As Hoffman points out on page 97 of his book, this description of the nature of consciousness serves as an explanation of a "mechanism" of how thinking takes place. The mere fact that neither Marx, Engels nor Lenin got around to analyzing consciousness on this level should not preclude succeeding Marxists from doing so. It appears to me that Reynolds, by using statements made by Lenin—when he was considering the problem of priority of being over consciousness on a "lower" level, in polemics against *elementary* idealism—

as a total refutation of Hoffman and Colman is just "closing the book" on any attempt to examine a real question of dialectical materialism.

On the question of the nature and relationship of basis and superstructure, I think we can establish greater clarity. There can be no question about the dialectical relationship between the level of the forces of production and the relations of production. The type of relations of production is always basically determined by the level of development of the productive forces (referred to as the law of correspondence—see *Fundamentals*, p. 318) but "it is the productive relations that determine the *social* nature of every mode of production" (emphasis added). By the latter is meant, for instance, that the social nature of commodity production and exchange is different under socialism (as one type of production relations) than it is under capitalism, even though the *technical organization* of production and exchange may be quite similar under both systems of society. The social difference lies in which class derives the use of the surplus value created by the worker in each society. The disagreement between Reynolds and Colman turns on what constitutes the basis for the *formation* of superstructure. Colman and Hoffman include "the level of productive forces" in the basis, Reynolds insists on leaving it out. In *Fundamentals*, p. 336, the quote "the basis is the economic structure of society, the sum total of the *productive relations* of the given society" (emphasis added) would seem to uphold Reynolds' position. Yet a subsequent sentence, "*While they are a form of the material productive forces*, the productive relations at the same time determine the content of the superstructural forms" (emphasis added) would seem to indicate that the level of productive forces are *somewhat* involved. That would also normally follow from the logic of the law of correspondence of production relations to the character and level of development of productive forces. However, there is no question but that production relations are the *paramount* basis of the superstructure.

The question of whether Hoffman and Colman are making a serious error by stating "that the economic basis only exists at all because it is related to the superstructure above it," as Reynolds charges, would be cleared up if Hoffman had written "continues to exist." Clearly we have established that the basis determines *the origin, the emergence* of the superstructure.

Hoffman's use of "exists" in a continuing sense is quite correct, for obviously, if the superstructure has any socio-political function at all it is to guarantee the continued life of the existing socio-economic basis. In this way Hoffman's concept of a unity of basis and superstructure is perfectly reasonable, and he does, on page 114, recognize the ultimate primacy of basis.

I find nothing wrong with Hoffman's dialectical analysis of the *ongoing* relationship of basis and superstructure.

In sum, I agree with Reynolds that Hoffman has produced a magnificent "answer" to the "praxists," but he has done it by a careful and basically correct exposition and expansion of Marxism. □

## On the Colman-Reynolds Exchange

HYMAN COHEN

Joseph Reynolds did a poor job of criticizing John Hoffman in the June and November 1976 issues of PA. Hoffman, in his book *Marxism and the Theory of Praxis* (International Publishers), credited Lenin with showing the mind/matter contrast to be an epistemological one. (P. 97-98.) The author was not as clear as he should have been, and, perhaps warrants criticism on those grounds. Reynolds, however, charges Hoffman with making a basic error in philosophy. To do this is wrong because Hoffman gave us a correct picture of Lenin's views on the subject, and Lenin was not guilty of any mistake on this score.

There are many things to talk about in PA, but I want to take just a few moments to back up my views on the Leninist conception of mind and matter. This is important because the subject seems to pop up in our journal fairly often. Using long and frequent quotations makes for awkward reading, and, more importantly, often betrays a scholastic approach to philosophy. Rather, I urge people who are interested in the issue to read chapter four of Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. Then they can make up their own minds.

The concepts of mind and matter are used in an absolute sense only within the limits set by epistemology. Lenin says that it is impossible to define mind and matter save in a fashion that shows which is primary. When he gives a definition, Lenin brings "a given concept within a more comprehensive concept." (P. 145.) Mind and matter are

the ultimate and most comprehensive of all concepts because they are the most inclusive.

Joseph Dietzgen, a militant philosopher of the working class, falsely asserted that the concept of matter should also include thoughts. Lenin corrected Dietzgen on this specific point, and it was within the context of this correction that he deemed it wrong to say that thought is material. No one involved in our discussion of the issue disagrees with Lenin on this point. However, if we wish to understand Lenin, and not simply to quote him, we must ask *why* he corrected Dietzgen.

Lenin knew that Dietzgen's inclusion of thoughts within the conception of matter destroyed the meaning of the mind/matter contrast, at least within the realm of epistemology. Such an inclusion makes it impossible to give a clear answer to the question, "Is matter primary in relation to mind?" A consistent materialist cannot clearly say that matter is primary in relation to mind, that existence precedes consciousness, if she or he also places an equal sign between the two concepts.

Fortunately, Lenin was a very clear thinker. He defined the area within which he thought his propositions were true. The mind/matter contrast holds true absolutely and is necessary only within the limits set by the problems of epistemology. The materialist, the Marxist, who erases this contrast within the set limits gives a service to idealism. The same materialist who pushes the mind/matter contrast beyond the set limits also makes a great mistake, one

that leads to sad consequences.

Ivan Pavlov, the great Soviet psychologist, once said that a time would come when the objective and the subjective would merge; the contra-position of mind and body would disappear, and a human being would be seen as an indivisible whole. (See *Psychopathology and Psychiatry*, Moscow, p.297.) Place this proposition within the limits of epistemology, and you can label it false. Pavlov, it seems, repeats Dietzgen's error. However, life gives us other realms of investigation besides epistemology.

Pavlov made the above proposition while giving a lecture on psychopathology. He was sure that the symptoms of hysteria can be grasped solely from the study of the higher nervous activity. A proponent of the objective method in psychology, Pavlov saw no use in the study of a patient's subjective state as a means of cure. Someone who holds the mind/matter contrast to be absolute would differ with Pavlov. That person would urge the study of the mind as a separate category. Idealistic psychology does this. Whatever the case, "mind" plays no role as a distinct concept when investigation is conducted by the objective method. This is true within the limits of psychology.

Strange friends await the materialist who fails to limit the absolute contrast of mind and matter. Praxist philosophers fill page after page with the argument that thought cannot be an objective, law governed process. Since the mind is non-material, they say, it stands outside of space and time. Ergo,

natural laws do not affect it. The mind, it seems, makes up its own laws, and it is these laws that form the dialectic. Women and men use this dialectic to fashion the world in their own image. Said activity is "praxis."

Jean-Paul Sartre, the patriarch of praxist philosophers, rails at Marx and Lenin. Sartre just hates the idea that thought is a "pure psycho-physiological determination," that is, an objective, law-governed process. He writes that thought has a "primary quality, which is its relation to the object." (See *Search for a Method*, New York, p.33.) This is a fuzzy, round-about way of saying that mind is primary in its relation to matter. Sartre attempts the same feat as that of Lenin's opponents in philosophy, namely, to separate Marxism from its materialist foundations. The French writer even implies that Marx was pre-Marxist, an idea that makes sense only if you happen to be Sartre.

Lenin went directly to the heart of the

issue. He argued that the brain is one development in the process of nature, and that, in turn, nature is reflected in the human brain. (See *Reader in Marxist Philosophy*, International Publishers, p. 346.) This is a material process, occurring in time and space, objective and law-governed. Pavlov was later able to concretely prove what Lenin said. The former discovered that the frontal lobes of the brain are subject to general laws of development, the frontal lobes being the organ of higher human mentality.

Joseph Reynolds tends to get a little picqued when some of us disagree with him on this point. He could say in his response that I have been very silly, that I have said at one point that thought is not material, and then said at another point that thought is material. However, this is not such a silly thing to say. It is one thing to argue, as Lenin did, that the extension of the concept "matter" to include the concept "mind"

is an error within the realm of epistemology. It is quite another thing to argue, as Pavlov did, that the investigation of human mental activity should be limited to the physiological within the realm of psychology. Lenin and Pavlov do not disagree. Both considered thought to be an objective, law-governed process. Whatever contradiction exists is the result of the movement of human knowledge from one area of life to another.

Of course, it may be possible to take a sort of Incarnate Word approach to the question, viz., that the mind is *in* the flesh, but not *of* the flesh. This just will not do for modern thought. To say that thought is *based* on the material process of the brain is to make a statement within the limits of epistemology, a statement that is necessary in order to preserve the integrity of materialism in its debate with idealism. Such propositions are intended to *assist* the development of human knowledge, not to put it in a death grip. □

---

## Upper Midwest Conference on Marxism and New-Left Ideology

MARC H. COHEN AND ERWIN MARQUIT

A conference on "Marxism and New-Left Ideology," sponsored by the Minnesota Marxist Scholars, was held November 20-21 in Minneapolis at the University of Minnesota. About 50 persons, mostly faculty and graduate students from universities in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Iowa, attended the sessions.

The calling of the conference was connected with the observation that too often one encounters discussions at academic meetings and in scholarly journals which purport to approach their subject matter from a Marxist viewpoint, when in fact the approach has little in common with the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin and those who continue their tradition today. Many academic workers who wish to become more familiar with Marxist methods in their fields face a formidable task in

cutting through the "overgrowth of (bourgeois) ideology" that seeks to choke out the healthy development of Marxist thought and turn Marxism into a sterile intellectual parlor game incapable of serving the cause of social and scientific progress. The conference was therefore convened to explore sources of misunderstandings and distortions of Marxism on the academic level as a first step toward the delineation of a consistent approach to the application of the powerful Marxist methodology to various fields of study by scholars in the Upper Midwest States.

The conference opened with an analysis of general characteristics of New-Left positions in the United States and Western Europe. The major points of New-Left ideology include constant efforts to draw distinctions between

the young and older Marx; the rejection of the industrial proletariat as a revolutionary force; concentration on "marginal groups" (as Herbert Marcuse calls them) as agents of social change; preoccupation with elements in the superstructure (such as the "culture industry") as divorced from the economic basis of society; rejection of a working-class party organization; anti-Sovietism and other forms of hostility to socialist countries; romanticization of "Third-World" struggles; concealing of reactionary ideology under a cloak of pseudo-dialectics; reliance on spontaneity; and distortion of the relationship of theory to practice.

A detailed review was presented of the book, *The Philosophy of Revolt*, a critical look at the New Left by the Soviet philosopher, Eduard Batalov. By examining the most salient traits of

New-Left theory and practice, Batalov approaches his subject critically, but not without sympathy. The radical protest of the 1960's has its source in two tendencies of contemporary society: a radical change in the social function of science and the narrowing of the human base needed for the reproduction of bourgeois relations. The intellectuals are losing the relative freedom they enjoyed in not seeing themselves directly tied to the production of surplus value and in not being the direct object of control and domination. In this situation many intellectuals find themselves in their current dilemma of no longer being bourgeois, but not yet proletarian. This ambiguous class position gives rise to ideological theories which cannot survive the thrust of a rigorous Marxist analysis: first, a view of capitalism based on consumption and technology, rather than on production and relations of production—a view which falsifies the essence of class relations under capitalism and negates class struggle; second, an ultra-leftist emphasis on negation and violence, which distorts the understanding of the revolutionary process and misdirects the emphasis unilaterally to the destructive; third, a utopianism projected beyond the realm of possibility; and fourth, a hostility toward the socialist countries, making impossible a correct assessment of the positive role played by these countries in the world revolutionary process, and manifesting itself in the failure to understand the importance of the process of detente to the peoples' struggles for liberation from imperialism and for the further consolidation of the socialist system.

The discussion on Batalov's book was followed by a historical review of the origins of the New-Left traits analyzed by Batalov.

The final discussion at the opening session was on "Marxism, Revisionism, and the State" and dealt mostly with the

attacks on the Marxist conception of dictatorship of the proletariat. The paper which opened the discussion noted that Marx once remarked that history does indeed repeat itself, the first time as tragedy and the second time as a farce; an instance is the revisionists Bernstein and Kautsky (who tried to deemphasize the revolutionary content of Marxism) as the predecessors of the current rediscovering of a "respectable/young / Hegelian / humanist / social-democratic" Marx. It was shown how shallow are the New-Left assertions that Marx and Engels ignored the bourgeois state; at least eight major works by Marx and Engels on the question of the bourgeois state were cited. Also discussed was the baseless assertion that Marx was an economic determinist, unlike, say, Lenin, who stressed the political aspect. If Marx paid more attention to the economic side than Lenin did, it was because he was dealing with different adversaries. Their respective differences are to be explained *politically*, that is, by reference to the internal politics of the socialist movement. A lively discussion ensued around the question of the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism through parliamentary means. In the discussion there was general agreement on the position that all states, regardless of the form, constitute a dictatorship of one class over another in order to maintain definite relations of production and therefore the process of transition to socialism cannot be completed without the transformation of the state into a dictatorship of the proletariat.

The afternoon session opened with a critique of Darko Suvin's recent essay in the *Minnesota Review*, in which he maintained that Engels' concept of scientific socialism was contrary to Marx's views and had no relevance to the present period. The critique pointed out that Suvin's contentions are based on a distorted view of Marx, a confusion of dialectics with metaphysics, and a

rejection of historical materialism and, with it, the concept of class struggle.

The next subject of discussion was the West German New-Left philosopher Jürgen Habermas and his vast revisions and critiques of Marx. Habermas was shown as obliterating the distinction between capitalist and socialist countries, as seeing technology, rather than labor, as the source of value, and as believing that social transformation must occur through a classless "public sphere," rather than through class struggle.

The final discussion of the afternoon, "New-Left Theories on the Mode of Production," dealt with abuses of Marxist analysis and terminology, particularly with relation to the developing countries. It was shown that these theories, which are prevalent among the New Left in Latin America, usually involve confusion between the concepts of mode of production and of the economic formation of the society. A single economic formation can embrace several modes of production, one of which, however, is a dominant one.

At the next morning's session, a paper written by an inmate in the federal prison system was read. The paper stressed the importance of a continuing struggle against the use of the prison system as an instrument of class oppression.

The final discussion of the conference outlined the theoretical views of leading contributors to the New-Left journal *Telos* on such topics as the working class in the United States and class consciousness. In view of the importance of the class question in Marxist theory, it was decided to schedule another regional conference in May 1977 on the subject of class in the contemporary United States. It was also decided to arrange for the publication of the papers that were presented at the conference. □

---

# HOLD THIS DATE: 1977

**ANNIVERSARY TOURS HAS GROUP-TOURS TO JOIN  
SOVIET PEOPLE IN CELEBRATING**

**THE 60th ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION**

**THESE GROUPS WILL BE IN MOSCOW  
MAY 1st & NOV. 7th.**

**WRITE OR TELEPHONE NOW!**



**ANNIVERSARY TOURS**

250 West 57th Street  
New York, N.Y. 10019  
(212) 245-7501

1741 Ivar Avenue  
Hollywood, Calif. 90028  
(213) 465-6141

---