

AUGUST, 1976

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

1976 ELECTION CAMPAIGN

THE FIGHT FOR NEW YORK CITY

Jarvis Tyner

THE PEOPLE'S FIGHT FOR BALLOT RIGHTS

Si Gerson

IQ THINKING: ITS EFFECT ON THE SCHOOLS

Ellen Tucker

COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A
PROMISE BETRAYED

Bea Lumpkin

ULTRA-LEFTISM: TROJAN HORSE
OF IMPERIALISM

Communist Party of Chile

\$1.00



1909-1976



HYMAN LUMER, Editor
BARRY COHEN, Asst. Editor

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

VOL. LV. NO. 8

AUGUST, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Communist Party, USA

A Tribute to Hyman Lumer 3

ELECTION CAMPAIGN

Jarvis Tynner

The Fight for New York City in the 1976 Elections 5

Si Gerson

The People's Fight for Ballot Rights 15

Ellen Tucker

IQ Thinking: Its Effect on the Schools 24

Bea Lumpkin

Community Colleges: A Promise Betrayed 32

Communist Party of Chile

Ultra-Leftism: Trojan Horse of Imperialism 39

BOOK REVIEWS

Joseph Harris

Economics of Racism, USA 62

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$10.00 a year; \$5.00 for six months; for foreign, including Canada, \$11.00 a year. Single copies \$1.00. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N.Y.

On Wednesday, July 21, Hyman Lumer died of a heart attack while on vacation in Bulgaria. His sudden death is a grievous loss to his family, his friends and comrades, and to the entire working-class and Communist movements.

Comrade Hyman Lumer—Hy as he was universally called—participated in the editorial leadership of *Political Affairs* for over a decade and a half. His work epitomized the requirements of the editor of a Communist theoretical journal combining exacting standards with persistent encouragement of creative work. Hy always regarded *Political Affairs* as a front line fighter in the ideological battle waged by the working class, and he strove in its pages to continuously deepen the foundation of the Communist Party's policy, to advance its campaigns for peace, democracy and socialism, and, not least, to strengthen its organized, conscious, leading role in the working class movement. He was unbending in his defense of the rigorous and principled character of Marxist-Leninist ideology, opposing with equal vigor overt attacks on it and efforts to dilute its content or distort its aims.

While serving as the editor of two journals—*Political Affairs* and *Jewish Affairs*, Hy still found time to write extensively. His writings embody a wide-ranging development and application of Marxist principles. In addition to those articles which have appeared in the pages of this magazine, Hy wrote frequently for journals in other countries, and recently added to his three earlier books on political economy a compilation of Lenin's writings on the Jewish question and an authoritative work on Zionism. Through these writings he deservedly became known to millions in the United States and worldwide.

Hy had an unusual talent for explaining even the most difficult questions in a clear and comprehensible manner, without ever sacrificing accuracy for the sake of simplicity. A genuinely erudite man, he brought an extensive experience and disciplined, scholarly study to bear on his analyses of any problem. For these reasons, Hy's advice was constantly sought. Though frequently ill over the last several years, he never refused such requests for help, but simply added the extra effort required to his already staggering load of writing, teaching, lecturing and organizing.

As for the many others who worked with him, Hy's death is a personal as well as a political loss for us.

The Staff

A Salute to Hyman Lumer

Hyman Lumer was a remarkable activist, a fully dedicated Marxist-Leninist in words and deeds. His passing at the age of 67—when he was so productive—is a great loss to our class, our people and our Party. The deep personal loss suffered by his widow, Dorothy, his two sons, Robert and Ernie, and his stepdaughters, Claudia, Margaret and Linda, and his stepson, Charles is shared by us.

On behalf of all comrades and literally millions who knew of Comrade Lumer, we express our sorrow and lower our banners in respect to him.

Comrade Lumer was a scientist and a scholar who earned his Ph.D. in the field of biology and became a professor at Western Reserve University and at Fenn College in Cleveland.

At a teacher, he helped organize the teachers' union in Cleveland. He soon became fully involved in union organizing during the CIO drive of the 1930's, supporting strikes in auto, steel, electrical and rubber. He left the college campus for class struggles in the mills and became the educational director of the Ohio-Kentucky district of the United Electrical Workers Union from 1947 to 1950.

Within the union he became known as a modest, skillful teacher who was always ready to discuss with shop workers the most elementary as well as the most complicated problems. His approach and his teaching always had a Marxist-Leninist class struggle quality. For this, he was made the victim of a Taft-Hartley frameup and served a term in federal prison.

Fought revisionism

Comrade Lumer was a source of strength against Browder revisionism within the Party and against McCarthyism in the unions. When the Party emerged in the struggles for its rights against the McCarthyist terror and violence, he became a leader in the fight for the Party in struggle against those of the right and left who sought to scrap the Party.

His struggle was always based on fundamental principles of working class solidarity and proletarian and socialist internationalism. He taught and organized on bread-and-butter demands, while fighting the poison of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism. He fought against racism in every area of struggle. He helped weld unity of Black and

white workers together with Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American Indian, Asian-American and all oppressed workers.

His struggle against anti-Semitism was combined with a constant, vigorous fight against Zionism. His writing and activities strengthened the struggle for national liberation, for democracy, peace, social progress and socialism—against imperialism, fascist juntas, neo-colonialism and wars of barbarous aggression and threats of nuclear annihilation.

He condemned U.S. imperialism in every area—Africa, Latin America, Asia and Europe. He called for a solution in the Middle East which would guarantee peace and the rights of the Arabs against Israeli aggression and occupation, for the rights of the Palestinians and the territorial integrity of all Mideast nations, including Israel, in a world at peace.

Comrade Lumer has been a constant champion for Communist Party candidates and participation in the Presidential elections, and for the exposure of and struggle against the twin-party domination of the electoral process by monopoly capital. He struggled to make the elections serve the needs of the people, as against the profit and power of the big business-military combine. He advocated, "Vote Communist" as the most effective vote against monopoly capital.

He wrote many books and pamphlets. Among his books are, *Is Full Employment Possible, Poverty: Its Roots and Its Future*, and *Zionism: Its Role in World Affairs*.

He taught and lectured and debated. He was a working class advocate, a Marxist-Leninist partisan, an unwavering champion of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

We salute his lifetime of great work even as we with heavy hearts mourn this enormous loss of our great comrade and friend, Hyman Lumer.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN

JARVIS TYNER

The Fight for New York City in the 1976 Election *

The 30 state primaries to pick the Democratic and Republican nominees for the highest office of the land was an exercise which revealed loudly and clearly that neither the Democratic nor Republican Party has a program to meet the urgent crisis confronting our nation, and that neither is really interested in developing such a program.

Neither has a program that would even begin to:

- put the 10 million unemployed back to work
- end the system of brutal racist oppression in our land
- bring massive financial aid to our cities
- guarantee a decent future for our youth
- meet the crisis in education, housing and health care
- end the continued discrimination against women
- guarantee a decent life for senior citizens
- endorse detente, end the arms race and cut the military budget.

Thus, this 1976 campaign exposes a new level of political bankruptcy of the two parties of big business.

The frontrunners, especially Ford, Reagan and Carter, go out of their way to push racist, big business and right-wing issues, as if the real issues and the real people didn't count. But the polls show that the people's will is in agreement with a program that would begin to cut back profits, corruption and big business domination of our nation.

Puny Primaries and Sham Democracy

Because such a program was ignored by the two old parties, less than one third of the eligible electorate turned out. And if one adds the non-registered voters, the real story is that 85 per cent of the voting-age population did not vote in the primaries, and only 7 per

* Adopted from June 13 Speech at Manhattan Center, New York City

cent of the total voting-age population supported Ford and Carter. Under these circumstances there could not be any genuine winners. They are all among the losers. And that, brothers and sisters, is what the millions of people who stayed away from the polls were saying to the two parties of monopoly.

These were the puny primaries. This was sham democracy at work. The candidates were looking out for monopoly's needs, not speaking to the people's needs. The lack of voter response reflects a new level of mass disgust and rejection of the two parties of big business.

We are at a historic moment, when the challenge and the dangers are great, but a moment when united action can open the way toward a people's party fighting for a people's program—and put people before profits.

The Attack on the Cities

The most vicious, criminal attack is being carried out by big business against the well-being of the working class and oppressed national minorities in our land. The attack is first against the workers of all nationalities, men and women, the workers of the mines, mills, factories and farms, the entire trade union movement. The attack is against the small farmers and the other middle strata, both urban and rural. All non-monopoly strata are under monopoly's gun. This is a racist attack which has placed the severest blows against Black masses, against Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American Indians and Asian American people, and particularly against those national minorities who reside within the cities of our nation.

The sharpest attack of the giant banks and corporation monopolies is against the cities. The urban crisis reveals much of the real aims and goals of the capitalists and helps us to understand that U.S. capitalism has no real future. The attack is against all of our cities, but New York City is getting the sharpest edge of the attack.

I want to say from the beginning that we must firmly and unequivocally reject the racist, big business lies that we've all had it too good; that the foreign-born, the Black, Puerto Rican and other Hispanic peoples are responsible. These racist stereotypes put the blame on those who are the most victimized by the crisis. The opposite is true. Rather than "living high," the Black, Puerto Rican and other Hispanic residents of New York are not only willing to work, but have been forced to take the hardest, lowest-paying, back-breaking, dirtiest jobs in the city.

Who are the majority of the garment workers? Who are the ma-

jury of the transit workers? Who are the postal workers, building superintendents, hospital workers, auto workers and longshoremens? Among these workers, Black, Puerto Rican and other Hispanic workers are numerous if not in the majority. Their hard work is the basic economic backbone of our city. I don't think there are harder-working, more self-sacrificing people on the face of this earth. If Black, Puerto Rican and other Hispanic New Yorkers are disproportionate in the ranks of the unemployed and welfare recipients, we must ask, "Why?" Is it laziness? No. That's racist propaganda. It is because the system of racist oppression that is so all-consuming in our society guarantees that vast number of people of color remain the last hired and the first fired, that they will remain on the bottom of the economic ladder.

But this system of racist oppression holds back white workers too. The problem is that there aren't enough jobs in the first place. Now, who is responsible for this? Capitalism. Capitalists do not believe in full employment. And the urban job market has been shrinking faster than that of any other area. Why is this? Who is responsible? Let's look at the record.

New York is not "in trouble" because millions of its workers have somehow walked away from their jobs to spend a "happy" life on welfare. This is absurd. It is a rare working-class person who finds welfare an easy alternative to a decent job. Listening to the official propaganda you would think that it is a crime to want a decent education, health care and decent services. To big business this is a crime because these demands infringe on their profits. For the people these are necessities, and it is our right to have them. The *real* low-lifers, the *real* "welfare recipients" are the Lockheed and Penn Central tycoons who get huge giveaways from the government. A life of luxury at the expense of working people is still the exclusive privilege of the rich.

What Happened to Jobs in New York?

Over the past five years, over fifty of the largest corporations have moved their headquarters out of New York City, taking 20,000 jobs in the private economy with them. Wall Street firms have cut back another 35,000 jobs. This flight by finance capital has led to the biggest cutbacks in commercial building in a quarter of a century, with the result that 30,000 private jobs in the construction field have already been destroyed. Various financial groups are refusing to invest any more funds in New York. For example, the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company, with \$100 million invested in New

York real estate, has decided that in view of the depressed state of the city's commerce it will not make any further investments.

The big banks used to reinvest much of their money within the city. Today most of it is exported to the suburbs and less developed areas, where immediate profits are greater. This export of money by the banks is matched by the export of manufacturing jobs. Over the past 10 years *over a quarter of a million jobs* in manufacturing have been taken out of New York City by private industry. In short, the monopoly capitalists have been systematically pumping out of New York the economic treasure *produced by its working people*. As they have done so, they have devastated the city's tax base and increased the cost of maintaining public services.

Federal Policy Makes the Rich Richer

The federal government allows multi-national corporations (who are home-based in cities like New York) to export capital overseas without real taxation. It actually offers tax incentives and subsidies which make it more lucrative for industries, higher-paid wage earners and wealthy people to move out of the cities. This undermines the tax base and turns the cities into areas of low-paid or unemployed workers. For example, in 1971 federal subsidies to suburban homeowners amounted to \$5 billion, 700 million dollars, which was twice the amount allotted for low-income public housing. This clear Federal policy of gross disregard for working people, particularly low-paid wage earners, has increased the ranks of the unemployed city dwellers to depression levels.

The only reason New York City has not been in even worse shape is that between 1969 and 1975 three-quarters of the new jobs were created by the city government. Thus, the city itself filled part of the vacuum left by big business. But city government can do this no longer and thousands more New Yorkers will be without jobs.

So, we can firmly say that the fault is not in the "corruption" of welfare recipients, but the corruption of the capitalists and their bureaucrats in Albany and City Hall. Their actions are covered up by attacking Blacks, Puerto Ricans and workers and poor people generally.

What Else Is Responsible?

The *tax structure*, too, is aimed at milking the lower-paid workers and guaranteeing big loopholes and subsidies for corporations and the rich. The rich also make a profit by the purchase of tax-free municipal bonds. The big banks loan the city money and collect a

lucrative interest. So while you and I have been paying the highest taxes in the land, the bankers and bondholders have been ripping off the city for big interest on loans and bonds. Eighteen per cent of the city budget goes to pay off the interest—that's two billion dollars!

While big real estate interests have been delinquent on their real estate taxes, even with lower-than-average taxes through under-assessment, rents have gone up by 57 per cent in the past five years. At the same time landlords have been abandoning housing at a phenomenal rate. In 1973, there were some 9 million abandoned dwelling units in U.S. cities.

Big business concerns in New York and elsewhere are delinquent in turning over the sales taxes that they collect. These taxes are deposited in banks and collect interest, but may never be fully paid out since it is solely up to the merchant to determine how much was collected and what should be paid.

Workers in New York and other cities pay more than their share to the federal government too. The federal government received some \$24-billion from New York City in the last fiscal year, but the city got back only \$3-billion. Where did this money go? Nine billion went to the military budget, a source of huge profits for the armaments producers. Another big part went to "welfare" for corporations like Lockheed and Penn Central, as well as subsidies to the oil monopoly and subsidies that actually *encourage abandonment of the cities*.

This crisis of our cities is a disgrace typical of U.S. capitalism. The big corporations and banks organized, engineered, and created the crisis. We must make them pay for it.

It is a crime of the capitalist system:

- that 50 to 60 thousand New York City workers have been laid off
- that 21,000 jobs have been lost through attrition
- that teachers and educational workers have been fired and schools closed
- that hospitals are being closed, leaving health care in a shambles, and more workers unemployed
- that building projects have been cancelled, causing the loss of thousands of construction jobs and services
- that day care centers have been closed, forcing hundreds out of work and thousands of parents onto the welfare rolls because they can't work without child care
- that *more cutbacks* are threatened.

The imposition of tuition and the destruction of open admission to CUNY is a racist crime. This destroys a 129-year tradition in

New York which made it possible for working-class students to get a higher education. The state and federal aid programs are too tiny to prevent thousands of working-class students from dropping out of school. The bulk of those who will be forced out of the City College system will be Black and Puerto Rican students. Most of the closed hospitals are in Black and Puerto Rican communities. The community colleges that are supposed to be closed have a predominantly Black and Puerto Rican enrollment. The cutbacks in New York City have hit all working people, but if we are to defeat this attack we must see its special racist edge.

The people are being attacked by big business at every point in the human life cycle—in childhood, as youth, as adults and as senior citizens.

Trade unions are under the gun, facing stiff resistance to righteous demands for long overdue wage increases. We're headed for an across-the-board wage freeze for the workers of New York City, both public and private, in addition to an inhuman increase in speedup.

The attack means big pressure on working-class families; people are being forced to move and are losing all of their hard-earned possessions. The attack means the growth of youth unemployment (already 40 per cent for Black and Puerto Rican youth), drug addiction and petty crime. The lack of future prospects for youth can lead to a drastic social dislodging; it can lead to the devastation of individuals, of a whole generation of youth.

The best qualities of a human being do not come forward when one has little to live for. With economic ruin comes social decay and destruction of the human spirit. Therefore, this is a life-and-death struggle.

Monopoly has a whole arsenal of diversions to cause confusion and misdirection. During times of crisis, racism is the number one weapon of confusion. Others are anti-Communism and anti-Semitism. These block unity and blind the people to the path of advanced thinking and action.

The government is also preparing to repress dissent against its policies. There is never any financial shortage when it comes to government repression. The FBI and the CIA continue to work to repress movements against monopoly. High on their list is stopping the Communist candidates from getting on the ballot. Watergate lives on; Watergate is a permanent part of capitalist rule. Its aims and methods must be continually fought against.

Presently there is a wave of racist violence throughout our land, spurred on by the frontrunners in both parties. Carter is a long-time

foe of busing and calls for "ethnic purity." Ford and Reagan call for resistance to school busing and publicly support segregation.

Presently, in North Carolina, there is the case of the Wilmington 10, led by Reverend Ben Chavis, who are victims of one of the most heinous racist frameups in our history. This is a basic fight. They must be freed. The Congress is now considering the most repressive piece of legislation in our history, the infamous Senate Bill 1. This also must be stopped.

The big bankers and monopolists who control the Democratic and Republican Parties have a long-term plan for the plunder of the cities.

The financial rulers aren't satisfied with their indirect rule; they have now set up the Emergency Financial Control Board and the Municipal Assistance Corporation (Big Mac). Both are financial control agencies staffed by the biggest bankers and industrialists in town. Through these boards the banks and monopolies have direct rule and veto power over the city budget. Our city is under a financial dictatorship of the richest capitalists in town. They have put the thieves in charge of the city treasury. Says Felix G. Rohatyn, head of Big Mac, "The pain is just beginning . . . (over the next four years the city will undergo) the most brutal kind of financial and fiscal exercise any community in the country will ever have to face." Arthur Burns, head of the Federal Reserve Board, put it this way (February 11, 1976): "New York City will have to live a life of austerity."

A Program to Fight Back and Win

The Communist Party's platform is such a program. It will make the creators of the crisis pay for the crisis. It puts people before profits:

1. Cancel the city's debts to the banks.
2. Tax the rich—banks, corporations, real estate firms and millionaires to pay for city services from a special super-profits tax.
3. Exempt all family income under \$20,000 from all income tax and private homes assessed under \$40,000 from all real estate taxes.
4. Municipalize the utilities and utilize the income to meet the needs of the cities.
5. A federal law that will prohibit the multi-national corporations and industries from abandoning the cities.
6. Immediate massive federal aid to the cities to guarantee no more cuts and the restoration of all cutbacks.
7. 30-hour work week at 40-hours pay.

8. Outlaw racism—make cases of racism by employers, landlords, etc., subject to criminal penalties—end all discrimination in hiring, promotion, job-training and layoffs.
9. Special programs to expand services and create jobs in the Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano, Asian-American and Native-American Indian communities.
10. Unfreeze wages and roll back prices and rents.
11. Expand trade with socialist countries (this could create thousands of new jobs).
12. 80 per cent cut in military budget—(this would mean 7.2 billion for New York City).

If all or part of these measures were won it would mean no more cuts; in fact, an expansion of services. It would mean that thousands of new jobs would be created. It would mean bringing the city towards a livable level.

This is an anti-monopoly program to meet the current crisis. To achieve these goals is a tall order. But there is enough money in our society to meet the needs of the cities, of all our people. For example, the New York banks' and financial institutions' total wealth is in the neighborhood of \$300 billion. The problem is that while this wealth was created by the majority it is controlled by a tiny minority at the top.

How To Win

To win this program will require the united might of the working class, the entire trade union movement allied with Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native-American Indian and Asian-American peoples. It will take unity between the youth and senior citizens, women and men. It will take unity of middle-class victims of monopoly aligned with the working class and oppressed national minorities. This unity can be achieved because we all face a common foe—big business.

The front line must be Black and white unity in order to win. We must learn some lessons from the New York City situation. Let us not underestimate the shrewdness or ruthlessness and the deep racism of these bankers. In launching their offensive against the people of New York City they have been using their time-honored method of "divide and rule." They seek to divide the people of the city into separate groups, disunited and squabbling among themselves. They know that if the target is welfare recipients and "illegal aliens," big business won't be the target.

These boards of financial dictators do not carry out the cutbacks all at once. First they reduce one service, then another, and still

later a third. Afterwards they return to the first target for further cutbacks. They use shock economics to demoralize and frighten the people. They try to get one group fighting the other. Thus, the entire weight of their power is turned against relatively small groups of workers and city residents each time. It is obvious that the only possible way to defeat this strategy is to unite all the victims on a fighting program.

The liberal Democrats and those trade union officials who are unwilling or unable to develop anti-monopoly unity of action will have to be replaced by more progressive and activist-minded leaders who are prepared to do this. When the working people of this city are sufficiently well organized and militant to elect a group of leaders with a program and real fighting spirit, they can win!

Nothing will be won in this fight by relying on the Democratic and Republican Parties. At this stage we all have to recognize that the Democratic and Republican Parties and their Presidential candidates are incapable of offering a solution. Both are parties that put big business first. They put monopoly profits before the people's needs. But the moment we show our independence and are able to unite around a fighting mass program, at that moment we will begin to win concessions.

We must begin from a position of political and electoral independence from the two parties of big business. That's the only way to win in either local or national elections, the only way to develop the united organizational and political strength to build a mass people's anti-monopoly party.

The lesser-of-two-evils notion is a drag on the movement for political independence. At this stage in the fight we need candidates who are neither *lesser* nor *evil*. We don't need to exchange Ford's racist anti-busing stand for Carter's "ethnic purity."

Georgia-style austerity isn't any less painful than Michigan-style austerity. The ruling class profits from either. But we don't! We've got to stand firmly *against* what they stand for. We have to show them that we are serious, that we want a real change.

We must use our votes wisely. You don't go up to an enemy and hand him your weapon. You'll get wasted. That's what a vote for the Republican or Democratic nominee means. And sitting out the election when there is a real choice is like sitting on your weapon in the middle of a major battle. You'll get wasted again.

The wisest, most meaningful, most powerful choice you can make this year is to vote for the Communist Party candidates. Every such vote will be a defeat for the powerful monopolists that run our

country because that vote is making a stand; that vote lets them know that you are for a completely new direction for this country. It is a vote they can't ignore. It is a vote powerful enough to begin to change things no matter who gets elected. They'll make big concessions to try to counter the impact of the Communist vote. We say that a big Communist vote in New York City will produce some federal funds for sure.

This attack on New York City will be tried elsewhere if they get away with it. This means economic ruin for every major urban center in the country. But it won't be confined solely to urban areas. The attack is aimed at working people and youth as a whole. Their long-range plans mean disaster for the vast majority.

But we have a long-range plan too. Our plan means a new society, a new life for all. No more racism and anti-Semitism, full equality for women. It means a society that provides medical care for all, free education for all. It means a society in which our youth can flower and reach their full potential, socially and economically. Such a society can be realized in our country, in our life-time. There's no question about it. The warm sun of socialism will rise in these United States. And big business knows it's coming.

They are working overtime now at the FBI and the CIA to keep us off the ballot. They recognize how important our campaign is. In state after state the laws have been changed to make it more and more difficult to get on the ballot.

If they'll spend millions to destroy Unidad Popular in Chile and millions to set back the MPLA in Angola, or save South African apartheid, or stop a Communist election victory in Italy, brothers and sisters, you can imagine how much a big Communist showing here in the U.S. will shake them up!

That's why a vote for Hall-Tyner is the most meaningful, most important vote you can cast.

The People's Fight for Ballot Rights

If we look more closely into the mechanism of capitalist democracy, everywhere, both in the "petty"—so-called petty—details of the suffrage . . . and in the techniques of the representative institutions . . . on all sides we see restriction after restriction upon democracy. These restrictions, exceptions, exclusions, obstacles for the poor, seem slight, especially in the eyes of one who has himself never known want . . . but in their sum total these restrictions exclude and squeeze out the poor from politics and from an active share in politics.

—V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*

• • • •

Lenin wrote the above words 59 years ago but the thrust of his argument remains valid today. Lenin makes specific reference to the exclusion of woman from suffrage, residential qualifications and "the techniques of the representative institutions" as well as "the purely capitalist organization of the capitalist press."

Details have changed over the years, of course. We now have women's suffrage, the elimination of the poll tax, considerable registration of Black voters in the South—all following prolonged popular struggles. But a close examination of the electoral process in the United States in the Bicentennial year of 1976 confirms Lenin's basic conclusions as to the nature of capitalist democracy.

The essence of the matter is that despite all the gains made over the decades of struggle, capitalist democracy still remains as Lenin said, "a democracy for the rich and powerful." Government is dominated by the two major parties, those cartels of power brokers operating on behalf of the giant monopolies that dominate the economy of the nation. The big trusts finance the major candidates—just check the campaign reports of Jimmy Carter, Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan—and it is chiefly corporate money that bankrolls their lavish expenditures for TV and radio time and newspaper advertising. Recent "reform" legislation providing treasury funds for major candidates simply supplements to the tune of an estimated \$60 million the huge sums coming from corporate-connected sources. (The legislation carefully excludes minority parties and independents from this golden flow.)

Growing recognition of big business control of the two old parties as well as popular disgust with the policies of both major parties—Vietnam and Watergate, for example—has literally turned millions off the conventional political process. In 1972 about 54 per cent of the eligible electorate voted; in the 1974 congressional elections it sank to about 40 to 45 per cent. In the 1976 primaries about 20 to 25 per cent participated. And most of these who abstained are to be found among the poorest sections of the population, the Blacks, the Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and working-class whites.

Significantly, among those who *do* register to vote, an increasing number record themselves as independents, avoiding formal affiliation with either major party. It is estimated that at least one-third of the voters are in this camp. Clearly, the non-voters and the independents today constitute the majority of the eligible electorate.

Dissatisfaction with the two major candidates is already evident. Support for Jimmy Carter in the Congressional Black Caucus, for example, is at best lukewarm and many other liberal Democrats are adopting a wait-and-see attitude. Some idea of the attitude of many can be seen by an unpublished survey taken by the Louis Harris polling organization that gives independent candidate Eugene McCarthy 10 per cent. A new Gallup poll reportedly gives him 5 per cent.

But—and here we get back to the difficulties thrown up against minority parties and independents—even McCarthy is finding it difficult to attain ballot status. He admits that he will be lucky to get on the ballot in 40 of the fifty states of the union. Some idea of the difficulties that McCarthy, a former Democratic U.S. senator faces, were outlined recently by syndicated columnist Tom Tiede:

As an independent he is not automatically included on state ballots, as are the representatives of major parties. So he must qualify for the right in each state, which is usually difficult, always expensive and sometimes impossible.

Every state has its own laws governing the placement of independent names on its ballots, and often the laws are the kind that give democracy a bad name.

In West Virginia, for example, voters who signed petitions for McCarthy were automatically expunged from the Democratic and Republican rolls, making themselves liable to a \$1,000 fine if they tried (some did) to vote in any primary.

In Michigan, a court ruled that McCarthy's name on ballots would 'clog the election system.' In Massachusetts, the McCarthy bid was invalidated because too many of his petition signatures

lacked middle names or precise addresses.

quality for the right in each state, which is usually difficult, always six states. The 100,000 signatures he's gathered have cost him \$200,000, or \$2 a piece. (*Waterloo, Iowa, Courier*, July 19, 1976).

A week earlier (July 12), the same newspaper carried the column of conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick discussing McCarthy's problems, noting that the former Minnesota Senator now "must master 50 different requirements for the filing of petitions."

"In some states," Kilpatrick continues, "the number of signatures is low; in some it is high. Here the signatures must be notarized; there they must be obtained by counties or Congressional districts.

"Filing deadlines vary enormously. Filing fees are high and low. State laws on challenges are a swamp of ambiguity."

Kilpatrick's concern for the ballot rights of independents and minority parties should not be mistaken for any progressive rebellion against the status quo. A diehard reactionary, he is a voice of that grouping of Big Business which seeks to bring into being an ultra-Right party. "This," he writes portentously, "is a pregnant time for the birth of new parties. In the name of a free society, we ought not to see them strangled in the womb."

His thinking is close to that of another right winger, Associate Justice William A. Rehnquist of the U.S. Supreme Court, who has expressed sharp criticism of the treatment of third parties and independents by Congress. He dissented sharply in a case in which the court's majority approved the law providing federal financing out minority parties. Rehnquist wrote (*Buckley v. Valeo*, decided January 30, 1976):

I find it impossible to subscribe to the Court's reasoning that because no third party has posed a credible threat to the two major parties in Presidential elections since 1860, Congress may by law attempt to assure that this pattern will last forever. I would hold that, as to general election financing, Congress has not merely treated the two major parties differently from minor parties and independents, but has discriminated in favor of the former in such a way as to run afoul of the First and Fifth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

Rehnquist and Kilpatrick are in fact speaking for that section of the ruling class which has traditionally supported the Republican Party as the most consistent party of Big Business. Now they have their doubts as to its viability, doubts expressed most clearly in recent months by William Rusher, publisher of the *National Review*, the intellectual organ of neo-fascist thinkers, owned by William F.

Buckley. The Buckley-Rusher group has talked up the idea of a right wing third party that will corral conservative Republicans and Democrats and also attract the supporters of George Wallace. In the current inner-Republican struggle they have in the main thrown their support to Reagan against President Ford, while keeping their eyes fixed on their long-range objective—a political realignment and the formation of a party of the extreme Right. Unquestionably it will represent the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital, mingling national chauvinism, a thinly-veiled racism with a demagogic populism and opposition to “big government.” It will oppose the “welfare state” and detente and boost militarism.

Their criticism of restrictive election laws, while frequently accurate and cogent, carefully avoids any defense of the rights of a working-class party such as the Communist Party—the principal target of reaction. Virtually all independents and minority parties have felt the weight of restrictive ballots, but in varying degrees. The Right-wing efforts have in practice always found them to be much less of a barrier, as was demonstrated by the Wallace candidacy in 1968.

Baring Communists From the Ballot

It is unquestionably the Communist Party against which reaction's fire has been chiefly leveled. A look at the record confirms the charge of Communist presidential candidate Gus Hall that there is in fact a national conspiracy to bar the Communists from access to the ballot.

The historical record is plain. In 1932, Communist votes were recorded in 38 of the 48 states. In 1972, primarily because of legal restrictions, Communist candidates achieved ballot status in only 13 of the 50 states. Besides finding its way in the maze of the varied election laws in 50 different states, the Communist Party today is faced in 12 states with outright anti-Communist provisions. One state, Delaware, requires that the Communist Party and its members register with the state police. Georgia has an anti-subversive clause under which election officials can easily deny ballot status to Communist candidates.

But anti-Communist laws—invalidated in some states after court fights—are only part of the story. There are fantastic requirements for signatures on nominating petitions in many states. California recently liberalized its election law; it now requires “only” about 100,000 signatures. Massachusetts calls for 37,000; Missouri, 18,000; Arizona, two per cent of the last vote for governor, etc.

But here against one runs into a series of barbed wire fences, some of those innumerable "petty restrictions" Lenin discussed. For even the process of collecting signatures is hedged with problems. In Texas, for example, the collector must have a notary with him or be a notary himself and have the signer attest to his signature. In many states, filing the signatures becomes a deeply-trapped obstacle course. Thus, Massachusetts and 10 other states decree that signatures be submitted first to town or country clerks or probate judges before filing with the state government. In Connecticut, the petitions have to be filed personally with about 160 town clerks!

At least four states—Louisiana, Missouri, Tennessee and Virginia—require one elector from each Congressional district. For a Communist elector from a bayou district of Louisiana merely to appear on the ballot or nominating petitions is an act of considerable courage.

West Virginia gives you a little more rope—enough to hang you. A canvasser needs a county clerk's certificate authorizing him to collect signatures in the magisterial district where he resides, and it is a felony for an out-of-stater to circulate petitions. The final irony is the requirement that candidates for President and Vice President pay a filing fee of one per cent of the annual salaries paid to those officers. So, Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner must shell out \$2,000 and \$625, respectively. They refused.)

Michigan has added a Catch-22 wrinkle. After filing the requisite signatures, the Communist Party was faced with a brand new law compelling minority parties to enter a primary election in which some would be eliminated. Michigan authorities argue that there are too many parties and that the voting machine can't accommodate them all; the Motor State's technology is apparently unable to cope with the problem. . . .

Apart from the legislative thimblerrigging, canvassers have met threats of violence and arrests. In Mobile, Alabama, the comptroller of Bishop State Junior College leveled two .45 revolvers at canvassers, accompanying his gun flourishes with a stream of anti-Communist invective. In Birmingham, a canvasser was arrested on the charge of threatening the life of Vice President Rockefeller, some 700 miles away. (The indictment was finally dropped.) In Louisville, Kentucky, two Communist canvassers were arrested for allegedly trespassing on a college campus. (The charges were dropped.)

And there is far more, including vindictive harassment by challenges after petitions have been filed, imposing new strains on the meager resources of minority parties.

Challenges to the Party petitions were filed in Michigan, New Jersey, Utah and Maine. In Michigan, the attack was spearheaded by some Democratic machine hacks. In New Jersey, the challenge was submitted by the so-called U.S. Labor Party, the political arm of the National Caucus of Labor Committees, widely believed to be CIA-connected. In Utah, state authorities pushed the challenge. In Maine, the assault was led by a reactionary Democratic state representative, one Louis Jalbert, and was publicly backed by ultra-Right "independent" Governor James Longley. Maine, the Governor declaimed, "is not and has no intention of becoming a refuge for the Communist Party." The challenge was rejected in New Jersey and the Party is certified to ballot. The challenges are still pending in the other three states at this writing.

A Struggle for Democracy

But these reversions to the spirit of the late and unlamented Joe McCarthy are meeting substantial resistance, paced in the first instance by the Communist Party and its candidates. American Civil Liberties Union lawyers have gone into the courts in a number of states on behalf of the constitutional rights of the Communist candidates. The National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee issued a strong statement declaring that it "deplores the violation of democracy . . . experienced by the Communist Party U.S.A. in seeking ballot status for its 1976 ticket." It charged that the ballot restrictions "run counter to the Bill of Rights" and added this warning to all democratic-minded people:

"To the extent that arbitrary and onerous filing requirements impede the appearance on the ballot of minority parties, they deprive us all of the full exercise of our rights."

In Massachusetts, 82 leading figures, including some public officials, joined in a statement published as an advertisement in the *Boston Globe*. The statement defended the rights of minority parties, noting that the "restrictive provisions are applied with exceptional vigor against Communist candidates."

In Maine, the *Portland Press Herald*, while treating the subject gingerly, nevertheless editorially warned that opposition to Communist philosophy must "never be used as an excuse to deprive a minority of the rights and privileges available to all under the law." (July 7, 1976.)

In Iowa and other states, newspaper voices have been raised, in one form or another, supportive of the Party's right to the ballot. Candidates Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner have found an almost uni-

formly friendly reception among media representatives, some of whom indicated support for ballot access by the Party. And even the august *New York Times* found space for a column on the Party's ballot fight on its famed Op-Ed page (July 17, 1976).

In a word, the fight of the Communists for ballot rights is increasingly seen as a broad democratic struggle involving the rights of all, particularly those independents and minority parties seeking access to the ballot.

This is not always understood clearly even on the Left and in the Party. Thus, even some members of the campaign committee, in speeches or writing, repeated rumors and speculations respecting various independents and minority parties which would tend to disrupt the unity of democratic-minded people in the struggle against the monopolies. This was quickly corrected in a statement issued by the Hall-Tyner Election Campaign Committee and signed by its chairman, Henry Winston, and this writer as campaign manager. The statement, published in the *Daily World* of July 15, restated the Committee's basic position:

We totally oppose any and all laws that restrict the ballot rights of independents and minority parties which stand for democracy. We may disagree with one or another party in its attitude towards our view of socialism but we oppose all efforts of the state to restrict the ballot rights of such parties.

We face a national conspiracy to keep us off the ballot and thus prevent the voters from having a working-class alternative to the candidates and policies of the two old parties. We see the attack on the Communist ballot rights as the leading edge of the whole assault upon the democratic rights of the people to make a choice outside the confines of the corporate-controlled two-party system.

We call for unity of all democratic-minded forces, inside and outside the two old parties, in the common struggle to defend the elementary right to the ballot. This is a crucial aspect of the struggle to maintain and extend democracy.

The firm and prompt restatement of the committee's position echoed favorably among progressive people who had followed the matter, and efforts by one or another splinter group to work up a hullabaloo against the Party and its candidates fizzled. Progressives recognized the statement as another expression of the Party's basic line of struggle for an anti-monopoly coalition.

The Anti-Monopoly Essence

The relationship between the anti-monopoly struggle in the United

States and the maze of election laws is not immediately obvious. But study of the historic trend reveals that the efforts to choke off third party movements roughly parallels the growth of monopolies in the nation and the struggle of the people against them. There is evidence—too detailed to recount in one brief article—that the two major parties, acting on behalf of big business, sought to strangle independent movements with renewed viciousness after each upsurge of a third party or insurgent movement. Thus, new restrictive laws were adopted after the 1912 elections in which Theodore Roosevelt and his Progressive (Bull Moose) Party, a split-off from the Republican Party, polled more than 4,000,000 votes and, more important, Eugene V. Debs, heading the Socialist ticket, garnered over 900,000 votes.

A similar tightening of the noose was felt after the 1924 election when Robert M. LaFollette, running as a third party candidate on the Progressive ticket, polled 4.8 million votes. Ditto after the 1948 elections when Henry Wallace received 1,157,000 votes on the Progressive line.

This is not to say that big business and the two old party bosses attacked third party movements only after the 1912, 1924 and 1948 presidential elections. They were busy year in and year out buttressing their control of the election process by many means—through legal gimmicks, outright ballot stealing, preventing minority party access to the media, and countless other ways.

A brief examination of the vagaries of the electoral process in New York, considered a "liberal" state, is instructive in this regard. In 1920, during the post-World War I Red Scare period, faced with the election of five Socialist assemblymen, the State Assembly simply expelled them—by a bipartisan vote. Later, the two parties ran "fusion" candidates to defeat them. In 1936, the Legislature upped the necessary number of votes required for ballot status from 25,000 for governor to 50,000, thus dropping the Communist Party off the ballot as a recognized party and forcing it to get signatures on nominating petitions.

Later, after the American Labor Party was formed, the Legislature passed the Wilson-Pakula law—known informally as "the anti-Marcantonio law"—in order to prevent Laborite Congressman Vito Marcantonio from entering any other party primary than his own. (He had a habit of entering major party primaries and winning their designations because of his popularity with voters of all affiliations.) That same year, 1947, the old party bosses joined in a campaign under the slogan of "Beat Communism" to knock out the

proportional representation system of voting for the New York City Council. This was the democratic system under which Communist Councilmen Peter V. Cacchione and Benjamin J. Davis, along with a number of Laborites and other progressives were elected. The old party bosses' campaigns succeeded in the hysteria of the cold war.

From the foregoing it is clear that big business has operated in a variety of ways to crush democratic struggle that has sought expression through third party movements and insurgent movements within the two party system. Control of the electoral law-making process in the legislatures is one of the chief elements by which the two old parties exercise their domination, a fact recognized by close students of the process. Warren Moscow, former chief of the Albany bureau of the *New York Times* and a cynic familiar with the ways of old party politicians, said of this process:

"A word about the election law. Though passed by the Legislature, it is actually written by the legal counsel of the two major parties and designed by them to make smoother functioning of their machinery. . ." (*Politics in the Empire State*, New York, 1948.) Some years later in a discussion on the difficulties encountered by minority parties and independents, Ralph Nader and Theodore Jacobs concluded in an article in the *Harvard Law Record* (October 9, 1959) that the electoral system is rigged by statutes to maintain "a practical monopoly of the ballot by the Democratic and Republican parties."

Such is the real character of the vaunted capitalist democracy. But enormous though the obstacles be, they can be overcome by mass movements. Barriers can be broken and the repeal of restrictive laws won as the drive for independent political action widens. More and more, as the popular anti-monopoly movement grows there will be increasing attention given to this arena of struggle. The fight for genuinely democratic election laws will be seen as an essential part of the total struggle for democratic advance. In this struggle, the Communists, as partisans of socialism and therefore partisans of the fight to maintain and extend democracy, will continue to be in the forefront.

IQ Thinking: Its Effect on the Schools

IQ theory has been effectively discredited by many social scientists and demonstrated to be racist and anti-workingclass in character. But theory dies slowly, especially when given sustenance by the ruling policy-makers. Meanwhile, a whole population has been and continues to be indoctrinated with the myth that "intelligence," though any used to sort children into "ability" groups. Without a ured and used to sort children into "ability" groups. Without a generally accepted concept of what "intelligence" is, even its most loyal psychometric adherents are forced to settle for its operational definition: "intelligence" = "what it is the test measures." In reality, these tests measure the predictability of academic success in a white middle-class dominated public school system. They measure the degree of assimilation into the dominant culture and value system. They are so infected with cultural assumptions that not ability or potential is being tested but race and class.

In spite of growing objections to intelligence testing, the continuing effects of IQ thinking in the school are disastrous. The thinking of generations of teachers has become permeated by the doctrine that intelligence is essentially inborn, rather than the result of teaching or training. It is assumed to refer to a generalized quality of mind responsive to all types of challenges, rather than specific to the task and based on life experiences. Teacher training curricula emphasize theories which teach that intellectual ability can be measured with accuracy and ease. Ranking children according to this "ability" is therefore assumed to be valid and is inculcated in yet another generation of teachers. One of the major and most pernicious aspects of this is the acceptance and advocacy of homogeneous grouping.

Even where group intelligence tests have been eradicated as a result of community protest, standardized tests have taken their place to assign children to slow, average, and fast tracks. Group intelligence tests are pencil-and-paper tests designed to test general information and reasoning, while standardized tests are meant to evaluate school learning. Both types of tests, however, unrealistically assume that basic reading and writing skills have been taught in

the first place. Whichever type is used, strangely enough, but not so strangely, the groups always end up reflecting the income and race of the child. Many Blacks, Hispano-American and other minority as well as non-minority social scientists have emphatically stated that testing serves as a gatekeeping function to keep poor people and minorities at the lowest levels of the economic and social scale. Resulting from such testing, tracking becomes the means by which equal educational opportunity is denied in the schools. For example, in New York City, the disproportionate number of Black and other minority children placed in classes for the retarded on the basis of an IQ test is incredible. Studies conclude that the majority of these children had been misplaced and had suffered "irreparable harm and injury."

Tracking generally begins in the very early grades. Whether groups are called "bluebirds," "doves," or "eagles," the children soon find out that these euphemisms really mean "smart," "average," "dumb." Reading is usually the key to tracking within the school. Where group IQ's are no longer given, it is by reading scores that pupils are ranked. In many school systems, standardized reading readiness tests are given at the beginning of the first grade. These tests claim to be able to predict a child's ability to read. On the basis of these tests of questionable validity, children who do not do well enough must wait while the other groups are taught to read. What six-year old would not be demolished at not receiving a book while others of his classmates start what can be an exciting adventure in reading. Actually, these tests have little relevance to the reading process. The really effective way of gauging a child's reading potential is to teach him to read, observe his progress, and test the results of teaching. Placed in a slow group at the very start of his school career, the child finds it difficult to catch up without help, and a retarded reader develops. The slow-tracked child rarely gets into a higher track.

The destructive effects of the IQ theory of measuring ability penetrate even more deeply into the fabric of the child's education. Instead of having a definite course of study for each grade, IQ theory argues that it is inconsistent to have the same goals for all children. Instead, children should be expected to work "up to the level of their ability," which, of course, is demonstrated by the IQ test, or other standardized tests. Test scores are seen as providing the ceiling on the amount of learning children are expected to achieve. If the scores are low, they are not expected to learn much and therefore no great effort is made to teach them

much. The theory that these should be individual standards based on the child's "ability" has been an important cause of the alarming amount of reading and language retardation in the schools today.

To continue the IQ line of thinking, being promoted or retained in a grade loses its significance since there are no grade standards anyway, and so the practice of one hundred per cent promotion was put into affect (and only lately and meaninglessly modified). The way was made clear for hundreds of thousands of children throughout the country to coast through school without attaining their basic skills. With standardized reading tests employing the multiple-choice type of guessing-game response, which conceals more skill deficiencies than it reveals, parents have no way of knowing how widespread reading and language disability is at every level of our educational system. Mistakenly, they join those teachers who blame the victims for being "lazy," "unmotivated" or "low IQ."

Since reading is the key to tracking, it is important to analyze the reasons intrinsic to reading disability. Studies in depth of the reading process attest to its great complexity. For years, reading performance was simplistically tied to "intelligence," again as tested by IQ tests. Children with low IQ's were denied reading remediation they so sorely needed on the assumption that they did not have the intelligence to profit from remedial instruction. But later studies showed that many children with average or even high IQ's also were found to have reading disabilities. How is it possible to explain this seeming contradiction?

Actually, reading and writing are developmental processes and are learned in stages. The beginning stages of training in phonics and handwriting are crucial in helping the child decode letter symbols into words. These processes need the coordination of the auditory and visual-motor perceptions. It is quite true that some children need more training than others in these early stages of perceiving and making automatic word-sounds and letter-forms. In the same way, some children have a better perception of musical tones than others. Neither is a process related to "intelligence," and both are strongly dependent upon training.

Unfortunately, careful training in phonics and letter forms has for decades been by-passed. Since the thirties, children have been taught reading by the "look-say" method of introducing new words. A very large percentage of children could not learn to read a phonetic language such as English by the "look-say" method because it provides no means of fixing the learning in the child's mind. Because letters were not related to sounds, each word became an

arbitrary configuration, a pure memory feat. Reading texts were so graded that all new words were repeated over and over with the mistaken notion that if the child saw a word often enough, he would remember it. But many did not remember it because they needed the auditory clues that would have impressed and stabilized the pronunciation and meaning upon their minds.

Black and other minority children, particularly, had problems with beginning reading as it was taught, for reasons that had nothing to do with intelligence. Coming from cultures other than middle-class white, they experience standard English as a second language. Especially is this so with Spanish-speaking children who are not being afforded a bi-lingual program. Black English, spoken by many Black children, has phonetic, syntactic and intonational differences as well as rich, unique imagery of expression often incorporated into standard English. Ignorant of these cultural language differences, the white middle-class teacher fails to provide the necessary bridge between the cultural language differences and the teaching of beginning reading of standard English. These language differences made it more difficult for minority children to learn the initial stages of reading and writing without the kind of knowledgeable teaching that could bridge these differences. As a result, they were tracked into the slowest groups from the start, and the fault was believed to lie in the child himself, that is, in his IQ. Teacher training courses tied to IQ theory continue to institutionalize this kind of mis-teaching.

When the fallacies of the "look-say" approach to reading were exposed in the 1950's, a great theoretical controversy arose around reading methods, a controversy which exists to this very day. In practice, many schools did begin to incorporate a phonic approach, among others. Publishers began to publish many different methods, including the phonic approach, in competition with each other. It became fashionable to be "eclectic" and to have many methods around so that the teacher could choose the appropriate method to fit the individual "learning style" of the child. The trouble was that teachers were ill-equipped to make such choices based upon their very superficial and fragmentary training in how to teach reading, not to mention the difficulties in determining the "learning style" of a child.

What happens in practice is that there is no uniformity of approach and schools teach children by several different approaches simultaneously, including the "look-say," the "phonic," the "language-experience," the "linguistic," the "structural," or any combination of

these. As children pass through the grades or change schools, they may be exposed to several different methods. The over-all learning experience of the child shapes up as being discontinuous, inconsistent, an overburdening hodge-podge of tasks which present many types of barriers to learning to read. Most remedial teachers, also trained in the use of different reading approaches, "to be adapted to the individual needs of the child," have provided "more of the same" of what was being offered unsuccessfully in the classroom. This trial-and-error method of teaching reading makes guinea pigs of children and produces semi-literate and illiterate graduates at every level of the school system.

What a far cry from the systematic, carefully sequenced phonic method of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries which have phonetic languages. Here, methodology is developed by master teachers and educational psychologists, carefully researched, and if found effective over a period of time, used throughout the country. Individual differences are dealt with in the context of the commonality of learning process based on Marxist psychological theory. Children who learn more slowly are given additional support and remediation using the same system. Children are not permitted to fall behind without being helped and brought up to grade. The overall result is that illiteracy has been reduced to the vanishing point.

The use of the IQ and standardized tests, and particularly the interpretation of test results, are increasingly seen as the barrier to social equality. But what are the alternatives? How can we reverse the present downhill direction of education, particularly of poor and racial minority children? On the most basic level, the schools must repudiate the IQ theory and break with all the practices that stem from it.

Back in the 30's, education in the Soviet Union broke with its own brand of IQ theorists, called "pedologists," who were being influenced by bourgeois educational thinking. After a long ideological struggle toward a dialectical materialist approach to how children should be educated, a new theory arose, and stemming from it, a system of education, which, in socialist countries, results in high levels of achievement and a very minimal degree of failure. It is important for us to understand this theory and how it might be applied to illuminate our own fight for high level achievement schools.

Soviet psychologists and educators point to the work of L.S. Vygotsky, a prominent psychologist of the Soviet Union at the time,

as providing the basis for their educational practices today. Vygotsky rejected the idea that the child's intellectual development is determined by innate intelligence. On the contrary, he believed that intellectual development is formed in the process of a child's activity under the influence of environmental stimulation both at home and at school. He saw the child's interaction with his surroundings as the basis for the development of complex functional connections within the brain. He stressed the role of the school learning because it could stimulate these internal processes of development, but only when such learning was consistent and systematic. His work, which was later developed by Luria and others, led to a new theory of education based not on fictitious innate ability ceilings, but on its active role in *forming* these abilities. This is a profound conception, which, when applied, is capable of unleashing creative forces in children far beyond any limits we establish today.

In practice, intelligence tests only classify. They serve no useful purpose in teaching. Teachers should receive training in perfecting their own evaluation techniques both in formal and informal ways in order to discover the level of preparation of the children for new learning. This practice is, in essence, one of diagnostic teaching. This two level testing procedure pretests to discover what a child has already learned in a specific area, provides for systematic teaching and then tests results. Before the testing industry became a mammoth business, good teachers had always constructed short assessment instruments to provide feedback for both the teacher and the pupil about his progress. Good teachers continue to do so. But it is the standardized test that determines educational policy today.

The schools should abolish the tracking system based on "ability." Instead, definite grade standards of achievement should be established in each area of skill or knowledge. This does not mean ignoring individual differences in performance, but a different interpretation of them. A low score and many errors should be understood to mean a low level of preparation and not a low level of innate ability. A low score should stress the need for more intensive help for the child to enable him to reach grade standards. For the large numbers of children who are being pushed through the grades in deteriorated schools without their basic literacy skills, massive remedial support systems are indispensable. These are by no means to be considered other tracks or special classes with watered-down curricula. Instead, they should become feeders for the main track in which remedial services should be offered for

all those who fall behind. When such remedial instruction is not provided and children are automatically and meaninglessly "promoted" from grade to grade without learning the curriculum, not only do the basic skills remain unlearned, but failure and frustration set in with all their accompanying emotional problems. Not only is the child's education harmed but, in many ways, his intellectual development as well.

Vygotsky was convinced from his research and from Marxist theory that "the mastery of socially determined experience changes not only the contents of the psychological life (one's range of ideas and knowledge) but also develops new forms of mental processes . . . thus creating a more solid structure for the conscious activity of man." Though he includes the child's total social activities as instrumental in developing intellectual abilities, he emphasizes that such mastery is best carried out systematically in a well-organized school. To apply Vygotsky's theory to school activities is to recognize that when a child is systematically taught phonics, he trains his auditory perception for sounds in words as well. When he is carefully taught handwriting skills, he develops his eye-hand coordination for written language. When he is taught language concepts, he also develops his verbal thinking. When he is effectively taught arithmetic, at the same time he develops logical mathematical thinking. When he is routinely engaged in appropriate learning activities, he is thereby lengthening his attention span for such activities and developing powers of concentration. Failure to develop these intellectual abilities in the process of mastering reading, writing and other language skills prevents the child from competing at the levels of abstraction required for educational advancement in the average school.

Does this mean that the child is neurologically damaged, or mentally retarded, or that his learning problems need be permanent? Certainly not, to all three questions. The child who is not properly taught the necessary knowledge and reading and writing skills acquired in schools is not a mentally retarded child. In terms of formal learning, however, he does lag behind since his language experience is "poorly suited for complex intellectual activity of the kind developed in school" (Luria). If not remediated, the child is placed at a disadvantage in becoming a productive adult in a technologically highly organized society.

In our country, such children have been labelled "learning-disabled." In the Soviet Union, there is no such social problem, but when cases do occur, they are diagnosed as "developmentally back-

ward," a condition indicated by Soviet psychologists to be caused by "pedagogical neglect." A developmentally-backward child is identified as one who goes to a regular school but who cannot keep up with the curriculum. With a special program in the regular school, the intellectual development of these children can be hastened and they can be returned to the mainstream at some future date. Because of the abysmal conditions in our schools, there are many children with the types of learning and language problems described above. A small percentage of these children do have neurological disorders. Most of them have problems which could have been prevented with well-organized sequential schooling.

The use of labels, in general, has tended to spread confusion. Labels continue, in many places, to reflect an outdated emphasis on medical or psychiatric diagnoses. Educational administrators and teachers often use them as excuses to cover up their own neglect of children's education. Instead of labelling children, our focus should be on the educational remediation of their performance problems. To effectively remediate their problems, teachers will have to be retrained away from IQ thinking and toward a developmental philosophy which involves an understanding of the process of intellectual development formation in children. "More of the same" kind of remediation now practiced in the schools will continue to be ineffective.

IQ thinking is one of the basic forms that racism takes, permeating the theories and practices of our school systems. We should be under no illusions that such thinking can be eradicated under capitalism. Only socialism can revolutionize the thinking of the educational system and eradicate racism from our schools as well as from our larger society. What is crucial now is to initiate a fight against this institutional form of racism. The responsibility for educational deficiencies must be shifted from the child to the school system. We can oppose this form of educational racism most effectively if we understand its nature ideologically together with its insidious effects upon our children's development.

Community Colleges: A Promise Betrayed

The two year community colleges have been the entry point to higher education for many students who have continued their study for a college degree, and who otherwise could not have gone to college.

One thousand community colleges in the U.S. now serve 3.8 million of the nation's 11.1 million college students and are the fruit of struggles by the working class and the civil rights movement for admission to higher education. Most Black and Latino students come from these community colleges and many, if not most, of Black college teachers work at these colleges (*New York Times*, 3/20/76). In Illinois, the community colleges led the increase in college enrollment, with a current enrollment of close to 200,000 students at 48 campuses.

This increased enrollment reflects the belief of working-class families that higher education is needed to compete successfully for the dwindling number of job openings. They are not succumbing to big business propaganda, such as the *Newsweek* article (4/26/76) titled "Who Needs College," and the reply—not the children of the working class. Although unemployment among PhDs has reached disaster proportions, workers are keenly aware that unemployment is high in industry also and they do not want their children educationally handicapped for years ahead in the bitter competition for jobs under capitalism.

Since propaganda against higher education has not reduced enrollment, more forceful, brutal methods are under way to reverse the gains of open admissions and affirmative action for minorities and women. The best known examples are the cutbacks at City University of New York. But throughout the country, including in cities like Chicago which are not facing immediate bankruptcy, master plans for higher education are being written to restructure public colleges to favor private colleges and to narrow education to a restricted elite.

These reactionary steps to restrict access to higher education come at a time when science is becoming a direct productive force as a result of the scientific-technological revolution and higher

education is a requirement for an increasing number of jobs.

In the 2-year public colleges, this attack has taken a particularly vicious if somewhat masked form, to not only quantitatively reduce the *number* of students, but also to water down the *content* of education. An example of this policy is outlined in the Master Plan for Higher Education of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, which would restructure the community colleges to divert students from the 2-year college programs into short term, dead-end vocational training. "Educational Genocide" was the apt title given to this policy in a paper by John Yeatman in 1973, then City College Union Vice President, in which he exposed these plans of state monopoly capital to deny college education to "Blacks, minorities and especially the poor."

A Case Study—The Master Plan for Chicago City Colleges

Neither faculty, student, community nor labor participation was invited when the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, a private company, was hired to produce the May 1974 Master Plan for CCC. Although the CCC Board of Trustees has never officially adopted the Plan, because this would have opened it to public discussion, the trustees have moved swiftly to implement it, step by step.

Master Plan statistics show that the CCC reach over 80,000 students, full and part time. 41 per cent of the students have family incomes under \$6,000, 25 per cent between \$6,000 and \$9,000, 47.7 per cent are Black, 3.9 per cent Latino and 5.1 per cent "others." The ACT average score was 14.8 compared to the national average score of 20.2.

From 1911 to 1974 CCC was tuition-free. In 1933 CCC was closed in an "economy" move, but protests caused the Board to rescind its action a few months later, proving that the Master Planners can be forced to retreat. In 1969 a perennial bill to force CCC to impose tuition was narrowly defeated in the state legislature as a result of a demonstration by students and faculty, assisted by Operation Breadbasket, in the state capital.

With the publication of the Master Plan in May 1974, a deceptive argument was advanced, that tuition should be imposed because state scholarships would be available and "85 to 90 per cent of the students will not have to pay more." This transparent deception has been given the lie by the actual statistics; only 6,000 students, less than 15 per cent, received state scholarships. These figures were stated in a letter by CCC Chancellor Oscar Shabat to the *Chicago Sun Times* (4/16/76), stating that about one half million

out of the 100 million dollar budget was raised by tuition.

Despite a broad coalition against tuition, which included PUSH, community and student groups as well as rank-and-file teacher unionists, tuition was imposed in September 1974 of three to five dollars per credit hour. Tuition was increased to \$11 per credit hour by a secret motion of the Board of Trustees in April 1976. Tuition has thus become an important tool in implementing the Master Plan, because it provides a way to control admissions—scholarships can be given selectively.

The key organization in the fight against tuition increases is the Cook County College Teachers Union. Unfortunately, the Swenson leadership follows the Shanker policy of not working with community organizations and, to date, has given only lip service to the fight against tuition. Hopefully, the 220 to 366 per cent tuition increase will spur this leadership to action. Rank-and-file teachers, whose caucus won 43-46 per cent of the CCC vote in March 1976, have the potential of mounting a successful fight against the increases but are at a disadvantage when the union leadership drags its feet. In addition to the rank-and-file caucus, there is a Black teachers' organization which has taken a strong stand against tuition. In view of the composition of the CCC student body, the tuition increases are blatantly racist. Students have already begun demonstrations to stop the increases but the student body changes so often that sustained leadership is difficult.

Master Plan Goals

It is not accidental that the Master Plan was initiated by imposition of tuition, a means of controlling the size and composition of the student body. The plan calls for "radical instructional changes" and "new and more flexible teachers." "Accelerated curricular reorganization" with emphasis shifting to "courses in occupational, semi-technical or technical fields leading directly to employment" is cited by the Plan as the mandate of the state legislature. Some clue to the desired proportion of college transfer subjects to non-college level subjects is supplied by the Master Plan list of 212 programs, of which 28 are college transferrable. Already cutbacks have begun in foreign languages, communications, literature, physical education, social sciences and other courses not part of the "core."

The Master Plan shift of emphasis to vocational instruction would not be objectionable if the other side of the coin were not drastic cutbacks in the academic, traditional college programs of the two-

year colleges. That this contradicts the wishes of the students themselves is clear from student responses to questionnaires, according to which over 80 per cent want to go on for a four year degree. For students who will be diverted away from college studies, the promise of the community colleges has been betrayed.

What Kind of Vocational Studies?

Careful scrutiny of the vocational programs shows that for these programs, also, the Master Plan calls for downgrading of academic content. The January 1973 Chadwin report of the state legislature (Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission, M. Chadwin, chairman, *The Illinois Public Junior College System*) complains that "over a third of the occupational students surveyed said they were planning on transferring to a four-year school." The Master Planners want to close the door leading to the four-year schools, making the vocational programs truly dead-end. Accordingly they want the community colleges to introduce more six month and one year programs in place of the two year programs carrying an AA (Associate of Arts) degree. The nursing programs at CCC have just been arbitrarily changed from AA to AAS (non-academic), reportedly to get more state aid.

How useful such short-term vocational programs may be to the students seems of little concern to the Planners. Many of these positions are the type for which employers used to give on-the-job training while the workers received their pay. To convert the community colleges to this purpose places the financial burden of training on the public, while at the same time the student-worker is deprived of pay while learning.

A basic fallacy of the Master Plan is its claim that people are unemployed because they are not "employable." Yet on page 59 of the same Plan, a survey shows that over 50 per cent of CCC graduates of occupational programs are not employed in their field of study, despite their "employability." Even from the viewpoint of employability, the broader the base of education, the easier it is to adapt to new developments. For example, in the technical fields, basic science background on a college level is necessary to avoid training that is too narrow and quickly becomes obsolete.

Since the Master Plan has met resistance from students who want to register for academic subjects and from faculty who refuse to disappear quietly, the state legislature is using financial weapons to accelerate the demise of liberal arts. They have introduced a differential in state support so that the current \$19.50 support per

credit hour is increased for vocational subjects but is chopped down to \$5 an hour for remedial subjects. This is a further betrayal of open admissions because many students who wish to take college courses need preliminary or remedial subjects to bring their skills up to the needed level.

Affirmative Action

The Master Plan briefly mentions affirmative action, but fails to make a single proposal on this subject. An attempt is made to cover up the racism which permeates this document by vague statements favoring "more vigorous affirmative action."

The shocking truth is that far less than one per cent of faculty and administrators are Latino. Failure to hire Spanish-speaking teachers is no doubt a factor in the under-representation of Latinos in the CCC student body. About 12 per cent of the faculty is Black, far less than the percentage of Black students (47 per cent). Most of the Black teachers have been hired in the last 7 years and any serious cutbacks in faculty size would wipe out these gains of affirmative action if the present seniority system is followed. Women are also under-represented, especially in administrative positions.

In practice, affirmative action has largely been ignored in hirings during the last two years. A joint Union-Board committee on hiring policy is provided for by the union contract but has not functioned. Pressure from the union could change this situation but the American Federation of Teachers, under the presidency of Albert Shanker, has dropped its support of affirmative action, giving the Board a relatively free hand on this subject.

Integration of faculty is mentioned in the Plan as a vague goal but not one step toward this goal is suggested in the Plan. At present, three of the campuses have almost no Black teachers.

Recently, the Chicago Police Department lost federal funds because of failure to follow affirmative action and the elementary and high schools are under similar federal pressure to integrate their teaching staff. Yet the Board of Trustees of CCC saw no need to incorporate affirmative action and integration into their Master Plan for the colleges.

The Union has lost much of its effectiveness because of failure to come to grips with this question. The potential of a teacher-student-labor-community coalition strong enough to defend the colleges from the evils of Master Plans can be realized only if the union takes a forthright position against racism and for affirmative action.

Schools Without Teachers?

In practice, the students are the first victims of this Plan; they now pay tuition for what had been free for 63 years. They often cannot get the courses they need to complete two years of college work. But in terms of the written Master Plan, the visible enemy is the faculty, and especially the union. The Plan states: "What is inhibiting the development of vigorous occupational and special programs is the conventional nature of the preparation of most members of the faculty." The plan attacks the union contract, tenure, the wage scale and the 12-hour contact load as well as the class size limits. Under the circumstances it is amazing that the union, Local 1600 AFT (American Federation of Teachers) has made no response to the plan. However, the Faculty Council, whose membership greatly overlaps that of the union, has made an extensive study of the academic implications of the plan.

The Plan wants college teachers replaced with an "instructional team" which will include paraprofessionals at one end and a great deal of hardware at the other end. TV instruction, computer terminals, cassettes, modules and auto-instructions are to be emphasized for greater "productivity." The dream of a school without teachers, similar to the capitalist dream of a factory without workers, is still fondly cherished by the CCC Board of Trustees.

But Chicago has already seen this nightmare, carried out to the ultimate end of destruction of education, during the presidency of Dr. Hurst at Malcolm X College, formerly a leader of Blacks for Nixon. Under Hurst paraprofessionals conducted classes of hundreds (class size limits were ignored); tape players and movie screens replaced classroom instruction. The North Central Association, the national press, and of course, the Board of Trustees applauded in the name of innovation. John Yeatman, then union leader at Malcolm X, led a group of rank-and-file teachers who exposed this fraud. As a result of persecution heaped upon Yeatman he had a fatal heart attack, but not before he lived to see these innovational frauds exposed. But the Master Plan would like CCC to go down that path again.

Funding the Colleges

Funding remains a crucial issue, but the Plan has no solutions other than imposing tuition in 1974 and raising tuition in 1976. Before tuition was imposed, the Plan reports that 48 per cent of funding came from local property taxes, 39 per cent from state

aid and 13 per cent from federal aid. The federal moneys are for special projects, not academic instruction. Under the Illinois-wide Master Plan, the formula for state funding is 50 per cent, and this additional 11 per cent is a major source of additional revenue which must be won.

But only 39 per cent of the federal tax dollars taken out of Illinois are returned to the state in any form. (*Economic Notes*, April 1976). Yet President Ford proposes a \$3 billion cut in basic grants to veterans and others attending college and elimination of social security support to survivors attending college. Federal aid to higher education is a vital issue in the Presidential election campaign.

Detente and a peace budget which diverts large sums from the military budget to education, health and welfare is the only hope for adequate federal aid to public higher education. The AFT, in the 2 years since Albert Shanker became the AFT president, has opposed detente and supported increased military spending. Yet as long as tax dollars are siphoned off for war, CIA interference in other countries such as Chile and high interest paid to the banks, just so long will education go from one crisis to the next with disastrous results. A change in AFT policy on the military budget is an important aspect of the defense of the city colleges and education generally.

National Coalition Needed

What is needed is a national coalition in defense of the community colleges as higher education, not merely post-secondary schools. It would be natural for such a coalition to form first in a number of cities around the issue of free tuition, open admissions and against cutbacks. The struggle to save CUNY is a stimulating example for other cities. Although the proposal for a National March on Washington for Funds for Education, made by the militant Washington teachers' local, was defeated by the Shanker machine at the 1975 AFT convention, the pressure of local coalitions can reverse this policy and bring the labor movement forward as the heart of a national coalition for public higher education.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHILE

Ultra-Leftism: Trojan Horse of Imperialism

At present, the central task of the popular movement in Chile is the creation of a broad anti-fascist unity capable of overthrowing the dictatorship and carrying out the revolutionary transformations needed by our society. The decisive role in this new democratic, popular, revolutionary unity belongs to the working class. To succeed in the effort to regroup and unite the supporters of revolutionary transformations of the popular government and to extend the political front of all forces opposed to fascism, in is indispensable to guarantee the unity of the working class on the basis of fundamental positions. This, in turn facilitates its ability to take account of and perceive the progressive ideas advanced by all strata who suffer from the dictatorship.

The chief cause of our temporary defeat was that the enemy was able to increasingly isolate the working class from its allies, and to set against us many of those who had held neutral positions and even those who had sympathized with the revolutionary experiment of the Allende government. Therefore, of prime importance is the need overcome our shortcomings and weaknesses in the ideological struggle against sectarian and dogmatic tendencies imposed on part of the popular movement by petty-bourgeois revolutionism, or ultra-leftism.

From the first it became necessary to wage an ideological battle against bourgeois ideology, which even during a surge of working-class struggle tries to "dominate" the situation. In addition, there was the need to counter petty-bourgeois revolutionism—*anarchism*, *Trotskyism*, *Maoism* and *MIRism* (*Revolutionary Left Movement*^{*})—which attempted to infiltrate the working class. All these "brands" of ultra-revolutionism ended up in the bog of opportunism, primarily due to their anti-Communism.

The most eloquent instance is the collusion of the Maoist clique with the Pinochet fascist dictatorship. Maoism also presented itself in Chile as an ultra-revolutionary trend. Our enemies loudly repeated its "radical" postulates in front of the North Americans while at the

* *MIR*—*Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario*.

same time using of its anti Soviet attacks. The Chinese clique launched a virulant campaign against the Communist Party of Chile.

After the fascist coup in September 1973, not a single progressive person has any doubt regarding the position of those who support the policy of the Maoist clique. In our country, we witness fraternization between the openly anti-working-class, bloody regime and the representatives of Peking. We are witnesses of how far adventurism and revisionism of Marxism-Leninism can lead! They do what even many representatives of the bourgeoisie cannot afford to do. By abandoning fundamental principles, they end up in the service of the most infamous cause: defense of Yankee imperialism.

Every conscious worker knows that in the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic struggle, and all the more so in the struggle against fascism, united action with the democratic and revolutionary contingents of other classes and strata is obligatory. It is just as clear that unity cannot and should not exclude confrontation of ideas, opinions, education of respective opinions, while maintaining the absolute independence of proletarian positions. From our experience we know what a high price the popular movement has to pay for internal weakness, when a part of the petty-bourgeoisie succumbs to revolutionism, to spontaneity, and, instead of approaching the positions of the proletariat, imposes on the working-class parties a policy of division and confrontation. Such tendencies surface owing to the weakness of the working-class movement, its inability to smash them through ideological struggle, to ensure unity and establish the leadership of the working class. This is one of the mistakes that must be corrected.

Some may ask, is it not wrong to insist on these accusations, to prove the harm of extremist tendencies, speak out against people who declare in support of the revolution, which it is a matter of struggle against the dictatorship? Is there not a favorable climate for convergence with all democratic forces, with those who upheld Popular Unity, as well as those who did not? Does it not smack of "sectarianism"?

Answering these questions already before September 11, that is, at the time when the scale of the attempts to set up fascism could be clearly seen, Comrade Luis Corvalan said: "We are not against the ultra-left *a priori*, and do not deny that there are consistent revolutionaries among them. We proceed from facts, from the actual situation. Today, as before, we place above all else the historic necessity for unity of all anti-fascist forces, democratic, popular and revolutionary organizations and elements. Those ultra-leftists who

without resorting to sectarianism or splitting activities facilitate this unity and adopt an anti-fascist program will have a place next to the Communists and other revolutionaries.”

The necessity for unity of all anti-fascist forces is today more urgent than ever. But it is a matter of creating a front that would be widely recognized by the people, which would not commit mistakes tomorrow and would not become meaningless as a result of internal strife or incorrectly defined objectives. To achieve this, the revolutionary core, the working class and peasantry, broad urban and rural sections must overcome the tendencies noted by Comrade Corvalan: sectarianism and splitting tactics.

Ultras Attack the Popular Movement

Precisely sectarianism and splitting tactics mark the activity of the Revolutionary Left Movement (MIR), which appeared as a political organization in 1965, when the political situation in Chile was characterized by a certain ebb in the popular movement due to the defeat in the 1964 elections, when bourgeois reformism, as represented by the Frei government, had reached its apex. Created on the basis of a few groups of intellectuals of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois origins, MIR united practically all the old, dispersed trends of petty-bourgeois revolutionism: Trotskyists, Maoists, Vanguardists, etc., as well as individuals earlier expelled from working-class parties. It was also joined by some who saw it as a militant revolutionary organization. On the other hand, there were not a few who came to MIR because of their anti-Communist positions. MIR proclaimed itself a new revolutionary force opposed to the “tradition parties,” and openly professed anti-Communist views, practiced anti-Sovietism and made terrorism its main political tactic. In line with these criteria, up to 1970 MIR opposed the creation of Popular Unity and announced its own line of boycotting the elections, but a month before the elections when the victory of the Popular candidate became a reality, it revised its position.

Petty-bourgeois revolutionism defined the Allende government as “reformist” and directed all its efforts to creating a “revolutionary pole” with clearly anti-Communist features and oriented on splitting the Popular Unity. Left opportunism was presented as an alternative to the working-class parties and their policy. Its main concern was to achieve a relation of forces favorable to extremist positions inside the broad revolutionary mass movement, while disregarding the need to strengthen the positions of the popular government and to extend its social base.

Implementation of such objectives inevitably led to MIR playing into the hands of the enemies of the government and virtually turning it into a center of provocation which, as it became clear after the coup, was widely used for the infiltration of police agents who launched subversive activities. Such a center always provided fertile soil for shady adventures.

The striving of the MIRists to counterpose themselves to the working-class parties, and particularly the Communist Party, led to their indiscriminate use of revolutionary phraseology, in support of both right and "left" positions.

In line with their dogmatic conceptions, the MIRists declared everyone not belonging to the proletariat or semi-proletariat an adversary of the revolutionary process. To justify their contentions, they denied the need for an anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic stage of the revolution, proclaiming its immediate socialist character. Losing sight of the principal enemies, they followed a primitive policy of isolated clashes with small and medium owners and the middle sections. This led to the isolation of the revolutionary forces, providing a mass base for the enemies of the popular government and facilitating preparations for the coup.

This course was counterposed to the policy of compromise and alliance needed to direct all forces against imperialism and the oligarchy. The shortsightedness of the slogans advanced against the measures of the popular government to strengthen its positions is evident in analyzing the history of the events.

Today it is clear that opposition to the dialogue of Popular Unity with the Christian Democrats was unjustified. The Christian Democratic Party, as is known, is a multi-class party, including, besides representatives of the monopolistic oligarchy, large groups of the democratically oriented small and middle bourgeoisie, middle sections, the peasantry and the working class. From dogmatic positions, this party was seen as a single mass. This facilitated the activity of the reactionary bourgeois groups led by Frei and striving to unite around itself the entire party and direct it along a path of blind opposition to the popular government. In these circumstances, it was easy for the right forces in the CDP to frustrate the attempts of the democratic-minded leaders to prevent the CDP from slipping into collaboration with the fascist plotters.

Today we can clearly see that the ultra-left actions to frustrate cooperation between the popular government and the constitutionalist sections of the armed forces were untenable. The attacks against General Carlos Prats, when he assumed the post of head of the

government, palpably demonstrate the sectarianism and irresponsibility resulting from the ultra-left's striving to counterpose themselves to the left parties, and to picture as "reformists" the revolutionary leadership, the Popular Unity and the President.

Equally, we should not underestimate the harm caused by opportunist tendencies inside the popular movement, that demobilized and diverted its forces from the urgent task of forming new economic and social relations, which was of fundamental importance in defending and developing the revolutionary process.

Progressive government measures met with the resistance of the monopolies, latifundists and imperialist companies, which resorted to boycott, sabotage, disorganization and chaos in all branches of the economy. This was the key aspect of Kissinger's plan of "destabilizing" the popular government. In these circumstances, the task of organizing production along new lines and struggle against the growing chaos was of decisive importance. Nevertheless, the ultra-left organizations, particularly the MIR, rejected the plans of the popular government. They opposed the battle for production proclaimed by the government and revolutionary parties. The ultra-leftist declared that "economic and production problems cannot be placed above the objectives of the class struggle," concluding that "big business is responsible for production" (*Punto Final*). In other words, they proposed that the popular masses disavow responsibility for the decisive field of social development precisely when the capitalists concentrated their forces there.

At the time, influential bourgeois parties like the Christian Democrats encouraged putting forward unrealistic demands to bring about a head-on-clash between the popular masses and the government. The ultra-left entered the game, striving to win more supporters among backward workers and peasants and advancing all kinds of limited demands which, while satisfying the interests of separate groups, disregarded the interests of the movement as a whole. And on this the ultra-left based their policy. They concealed their right opportunism by revolutionary phraseology, which was no impediment to their acting in concert with reaction. One of the many instances of such collaboration was the copper miners' strike, which CIA agents organized and used for their own aims, together with the ultra-left.

Such actions had a harmful effect on the popular movement because they sowed confusion inside Popular Unity and in the revolutionary leadership. One of the chief causes of our defeat was the lack of a united leadership of the movement capable of conducting a principled policy, which created the danger of opportunist deviations

of both right and left varieties. And behind this looms the subversive activity of petty-bourgeois revolutionism that is called upon to hamper the establishment of the necessary hegemony of the working class and its parties in the guidance of the revolutionary process.

Extremism—An Offspring of Bourgeois Ideology

The methods the ultra-leftists use in achieving their aims are yet another evidence of their sectarianism. Proclaiming the principle of "self-reliance" as their objective, they practiced infiltration of political parties to effect changes in their policy in the interest of the ultra-left. The policy of infiltration was practiced mainly with regard to the Socialist Party, a decisive party in the leadership of the movement, on whose orientation implementation of a united leadership of the revolutionary process largely depended. The positions of the ultra-left frequently found an audience in this party, causing great harm to the process, as well as to Socialist-Communist unity.

The revolutionary leadership, as well as our Party, unquestionably bear responsibility for the shortcomings in the ideological struggle, which should have ensured and deepened unity on the basis of fundamental positions and made it possible to resolutely prosecute an independent working-class line. In general, experience shows that petty-bourgeois revolutionism flourishes only where the work of consistent revolutionaries is weak or insufficient. And though it is evident that revolutionary rhetoric finds a ready response in the nonproletarian social sections, a solution can be found to any situation by decisively defending unity. Unity of the proletariat with the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie will be the stronger the better the working-class party defends its fundamental positions. One aspect of ultra-left activity requires a somewhat different assessment. They conducted work in the armed forces, trying to strengthen their influence. True enough, it was imperative to promote left ideas among the military, but this was largely underestimated by the popular movement. However, it is also true that the narrow sectarian line serving as the basis of the ultra-left work among the military linked this work with their struggle against the effort of the government to develop cooperation with the constitutionalist sector of the army, and turned into provocative actions against the officers who supported the government, thereby weakening our positions. In ultra-left propaganda, the armed forces were artificially divided "horizontally," presenting as a decisive factor contradictions between officers and men; the very forms of their work in the armed forces permitted infiltration by agents-provocateurs, facilitating the creation of a correlation of

forces favorable for the fascist coup.

Petty-bourgeois revolutionism rejected the lesson of this experience. There is not a single document attempting a self-critical assessment of these positions, or proving the seriousness of these organizations. On the contrary, their policy after the fascist coup contains all the features of their former opportunism. Nor are there any modification of their striving to establish themselves as an alternative to the workers' parties, or of their adventurism that places them outside the mass movement.

The slogans put forward by MIR in the wake of the coup are directed primarily against the popular movement. The dastardly campaign of the fascist junta—striving to depict the popular government as a corrupt regime and to call in question the activity of Comrade Allende and the most outstanding leaders—was also used by the ultra-left. Their leaflets claimed that "MIR cannot be accused of unseemly dealings," thereby inferring the legitimacy of the fascist calumnies. The ultra-left hoped thus to win over supporters of the popular parties.

With the same aim they spread the slogan: "MIR is not asking for asylum," striving to call in question the legitimate and indisputable actions of the left parties, temporarily sending abroad some of the more prominent cadres to safeguard their lives and guarantee continuity of the revolutionary leadership. Besides the falsity of these statements, the very fact that they were made is evidence of the divisive intentions of the ultra-left. As to asking for political asylum, this has been done by hundreds of MIR-ists.

The most striking evidence of ultra-left political adventurism in the period immediately following the coup was, undoubtedly, the negotiations between MIR and the Intelligence of the Air Force (SIFA). This is adventurism pure and simple, because attempts were made to reach agreement without mass participation, in complete disregard of the process of mass struggle. And although in the end most of the leaders adopted a sound stand, these actions led to open betrayal by others.

Negotiations between MIR and SIFA centered on the fascists' proposal to discontinue repressions against MIR with the aim of isolating the Communist Party and concentrating attacks exclusively against us. The very fact that the arrested MIR leaders agreed to begin talks with the fascists on these conditions is indicative. Their emissaries were in contact for almost two months and though in the end MIR publicly rejected the junta proposal, there is no doubt that this episode caused the betrayal of four persons, who made pitiful

appeals to the revolutionaries to submit to fascism. This fact was widely used by the junta to demobilize the popular movement. We were all outraged at the murder of many MIR leaders. Everybody is now helping to protect them from repressions. Most of these crimes occurred after the negotiations between MIR and SIFA. Among the victims is Miguel Hendriquéz, general secretary of MIR, who was killed after the dictatorship announced an alleged assault on a bank. This was done clearly with the intention of distracting attention from another crime—the killing of General Carlos Prats.

Many arrested MIR-ists obviously lack revolutionary consciousness, for time and again they betray new data to the enemy. This information has resulted in the destruction of many units of their organizations and frequently does harm to activists of other parties, who helped some of the MIR leaders.

In a recent resolution the MIR leadership adopted a self-critical attitude to both its line of open opposition to the working-class parties, particularly the Communist Party, and the use of terror tactics. But this process was not developed further. Moreover, in letters to Popular Unity and our Party, MIR is once again reverting to positions that separated and frequently counterposed it to the popular movement.

Confirmation of this is a letter addressed to our Party leadership at the end of February 1975, where MIR comments on our document of December 1974.

This letter, formally couched in terms of unity, emphasizes resolute opposition to the tactical line being elaborated by the revolutionary movement and directed at struggle against the fascist dictatorship, for its overthrow.

To Draw Inspiration From Lenin's Teaching

Apart from the secondary questions—attempts to justify attacks against the popular movement and to impose their own point of view as the criterion of truth—this lengthy letter leaves no doubt that the assessment of the MIRists differs profoundly from that of the Chilean Left.

Let us examine the principal difference.

The fundamental point of difference is around the policy of unity conducted by the popular movement. The ultra-left say that in our document "many pages are devoted to appeals to the Christian Democrats," and add: "It is with concern that we note in this document an appeal to the Christian Democrats as a whole, without distinguished between those in the CDP who represent the democra-

tic and anti-fascist small and middle bourgeoisie, and the supporters of Frei and Aylwin, who represent the interest of the reactionary big bourgeoisie."

"What surprises us," they continue, "is that it has so soon been forgotten that these CD groups, in the service of the big imperialist bourgeoisie headed by Frei and Aylwin, bear the main responsibility for the boycott and subversive activity against the Popular Unity government, and also for the coup, as a result of which Allende was overthrown and murdered."

This is the strongest argument, and on its basis opposition is voiced on the next three pages to the policy of Popular Unity and our Party aimed at building a broad antifascist front.

The above assessments represent simply a development of the criteria adhered to by MIR before the coup, and which were analyzed earlier. In an attempt to conceal their inconsistencies, they distort our positions.

We distinguish in the Christian Democratic Party not only between the small and middle bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the big bourgeoisie, on the other; we single out—and this is much more important—the workers, peasants, broad middle sections, including artisans, professionals, the intelligentsia, etc., who belong to this party or support it. We take account of this pluralism, without idealizing it or concealing its essence. Our document mentions the successes won by the people when the CDP and the Left acted jointly, pointing out, however, that it is "one side of the coin. There is another side: the CDP is a pluralist party, frequently reflecting contradictory interests. Therefore . . . when sectarian forces, linked with the monopolies and supported by the sectarianism flourishing in the left forces, established themselves in the CDP leadership, a split was imposed and even a clash (between various sections of the people), benefitting the reactionaries." And the document specifies: "CDP participation in a blind opposition to the popular government, into which it was drawn by a part of the leadership, resulted in the fascist coup, the grievous consequences of which affect the entire people, Marxists and Christians alike."

In our document the problem is analyzed in detail, and therefore the attempt of MIR to counterpose us to Popular Unity has no justification or sense.

In a way this is natural, because essentially it is not a matter of posing the problem, but of the form in which it is posed, of the understanding of the role the CDP plays as a mass party in Chile. Clearly in the CDP itself there are two trends conflicting over the basic lines

of policy. One facilitated the coup, then collaborated with the junta in a bid for power, and is now searching for a bourgeois way out that would deny the working-class movement a corresponding role in the democratic future of the country. This trend is led by Frei. The other trend, uniting democratic sections and expressing the interests of the majority of the Christian Democratic masses, is seeking an understanding with the left forces in line with its liberal principles and favorable attitude to social change. In these circumstances, MIR urges a split in the CDP as a condition of building an antifascist front and demands that Popular Unity accept its stand. We, however, are of the opinion that the Christian Democrats must themselves decide on their political direction in a way that suits them, that they themselves determine. We are not imposing organizational conditions on them and restrict discussions to political issues which pave the way to a united front. We see the struggle for anti-fascist unity as a process based on the political realities and correlation of the main classes. Anti-fascist unity is projected primarily into the future, built up at grassroots level and its success is determined by ideological struggle, by the defeat of conciliation and sectarianism, which are still sowing discord among the people. To accentuate discussion around one individual, while obscuring the fundamental problems that are of decisive importance for the masses, means to help those who are seeking a bourgeois way out of the crisis, i.e., an alternative that can only be defeated by building a strong antifascist unity. In other words, in this case a situation will be repeated when part of the people, including workers and peasants and particularly the middle strata, serve as a springboard for establishing a new bourgeois government. Division among the people, contributed to by dogmatic positions, in a very real sense serves to subordinate them to the bourgeoisie. Unity, on the contrary, will guarantee the revolutionary prospect of the democratic process.

In justification of its sectarian line, MIR writes: "In our opinion, this erroneous policy of seeking alliances with the bourgeois factions of the Christian Democracy is directly linked to the incorrect characterization of the Chilean military dictatorship as a fascist dictatorship." MIR itself refutes this proposition: it shows that the dictatorship is ruling exclusively in the interests of the monopolies and imperialism (no mention is made of the latifundists, but presumably they too are taken into consideration); that the junta deals blows not only at the proletariat, middle urban and rural strata, but also at the national bourgeoisie; it does not dispute that terror is used as a political instrument, a tool to liquidate the democratic forces; but a conclu-

sion is drawn nevertheless that this is not a fascist dictatorship. What is it then? MIR answers: "On our continent these regimes are widely known as gorilla military dictatorships and they were resorted to by the creole bourgeoisie and imperialism in countries such as Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Uruguay, etc." Note the scientific precision of the definition.

The Ultras—Apologists of the Junta

Fascism, essentially, is a form of political rule expressing the interests of finance capital and the monopolies and is aimed at absolute domination over society. As the power of monopoly capital, it tends to eliminate every form of democratic government. It is totalitarian: it does not and cannot accept democratic coexistence even within the bourgeois class. Traditional forms of coexistence of the interests of various sections of the bourgeoisie (parliament, plurality) are liquidated because the aim of fascism is to bring the entire society under the sway of the oligarchy and imperialism. The antagonism between fascism and democracy is absolute; hence, resort to terror derives from its very character, is an inevitable concomitant of all such regimes, and is used against whoever does not accept its positions, with only some difference as to degree.

Fascism is a product of counter-revolution, the violent interruption of the revolutionary process. The hatred of the old ruling classes is increasing due to fear of losing their privileges and they are resorting to ever more brutal repressions. Such is the experience of Spain, Hungary, Bulgaria, to mention only a few of the more distinctive cases.

Fascism uses an ideology in which the decisive part is played by the most reactionary bourgeois nationalism. It extols the so-called racial and national values, proclaims an expansionist policy, seeking aid and justification in geopolitical theories. From this derives the tendency to military provocations. Another feature of the fascist theories is the definition of the state as a supra-class body, designed to suppress the class struggle (not the classes themselves), claiming that this struggle exists solely due to the will of individual Marxists. The struggle against politicians in general, inherent in fascist propaganda, implies the imposition of the interests of monopoly capital on the bourgeoisie as a whole and on the entire society.

True, this phenomenon is and has been an inherent feature of the developed countries, but today it has shifted to the less developed capitalist countries, where it is characterized by the use of the armed forces as the decisive factor of power. This should be seen as a con-

sequence of the role of imperialism and its influence on the national development of dependent countries. In this sense, this form of fascism can be defined as military fascism. That is why the definition of the junta given by the popular movement of Chile and the whole world is correct.

How did MIR arrive at the negation of this reality, which in the final count plays into the hands of the junta? Why does it feel a "theoretical obligation" to negate the fascist character of the dictatorship? It does so to buttress its narrow conception of possible allies of the proletariat. For this, fascist demagogy is used in order to obscure its class character. Making uncritical use of bourgeois interpretations of history, which stress the mass character of nazism up to 1933, or the influence of Italian fascism on the middle peasantry, they embellish the system and allege that it owed its stability to mass support. In their delirium they are outdoing even the bourgeoisie in attributing to fascism something it never had to any significant degree: influence among the working class. Its successes in this field were the result of maneuvering designed to widen the split of the proletariat—between the Social Democrats and Communists, between the reformists and revolutionaries. The phenomenon, profoundly analyzed at the Seventh Comintern Congress, serves as a lesson in our present struggle and is decisively at variance with the ultra-left positions. MIR has distorted this without a twinge of conscience. Its digressions do not make it clear why "such a stable system" as fascism must resort to brutal terror in order to stay in power, which is widely recognized as its characteristic feature.

That is the problem: While some are dealing with superficialities, the revolutionary working class is delving into the essence of the phenomena in order to formulate its policy.

True, substitution of a popular approximation for a scientific definition (which we in no way disparage) is no theoretical achievement. Of gorillas there have been many, but not all of them have been able to establish a fascist system.

Now MIR itself is calling attention, as we have already mentioned, to the fact that fascist dictatorship is opposed to all social strata, with the exception of the oligarchy and imperialism. It declares: "Even sections of the petty bourgeoisie (we frankly say, the majority) which yesterday supported the coup are today turning away from, or against, the fascists." Or: "The monopoly bourgeois sections, and the contradictions among the bourgeoisie are increasing with each passing day" (that it did, there is no doubt, another thing is whether it is to the liking of the national bourgeoisie).

And what is the conclusion MIR arrives at? That we need not create an antifascist front!

The ultra-leftists claim that building an antifascist front means "subordinating the working class to the bourgeoisie." And they accuse the European working-class movement of having done so by creating antifascist fronts during the Second World War. Regarding such accusations, they should hear what the bourgeoisie of the respective countries have to say on this score. The Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Polish, Rumania, Yugoslav, Hungarian, German, as well as the French and Italian bourgeoisie could produce arguments demonstrating the exact opposite.

These contentions, unless combated, lead to sectarian narrowness of the working class. It cannot and must not renounce its democratic demands, must participate in the popular movement and play the leading role in it, which is the immediate objective today. That is the essence of Leninism. This was stressed especially during the struggle against tsarism. According to the ultra-leftists, inclusion in the program of the front of such objectives as agrarian reform, is a typically bourgeois-democratic measure, signifying "subordination to the bourgeoisie." Life has shown that this is simply ridiculous.

The Working Class and the Mass Struggle

The working class cannot win hegemony by clamoring for it. And to demand it before achieving unity is to put the cart before the horse. The working class will establish and consolidate its hegemony as a result of mass actions, through struggle, by pursuing a policy taking into account the interests of diverse classes and social strata opposed to fascism, that is, the interests of a stable majority.

The problem of armed struggle is plainly one of the problems on which the MIR lays special emphasis in the letter we have mentioned. "Your document," it writes, "is not quite clear in regard to the problem of developing the people's military rule and the forms of armed resistance of the masses . . . Indeed, the document seems to suggest that your leadership fully rejects the use of armed forms of resistance to the military dictatorship and, moreover, to mistake every form of armed struggle for terrorism, for action by small groups, for adventurism."

A few lines further, the above takes the form of a categorical statement. "Nowhere does your leadership explain," the letter says, "why resistance to the military dictatorship should reject armed forms of struggle." Indeed, we do not explain this anywhere because we have never asserted any such thing. Yet the letter goes on harping on this

subject: "Such pacifist tendencies . . . can only help the bourgeoisie and dictatorship. The working class and the Chilean people have already paid for that harmful pacifist policy with the most painful defeat ever, with thousands of victims, tortures, concentration camps, poverty and hunger." This is how the MIR gives us its views on military problems.

The party of the working class has always borne in mind the need to solve the military problem, the problem of the balance of forces from the military point of view, which is of decisive importance in the fight for power. This is a Marxist axiom following from our concept of the state and its class character.

But what is no longer an axiom but a result of creative application of Marxism in a specific historical situation and in a particular society is the issue of how the working class and the people go about achieving a balance of military forces favorable to the revolutionary process and enabling the revolutionary forces to prevent or crush the attempts of the reactionaries to maintain their privileges by force of arms.

The mistakes made by the Chilean popular movement (our Party assumes its share of responsibility for them) were not due to a pacifist conception of the class struggle, as the ultra-leftists irresponsibly allege. In fact, it was precisely the influence of narrow-minded and sectarian militarist concepts that undoubtedly did much harm, greater perhaps than the harm done by overestimating democratic trends in the Chilean social system and in the armed forces.

Be that as it may, an analysis of the military problem aimed at learning the lessons of the past and choosing the right policy today should proceed from the fundamental principle that there is no, and nor can there be, a favorable alignment of military forces guaranteeing the success of the revolutionary process, without a favorable alignment of political forces, without the revolutionary forces rallying the majority of social strata and opposing them to the forces which the people's enemies succeed in grouping around them. This kind of consolidation is a primary condition which we were unable to meet under the popular government and which became the main cause of our defeat.

At that time, the popular movement was oriented toward strengthening the positions of constitutionalists in the armed forces loyal to the popular government and resisting fascist efforts to make the armed forces protectors of oligarchic and imperialist power. Leaning on the constitutionalists for support, the government tried to bring the armed forces into solving the country's economic and social problems. In this way they embraced the interests of the majority of the nation and

joined in the effort to end the backwardness and poverty inherited from the old regime. It was in that period that a trend developed toward a growing community of the interests of the armed forces and the exigencies of the country's advancement and hence the revolutionary process.

In keeping with these criteria, the military were invited to help in forming a government, with the result that the employers' strike in September 1972 was defeated. It will be recalled that the ultra-leftists opposed that orientation and thereby facilitated fascist subversion.

Yet the position chosen by Popular Unity and President Allende was best suited for combatting reactionary trends in the armed forces themselves, blocking the rebels, winning support for the government, the working class and the people, and fighting reactionary army officers should they venture on a fascist military coup.

The reason why this orientation failed was that the balance of political forces deteriorated sharply to the detriment of the popular movement and that the revolutionary forces did not promote this general orientation consistently. We were unable to exert direct influence on the armed forces or counter fascist plotting, especially when the positions of the constitutionalists were weakened. Indeed, we overrated the constitutionalists' potentialities in the armed forces and democratic influence in military institutions.

The military policy of revolution must be in harmony with the process of mustering forces in support of revolutionary positions. We are opposed to the MIR concepts because our experience and international revolutionary experience has convinced us that the MIR proposals and policy in this respect frustrate the prospects of the working class and its allies to bring about a balance of political and, hence, of military forces favorable to the revolutionary process.

Let us verify this against the proposals and criteria set out in the letter the MIR has sent our Party.

The Dividing Line Runs Between Fascism and Anti-Fascism

Work in the armed forces is a matter of prime importance. The MIR persists in its sectarian position, which did so much harm under the popular government. It proposes that the popular movement should join in struggle against army officers and regard the antagonism between officers and non-officers as a "fundamental" contradiction of the same nature as the contradiction between fascism and democracy, between patriotism and subservience, between defense of human rights and the practice of crimes and tortures.

This is not a policy for victory. The popular movement cannot

shackle itself by the dogmatic criteria of those who refuse to draw conclusions from events, such as the recent events in Portugal.

The rebels fully committed the armed forces to politics. They renounced all constitutional traditions, seen as unquestionable gains, and thus paved the way for open discussion in the armed forces. This happened for the first time in 40 years of Chilean history. The duty of the Chilean popular movement is to strengthen the influence in the armed forces of the ideas and sentiments of the majority of the people and organize systematic work among these tens of thousands of Chileans in uniform. A few months ago we succeeded in acquainting thousands of servicemen with our more important political documents.

In carrying on this work, the popular movement must undoubtedly take into account privates and petty officers first of all, whose social standing and association with the people's drama makes it easier for them to realize the need to end fascism. In a somewhat different sense this also applies to most of the army officers connected with the middle strata, which are likewise oppressed by fascism.

This is why, to quote Dimitrov, we are ready to join up even with generals who live by their job and have no hand in crimes or embezzlement, for the dividing line between the people and their enemies does not run at anyone's whim but is necessitated by history and leaves the oligarchy and imperialism and the fascists in their service on the other side of the barricade.

It follows that armed forces who are loyal to the people (this is the goal of the antifascist front) and really respect political rule freely established by the people and from whose ranks all fascists, torturers and venal elements have been removed, will also include many of today's officers. In such armed forces there will be no more injustice or discrimination against petty officers or privates while hierarchical principles, the principles of discipline and organization guaranteeing the normal functioning of this institution will be preserved. In fact, these principles will acquire a new content under a democratic system.

The antifascist orientation of most servicemen will be primarily influenced by the development of the working-class and popular struggle. When the broad masses come into movement, antifascist sentiments in the army will revive the unity of the people and the soldiers will be strengthened in the course of class battles. We are already witnessing the beginnings of that. Already many employers go out for wool and come back shorn. Confronted with workers' strikes, they call in the army, but the workers' firmness in pressing their demands induces the soldiers to come out against the employers. That attitude is shared by the officer in command of the detachment.

Of course, such cases are still the exception—on the whole the army remains subservient to big capital. But it would be wrong for the revolutionary movement not to take account of such phenomena and their development. The movement must not confine itself to conspiracies and consider the problem of the armed forces out of context with the general purpose.

In saying that we are not belittling the importance of work within the armed forces and the problems connected therewith. We consider them as part of our general plan and subordinate to it.

Terrorism—A Product of Bourgeois Ideology

The ultra-lefts hold up terrorism as the decisive element of all their political plans. The MIR people say in their letter that they are combatting adventurism, are “against actions by small groups not connected with the masses and against terrorism because we do not punish innocent people, something the dictatorship does day in and day out.” A few lines further on they give a more precise formulation of their demands in the present period: “We must confine ourselves to defense or armed support of certain forms of political and economic struggle against the dictatorship (propaganda, certain specific demands, etc.) that will weaken the dictatorship and wear out its machine of repression (simple mass sabotage, actions against the repressive machine), punishment of the murderers, tortures and henchmen of the dictatorship . . .”

These actions add up to a plan of terror, even if they mean the death not only of innocent persons. Every such action can only be performed by individuals or small groups with no ties with the masses, and the latter will not, in the present conditions, have any part in such actions. The terrorist character of the organization does not vanish by claiming that the terror is in behalf of the “masses.”

Terrorism as a method of struggle was rejected by Lenin in his fight against the Socialist-Revolutionaries way back in 1902. And his criticism has lost none of its relevance today, for the MIR arguments look very much like a carbon copy of those advanced by the Socialist-Revolutionaries 70 years ago.

There is no doubt in our minds that we have to be guided by the tried and tested Leninist principles. There is the proof of analyzed experience that, far from adding to the strength of the revolutionary movement, terrorism only brings on more repression by the dictatorship.

They resent our exposure of terrorism, our revelation of their opportunistic actions, which we maintain only help fascism. “To develop

the armed struggle of the people does not mean providing the dictatorship with a 'pretext.' We know that it does not need any pretext to kill and torture, destroy democratic freedoms and impose a reign of terror," the MIR people say. What sort of society are ultralefts living in? Haven't they ever heard of plan Z, the Leopard Plan, the raid on the Bank of Chile, Bloody Easter, the war in Peru, and so on and so forth? No matter how criminal the fascists really are, they need to carry out their—let us euphemistically call it—"policy of the masses," a policy of demagogic deceit, and if the maturity of the people provides no pretext for operating that policy, they manufacture such pretexts.

This is beyond all doubt: terrorism does not help the people and serves reaction. The opposite is true of real mass struggle. Don't the MIR people know how carefully the dictatorship conceals the news of mass actions, strikes, sit-ins, demonstrations? There have been dozens of these and there is a growing militancy in many of our proletarian centers and among diverse social strata. And yet the MIR-ists draw no conclusions from this. They fail to realize that precisely this is what the dictatorship fears above all. Mass work is much more useful and helpful to the revolution than preparation of terrorist acts in which the masses refuse to have any part. And when terrorism goes under the label of "popular," it does even greater harm to the fight against the dictatorship. For it has nothing in common with the people, with the masses, and this is decisive. The ultra-lefts have deprived the word "people" of its dignity and prestige, and they will need both at a definite stage in the development of the mass struggle.

Insistence on these erroneous concepts of work in the armed forces and on the supposed value of terrorist tactics have led the ultra-lefts to the mechanistic conception of the forms through which the popular movement can achieve a favorable correlation of military forces. The whole theory is capsuled into the formula "our own military power."

Let us see what they have to say on the subject: "Even if the vast majority of the people come out against the dictatorship and want to topple it, the bourgeoisie can still for a long time maintain its repressive regime if the dictatorship is not weakened militarily and politically." And there is this piece of reasoning: "In the final analysis . . . the working class and people can halt the armed suppression only if they establish a popular and proletarian military power and destroy, by armed struggle, the repressive forces of the bourgeoisie."

It would be hard to be more confused. If the vast majority of the people want to topple the dictatorship and act in accordance with their wish (to question that inevitability is to grossly underestimate the

masses), the days of the dictatorship will draw to an end. That is the first consideration. Only mass struggle can create a revolutionary situation, and consequently, the basic conditions for a favorable military and political correlation of forces. But apparently MIR attaches secondary importance to that. Its main concern is "military power," though, as it itself explains, it is fighting against all militarist deviations.

The "popular and proletarian military power," which according to the MIR blueprint will be the result of terrorist acts, capable of destroying the repressive forces of the bourgeoisie (which means, having a military and technical machine superior to that of the armed forces) is simply an illusion, especially since it is discussed out of all context with the real class struggle. Such an attitude will never produce anything worthwhile for the real revolution, as long as it is based on division of the political and military forces, as if we are dealing with two independent categories.

The People Will Themselves Overthrow the Dictatorship

Our Party is working to give the people a correct understanding of the key problems. We are bringing to the fore what is of fundamental importance, viz., the mass struggle. "No revolutionary process can win without reliance on the masses. In this sense violence is necessary for any form of establishing the power of the working class and people. But the form of violence depends on the degree of resistance offered, or let us better say, might be offered, by the reaction, and this in turn depends on the activity of the proletariat, on the degree to which it can isolate the enemy, on the situation that takes shape within the armed forces, on the international situation, etc. And since these conditions cannot be determined today, it would be wrong to preclude any plan because the development of the revolution will introduce the necessary correctives."

We do not rule out the probability that the fascist dictatorship will offer armed resistance and unleash a civil war against the offensive of the masses which will inevitably develop and sound the death knell of the dictatorship. But even in these circumstances the revolution will not triumph with the help of a phantom military power unrelated to the mass struggle.

Lenin pointed out that if the revolution does not acquire a mass character and does not influence the army, there can be no talk of serious struggle. We must take that into account in our social, political and also geographical situation in the event of an armed clash. It need hardly be said that action ability of the popular and workers' detachments will play a crucial role. That is beyond doubt and has nothing in

common with the concept of "military power" advocated by MIR.

On the other hand, even MIR sees the "theoretical possibility of overthrowing the gorillas' military junta with the help of a popular political and economic struggle (accompanied by simple forms of armed struggle and revolutionary work in the army), without recourse to wider military clashes." And though this possibility is later abandoned without any serious argument, it doubtlessly exists.

Whatever the circumstances, no serious revolutionary can precisely forecast how the dictatorship will be overthrown. We make no such predictions, for we are convinced that any dogmatic determination of the process will only do harm and delay the hour of victory. Organizations that claim a vanguard role must form indestructible links with the mass movement, overcome the weaknesses and mistakes of the past, master all forms of struggle, and particularly concrete day-to-day patient work among hundreds of thousands of people. It is to this that we address our efforts; we are working to build up unity and develop anti-fascism actions, for this is decisive for victory, the very basis of success.

It is only natural, we hold, that the political criterion of the ultra-leftists has led them to the idea of forming an anti-dictatorship organization of selected cadres based on action by these cadres, and not on mass struggle. Their sectarian conception of strategy and tactics has led to a sectarian conception of organization, and will therefore lead to defeat.

In one of their documents, dated March 1974, they said: "We intend to promote popular power that could today assume the tasks of resistance, tomorrow a mass offensive, and in the future an insurrectionist movement. Today, we must sow the seeds of this popular power in every factory commission and in every resistance committee."

This is not a serious approach. What would popular power stand for today? It is just another phrase, like "youth power," "women's power" and other gimmicks of the bourgeoisie, which have never really opposed the reactionary power of the state, whereas the working class and the people are interested, first and foremost, in radically changing it.

To set out to create an alternative power worthy of the name at this moment is to breed harmful illusions, to confuse the masses. Where and over whom could this power be exercised?

What is really necessary, instead of dreaming about a mythical "popular power," is to investigate devolutionary action in fields where it will pave the way to victory: democratic activity where the people live, work, learn, and rest. The fascists may impose terror, but will

never be able to prevent trade union activity, the activity of tenants' groups, of women in maternity centers, students' centers, the activity of Party clubs, and cultural and art activities. That is where indestructible foundations will be laid for the people's struggle against fascism, setting the stage for a really serious battle for power against the oligarchy and imperialism.

This is entirely contrary to the idea of resistance committees as "seeds of popular power," which lead through revolutionary rhetoric to splits in the mass organizations, to parallel organizations isolated from the people's mass organizations.

The resistance committee concept arose in March 1975 on the proposal of the MIR. In a letter to us they said: "You have advanced the idea that the prime duty of resistance is to participate in mass organizations." It would appear from this that we could reach an understanding. Unfortunately, however, 30 lines below they added: "But we note the absence in your document of a concrete proposal for a mass underground resistance organization." What do they mean? Either we work in the mass organizations, or create underground organizations which, naturally, cannot be mass organizations in the full sense. Quite right, we make no concrete "proposal," because we have decided to work in the mass organizations which the people have been able to form and which encompass the vast majority, uniting millions of Chileans. We have decided, furthermore, to help revive the organizations that fascism succeeded in destroying, but, despite brutal repressions, constitute the historical basis for popular organization. It is our firm belief that in Chilean conditions parallel organizations would be a fallacious and suicidal policy leading to defeat of the popular movement.

In the present conditions it is the vanguard political forces, from local branches right up to the leadership, that should work underground. The liaison between the anti-fascist forces at local level should also be underground. We have made a concrete proposal on this score; to form anti-fascist committees connecting party organizations and individuals, and serving as centers of leadership for the various mass organizations. But that is an entirely different matter.

Deadly Struggles Against Anti-Communism

Each of the MIR deviations concerning mass work betrays opposition to the popular parties and the latter's role in the revolutionary process, and the wish to destroy their organization, to make them abandon their vanguard role. Substantiating the idea of resistance committees, the MIR people write: "We hold that unity in resistance should not be expressed solely through the front of political parties,

but—and this is the main thing—it should be created on the basis of underground organizations of the masses.”

What are the political parties the MIR can refer to if it thinks they are able to form a top-level front and cannot form a front on the basis of the mass organizations, which is really the decisive question? Surely not the workers' parties. Their scheme would possibly fit some petty-bourgeois party, which rejects ties with the masses “in principle.” For us leadership at primary level implies the presence of a party. To deny this is to abandon our vanguard role and sink deeper and deeper into opportunism.

We are prepared to work at primary level with all antifascists. More, we have always emphasized this. That is the road to a united front confirmed by experience. But we consider it wrong and unacceptable for ourselves and other Popular Unity parties to use organizational forms in which we have no experience, and to destroy our primary organizations. Yet this would be the result if we were to form the resistance committees suggested by the MIR.

The MIR suggests, in fact, that these committees should consist of tested representatives of the left forces in each enterprise, whether Communists, Socialists or independents. But who would pick them? The MIR itself. Each group should form its own leadership “democratically” (which would be no problem by means of appropriate elections). And these bodies of leadership are to establish ties among themselves first at local level, then at provincial, etc. But who would tie them together? Naturally, the MIR.

This type of organization has two basic features: first, it is to be completely independent of the political front, and, second, the parties must not interfere in the affairs of the primary organizations, because these are groups of individuals formed to avoid “sectarianism” and facilitate the forging of “unity.”

To put it more bluntly, the MIR proposal is less concerned about the ability or inability of the popular parties to head the struggle at mass level, and amounts, in fact, to just another demonstration of party chauvinism strongly colored with anti-Communism, previously expressed in the impertinent thesis of a “revolutionary pole.” The MIR people hope that in this conglomerate of resistance groups divorced from the political parties there will prevail principles that by disorganizing the popular parties will give the MIR some influence among the masses. Needless to say, the nation will never be able to win if it follows this path. It is bound to fail, and the masses understand this and refuse to be drawn into this suicidal scheme.

The severe trials that have fallen to the lot of our people under

fascist rule have generated a striving for antifascist action unity. Decent people who did and still do consider themselves members of the MIR participate in concrete actions along with representatives of Popular Unity parties and the Christian Democrats chosen by the workers to express their demands. That is how, on a popular basis, through antifascist unity committees involving parties and all or the vast majority of the working people, antifascist unity is being forged. Like all the Popular Unity parties, our Party encourages unity. Attempts to impair this process by advancing sectarian criteria, instigating struggle against parties, imposing division or unilateral "criteria" concerning allies in order to "turn them into the prow of the ship while we hold the helm" (from MIR documents on organizational work), are malicious and harmful, and sure to be rejected by the people.

These are some of our ideas concerning irreconcilable struggle against sectarianism, divisive actions and dogmatism, which have done so much harm to the struggle of the Chilean people. An objective analysis of the recent past shows that our Party, the party of the working class, has not fought firmly enough for its own independent policy, against right and left opportunism within the working-class movement. And it would be a crime to repeat this mistake. To fight more effectively against the main enemy, to consolidate the unity of the people, we shall conduct our ideological struggle more vigorously than before in order to combat confusion, sectarianism, divisive tactics and conciliation.

This struggle is not designed to dissociate a single decent fighter from the revolutionary movement. On the contrary, it is our purpose to attract every real revolutionary to the positions of the working class movement. And we are convinced that in this case his or her contribution to the revolutionary process will be really fruitful.

BOOK REVIEWS

JOSEPH HARRIS

Economics of Racism, USA

*Economics of Racism, USA** is a pioneering work in Marxist literature. In its 256 pages, Victor Perlo examines "the roots of Black inequality" and provides massive documentation and cogent arguments to prove that "today . . . economic discrimination against Blacks is the nation's number one economic problem." As Perlo informs his readers, although the book is a scientific work, it is also partisan. "This book aims to contribute to the factual and analytic basis for attempts to solve that number one problem, and to provide ammunition for the mass struggles that must become a major part of such attempts."

Economics of Racism focuses on the relative conditions and positions of Blacks and whites, stressing the questions of income, occupation and industry, wages and unemployment—the most fundamental aspects of economic situation. (While questions such as housing, health services and education are important to an all around comparison of the quality of life, little space is devoted to

them. Another book, examining comparatively these conditions of Blacks and whites—with the same scientific, statistical probing and sharp argumentation—would be an additional valuable contribution to the subject.)

Perlo begins by examining the U.S. census count of Black and other minority people. The way in which they are seriously and disproportionately undercounted by the census is analyzed. The discriminatory implications of this undercounting in terms of federal aid and electoral representation is explained.

Perlo then proceeds to examine the class composition of Black people in the United States. He notes that "By 1970, about 2.8 million Black workers, or 40 per cent of all gainfully employed Blacks, were engaged in industrial production." Regarding location of the population, Perlo points out that "In 1970, 58 per cent of all Blacks lived in the central cities of large urbanized areas . . . among the white population, however, only 28 per cent lived in central cities."

Since "personal income is the most meaningful indicator of living standards," an entire chapter

*Victor Perlo, *Economics of Racism, USA*, International Publishers, New York, 1975. Paper, \$4.25. Forward by Henry Winston.

is devoted to probing the income trends and current position of Blacks, other oppressed minorities, whites, and the so-called ethnic groups. Perlo proves that the relative position of Blacks is either not improving at all or that the improvement is so slow as to be negligible. In contrast to the claim of the Commerce Department, for example, that "since 1964 . . . the income differentials between Negro and white families have narrowed," Perlo demonstrates that this is not the case, and that since 1969, in fact, the gap has probably increased.

One way the Commerce Department arrives at a distorted conclusion is to count almost all Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other peoples of Latin American descent, themselves the victims of extensive discrimination, as "whites," thus lowering the recorded white median income. Blacks' per capita income was 54 per cent of "white Anglo" income in 1969, Chicanos' was 55 per cent, Puerto Ricans' was 54 per cent and Native American Indians' was only 46 per cent. (Since the number of Spanish surname people in the U.S. is growing more rapidly than the average, this distortion tends to grow over time.) Distortion also results from the undercounting of Blacks, especially the poorest. Additionally, undercounting and noncounting of property income and capital gains, more significant on the average for whites than for Blacks, lowers the reported median income of the white sector of the population.

Perlo polemizes throughout against theories which downgrade the centrality of the struggle against racism. Thus, in the chapter "Trends in Income," he argues against the idea that the motion of the economy can by itself account for the fluctuation in the relative position of Blacks. While some argue that demands for full employment or job creation are adequate for satisfying the needs of the Black population, Perlo is persuasive that "the political struggles of the Black people and their allies, and the counteroffensive of racist reactionaries, have been decisive in the gains and losses of the Black people. . . . Thus, the sharp economic gains of Blacks during World War II were not due only to the labor shortage. They were very much connected with the rise during the 1930s of united struggles and organizations of Black and white workers. . . . On the other hand, political factors of an opposite character were very much in operation in the 20 years following World War II."

Migration from South to North and from farm to city continued during 1945-1965. As Perlo remarks, these population trends "all other things being equal . . . should have led to a steady upward trend in the national average ratio of Black to white incomes." But "these were the decades of the cold war, of virulent anti-Communism and racism." The result was a stagnation of the ratio of Black to white income.

Similarly, the racist offensive of the past few years, spearheaded

by the Nixon Administration, continues to strongly affect the relative position of Blacks. The goal of the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill of a three per cent adult unemployment rate is inadequate, since it implies four per cent overall unemployment—and at least eight per cent for Blacks, given present racist practices. Lack of attention to alleviating the special oppression visited upon Blacks and other minorities means that racist practices not only continue, but worsen, since the racists continue to apply their pressure.

Discrimination in employment and wages is analyzed by Perlo in depth. Kinds of jobs, trends in Black employment patterns, discrimination in promotion, lower pay for the same job, Black workers in low wage plants and sex discrimination in wages are some of the subtopics of Perlo's treatment. One very interesting section deals with employers' increasing substitution of female for male clerical workers, and within that framework of Black for white women workers. Does this represent a lessening in discrimination against women and especially against Black women? *No!* Perlo shows that employers "got away with a substantial reduction in money wages, and a more marked reduction in real wages, considering the rising level of prices."

Further, "the gains of Black women in white collar, especially clerical employment, while socially important, are diminished in economic significance to the extent that employers use this to hold salaries for clerical occupations

down to levels which, relative to wages and salaries in other occupations, are at historical lows. It is a fact that today the average salary of a full time, year-around clerical worker is lower than the average wage of a full time, year-around factory operative."

Super-unemployment is the topic of still another detailed study. To get a full understanding of unemployment statistics—and their weaknesses and biases—of the Department of Labor, you must read this chapter. It is the finest treatment of the subject I have seen.

The last half of *Economics of Racism* has fewer statistics than the first half, and so for many readers it may prove easier sledding. Ideological questions are treated in a more free-wheeling manner.

"Blaming the Victim" contains an especially fine treatment of Edward Banfield's racist program. The question of capitalist responsibility for economic discrimination is examined concretely. American Telephone and Telegraph, the nation's largest employer, the "most ubiquitous monopoly . . . with the most ramified political and economic ties" receives particular attention.

In "Extra Profits From Discrimination" and "What Whites Lose" Perlo clinches his argument as to who is responsible for racism and why all workers must, in their own interest, actively struggle against it.

Perlo devotes a chapter to "Black Capitalism," showing it to be largely an invention of the

ruling class to siphon off militancy among Blacks. He examines the number, size and influence of Black owned firms, discusses the reasons for their weakness, and suggests that while the demand for the right of Blacks to own their own business is one that must be defended, Black capitalism cannot solve the problems of the Black masses.

In "Labor Union Influences" and "Government Influences" Perlo examines further the sources of discrimination. While the unions do not receive a clean bill of health, Perlo makes it quite clear that racism is the result of capitalists and their government. Overall, the unions have played and continue to play a positive role in the struggle against racism, but serious flaws, especially among the craft unions, remain. Perlo's statement that "If the Black struggle for equality has gained, on balance, from the activities and policies of the organized labor movement, the working class as a whole and the trade union movement in particular have gained even more from the struggles of the Black working people" deserves much reflection.

On the other hand, "In the most fundamental sense, the regime of racism and discrimination could not be maintained except through enforcement by the government . . . the government, despite Constitutional guarantees

and laws to the contrary, is the essential protector and enforcer of the entire system of discrimination and super-exploitation of Blacks in the United States. This fundamental role of the government of monopoly capitalism is moderated by the course of political struggle, in relation to economic discrimination as with other specific issues."

Finally, Perlo outlines a program for winning the struggle against economic discrimination—against racism. The argumentation for this program of struggle will be an education for many. For those who have had trouble defending "preferential" treatment or the "quota" system, read this chapter carefully. The treatment of the De Funis case provides the information you need.

It is impossible to quote more than a smattering of the many examples which dot this book—but they are the meat, and will provide valuable ammunition with which to defeat the many and varied racist and racist-influenced views.

Economics of Racism makes a lasting contribution to Marxist literature because it raises the struggle against racism to a new level. As Henry Winston wrote in his Foreword, "It helps light the way to the struggle here and now, to overcome all of the ignorance, and erroneous conceptions, which hold back the forces of anti-monopoly unity."

travel. . .

with Anniversary Tours

. . .meet our friends around the world

- * GROUP TOURS
USSR, Eastern and Western Europe, Greece,
Portugal, Middle East, Latin America
- * WORKER-TO-WORKER BUDGET TOURS
to the Soviet Union
- * YOUTH BARGAIN TRAVEL
- * INDIVIDUAL TRAVEL
USA or world-wide
- * AIR TICKETS
domestic and international
- * CRUISES
- * HEALTH SPAS/ SANATORIA



ANNIVERSARY TOURS

250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019 (212) 245-7501
1741 Ivar Avenue, Hollywood, Ca. 90028 (213) 465-6141