

AUGUST 1973

# political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

**RECOGNIZE CUBA!**

Editorial Comment

**WATERGATE AND THE FASCIST DANGER**

Gus Hall

**A GUIDING IDEOLOGY FOR ANTI-RACIST,  
ANTI-MONOPOLY STRUGGLE**

John Pittman

**NEW LEFT REVISIONIST DISTORTIONS OF  
SOCIALISM**

V. Shukov, Y. Olesevich and V. Sikora

**CZECHOSLOVAKIA: FIVE YEARS LATER**

Phil Bart

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Editorial Comment</i>	
Recognize Cuba!	1
<i>Gus Hall</i>	
Watergate and the Fascist Danger	5
<i>John Pittman</i>	18
A Guiding Ideology for Anti-Racist, Anti-Monopoly Struggle	18
<i>V. Shukov, Y. Olesevich and V. Sikora</i>	
New Left Revisionist Distortions of Socialism	31
<i>Phil Bart</i>	
Czechoslovakia: Five Years Later	50

COMMUNICATIONS

<i>James Dolsen</i>	
On the Role of the Soviet Union Today	58

BOOK REVIEWS

<i>James West</i>	
A False Picture	61

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$6.00 a year; \$3.00 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$7.00 a year. Single copies 60 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N.Y.

# Recognize Cuba!

The twentieth anniversary of the attack on the Moncada barracks by a band of Cuban patriots led by Fidel Castro on July 26, 1953, can mark another turning point in U.S.-Cuba relations, a turn toward normal, equal and cooperative relations.

It is the growing influence of the socialist states in world politics which has created this possibility. This growing influence has forced on U.S. imperialism a greater acceptance of the policy of peaceful coexistence and a turn toward normal relations with the countries of socialism. With the Brezhnev visit additional advances in U.S.-Soviet relations in matters of reducing war dangers and developing peaceful cooperation have been registered. Some important obstacles to the recognition of the German Democratic Republic by the U.S. have been removed. But the U.S. government continues to attempt to exclude socialist Cuba from this general movement toward detente and the development of relations of peaceful coexistence. Against the first socialist state of the Western hemisphere the U.S. policy of isolation, blockade, and intervention remains. To defeat this policy—as it can be defeated—calls for the development of a mass movement of U.S. citizens demanding, in the interests of peace and in the mutual best interests of the peoples of the U.S. and Cuba, the resumption of economic relations and the diplomatic recognition of Cuba by the U.S.

The attack on Moncada, an armory of the bloody Batista regime, failed. Many of the participants were killed, the remainder were jailed or exiled. Yet an attack on Batista was not only an intra-Cuban struggle, for behind the dictator stood not only the most corrupt elements of Cuban society but also the sugar interests, the oil and nickel exploiters, the telecommunications monopoly, companies such as Standard Oil and ITT. It was also an attack on the imperialist policies of the U.S. government on behalf of these multinational corporate monsters, on "Plattism" (after the Platt amendment), on colonialism and neocolonialism in Latin America. July 26, 1953, marked a turning point in the process which led to the abdication of power by Batista and the accession to power of a revolutionary government in Havana on January 1, 1959. For this reason it is celebrated in Cuba as a revolutionary holiday, as well the national independence day.

The revolutionary government of Cuba, headed by Fidel Castro, immediately took vigorous action to break the 60-year-old pattern of U.S. economic domination and political hegemony over Cuba, and

to liquidate the economic and social conditions which were the legacy of those sixty years. Under its revolutionary government Cuba has fully retrieved its national sovereignty, recovered control of its natural resources and eliminated relations of capitalist exploitation on its soil. In the brief period of 14 years Cuba has wiped out illiteracy among its population, abolished unemployment and made giant strides toward transforming its former neocolonial economy into a flourishing socialist economy. History has, as Fidel Castro promised in his famous speech before the court in 1953, vindicated the Moncada attack. We join on this occasion in extending our congratulations and fraternal solidarity to the Cuban people and their vanguard Party.

The Cuban revolution is living proof that even a small nation, with the support of the socialist camp, can overcome foreign economic domination. It has demonstrated that socialism is not alien to the Western hemisphere, and that in the Western half of the world, too, socialism is the guarantee of cultural, economic and social advance for the working people. It has shown that with the present world balance of forces the peoples and nations of Latin America need not await a giant from the United States nor the approval of an "inter-American system" dominated by it to exercise their sovereign rights. It has reaffirmed that the right of nations to choose their own social system and to dispose of their natural and human resources is inherent in their nationhood. The Cuban revolution has stood as constant inspiration to the advance of the people of Latin America.

The U.S. government not only refuses to recognize the Cuban government, but with that refusal closes its eyes to those above-mentioned realities which Cuba represents. Since 1960 it has chosen instead to attempt to diplomatically isolate, economically blockade and to undermine and overthrow the Cuban government. These realities, however, are not dependent on U.S. recognition of them. The successes of Cuba and the advances of the Latin American revolution, along with the solidarity of the Soviet Union and the world's anti-imperialist forces have prevented U.S. policies from achieving their intended result and have steadily eroded the U.S. blockade. Contrary to U.S. expectations, Cuba has proven able to market its entire sugar product, obtain the necessary supplies for development and manage its extractive and other industries.

While originally only Mexico of the OAS member-states defied the ban on diplomatic relations with Cuba, today Cuba is re-establishing relations with other area states. In 1970, with the election of Salvador Allende as President, Chile resumed relations with Cuba, soon followed by Peru. Today Cuba has relations at the ambassadorial level with Jamaica, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, Argentina and Guyana.

On May 25, 1972, the government of Peru presented a draft resolution to the OAS to the effect that the member states who deem it desirable might normalize their relations with the Republic of Cuba, being free to do so at whatever level they deem convenient. The U.S. representative was able to muster only 13 votes (out of 23) against the resolution. Only the U.S. and the oligarchic governments subject to its dictation voted to maintain the ban. If it adheres to its present course the U.S. may face the kind of repudiation in the OAS in respect to Cuba as it did in the UN on the question of the seating of the People's Republic of China.

U.S. policies toward Cuba have had a particular set of consequences and lessons for the people of the United States.

The policy of economic boycott against governments whose policies the U.S. government disapproves is depriving the U.S. of supplies of raw materials just at the time when economic interdependence of nations, including the U.S., is reaching new levels. Withdrawal of Cuba's sugar quota did not topple the Cuban government but it is denying the U.S. access to what was previously its principal external source of sugar at a time when food prices are soaring. But the scale of damage wrought by the Cuban sugar boycott to the U.S. will be multiplied many times if it is allowed to be translated into a precedent for mid-East oil. Only recently—after 55 years—has the U.S. abandoned its policy of economic boycott against the Soviet Union in favor of mutually beneficial economic relations. These relations have been established in spite of differences in policy, ideology and social system. Need it take 55 years to learn the same lesson in Cuba?

Following the failure of other measures to accomplish the overthrow of the Castro government, the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations ordered the CIA to prepare the forcible overthrow of the Cuban government by utilizing an invasion of Cuban exiles. Not daring to subject this policy of blatant intervention and aggression to democratic scrutiny and approval, they relied on undercover techniques of warfare, which with the Bay of Pigs became firmly established as national policy. The techniques developed to carry out the Bay of Pigs included bypassing of all controls on the executive power, eliminating Constitutionally established mechanisms of review, including the right of the Senate to advise and consent on foreign policy and the right of Congress to declare war. In Cuba the CIA developed the methods of waging clandestine war which have since been employed on an even larger scale by the CIA and the Pentagon in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

In order to carry out an armed invasion of Cuba the U.S. armed, organized, paid and directed the activities of Cuban expatriates. These

“freedom fighters,” recruited from among the criminal underworld of the old Cuba as well as from among the *Batistianos*, have proven that they can serve their masters as well on the continent as they did on the island. And they are used as provocateurs, thugs, bombers and informers against the people’s movements in the U.S. It is only the logic of anti-Communism and aggression against foreign countries that the instruments devised for these purposes should be used for them here, that *gusanos* trained by the CIA should be Nixon’s legmen, the *Playa Giron* hero Howard Hunt should be a cog in the White House horror machine.

Behind the flood of accusations against Cuba for being an “interventionist” power, the U.S. taxpayer has been the unwilling contributor of billions of dollars to carry out in Latin America a policy of blatant and continuous intervention in the affairs of numerous other states. Chile, Panama, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Bolivia, Uruguay—and others—have been the victims of overt and covert military adventures undertaken on behalf of the holders of 14 billion dollars of U.S. investments in Latin America—all under the cover of the “inter-American system” and “the fight against foreign subversion.”

But as was pointed out by the organizers of EXPOCUBA, “In the end it is not Cuba that is isolated by the U.S. blockade campaign, but the U.S. public. The American people are restricted from receiving first-hand information about one of the most important areas of social transformation in the Western Hemisphere.”

Fortunately, an increasing number of Americans are coming to see that the policy of non-recognition and blockade against Cuba is just as dangerous to peace, as economically costly, as politically subversive and as unavailing against contemporary realities as was U.S. cold war against the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China. And the various pressures which are being exerted to change that policy can succeed. The Christian progressive movement has established the Cuba Resource Center, which disseminates information on the Church and life in contemporary Cuba. Several organizations have arranged for travel to Cuba and for exchanges between our two countries, including the Venceremos Brigade and the U.S.-Cuban Health Exchange (U.S.-CHE). And in Washington considerable sentiment has begun to build up for a change of policy as evidenced in the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs on “U.S. Policy Toward Cuba” and by the statement by a group of 12 Representatives on “Detente with Cuba.”

Already the statement which Nixon made after the November elections that there could be “no change whatever” in U.S.-Cuban relations

(Continued on Page 65)

# Watergate and the Fascist Danger<sup>\*</sup>

The Watergate hearings have opened up a political can of worms. As a result the slithering, corrupt figures with their crew-cuts are crawling from their inner Capitol Hill sanctuaries. They are people who had unprecedented political powers, but are for the first time in public view. Their concepts of state power have shocked the mass democratic mind. They have openly expressed their "Gestapo mentality." They have expressed Nixon's concepts of government, but more basically they have expressed concepts dictated by monopoly state capitalism in a crisis. They are loyal to Nixon—but above all else, they are loyal servants of the monopoly corporations.

These cold-blooded henchmen of monopoly capital are important cogs in the hub of reaction. But more significant is the police-state structure they were building and servicing and the "Gestapo mentality," the fascist ideology that sustained them.

But the most crucial question in all this is that it is monopoly capital that gave rise to and sustained this cancerous growth—the creeping growth of a police-state structure in the very heart of the democratic governmental edifice. They shaped and financed this structure to serve their purposes of maximum profits. This is where the roots of Watergate are. If they are not exposed and cut there will be new Watergates, there will be new cans of worms.

## *An Independent Class Line*

We welcome all exposures on all levels of the Watergate affair. The hearings are making an important contribution. We will join with all forces that have been propelled into action as a result of the Watergate exposure. But we will not limit ourselves to the surface manifestations. We will not make the mistake of trailing behind liberal shallowness or classlessness. We are for the whole truth, without any limitations, because the interests of our people can best be served only by a full exposure of the roots and the processes that led to Watergate.

In this historic crisis we must pursue a clear, sharp, independent class line. A clear, independent working-class policy is not in contradiction with working with people and dealing with issues on a broader scale. Therefore, we will pursue such a line while working

---

\* The following is part of a report presented to the Central Committee of the Communist Party USA on June 2, 1973.

with broader democratic forces who are ready to act on more limited issues.

It is obvious that the coverup is an important feature that affects everything around Watergate. What is it that most political figures want to cover up about the Watergate affair? Above all else they want to cover up the fact that it is monopoly state capitalism that gives rise to the Watergates. It is here that the roots of Watergate get sustenance. They want to cover up the class roots and we want to expose them. Most politicians want to cover up the fact that there has been a creeping buildup of a police-state structure. We want to expose this fact.

They want to cover up the most important fact—that it is anti-Communism that is the mask the conspirators use to hide their deception. They want to hide these facts because the exposure would bring to light of day their own use of big-lie anti-Communism.

They want to sweep under the rug the way racism is used to put over the policies that led to Watergate. They want to cover it up, we want to expose it. They want to cover up the connection between Watergate and the corporate policies of maximum profits—policies of speedup and inflation. We, on the other hand, want to make these connections as clear as possible.

They want to protect the two old parties, and the two-party system of monopoly capitalism. And the conspirators want to cover up for Nixon. They talk about saving the “presidency.” This is nothing more than a coverup for Nixon.

The working class is the only class that has no self-interest in any kind of coverup.

In regard to Watergate the tasks are manifold. Each crisis has within it its own key links and concentration tasks. This crisis is no different. In the field of education and ideology it presents an historic opportunity to expose the basically evil nature and decay of monopoly capitalism. In monopoly circles there is deep concern because of the “loss of confidence in the system.” In our books a loss of confidence in capitalism in the minds of the masses is an historic, progressive step forward. This has made it possible to go on an ideological offensive against monopoly capitalism. It is a moment when millions can be made to see that monopoly capitalism is the root of all social evils; that it is associated with everything that is anti-democratic, corrupt, immoral, vulgar and criminal. It is a moment when masses can be made to see capitalism as an inhuman, brutal, anti-social system. In this sense we can now make a qualitative change in mass patterns of thought. We can raise political and ideological mass understanding.



It is necessary to expose the links between state monopoly capitalism and the police-state developments. We must sharply bear on the fact that it is a class structure resulting from the class policies of monopoly capitalism.

We have a new and historic moment to go on the offensive against the use of big-lie anti-Communism. We can make a lasting qualitative change in mass ideology in this regard also.

We can expose, in a new way, the responsibility and the role of the Meanys and Lovestones for the Watergate policies. We can expose these arch criminals, these tapeworms in the bowels of the working class movement. The collaboration of the Meanys, Abels and Lovestones with the policies that led to Watergate is a total betrayal of working class interests.

It is an historic moment in the struggle against racism. Millions can now be made to see the crystal-clear relationship between racism and reaction, racism and fascism. We must expose the use of racism as a major factor in the electoral fraud that took place in the last Presidential elections. It is now easier for people to understand that while they became involved in the fake busing issue they were, in fact, being bused into a police-state structure.

### *Shift to the Right*

We are hearing much about the secret 1970 White House document, and as Senator Ervin says, "It shows the Gestapo mentality of the Nixon-Agnew Administration." He said "it would be a shock to the people" if they found out what is in that document. It should not be a shock to us. In 1970 we described that process quite accurately. In a pamphlet entitled *The Erosion of U.S. Capitalism in the '70s* (New Outlook Publishers, New York) we said:

The subjective factors in the election campaign include the McCarthy-like rantings by the President and the Vice President. They include the fascist-like attempt to use staged provocations in an effort to panic the people. They include the attempt to capitalize on the Nixon grand strategy of racism and repression. (Pp. 3-4.)

We said further:

The ruling class is not placid or passive about its misfortunes. The erosion in the position of U.S. capitalism is bringing in its wake some new and rather important shifts in attitudes by sections of monopoly capital. . . . This is a shift to the Right in monopoly circles. It creates some new problems for the progressive forces. . . . This shift to the Right showed up in the election campaign. There is no question that these forces withdrew financial support from liberal and moderate candidates and gave it instead to more

reactionary hardliners such as Buckley. . . .

This shift to the Right also means more support by top monopoly circles for the policies of repression and racism. These are important signposts. Such shifts result from the defeats and setbacks suffered by U.S. imperialism. They are reactions to the erosion and the growing isolation of U.S. imperialism. They are expressions of support for a policy that says: "We must fight our way out of this mess and we must clobber any opposition to this outlook at home." And this adds a new dimension to the ultra-Right danger. . . . It is a shift towards using the big stick. . . . These efforts are intended to cover up the fact that it is really they and sections of the capitalist class they reflect who are moving to the Right. . . .

The central element that gave the elections a special character and significance was the attempted blitzkrieg by the most reactionary ultra-Right forces led by Nixon and Agnew. . . .

It was the best-financed reactionary campaign in history. The estimates are that the Republicans alone spent in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000. Even the most extreme Right-wing candidates such as Buckley, Reagan, Rafferty and other Birchite candidates this time had no difficulty in raising tens of millions of dollars. In this sense, there is a significant shift within the top financial circles toward supporting ultra-Right candidates. . . . It would be naive not to recognize that this has added a new dimension to the ultra-Right, fascist danger in our country. . . .

A second aim of the blitzkrieg was to . . . take over the Supreme Court. What he [Nixon] has sought is a Court that will legalize his racist policies and uphold his police-state measures.

We would be naive if we did not take warning from the nature of the reactionary blitzkrieg. The style was McCarthyite and fascist-like. (Pp. 11-15, 17.)

### *The New Fascist Danger*

It is obvious that the events around Watergate have, in a new way, focused on the danger of fascism. It is in the light of these developments that we must take a new look at this danger. We must turn on the warning lights in the country and in our own Party. There are some very new areas of this danger that we must probe more deeply. The crisis has exposed the processes that are weaving the web of fascism. What has become clearer are the outlines of a unique U.S. pattern, a unique U.S. structure for fascism. This unique pattern consists of a creeping process of constructing a government within a government—a police-state structure within a parliamentary structure. This process has been one of creeping transition of the functions of government from the elected bodies to the

corporate-like, police-state structure under the shield of the executive branch.

We have paid attention to the politicians, but we have not paid enough attention to the structure of the creeping fascist development. We have raised the danger of the ultra-Right and its policies, but we have not warned about the structural changes—changes that have set the stage for a police-state takeover.

Monopoly state capitalism is a conglomerate of capitalism in a crisis. The buildup of the police-state structure is a feature of this crisis. It is an attempt to overcome the crisis by way of eliminating the democratic structure. The creeping transition to a corporate police-state structure is fed by the same laws that feed the development of monopoly state capitalism. The police-state structure grows to serve its needs. It is staffed directly by the corporate interests. The executive branch of the government is now run, and has been for years, by corporate executives on short sabbatical leaves from their corporations. As it has assumed greater powers, more and more this has become the basic nature of the executive branch. It is dominated by big corporate executives and by top military brass.

In this setup the executive branch has become the direct, active state participant in the state monopoly capitalist setup. It deals directly with the corporations and their executive branches. This makes the corporate and state relationships direct and efficient. This provides the close-knit setup for the operation of state monopoly capitalism. In order to carry on these new tasks that have been given to the state, the President and the executive branch must have more and more authority. This setup needs increasingly more secrecy, and more and more it becomes a power unto itself.

The Watergate Nixon Administration has become just that kind of a power. The executive branch has taken on the power to make war, which is an open violation of the Constitution. It directs the open and the secret paramilitary operations. It directly controls the huge military budget. The state monopoly operation dictates that the executive branch must have the power to manipulate all state finances. This includes taxes. This police-state structure controls the expenditure of \$200 billion dollars a year. To fulfill its assigned tasks the state must have power over wages and working conditions—and so there is a presidentially decreed wage freeze. It must have power over all people's movements and that is where the 1970 secret document fits into the scheme of things, because it is a plan for a mass roundup, a plan for mass frameups. It is a plan for takeover.

The creeping development of a police-state structure has resulted in a government by edict and vetoes, but that is what monopoly

capital wants from the state. In a crisis the monopolists want a dictatorial type of state power. That is why the executive branch has usurped the unprecedented powers that it now has. Besides these unprecedented powers, the executive branch has 531 full-time staffers working solely on controlling Congress. That is why Nixon's Congress has become even less than a rubber-stamp. This is a staff trained and skilled in the art of extortion, corruption and bribery. This is an area the Senate Committee will not touch because it would expose the corruption in Congress.

These police-state structural changes did not start with Nixon. President Roosevelt was a crisis President and while he was forced to project social welfare programs, especially in his second administration, the fact is that he initiated many of these corporate state concepts. President Truman added the "national emergency" as a shield behind which the executive branch took further powers. And every President since has added something to this police-state structure. Every President since has added bricks to the process of building a government within a government. The Presidents who added most to the police-state structure traditionally have been hailed, by liberals as well as others, as the "strong Presidents."

But of course Nixon made the qualitative additions. He gave the inner structure its most fascist-like nature. Nixon usurped more powers than any other President in history. He gave it total secrecy. He tied the labor leadership to it in a way that was never done before. And he gave this process the most reactionary fascist-like ideology of any President. Nixon gave it the most open racist position and outlook. He gave it the full shield of "executive privilege." Haldeman, speaking for Nixon, said that executive privilege would apply to some 30,000 staffers. This is a huge police-state structure operating in secret, immune to public scrutiny and criticism, behind a shield of "executive privilege." It has its own laws. It operates beyond the Constitution. It has developed into a high level police-state fascist-like structure.

### *Move Toward Police-State Rule*

For some members of Congress the new structure was a "contingency structure." Many of its features were built into it on the basis that it would be used for some future contingency. But Nixon activated the structure. That is where the 1970 document comes in. That is why Nixon became hysterical when the Senate Committee talked about releasing the document to the public. Nixon did not have to worry, because the fact is that the Senate Committee has not released it to the public. Nixon was hysterical because the 1970 document is proof-positive that the plan was for a police-state takeover.

It is also now obvious that in his lame duck years Nixon was getting ready to unfold the plan in full. But even if the plans were never put into practice, people must take serious warning. There is no question that this adds a new dimension to the danger of fascism. In a sense the police-state structure makes the fascist danger clear and present. It is important to see the new dimension of the danger of fascism, without drawing the erroneous conclusion that we now live under fascism or are about to do so.

It would also be an error to attribute this development to Nixon as an individual, because there is no question that in this past period it was monopoly capital that decided to build up the police-state power, that decided to use the contingency plans and to push for a qualitative shift, a qualitative change of forms of its class rule. That is the crux of the whole development. That is an important shift. This decision to shift to a police-state rule was made by the most powerful sections of monopoly capital. What makes it more serious is that it was supported by most sections of monopoly capital. Nixon's lame duck plans for his second term of office were to give this process a further qualitative turn: That is why the Haldemans, the Erlichmans and the Schultzes were given Czar-like powers. The executive branch became a corporate-like operation. This qualitative shift gave further and new powers to the inner junta. It replaced the cabinet as the operating body for the executive branch. So what we have had is a process of a gradual growth of a police-state corporate structure within the old Constitutional structure. This served monopoly capital and its reactionary policies and became a "contingency structure" for a fascist takeover at some later date.

It would be naive not to see the nature of this structure and the direction that it has taken. It is also obvious that we need to do a lot more digging and probing as to the essence and nature of this development. We must do more probing in the area of the relationship between monopoly state capital and creeping fascism. We must study in greater depth the growth of a government within a government. We must do more digging into the dialectics of the overall effects of the crisis of capitalism and its effects on the forms of class rule.

As the crisis deepens the pressures develop in two directions. Capitalism retreats in one area, and continues on an offensive in another.

On the one hand, there is a developing crisis of capitalism. There is a shift in the balance of world forces against imperialism. There are the defeats suffered by U.S. imperialism in many areas. And there is the process that leads to the lessening of world tensions. This results in moods of desperation and panic in the ranks of big business. It feeds trends towards reaction and a fascist solution to the

crisis. That is one side of the dialectical process.

On the other hand, as capitalism is weakened on the world scene, and as it suffers from internal crises, it has greater difficulties in going on the offensive. It is more vulnerable because of its internal contradictions. These contradictions become sharper and capitalism becomes more unstable. In moments like this there are greater mass movements and struggles. They have a greater influence on the direction of events.

In a sense we are witnessing just such a dialectical process in the change that is taking place regarding the policy of blockading socialism, a policy that has existed since the October Revolution fifty-five years ago. This was a long-range class policy, that world capitalism would sacrifice the profits from such trade because it was in the long-range interest of capitalism. Behind this policy was the illusion that at some time capitalism could still destroy the socialist states. But the pressures became too great. Some capitalists began to break ranks. In a basic sense, the policy collapsed. In this case the contradiction was resolved in favor of giving up the long-range class policy.

The cold war became a drag. World capitalism was not able to unite its ranks behind continuing the old cold war policies. But while this retreat was taking place, U.S. monopoly capital was up to its neck in building the police-state structure and preparing for a contingency fascist takeover. It was retreating in one arena, while preparing for a reactionary offensive in the other. While these policies differ in direction, they are very closely related to each other. So the change in the balance of world class forces does not by itself decide the nature or direction of class rule in a specific capitalist country. But this is a sign of its basic weakness, not its strength. That U.S. monopoly capitalism feels it cannot rule by means of the Constitutional system is a sign of its basic weakness.

### *Anything Goes*

We must probe deeper the specific path Watergate has exposed. It is important to understand that the creeping process of building a governmental dictatorial structure within the democratic structure is dictated by the unique U.S. reality. The process was carefully camouflaged because there is no specific mass movement or support for such a process. Monopoly capital gave its support to this process because it provided an immediate form for its policies of class confrontation. It must be clearly understood that the inherent danger was not only in the rise of the structure but also in the creeping transference of state power from the elected bodies to the police-state

executive body. This was a process within a monopoly-controlled bourgeois government. It was possible because the whole government structure is in the iron grip of the monopoly corporations.

We must give deeper thought to the ideological and political reasoning that is given to justify Watergate and the structure that it exposed. We must expose the excuses its perpetrators give for their crimes. In one sentence, their reasoning is that anything goes, that any action, any crime, no matter how heinous and brutal, is acceptable because it is done in the interest of "national security." They openly state that the junta has a right to take any action it decides is necessary because it is in the interest of "national security." They openly state that the elected bodies must in no way interfere with their operations, that they have the full right to carry out their actions in secrecy. They openly defend the idea that it is permissible to lie to Congress, to the public and the world when it is in the interest of so-called "national security." In essence, this is an identical coverup with those used by the forces of fascism in Hitler Germany and fascist Italy.

It is necessary to see the logic of the creeping process. The 1970 plan was not a contingency plan in the sense that it was put aside until some future date. The process of usurpation of power not only went on, but on an increasing scale. The logic of this is that when the process of usurping power by the executive branch has reached the point where the elected bodies are without power, then there can take place a qualitative shift to a police-state power. So, in fact, the "contingency plan" was an operational plan.

There is a second basic lesson in this current crisis and it is that fascism and reaction can be defeated. It is necessary to see that this process does not take place in the world of 1930 or the USA of 1930. The exposé now going on is laying the basis for a serious setback for reaction. The exposés have opened up tremendous possibilities in the struggle to defeat these forces. These are dialectical opposites. The fact that on the one hand capitalism suffers defeats and is weaker, and on the other hand that it presents serious dangers of moving in a reactionary direction, is not an irreconcilable contradiction. The historic and decisive question is: what class is going to take advantage of and use the new objective developments? That, in a sense, is the most critical question of this moment.

Fascism in Germany and Italy was the response of monopoly capital in a crisis. But it was not an inevitable development, and it is definitely not an inevitable development in the U.S.

The following experiences give proof that:

a) Favorable developments in the balance of world forces, the

relaxation of tensions, the thawing of the cold war, important as they are, do not by themselves block the path towards a reactionary development.

b) There can be a growth of a police-state structure within the old democratic structure. A democratic rhetoric and the appearance of a democratic operation can go on while the structure and the essence of class rule is, in fact, changing. That is a very important lesson that people will have to learn.

c) State monopoly capital in its very essence is the basic propellant for the police-state fascist process.

d) Positive developments in the world struggle, the tipping of the scales against world imperialism, is a powerful factor in the struggle against domestic reaction, but only as a supporting factor to the movements and struggles that must take place on the scene.

### *On Ruling-Class Divisions*

The Watergate crisis has unearthed problems of assessment in all movements on the Left. For instance, there are some problems of how to place the question of divisions in the ranks of capital, as they are related to the developments around Watergate. Some on the Left say the essence of the Watergate affair is a struggle between old money and new money. It is an old argument that somehow the new billionaires are different; that the "newly rich" are supposed to be more or less reactionary than the "older rich." This does not seem to be a solid basis for assessing anything. The real dividing line is between rich and poor, employer and worker. The other is not a class analysis.

There are others who say that it is a struggle between "the eastern establishment and southwestern oil money." I don't think that would be a solid basis for assessment either. In fact, regionalism and regional interests in the ranks of the capitalist class have lost much of their significance, and for obvious reasons. Still others say the struggle is between those with foreign investments and those with domestic investments. But with the development of conglomerates, supermonopolies, multinational corporations and the dominant rule of finance capital in general, the lines of demarcation have become blurred. They overlap and criss-cross over regional and industrial lines.

Some, of course, come right out and say that the struggle is between two groups of capitalists, one represented by the Republican Party, and the other by the Democratic Party. And they say that this is what the Watergate struggle is all about. The Democrats want to expose the Republicans, and the Republicans don't want to be exposed. I don't believe that explains Watergate either. The central question,



and the most important factor, is that the creeping process has, and has had for some time, the full support of the dominant monopoly circles in the U.S.

What is the danger of placing "divisions in ruling-class circles" as the central criteria in explaining trends and events. The danger is that it takes the capitalist class, as a class, off the hook. And we want to do nothing that in any way takes monopoly capital off the Watergate hook. And danger is that such assessments become a substitute for class analysis, a substitute for sharp class assessments. They become a basis for the "lesser evil" approach to electoral politics, because they tend to say "in this case we can side with the Democrats" and many have already said that. The use of "differences in ruling-class circles" as an assessment tends to become the basis for tactics of maneuver, rather than for tactics that call for the full mobilization of the masses. It tends to displace the class struggle and the working class as the most critical element in struggle.

In a general sense, we have a Marxist-Leninist approach to the question of divisions in ruling-class circles and how they fit into the overall concept of struggle. We have corrected an overemphasis that prevailed during the Browder period. Why are we interested in divisions in ruling class circles? We are interested only if they can add to the strength of our class forces and for no other reason. If these divisions make it more difficult for capital to rule, then it is important to see what these differences are. But we do not make our appeals on the basis of divisions in ruling-class circles. It is our opinion that there are times when it is necessary to give more emphasis to such divisions, but it is also our opinion that this is the time to give maximum emphasis to the reactionary, corrupt rule of monopoly capital as a class. This is our central task. This is correct because the policies that have emerged are capitalist class policies. They are not bad policies of certain bad men; they are bad policies of a class—of monopoly capital.

The system of capitalism is propelled by objective laws. It is these inherent processes that give rise to police-state policies. To base the assessment of such a process on divisions in ruling-class circles is to start from peripheral issues. There are divisions reflecting inner-capitalist contradictions, and it is possible that as mass struggles around the issues emerge and get off the ground, the divisions in ruling-class circles will become sharper. This is also a dialectical process.

Furthermore, not all differences are reflections of basic divisions in the ranks of the capitalist class, and not all divisions can be described as between "good" and "bad." As an example, last night on TV there was a discussion between two professors who differed on the energy

crisis. One professor advocated sending U.S. troops to the Middle East to take over the oil-producing countries. The other said, put the "environmentalists" out of business and drill for oil wherever it is, regardless of its effects on ecology. They reflected divisions in ruling-class circles, but they both must be rejected. Many times political differences are only partisan political ones, and partisan politics do not necessarily reflect ruling-class divisions.

In the present Watergate exposé differences have appeared, but they have appeared only over the bugging and the coverup of dirty politics. There are differences on bugging, but not when it is used against radicals and Communists. They are still all for such bugging. And there is basic unity on not permitting the investigation to get out of hand. The differences over the creeping police-state structure and over the monopoly control of that structure, as it has been developing under both Democratic and Republican administrations, have not come into sharp focus. As the hearings have developed some concern has surfaced over Nixon's obvious attempt to destroy the two-party system. This is important, but these are not differences that go into the forms of class rule. Partisan politics has some importance, but basically it reflects only the narrow, individual, opportunist interests of particular politicians.

### *The Democratic Forces*

But there is a third factor which is more important than the question of divisions in ruling-class circles. It is what can be called, generally, the democratic forces. These are broad forces reflecting overall democratic traditions and feelings. In this group there are many intellectuals, professional workers and people in the mass media. In this sector there are large numbers of Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other oppressed minorities. In many ways, at this moment, this grouping is of the greatest importance. Such forces may or may not reflect divisions in ruling-class circles. But they can become the decisive forces in the crystallization of a broad, democratic anti-monopoly coalition. We must take into account all forces. We must have a deepening assessment of all forces. But at all times we must base our work on a clear-cut working-class line. We must never start our analysis of any major development based on divisions in the ranks of the ruling class.

Our central concern must be how to tap the potential of this moment by means of initiatives that will lead to mass actions. Our task is to tap this potential so that masses will draw lessons that will raise their democratic, class and socialist consciousness, to tap in the struggle against racism, to raise it to new levels. Our task is to tap

these potentials so as to give rise to forms of political independence that will lead toward a new mass political party based on labor, Black, Chicano and other oppressed minorities, to tap it to build the Communist press and the Party. That is what we must be concerned with in a new way, on a new level.

The Watergate exposures call for a restatement, a repackaging of some of our tasks. There is a need for new initiatives, for the building of a people's movement to establish a new democratic structure—a people's democratic structure. There is a need for movements and struggle to strip the executive branch of most of its powers, for Constitutional reforms to limit warmaking powers. There is a need for people's movements in the struggle to cut the military to the very bone, to put an end to the war economy and the war budget. There is a need for movements to demand the full application of all anti-racist laws. There is a need for movements for repeal of all anti-labor laws.

In the center of the demands for a people's democratic structure, there must be a demand for the redrawing of all electoral districts—congressional, state and city—with the specific aim of guaranteeing proportional representation to the working class, the Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American and Asian peoples. There is a need for movements that will demand a total rewriting of the tax structure to the end that only the rich will pay taxes. There is the need to raise the demand for the setting up of people's tribunals to try the Watergaters as war criminals; a people's tribunal to try the Nixon Administration, not only for war crimes, but for its crimes of racism, its crimes against labor, against children and against women. It is not possible to mobilize movements with a demand to return to some past status quo. It is possible to mobilize masses where there is boldness, where the movements have an offensive posture.

There is a need to demand the repeal of all anti-Communist laws. There is the need to build pressure for the impeachment of the Nixon administration.

There are dangers of cynicism and of the attempts of the reactionary forces to use this for their own purposes. But it is important to see the disillusionment with the two-party system that cynical statements sometimes express. It is a moment when programs and slogans that call for more basic qualitative changes will get the ear and support of new millions. It is a moment to raise to new heights the question of working-class candidates for public office. There is a need for a qualitatively new approach to questions of working-class political independence.

*(Continued on Page 80)*

JOHN PITTMAN

# A Guiding Ideology for Anti-Racist, Anti-Monopoly Struggle

The publication of the first full-length work of Henry Winston, national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States,\* comes at a critical moment in human affairs, at a moment of acute political crisis and economic instability in the United States. It is a book for such a moment, global in reach, topical and specific in treating U.S. reality. Its content is informative, its tone optimistic, and it is eminently convincing in its counsel for united, disciplined mass struggles, led by the workers of all colors, to defend democracy, impose peaceful coexistence on monopoly capital, and achieve liberation from class, racial and national oppression through the establishment of socialism.

The necessity and possibility for such struggles is Winston's dominant theme. His book stresses that the necessity is urgent and compelling. "What is involved now is the threat . . . of fascism," he warns, and his warning expresses the fears of millions stirred to outrage by the conspiracy of monopoly capital that came to light in the Nixon government's fiasco at Watergate. However, the time is auspicious for beating back the fascist threat, Winston maintains. The possibility exists of defeating it by a united front of struggle against measures which monopoly capital is preparing to nullify the people's constitutional liberties, as limited as they are under capitalism, and to impose its dictatorial rule on the country. It can be repulsed by struggles to break the monopolists' domination of the Congress and the Federal government. It can be forced to retreat by struggles for the immediate interests of the people. It can be routed for all time by struggles that lead to the establishment of socialism. Winston affirms that "to regain the people's offensive against monopoly is *the challenge of our time.*" (Page 91.)

## *The Enemy: Monopoly Capital*

To meet this challenge, Winston himself takes the offensive. He directs the full force of his considerable powers of analysis and argumentation against obstacles to united struggles of the exploited and oppressed of all colors and nationalities in opposition to corporate monopoly. He draws on Marxist-Leninist science, on applica-

---

\* Henry Winston, *Strategy for a Black Agenda: A Critique of New Theories of Liberation in the United States and Africa*, International Publishers, New York, 1973, cloth \$7.50, paper \$2.50.

tions of Marxism-Leninism to the specific conditions of the United States by the CPUSA, of which he has been a member and leader for 43 years. He draws on his personal experience as a member of the 25 million triply oppressed and exploited African-descended people of the United States, and on the teachings of world and United States history, and on this basis Winston concentrates his fire on "the power of monopoly-fostered racism." It is this, he says, that perpetuates "division between the white majority and the Black minority in the United States . . . maintains disunity between Blacks and whites, and perpetuates discrimination against and superexploitation of the Black minority." (Page 19.)

It is racism that diverts the exploited and oppressed from the struggle against their exploiters and results in their division and fragmentation. "The history of this country has been warped and distorted, first by slavery, then by the survivals of slavery and the ceaseless propagation of racist ideology. And from this history it can be clearly seen that the class interests of white workers, as in the struggle against the supermonopolies today, can only be advanced in unity with Black workers as an integral part of the fight to end the oppression of Black people." (Page 278.) And he recalls that "because of the perpetuation of racism and the resulting division between the triply-oppressed Black workers and the exploited white workers, it took more than 60 years of struggle against the bosses' government-supported violence to win the right to organize. Today, the rights of labor are once again under grave attack, and labor's fate, as in the past, is inseparably bound up with that of the Black liberation movement." (Page 269.)

What is more, because U.S. state monopoly capitalism today faces "a world in which the forces of socialism and class and national liberation are on the ascendancy, and in which foreign imperialist powers are challenging its domination," it is attempting to perpetuate and intensify racism. (Page 267.) It is reinforcing racism with kindred divisive measures and ideologies. Accordingly, Winston broadens his offensive to expose the aims and fallacies of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, of manifestations of narrow nationalism in the form of neo-Pan-Africanism, Black capitalism and Maoism, and of "short-cut" and "instant socialism" distortions of Marxist-Leninist teachings on revolution. The 323 pages of his book form one coherent and sustained polemic with these divisive ideas and their authors. Underlying and permeating the entire work, however, is a guiding ideology to enable the workers of all colors and nationalities to transform their separate struggles against exploitation, impoverishment and racism into a struggle against monopoly.

While concentrating on the exposure of U.S. state monopoly capital's use of racism and allied divisive measures and ideologies to prevent effective opposition to its reactionary domestic and foreign policies, the national chairman of the CPUSA offers guidance on many other burning questions of today. He relates the liberation struggles of African-descended people in the United States and of the U.S. working class as a whole to the liberation struggles of the peoples of Asia, Latin America and especially of Africa. His discussion of problems confronting the newly emergent African states in their struggles for genuine independence from imperialist domination brings into focus the organic relationship of the right of self-determination and peaceful coexistence.

His emphasis on certain peculiarities of China's development shows the magnitude of the dangers of narrow nationalism, as expressed in the Great Power chauvinism of Mao Tse-tung and his followers. Today the Maoist nationalist revision of Marxism-Leninism constitutes a serious threat not only to the Chinese people's development of socialism, but to the anti-imperialist struggle on a world scale, and especially to the liberation struggles of the Asian, Latin American and African peoples.

Winston also restates the Marxist-Leninist position on one of the most persistent and vexing questions of the century-old emancipatory struggles. This is the question of the relationship of the struggle to defend and expand the limited freedoms of capitalist democracy and the struggle for socialism. As in the case of all Marxist-Leninist interpretations of specific national conditions of a given country, he gives new confirmatory evidence and emphasis to many important truths of universal validity. The title of his book could well be also "Agenda for People's Liberation."

Indeed, the estimate of the main characteristics of the present moment in history which form the global and temporal context of Winston's work represent the labor and unanimity in 1969 of 75 Marxist-Leninist Parties. With significant contributions by the CPUSA, this estimate has been continually updated to keep pace with developments. It is especially applicable to the situation in the United States. It is set forth in detail in many issues of this magazine, and in the work of Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CPUSA (*Imperialism Today*, International Publishers, New York, 1972).

In the context of this moment in international and national affairs, as defined by Marxism-Leninism, Winston dedicated his analytical skill to unveiling the camouflaged aims of U.S. monopoly capital and their threat to peace, democracy, national liberation and social progress. To do so he uncovered the manifestations of these aims in the

now intensified use of racism and its supporting measures and ideologies, and in their grave and imminent danger for the exploited and oppressed peoples of all colors and nationalities in the United States.

### *The Roots of Racism*

For the accomplishment of this task, Winston was prepared by the conditions of his life, the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, and the struggles of the CPUSA to apply these teachings in the specific conditions of the United States. The grandson of a slave, he was born and raised in a poor Black family in Mississippi, the most backward in racial relations of the 50 states of the U.S.A. From birth he has encountered the class, racial and national oppression imposed on the Black minority. Later, while in prison as a Communist leader under a Smith Act frameup, he suffered this oppression in its most flagrant and brutal form when neglect of the Federal authorities deprived him of his sight. In 1930, Winston joined the Young Communist League. This event inaugurated his life-long study of Marxism-Leninism and active participation in struggles of the people—struggles of the unemployed, struggles for defense of the Scottsboro youth, for the organization of workers in trade unions, for the organization of Southern youth, and as a member of the U.S. armed forces, in the struggle to defeat Hitler fascism. His total commitment to the cause of liberation for the working class and the Black minority, combined with exceptional organizational and theoretical ability, carried him through the Party ranks to his present post as National Chairman of the CPUSA.

At some time in his crowded life Winston thoroughly studied theories of race and racism. No search for truth is more difficult, for generations of bigots, pseudoscientists and subsidized scholars have obscured the essence of these phenomena. Yet Winston, in his polemic with the ideas of James Boggs, has laid bare this essence. Boggs, he says, has confused “the fact of race with the ideology of racism. But the fact of the multi-racial composition of the working class is not the source of racist discrimination and superexploitation. Racism is not a biological characteristic. It is a social phenomenon with a class origin and role. Racism has its source in a ruling class that, in modern times, has added the twin weapon of anti-Communism to keep the working class in the U.S. from waging a united class struggle against its monopolist enemy.” (Page 33.)

Winston points out that the division between the white majority and the Black minority in the United States did not originate in differences of skin color. It originated “from a different system—slavery—which was grafted on to the rising capitalist system. This

different system was the basis for developing the differential in the nature, intensity and character of the special oppression and exploitation of Black people as compared to the white masses. But today the Black minority and the white majority are no longer separated by different economic systems. Now only the power of monopoly-fostered racism maintains disunity between Blacks and whites, and perpetuates discrimination against and superexploitation of the Black minority." (Page 18.)

Yet, if the fact of race does not account for the slavocracy-created division between whites and Blacks, racism, used first to justify that division and now to perpetuate it, has produced an affinity among Black people. It is an affinity stemming from the common experience of struggle against oppression. It reaches across the boundaries of states and across the seas to the countries of the Caribbean and Central America, to Brazil and especially to Africa, the original habitat of Black-skinned peoples, where struggles against the slave trade, colonialism and the neocolonialism of today have been a central feature of the history of that continent for more than five centuries. Moreover, Winston affirms, "this special affinity can add solidarity and strength to all the forces of class and national liberation, involving every race on every continent in the anti-imperialist revolutionary process." (Page 15.)

### *The Skin-Strategy*

Today, however, U.S. monopoly capital is attempting to exploit this affinity for its own purposes. Having critically depleted the natural resources of the United States in its insatiable greed for profit, today it covets the immense undeveloped wealth of the African peoples who are now engaged in their struggle for freedom from imperialist domination. "The U.S. neocolonialist program aims at using U.S. power to direct these countries along capitalist lines, keeping them within the orbit of imperialism," Winston says. (Page 26.) And further: "Now the United States policy aims at penetrating African countries by U.S. Black nationals as the administrators and ideological vanguard of its economic and political expansion." (Page 25.)

U.S. monopoly capital's policy makers calculate that U.S. Blacks in such positions will render white monopoly capital's imperialist aims invisible to the African peoples. It can be seen that this is a strategy based on skin color, a skin-strategy. As the slave-trading agents of the wealthy "civilized" Europeans and the slave-owners of the Americas created and fostered racism to justify their traffic in and bestiality to black-skinned human beings, so today the U.S.



monopolists, the political heirs of the slave-traders and slave-owners, are fostering an up-to-date variation of racism, a skin-strategy to subjugate and exploit the Black nations of Africa while simultaneously diverting the U.S. Black minority from struggles to achieve their liberation.

Winston discovers the sources of the skin-strategy for the liberation of Black-skinned peoples in distortions by George Padmore, C. L. R. James and others of the work and writings of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois. He reviews the internationalist content of the liberation theories of Du Bois as contrasted to the separatist, skin-color views of Padmore, whom he calls "the father of neo-Pan-Africanism," a distorted version of the Pan-Africanism of Du Bois. He cites Du Bois' "record of uncompromising struggle" against all the forms of the "back-to-Africa" ideology of Marcus Garvey. He recalls that the "culminating effort" of Du Bois' long life was that, as a member of the CPUSA, he "gave his last days and strength" so that African countries "with the support of the Soviet Union and all the world anti-imperialist forces," might "guarantee their independence by taking a consistently anti-imperialist, non-capitalist path toward socialism." (Page 16.)

Winston characterizes the imperialists' and neo-Pan-Africanists' denial of the diversity of African nations and treatment of Africa's multinational population as one undifferentiated mass as actually a denial of the right of self-determination for each of these nations. He regards Padmore's anti-Communist distortions of Du Bois' Pan-Africanism and the Maoists' distortion of Marxism-Leninism as twin ideologies for separating the African nations from one another in their common struggle against imperialism, and for isolating them from the non-African world forces against imperialism, headed by the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries. "The future of Africa's continental unity, of Pan-Africanism and socialism as envisioned by Du Bois," Winston says, "will depend on the outcome of the struggle against those seeking to impose capitalism within each African country . . . Genuine Pan-Africanism can only emerge from expanding internationalist solidarity—winning and consolidating self-determination by defeating capitalism and neo-colonialism inside each country." (Page 31.) As for so-called "African socialism" constituting a "third road" out of dependence, Winston maintains that there is no "third road" to national liberation. "The *only* alternative to solidarity with the Socialist countries, and first of all the Soviet Union, against the economic, political and military intervention of imperialism is *surrender* of the right to national existence and liberation." (Page 150.) And he reminds the U.S. Black minority that "the African

opponents of neo-colonialism consider that the way Blacks in the U.S. can help defeat counter-revolution in Africa is with a strategy that unites oppressed Blacks in the U.S. and at the same time adds their strength toward building a wider, anti-monopoly struggle of all the oppressed and exploited against U.S. imperialism, the common enemy of all the peoples and races inside and outside the United States." (Page 34.)

In addition to neo-Pan-Africanism, U.S. monopoly capital sponsors another form of its skin-strategy designed specifically to sidetrack the Black liberation movement in the United States. This is Black capitalism, which Winston characterizes as "neo-tokenism." As evidence of monopoly capital's fostering of this form of its skin-strategy, Winston cites the program promulgated in the "Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders" and the policies of the government which Nixon revealed in a radio broadcast before his election. Winston calls attention to the Advisory Commission's appointment by President Lyndon B. Johnson to lay the ideological groundwork for a new monopoly strategy following the 1967 ghetto rebellions. Both the Commission and Nixon performed the tasks assigned to them by the monopolists. Both put forward programs based on the premise of a permanent division of the country into "two societies," with the ghetto society of the Black minority in a state of underdevelopment, as in the case of a colony. Both glibly pronounced generalities favoring "integration," but specifically recommended "enrichment" and Black control of the ghettos, which Winston calls "a euphemism for the permanent segregation and inequality of Black people within the single economy of monopoly capitalism." (Page 299.) Both would turn the Black minority from the strategy of Martin Luther King during the Civil Rights Decade, "a strategy in which the unity and self-action of the Blacks would be expressed as part of a wider anti-monopoly formation," confronting monopoly power "with a new majority of the oppressed and exploited of all colors." (Page 13.) Should this monopoly-monitored program succeed, Winston warns, the gains achieved by the Civil Rights Decade would be destroyed, and monopoly would unleash a new onslaught not only against the Black minority, but against the working people of all colors as well.

The concepts of "two societies," a "Black colony" and "Black capitalism" bear no relation to reality, Winston says. "Two separate societies do not and *cannot* exist in the United States. The segregation and triple oppression of Black people occur within a single system, a system that locks all forms of class and racist oppression into one society based on the same economy." (Page 297.) And further "the

ghetto enclaves across the country cannot form the basis for a viable economic life apart from the nation's total economy—either on a capitalist or a socialist basis. Unlike colonies, the ghettos scattered across the country have no economy and territory that can be separated from the monopoly-controlled economy dominating every nook and cranny of the country, including the ghettos. Moreover, unlike colonies, there are no riches in the form of oil, minerals and agricultural products to be extracted from the ghettos." (Page 303.) The illusion that the white monopolists are ready to share their control of the country's economy with Black capitalists is "particularly ludicrous," Winston says. "Black business has always been marginal even within the ghetto. And capitalism in its present stage takes the form of giant conglomerates that increasingly devour all small business." (Page 304.)

Because the monopolists control the total economy, "all talk of self-determination in the ghetto is a fraud." The aim of monopoly's fostering of the Black capitalism illusion is to allow the Black bourgeoisie a limited share of the Black market, "while the mass of the Black people are diverted from the wider anti-monopoly struggles for equality and jobs—that is, for jobs where, as and if they can be found outside the ghetto." (Page 307.) Therein lies the neo-tokenism of Black capitalism.

Thus, Winston's analysis discloses the common denominator of both neo-Pan-Africanism and Black capitalism. It is the idea that the sole path to liberation for Black-skinned people, in the United States and in the countries of Africa, is the path of separateness, of "going-it-alone," divided from oppressed and exploited peoples who are not Black-skinned, and deprived of the support and aid of the many races and nationalities of the socialist countries. This idea is reinforced by anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, which international monopoly capital and U.S. monopoly capital in particular have inflated to dimensions of a global crusade to further their counter-revolutionary offensive against socialism and the national liberation movement. It also receives increasing support from Mao Tse-tung and his followers, who are drawing close to an open alliance with imperialism, directed at the Soviet Union and the Marxist-Leninist parties of all countries.

"In the hope that they will seriously reappraise their views," Winston engages in sharp polemics with the "talented but tragically mistaken proponents of self-defeating separatism." He calls attention to the "indifference to the national aspirations and the right of self-determination of the African countries," and the bypassing of the economic and social realities within each of these nations by Roy Innis, Stokely Carmichael, James Forman, Imamu Amiri Baraka, and other

neo-Pan-Africanists. He deplors monopoly's "appropriation of the intellectual capacities of Black people," as reflected in the propagation by these talented people of the skin-strategy, and its neo-tokenist ideas fostered by the monopolists as Black capitalism. For such elitist "super-revolutionaries" as Huey Newton, and such white "militants" as Tom Hayden, Rennie Davis, Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, his criticism is harsh. He considers Newton's switch from advocacy of the suicidal program of "picking up the gun" to the shameless espousal of Black capitalism as no more than a change from one ideological quicksand to another. The white radicals' encouragement of Black super-militance, even including "urban guerrilla warfare," he brands as white chauvinism. He is particularly caustic regarding the views of Eldridge Cleaver, Newton's erstwhile associate whose ultra-revolutionary rhetoric helped Newton develop sectarian caricatures of Marxism-Leninism and who eventually called for Soviet brinkmanship at the risk of thermonuclear war. Winston blames the influence of monopoly's skin-strategy and anti-Communist crusade, and Padmore's machinations to implement both, for the advocacy by some African leaders of so-called "African socialism," as counterposed to scientific socialism, for the provocation by the separatist Pan-Africanist Congress that resulted in the massacre of Africans at Sharpeville, South Africa, on March 21, 1960, and for the overthrow of Nkrumah by imperialism and bourgeois Ghanaians.

### *Maoism Unmasked*

Winston investigates many data in order to unmask the Maoists and bring to light their pernicious influence on the liberation struggles of peoples oppressed and exploited by imperialism. He devotes five chapters to this task. He unearths the realities that lie beneath Peking's posture of affinity with the countries seeking independence from imperialism, and professed championship of their interests against the "two superpowers," by which Peking strives to arouse hatred for the Soviet Union through associating it with U.S. imperialism. This posture is false, Winston explains. The Maoists are Great Power chauvinists and executors of the legacy of Han Chinese racial supremacy that stretches back to approximately 500 years B.C. The Hans have a 2000-year record of oppressing not only foreign peoples, but also subject nations within the Chinese Empire. These nations continued to be held in subjection by the Han Chinese during the century when their own sovereignty was violated by imperialists. "Today," Winston observes, "the Han Chinese dominate a multinational state of close to 100 nations, national groups and nationalities, with histories of oppression going back through much of the past

5,000 years." (Page 108.) Against these non-Han peoples today they practice discrimination in jobs, education, housing and representation in the Communist Party and the government.

For a short period following the victory of the Chinese Revolution and the establishment of the People's Republic of China, an attempt was made to put into effect Lenin's program for solving the national question. But even then Mao Tse-tung's influence led to the deformation in practice of Lenin's principles. Winston's explanation of the contrast between Peking's practice and the Soviet Union's solution makes clear the nature of the Maoist betrayal of Marxist-Leninist principles of the right of self-determination. Peking withheld this right from the non-Han nations and nationalities, granting some only a formal and limited regional autonomy within the Han-dominated unitary state; whereas the USSR embodies the right of self-determination of 15 nations in a voluntary union, with regional autonomy for smaller national minorities whose areas lack the resources for developing viable national economies. In the areas granted formal regional autonomy, Peking pursues a policy of forcible Sinicization of the non-Chinese languages, of Han administrative leadership and control, and of the mass emigration of Hans to increase their numerical strength.

Nor does Maoist practice contradict Maoist pretensions only in the sphere of internal nationality policy. By now the Great Power chauvinism of the Peking leadership in respect to the Mongolian People's Republic, India and Bangla Desh are a matter of record. Winston recalls Peking's refusal to join the worldwide front of solidarity with the Vietnamese people's struggle against the U.S. imperialist aggression, and its attempts to sabotage Soviet deliveries of aid to Vietnam and to embroil the Soviet Union in a nuclear war with the United States. He cites the Maoists' economic and political collaboration with the Portuguese colonialists and the South African fascists at a time "when the world anti-imperialist forces were calling for unity behind the freedom-fighters in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Zimbabwe," and "when armed struggles, led by the African National Congress of South Africa, against the apartheid regime in South Africa had already begun." (Page 163.) While preaching to the nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America the virtues of "self-reliance" and "going-it-alone," the Maoists conceal both the immense Soviet aid that laid the foundations of China's economy and their present dependence on economic and political ties with the imperialist powers.

Winston makes clear that the Maoists propagate separatism and anti-Sovietism. He explains that their concept of "the villages versus the cities," of a "third world" of dark-skinned peoples arrayed against

a world of white nations, is a skin-color concept, a racist concept, "a substitution of race for class as the motive force of history." But the most insidious form in which Maoist ideology converges with and supports imperialist ideology is its opposition to disarmament and its distortion of the principle of peaceful coexistence.

Although the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America suffer most from the continuing diversion of resources for development projects to arms and war preparations, the Maoists oppose all efforts toward a curtailment of these expenditures. Disarming the imperialist powers, which confront the peoples of these countries armed to the teeth and united in military alliances, would be important assistance for the independence struggles of these peoples. Yet, the Maoists attempt to persuade peoples armed at most only with obsolete conventional weapons that disarmament would destroy their defensive capability against the air armadas, armored vehicles, heavy artillery, and chemical, germ and atomic weapons of the imperialists.

This position of the Maoists is consistent with their distortion of the principles of peaceful coexistence. While claiming the right to struggle for peaceful coexistence for themselves and other socialist states, they would deny this right to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America on the ground that peaceful coexistence does not apply to the relations between oppressor and oppressed. With this argument, they deny the urgent need of the oppressed peoples to struggle for peaceful coexistence, that is, to impose peaceful coexistence on the oppressors, by armed struggle as well as by other means. This Maoist position, Winston points out, is actually a denial of the right of self-determination. Only by a permanent strategy of struggle for peaceful coexistence, a struggle to compel the imperialists to accept it in deed as well as in word, can these rights of peoples be realized.

### *A Strategy for Liberation*

Through these polemics with the proponents of the skin-strategy and anti-Communism of monopoly capital, in their many neo-Pan-Africanist, Black capitalist, Maoist and "super-revolutionary" variations, Winston clears the way for a strategy of liberation based on united anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly struggles of all the oppressed and exploited, led by the workers of all colors and nationalities. His own words are an impressive summary of that strategy:

"The aim of monopoly is to force a reversal of every aspect of bourgeois democracy, limited as it is, in order to open the way for fascism. The aim of the anti-monopoly program, as advocated by the Communist Party, is to bring about a strategic breakthrough to a deeper and wider degree of democracy, one that would powerfully accelerate

the revolutionary process, opening the way to Black liberation and socialism.

"Once this anti-monopoly strategy succeeds in breaking the control of state monopoly capital over Congress and the government, the forces exist, internally and internationally—in contrast to the anti-slavery period—that can prevent betrayal of the struggle. There is such a perspective, and this is so, first of all, because the forces of class and national liberation, headed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, have changed the world balance of power."

In the preparation of his book, Winston devotes most attention to combatting isolationist and separatist tendencies among the U.S. Black minority. At the same time, however, he offers important guidelines for members of the white majority to conduct the struggle against racism in their own self-interest. "There is no separatist way out for white workers," he says, "just as there is no separatist narrow bourgeois nationalist way out for Black workers." (Page 33.) "White workers will stop cutting their own throats," he reminds people with views like those of James Boggs, "only when they overcome their racism and unite with Black workers in defense of their common class interests." (Page 32.) In his polemic with James Forman he stressed that "no segment of the population can defeat the control of government by corporate monopoly via a go-it-alone skin-strategy. This holds for the white working-class majority, as well as for the Black minority. . . ." (Page 28.)

It is this new potential of the Black workers for the anti-monopoly struggle that Winston points out to the white majority. In order to win this struggle the white workers need solidarity with the Black workers, who suffer the worst racist superexploitation, are the leaders and backbone of the Black liberation movement and a decisive component of the U.S. working class. "No fundamental change—or even a challenge to the monopolists—can occur without the working class," Winston says. "And today the proportion of Black workers in basic industries such as steel, coal, auto, transport and others is transforming the prospects for the class struggle and Black liberation." (Page 216.) One-third of the workers in mass production industries are Black, he says, giving new meaning and new emphasis to the long-time slogan of the CPUSA: "Black and white, unite and fight!"

Winston also offers guidance for the liberation struggles of other racially oppressed and superexploited U.S. minorities, including the Indian peoples, the Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and Asians. In addition, his book contains instructive material on related tactical questions.

No outline can give more than a hint of the riches contained in this work of Henry Winston. The word limitations of this review

preclude deserving comment on many other themes elucidated by Winston: Black pride, cultural nationalism, the ideas of Nkrumah and other African leaders, Marshall Plan type "aid" for African nations, the lumpen proletariat as distorted by Newton and Cleaver, the role of the traffic in drugs, defensive versus offensive strategy, regional versus national strategy, and the organic relationship between struggles for democracy, liberation and socialism. Future editions will benefit from more extensive treatment of the conservative, accommodationist forces in the Black liberation movement, and the racist, class collaborationist rule of sections of the trade union leadership aligned with AFL-CIO President George Meany. An index will be a welcome addition to the book. More fully to plumb its mine of information and appreciate the author's achievement, one must read and study this book, and read and study it again.

(Continued from page 49)

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 25, p. 473.

<sup>11</sup> In 1959 there were 386 persons with a higher or secondary education per 1,000 workers in the USSR, while today there are more than 550.

<sup>12</sup> Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, New York, 1942, p. 496.

<sup>13</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Op. cit.*, Vol. 25, p. 467.

<sup>14</sup> *Socialkapitalismen*, p. 32.

<sup>15</sup> *L'Unita*, June 10, 1971.

<sup>16</sup> K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 114.

<sup>17</sup> *Monthly Review*, January 1966, p. 37.

<sup>18</sup> *Sotsialisticheski trud*, No. 10, 1968, pp. 128-29.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> K. Marx and F. Engels, *Early Works*, 1956, Russ ed., p. 586.

(Continued from Page 17)

The Watergate affair has exposed the close interrelationship between the development of monopoly state capitalism and the danger of fascism. It has shown how the further development of monopoly state capitalism gives rise to a new process that results in the building of a police-state structure within a democratic structure that it dominates.

This must lead to some new conclusions about the nature of the struggle that must be organized. The struggle against monopoly rule must include a movement that fights against the usurping of political power through the Presidency. The anti-monopoly movement must be presented with a clear picture of the relationship between monopoly state rule and fascism. These are political and ideological concepts that must be injected into the broad anti-monopoly coalition.



# New Left Revisionist Distortions of Socialism\*

Both bourgeois and revisionist theoreticians have invented various concepts about the "disintegration," "degeneration," and simply the "vanishing" of socialism in the USSR. And as such theories drop out of circulation, others seem to quickly take their place. One of the newer concepts of the "denegeration" of socialism, followed by a program for its "salvation," is the subject of the book, *Social Capitalism*, published in Sweden. Edited by B. Gustafsson, it is based on materials in a discussion in which P. Sweezy (USA), the late L. Huberman (USA), E. Sogonik (USA), and Charles Bettelheim (France) took part.<sup>1</sup>

What new elements do these theoreticians introduce into their "debunking" of Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of socialist construction?

What is characteristic here first of all is that this time the men who have undertaken the task of denigrating socialism regard themselves as the only "true Marxists," exponents of contemporary "Left" revisionism. Secondly, the blueprint for "salvation" which they propose is not the product of pure theory, but, as it turns out, has passed a "successful" practical test during the "cultural revolution" in China.

It should be noted at once that the authors borrow their arguments against the theory and practice of developed socialism from bourgeois ideologists, starting with V. Pareto and F. Hajek all the way to P. Wales, while their "positive program" stems from anarchism and Trotskyism.

Central place in the theoretical platform put forward by them is held by the concept of a gradual crystalization in socialist countries of an "exploiting class" culled from among persons engaged in mental work and the administration of the various sides of social life. Such a "class" has supposedly seized power, actually gained possession of the means of production, and is now exploiting the other working people. "The reason for these [new] relations," writes Bettelheim, "should be sought specifically in a bourgeois division of labor

---

\* From *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, No. 1, 1973. English translation reprinted from *Reprints from the Soviet Press*, May 18, 1973.

—in other words, in the difference between manual and mental labor, between the actual performance and the management of work.”<sup>2</sup> He is echoed by Sweezy, who declared in 1971 that he was increasingly inclined to accept Bettelheim’s assertion that Soviet society was state capitalism administered by a new state bourgeoisie.

This attack on developed socialism from “ultra-revolutionary” positions sounds distinctly in unison with bourgeois concepts of the “convergence of the two systems,” of the “industrial society” according to which in the epoch of the scientific and technological revolution the scientific and technical intelligentsia and the “bureaucracy” (used here to mean persons employed in managing the economy) turn into an independent, decisive social force, capable of “wresting power” from both the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and of ruling society in their own interests.

Active use of the system of material incentives and commodity-money relations in the interest of developing the socialist economy is regarded by the “New Left” as the next mortal sin of developed socialism. Commodity-money relations and the material incentive system are proclaimed to be alien to socialism, and as such must be restricted to the utmost. Bettelheim writes specifically that the introduction into the socialist economy of motivations (dependence on rewarding the workers with extra profit) is alien to socialism, hinders its progress and retards the molding of the new man.<sup>3</sup> Sweezy and Huberman especially emphasized also the moral “degeneration of socialism” which supposedly occurred because of the transition to production for profit in the USSR. Socialism itself, according to the views of these “Left” theoreticians, must include its own moral stimuli, selfless concern for the public good, and “political consciousness” as the decisive motive for economic attitudes of individuals.<sup>4</sup> “Material incentives” are the “hallmark” of capitalism. In the opinion of these “Leftists,” the needs of socialism are mainly connected with the building of the new society within which the new man can develop.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, they are not interested in the development level of the productive forces of the socialist country examined, nor with the living standard of the population. Criticism is conducted from positions of an abstract *a priori* ideal of socialism, without considering to what extent this ideal is consistent with the actual conditions in which one or another socialist state develops. Bettelheim and others of like mind proclaim equality to be an all-embracing ideal of socialism not subject to the real conditions, an ideal conceived as universal egalitarianism in consumption and the unification of all tastes and desires.

But all this is not regarded by the “Left” theorists as a sufficient guarantee against the “degeneration” of socialism into “social capital-

ism." The second necessary condition for "salvation" is the "permanent revolution" of the masses against the scientific and technical intelligentsia, so as not to give the latter an opportunity to become consolidated into a class, a "ruling stratum."

The architects of this concept are well aware that in a developed socialist society the aim of setting the working class and the peasantry against the intelligentsia is, to put it mildly, a rather forlorn hope, if only for the reason that in every worker's or peasant's family in the developed socialist countries at least one, and often several members either already have a higher education or are in the process of getting one. That is why the "Left" ideologists assign the role of "revolutionary force," which is continuously or periodically supposed to "shake up" the scientific and technical personnel, to some kind of "ersatz-proletariat" consisting of the anarchically-minded sections of the youth, military men, declassed elements, *i.e.*, groups of persons dissatisfied with the gradual development of socialism and inclined to search for "swift, radical," but in effect adventurist, ways of resolving all emerging difficulties and problems.

The initial thesis itself of the "New Left" concerning the supposed "seizure of power" by some sort of "stratum" of engineers and officials stems from a confusion between the concepts of classes and strata, of power and administration, an approach which for Marxists is simply impermissible. In a class society, power is always and everywhere the function of a definite class or alliance of classes. A class can exercise its power in part directly and in part through representatives from among its midst; part of its functions (mainly the technical ones of management) may also be entrusted to hired employees who do not belong to the class in power.

A number of functions of the management of modern economy, and other aspects of contemporary social life, require the highly skilled and specialized effort of a considerable number of individuals. The efficiency of the national economy, the adaptation of its product to the social and personal needs of the population, largely depend on the work of this group. But neither under capitalism nor under socialism can the stratum of highly specialized managerial personnel become a decisive force. For it has been put where it is by the class in power, and discharges its managing function only in the interests of one or another class.

Alongside the need to differentiate between management and power, it is also necessary to differentiate in approaching the management processes as such. Some of these processes, which call for profound, highly specialized knowledge, are effected in the main by a

limited circle of specialists. In contemporary capitalist society there really are some tendencies to intensify the "caste" character of this stratum (high cost of education, consideration of "origins" in appointment to an office, and so on). This, however, in no sense implies a weakening of the power of the big bourgeoisie in favor of the castes of its privileged hired employees. On the contrary, the conscious reinforcement of all kinds of social barriers represents a traditional method of consolidating the power of the ruling, exploiting class.

In the USSR and other socialist countries, a great deal of work goes into the broadest possible dissemination of special knowledge about the functions, problems and methods of modern management. This work, one must admit, is encountering a certain amount of difficulty due to the newness and the swift progress of the science of management, including electronic managerial technology.

As for other, more general functions of management, especially those most intricately connected with the exercise of power, the drawing into them of ever broader numbers of rank-and-file working people is a process which has been spreading extensively in all socialist countries. Every one of these countries has been facing, and still does face, the problem of scientific differentiation between specialized and general functions of management as well as the exploration of various approaches to the most effective enrollment of the masses in both. Lenin long ago emphasized that to combine a centralized economy with achieving active participation by the masses in the management of production would be extremely difficult. The difficulties in this sphere are of an objective nature, linked with certain very real contradictions between the processes of specialization of human knowledge and the all-around development of the human personality, not with any ill-intentioned actions on the part of some sort of mythical "stratum."

If not the "managers," who then is the leading force in a mature socialist society? To define the social nature of a state we have to answer a number of interconnected questions: a) Whose interests are served by the domestic and foreign policy of a given state over a sufficiently long period? b) What social forces exercise control over the activity of the state bodies, and how effective is that control? and c) How are these bodies formed and out of what social groups?

As for the first question, here Sweezy and Huberman are compelled to admit that the aim of state policy in the USSR is economic growth and a rise in the people's welfare, but only because otherwise the ruling stratum could not retain power. Thereby these "Left" theorists sink deeper into a morass of contradictions inasmuch as

they actually admit that the men who exercise state power represent the interests of the whole society.

The composition of the cadres of Party and state bodies in the USSR is as follows. By the time of the opening of the 24th CPSU Congress, four-fifths of the Secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Union republics, territorial and regional committees, Chairmen of the Councils of Ministers and Chairmen of territorial and regional executive committees were men and women who started their active lives as workers or peasants. Of the Ministers and Chairmen of the USSR State Committees, about 70 per cent come from among workers and peasants. More than half of the directors of the largest Soviet industrial enterprises are workers by origin. Three million people were admitted into the CPSU after the 23rd Party Congress, and of these almost 1,600,000, or more than half, are representatives of the working class.

The cardinal Leninist principle for guiding the socialist national economy is democratic centralism. Democratic centralism ensures the coordination of the interests of the entire people with the personal interest of the individual. More specifically, democratic centralism pre-supposes broad democratic discussion of production plans at all links of the economy; it makes public and compares the results of the emulation movement; it ensures public control by the working people over the activity of economic management, as well as collective guidance combined with one-man management and the personal responsibility of executives for the job entrusted to them. Management bodies at enterprises and ministries are accountable to the elected political bodies of the state.

One of the most important factors in exercising the power of the entire people in a developed socialist society is the participation of the masses in national economic planning. The drawing up of a plan begins with an evaluation of the results of the preceding plan period. Huge sections of the population join in examining the results of the plan through various organizations: at some stages directly, in the form of general meetings of workers and collective farmers; at others, through elected representatives in trade union, state and Party bodies. The 24th CPSU Congress pointed out that "it is necessary to encourage the practice of heads of associations and enterprises, and also top-level ministry officials, regularly accounting for their work directly to the workers." The evaluation of plan fulfillment already contains an element of the exercise of power by the whole people, determining how successfully the sphere of management and planning has worked in any given period and to what extent its actions conformed to the interests and requirements of

society and to the possibilities of satisfying them.

The second stage in exercising the power of the entire people is the passing on of its decisions to specialists in management and planning, namely, the process of formulating the new plan. Here even broader masses actively join in the exercise of power. Draft plans for enterprises, drawn up by specialists, are discussed by production collectives, by Soviets of Working People's Deputies at all levels. All Soviets—from the local to the Supreme—include economic commissions which draw up proposals for improving the plans and submit them to the relevant Soviets for examination. Planning specialists usually have to draw up a number of plan alternatives until the optimal one is approved by the bodies of people's power.

The third stage of the interaction of power with economic management is the process of plan fulfillment, which takes place under the constant influence and control of the trade union, Party and other social organizations and elected state bodies.

And so, the interconnections of power and management under conditions of developed socialism represent an intricate, constantly functioning mechanism which bears no resemblance to the fabricated schemes of "domination of technocracy," or "rule of engineers and managers"—schemes borrowed by the "Left" ultra-revolutionaries from modern bourgeois theories.

It goes without saying that the development of the socialist mechanism of power and management keeps encountering difficulties, and proceeds by resolving various contradictions. Not all the organizations through which the people's power guides the process of management, nor all the specialists employed in them, work with equal efficiency. The Soviet press constantly and extensively watches and criticizes the activity of state and economic links as well as individuals who fail to cope with the tasks entrusted to them by the people's power. The most effective forms of enlisting ever broader masses in state activity are unceasingly explored and re-examined.

"The socialist world is forging ahead and is constantly improving," L. I. Brezhnev said recently. "But its development naturally advances through struggle between the new and the old, through the resolution of internal contradictions. The experience we have accumulated helps the fraternal parties to find correct and timely solutions for the contradictions, and confidently to advance along the path indicated by Marx, Engels and Lenin, those great teachers of the proletariat."

•

Thus the accusation that the Soviet intelligentsia has somehow "seized power" turns out to be false. Let us now examine the second

charge, that of exploitation. After all, it is perfectly possible to exploit without being in power: the bourgeoisie did precisely that even under feudalism. But then, it already had at its disposal the means of production, while the socialist intelligentsia, as even bourgeois economists are ready to admit, has nothing. In this respect a statement made by I. Deutscher, certainly no friend of socialism, is of considerable interest. In Deutscher's opinion, the whole proposition about the new class of exploiters and similar theses having to do with a Soviet managerial society is an oversimplification which, rather than clarifying, tends to confuse the issue. For those who are called the new class are without property. They own neither the means of production nor the land. In contrast to managers in the capitalist society, they are unable to convert any part of their income into capital. Thus they cannot perpetuate themselves as a class.<sup>6</sup>

The ideologists of the "New Left" have different views on this point. Sweezy and Huberman assume that the main benefits from economic development in the USSR accrue to a self-reproducing stratum. This privileged stratum consists of scientists, engineers, managers and officials—all those without whose know-how economic development would be impossible. Society must provide these people with everything they need for the performance of their work. And this means that their salaries are higher than the wages of other groups of working people, which in turn leads to privileges and inequality. Such privileges and inequality arouse in this stratum a desire to perpetuate them, engendering a morality of greed which leads to their becoming divorced from the masses.<sup>7</sup>

If not ownership of the means of production, then what makes up the true basis for the systematic "appropriation" by the intelligentsia of the product of the labor of others?

We cannot find any consistent answers to this question in the works of the theorists of the "New Left." At times they emphasize the point that the intelligentsia in its own interests exploits a monopoly of knowledge—*i.e.*, its own mental labor. A still more simplistic explanation reduces itself to the point that the "stratum" has seized power and now wilfully utilizes it for self-enrichment. But these two explanations do not click very well.

Let us examine first the arguments which lay claim to a "more profound" explanation of the question. Can a monopoly of knowledge really arise and be intensified under the conditions of a swiftly developing socialist society?

In elaborating the theory of the transition period, Lenin repeatedly drew attention to the role of the intelligentsia. His approach was based on the principle that the bourgeois intelligentsia "is not an *independent* economic class and therefore not an *independent* politi-

cal force. . . .”<sup>8</sup> It holds “an interclass position.”<sup>9</sup> In his work, *The State and Revolution*, he pointed out that future engineers, agronomists and others would work under the control of the proletariat.<sup>10</sup> But for this, alongside political and ideological methods, a material incentive for the intelligentsia to so work was required. In a time of undeveloped production and a shortage of material goods, this meant giving the intelligentsia certain privileges regarding living conditions as compared with other workers. But can such privileges be qualified as exploitation? Most unlikely. The intelligentsia worked under the control of a proletarian dictatorship, in the latter’s interests. If a high price had to be paid for this, the Communists consciously paid it.

Let us for the moment, however, put aside the whole question. The early stages of the development of socialism in the USSR arouse no objections on the part of “Left” theorists. It was only later, according to their views, that the Soviet intelligentsia reinforced its privileges, became consolidated into the “ruling stratum,” seized power from the proletariat and began to “exploit” it.

To achieve a “monopoly position” and appropriate unearned income, the Soviet intelligentsia apparently should have done everything it could to hinder access to higher education for the overwhelming majority of the members of society, to restrict the number of persons studying in higher educational establishments. Let us turn to the relevant figures. In 1960 the national economy of the USSR employed 3,545,000 specialists with a higher education and 5,239,000 with a specialized secondary education. In the next ten years the numbers for both groups almost doubled. Thus, in the real life of socialist society, in contrast to the theories about a “monopoly of knowledge” and a “self-reproducing élite,” stands the rapid process of the spread of training and knowledge in which the striving of the working people for an education meets not with resistance by the “élite,” but on the contrary with a desire on the part of the intelligentsia to broaden its ranks, to raise all the working people to its level.

From the role of “hired employee” in the service of proletarian dictatorship, the intelligentsia has become a politically conscious and active participant in socialist construction. Simultaneously with the growth of the ranks of the intelligentsia and the increase of elements of mental activity in the labor of ever larger sections of workers and peasants, the last possibilities are “eroded” for a caste monopolization of any sphere of social activity. Under these conditions the meaning and purpose of special privileges for highly qualified personnel is obviated. It is sufficient that skilled labor, for making a larger con-



tribution to the social product, receives correspondingly higher rewards, irrespective of whether the labor is mental or manual, managerial or a matter of performance.

Could a subjective desire to maintain privileges not justified from the viewpoint of society's interests arise among members of the intelligentsia? Probably so. The authors of theories dealing with the "degeneration" of socialism tirelessly emphasize this point. But does it behoove men who call themselves Marxists to base their arguments on subjective desires? After all, both the desires themselves and the chances to realize them are determined by the objective conditions of the existence of the given class or stratum, its place in the system of social relations, and above all its relation to the means of production.

Under socialism, where the principal means of production are the property of the entire society, the unified social interests of all working people gains dominance. The improved well-being of every class and stratum, every member of society, depends, above all, on the development of social production as a whole. Under these conditions, individual group interests which run counter to the interests of the whole people cannot have a mass basis. Even in an embryonic form they already run up against the organized resistance of the overwhelming majority of society, and cannot be consolidated.

o

There are, however, certain valid grounds for the emergence of another type of group—or local—interests which, while they do not directly coincide with those of the whole people, are nevertheless not antagonistic to them. Socialist society is an intricate organism which consists of a plurality of relatively independent units—production, territorial, and others. Each of these performs certain definite, and to one or another extent specialized, functions and has definite means and operational independence for their performance. Such a societal structure engenders the shaping of various sectoral, local interests which, given a normal situation in the social organism, correspond in their main features to the interests of the entire society. As for the non-antagonistic contradictions between different interests, they do exist, are in motion, and definite forms of resolving them are to be found at each stage of development. The proposition of Marxian dialectics about development being a struggle of contradictions is not abolished by socialism. Only the content and form of the contradictions change; they simply are no longer socio-class antagonisms. Individual and group interests, alongside the interests of the whole people, also arise among representatives of the socialist

intelligensia. But the mechanism of the socialist economy and its structure do not create conditions for the consolidation of these interests into some kind of uniform interests of the "managerial" stratum which differ from the interests of the whole people.

The means of production, which are the property of the entire people, are entrusted to production collectives which carry out assignments under a single plan. The incomes, the conditions of work of all members of every collective, largely depend on the results of the operation of the given enterprise. But in that case the local interests of the director, the engineers and the workers of the same enterprise have a great deal more in common than do the interests of, let us say, the directors of many various enterprises. Let us note that in the USSR there is no separate (craft) trade union of engineers, for instance. Engineers, together with the other workers of their individual enterprises, belong to sectoral trade unions. It follows that the local interests of the working people of each separate sector are more clearly expressed, and organizationally better formulated, than the "stratum" interests of, for example, engineers as a profession.

What are the means for realizing sectoral interests? It is possible, say, to strive to get for a single sector, through planning agencies, an unjustifiably high share of the centralized fund of capital investments, or higher than average prices for the goods it produces. There have been such phenomena, and the methods of combating them are still not perfect. But there are also more reliable methods of improving working conditions, and increasing incomes, on a sector scale through the accelerated growth of production with the help of internal reserves, and correspondingly also of increasing the bonus funds and money for investments from the profits of the sector. In this form the "sectoral" interest is close to the social, although it does not coincide with it.

Thus, counterposing the interests of mental and manual workers turns out to be an abstract scheme far removed from the true structure of interests in a developed socialist society.

The real content of the process of obliterating distinctions between mental and manual labor has nothing in common with such vulgarizations. The "Leftist" ideas about there being a tie-in between the increase in the number of mental workers and the "strengthening of the managerial stratum" simply do not conform to the reality of the situation. The management of the manual-labor processes, that is, of the direct reproduction processes, has always been a traditional function of mental labor in the economic sphere. But in the conditions of a scientific and technological revolution, a new function of

mental labor—direct participation in material production processes and the control of automated systems of machines—is increasingly developing and becoming dominant.

It is the extension of this function, alongside the development of of cultural levels, the health services, and the whole educational system, that absorbs the main mass of the growing intelligentsia, *i.e.*, the increasing number of people with a higher education. For it is the (overall) growth of this stratum in all sectors of production as well as in the nonproductive sphere, and not the “managerial stratum” as interpreted by theorists of “social capitalism,” that is the characteristic feature of the real process in the formation of manpower, which corresponds to the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution under socialism.<sup>11</sup>

•

The “Left” theorists’ views on the economic mechanism of socialism are marked by the typical lofty contempt of the “true revolutionaries” for the painstaking, “prosaic,” economic spade work which has to be done—a contempt which, incidentally, Lenin tirelessly criticized in his time.

In fact, in the eyes of the “Left” ideologists, the ideal of socialist organization seems to be the height of simplicity: some sort of central agency issues a detailed, maximally intensive planned directive addressed to all the links of the economy; the production collectives, encouraged by moral stimuli pure and simple, fulfill and overfulfill their assignments, in the meantime keeping the engineers, agronomists and economists in constant fear lest they dare think of “consolidating into a stratum;” the consumer goods thus produced are then distributed equally among all the enthusiasts, without taking into account any differences in the intensity, ability or skills of the workers. Of course, it is not at all clear who, in this scheme, would actually allocate assignments at the center—qualified specialists or “ersatz-proletarians” filled with “revolutionary zeal” and ignorance. Judging by the results of the “big leaps” of the Chinese economy proceeding from “Left” principles of management, the second assumption seems closer to fact. But the efficacy of the proposed system hardly disturbs our theorists, the main point being that it fully corresponds to what they picture as “the principles of socialism.”

Engels already pointed out that, all other conditions being equal, the method of distribution “essentially depends on how much there is to distribute, and that this must surely change with the progress of production and social organization, so that the methods of distribution may also change.”<sup>12</sup>

In the initial, lowest stage of communism, with society's productive forces limited and the nature of labor not yet at a level where it has become a prime requirement of man's life, the state personal consumption fund can be distributed only in proportion to the labor contribution of every workingman. Only afterwards will distribution turn into an important factor in advancing the productive forces and creating the economic prerequisites for eventual transition to the highest form of distribution—distribution according to need. "If we are not to indulge in utopianism," Lenin once wrote, "we must not assume that, just because they have overthrown capitalism, people will at once learn how to work for (the sake of) society, *without first acquiring standards of what is right*. Moreover, the abolition of capitalism *does not immediately create* the economic prerequisites for *such* a change."<sup>13</sup>

It is easy enough for the theorists of the Western "Left" verbally to "refute" these life-tested principles. It is much harder for their Chinese confreres: somehow they still have to drag the country's economy out of the void into which it was plunged by the "big" and "great" leaps. For this purpose the artificial whipping up of "general enthusiasm" with demagogic promises, chauvinistic slogans and militaristic calls must be supplemented by something more material. And the first such "supplement" inevitably proved to be the method of extra-economic coercion.

Sweezy, Bettelheim and Gustafsson would, of course, protest vehemently if one were to reproach them for providing an apology for forced labor.

But whether they like it or not, the need for the use of massive coercion over the working people practically follows from their concepts. Indeed, the practice of all countries which follow the socialist path shows that at a given development level of the economy as well as of the people's consciousness moral stimuli alone are not enough. If material stimulation is proclaimed unacceptable under socialism, nothing else remains except to "supplement" moral stimuli by an organized system of coercion. It is this path that Maoism has taken.

The "New Left" proclaims that Maoism aims to release the spiritual energy of man: supposedly, for this purpose the material needs and stimuli of the working people are suppressed and "pure" enthusiasm is whipped up. Actually, nowhere are the working people subjected to such coercion, to such suppression of all independent individual spiritual potentialities, as under the system of Maoism.

Gustafsson asserts that "after the cultural revolution, production increased substantially" in China and that "we probably should expect still better results within the next few years."<sup>14</sup> Expressed in

figures, this statement sounds rather more modest. With 1966 taken as 100 per cent, gross industrial output in the People's Republic of China fell to 83 per cent in 1967 and was about 96 per cent in 1969. Only in 1970, when gross output had risen by about 10 per cent as compared with 1969, was the 1966 level exceeded. True, in 1966, as is known, production did not advance far beyond the level of 1957, that is, the last year preceding the "big leap." Nevertheless, a certain economic stabilization, a return to extended reproduction is now in evidence. But does this prove the correctness of the "Leftist" principles? In the course of the "cultural revolution" the Maoists viciously attacked the principle of material incentives. All those who favored its application were accused of attempting to "infect the workers with bourgeois egoism, to dishonor the working class, imputing to it greed, the quest for material benefits inherent in the bourgeoisie." The newspaper *Yang cheng wen pao* asserted in one of its articles that the "material incentive is a poison for vitiating the Soviet people, a major measure aimed at restoring capitalism in the USSR."

But when it came to normalizing the economy after the bankrupt experimentation, the adepts of "selfless enthusiasm" were willy-nilly forced, in addition to using coercion and bombastic slogans, to turn to some extent at least to the old methods tested in socialist practice: in order to obtain quality and quantity, they too had to resort to material stimulation. Thus, in 1970, wages at a silk mill in Hangchow, depending on degrees of skill, ranged from 31.5 to 82 yuan; at the Nanking chemical fertilizer factory, workers' wages ranged from 34 to 108 yuan, and those of engineers reached 150 yuan.<sup>16</sup> It is also significant that the differentiation in wages, alongside skills and hours of work, depends also on "ideological and political behavior"—a kind of material incentive offered for loyalty to Maoism. The Chinese press sheds very little light on the differentiation in payment for work. Data for individual enterprises makes it possible to draw the conclusion that the differentiation between the two extremes is more than 1:3.

Verbally, Gustafsson, Bettelheim and Sweezy are ardent proponents of planned economy. But their statements show that they have a very superficial knowledge of the theory and practice of socialist planning. Otherwise they could not obstinately put forward the proposition that the plan and commodity-money relations are antagonistic, nor would they confuse two entirely different concepts—the use of commodity-money relations within the bounds of a plan-

ned system with the regulating role of the market in the system of "market socialism."

According to primitive "Leftist" schemes for socialist countries, and particularly the USSR, there were two possibilities of development in the 1960s: one was the "cultural revolution" in the specific meaning the Chinese invested in this term; the other was to rely on the discipline of the market and on profits as a stimulus. *Tertium non datur*, as the saying goes—no other alternative is given.

Marx pointed out that "the production and circulation of commodities are, however, phenomena that occur to a greater or lesser extent in the most diverse modes of production. If we are familiar with nothing but the abstract categories of circulation, which are common to all these modes of production, we cannot possibly know anything of the specific points of difference of these modes, nor pronounce any judgment upon them."<sup>16</sup>

The nature of commodity-money relations under socialism can be understood only if we proceed from the premise that these relations develop within the structure of socialist property, following the specific laws of the socialist economy, within a structure of interests which are not antagonistic. Then we will find that under socialism the market does not function spontaneously: it is subordinate to the plan, the structure of the national economy being determined to a decisive degree by planned centralized regulation. It is the centralized plan that expresses in concentrated form the interests of society. The market, on the other hand, is an auxiliary, and quite efficient, means for realizing more fully both the social and individual interests.

The use of commodity-money categories in the planning process makes it possible to elaborate economically-based indicators of the operation of enterprises in fulfilling plan assignments, helping better to adapt planned production to the continuously changing needs of the working people.

Sweezy, Bettelheim and Gustafsson try to make it appear as though with the introduction of the economic reform in the USSR "production for profit" had been restored. They see signs of such a "restoration of capitalism" in that the number of obligatory targets for enterprises was substantially reduced in the course of the reform: alongside planned assignments for major types of output in physical terms, a greater role was acquired by indicators of sales volume and of profit. What these "Leftists" dislike in particular is that allotments from profit go toward setting up funds at enterprises designated for expanding production, modernizing equipment, satisfying the social and cultural needs of the collective, and materially stimulating its

members.

Bettelheim and Gustafsson hold that the introduction of material incentives drawn from profits may upset the correlation between the labor contribution of the workers and the reward. Two who exert the same efforts and produce the same quantity of goods but are employed at different enterprises, they claim, receive different pay if part of the profits is distributed between them.<sup>17</sup>

Here we see a tendency inherent in all the dogmatists of the "Left" to reduce every economic law, every principle to the most primitive kind of "rules" that simply do not apply to reality. "According to work done" means to "receive equally for equal effort, for equal quantities of output," they insist. Everything that does not fit into this formula is a transgression. The fighters for the "purity of principle" forget that present-day labor is a highly intricate social process incorporating the efforts of individual workers, teams, and also the collectives of entire enterprises. As for output, even if two workers at two different enterprises do produce in a day an equal number of equal parts, these parts may be produced on machine tools of different makes, from different blanks differently processed, under different working conditions, and with unequal shop organization and production pace.

Only a complex, many-sided system of remuneration can reflect the full complexity of the modern processes of social labor and take into account its quantity and quality. No central agency can or should define the concrete share of every workingman in the total product. Central and sectoral organizations, enterprises and production sections all take part in distributing the payment fund according to work done.

Thus we see that what socialism offers is not primitive dogma but an intricate mechanism whose operation affects the composition and distribution of manpower, the pace and technical endowment of different links of production, a mechanism which includes active constructive endeavor, the interaction of the material and moral interests of many organizations, collectives, groups and individual workers.

While denouncing the payment of bonuses to workers out of the profits of socialist enterprises, the "Left" also seeks to prove that workers receive only wages—the necessary product—while directors of enterprises and engineering and technical personnel appropriate ever greater share of the surplus product. They try to prove their point by showing that workers (generally) receive comparatively smaller bonuses out of the material incentive fund than do engineers and technicians.

True enough. But workers receive their main bonuses for over-fulfillment of quotas out of the wages fund, which does not depend on the results of the fulfillment of the profit plan by the enterprise as a whole, so that only a second, smaller share of their bonuses comes to them out of the material incentive fund. The bonuses of directors of enterprises, on the other hand, as well as those of engineers, technicians and other employees, depend to a greater extent on the incentive fund.

This difference in the forms in which bonuses are paid, however, is anything but exploitation; it is, in fact, designed to ensure the fullest possible protection of the interests of all categories of employees, rank-and-file workers first of all. Since it is the engineers and technicians who are the ones mainly responsible for the operation indicators of the total enterprise, it would be unfair to deprive the workers of one section of their entire bonus because of shortcomings in other sections, even if these shortcomings affected the operation and production quotas of the whole enterprise. Recognition of a lesser degree of responsibility is thus expressed in that a considerable part of the bonus fund for the workers remains independent of the profits which the enterprise makes.

As for the size of bonuses to engineers and technicians paid out of profits, had Gustafsson made a careful analysis of the data instead of tendentiously juggling them, he would have learned that at the time this procedure was introduced, approximately corresponding sums were transferred from the wages fund of engineers and technicians formerly used for the payment of bonuses. Such an operation is hardly capable of converting payment according to work done into exploitation.

•

The views of the "Left" as regards the role of commodity-money relations under different socioeconomic systems are not, as we see, so very different from the views of the early Christian prophets who denounced money as such as the great evil: abolish money, and at one fell swoop peace, justice and full harmony would reign throughout the world.

Is there a contradiction, then, between the goal of achieving the all-around harmonious development of the members of a socialist society and the actual forms of satisfying their needs with the help of exchange, of commodity-money relations? Undoubtedly there is. When he buys goods for money, a man is almost unconsciously inclined to set a higher value on the potential usefulness of the more expensive goods, luxury items which perhaps are not really so very



necessary for the all-around development of his personality. People with higher incomes or a smaller family are able to satisfy their needs more fully. There is no point in closing our eyes to these and other contradictions. But can they be eliminated by reducing material incentives to work and curtailing commodity-money relations?

The experience of all socialist countries points to the opposite. During difficult periods of sharp class struggle, war, and later the elimination of its consequences, all states which follow the socialist path did in fact to some extent apply methods of egalitarian distribution, of introducing the ties of a natural economy. This was justified as a temporary, forced measure in times of acute shortages of material goods. But if a state delayed developing commodity-money relations in a planned way, they inevitably arose and grew in warped, "underground" forms, as speculation, "spontaneous" money, semi-natural exchange. By refusing to utilize normal commodity-money relations a socialist state can only lose control over them. And this is understandable. Under socialism, commodity-money relations are only a form of expressing the deeper distinctions of production, labor and consumption. These distinctions inevitably continue to exist in a society which has freed itself from capitalist exploitation and the anarchy of production but has not yet attained, either materially or morally, the level conforming to the higher stage of communism.

The experience of the USSR and other socialist countries shows that it is necessary to elaborate and consistently apply a comprehensive program for eliminating these contradictions. This specifically includes: a general increase and gradual evening-out of the money incomes of the working people by advancing their skills—more swiftly among the less skilled sections; the spread (alongside payment according to work done) of free consumption out of social funds, which does not depend on skill; the scientific elaboration, without infringing on the sovereignty of the consumers, of rates and a composition of consumption which best conforms to the all around cultural development of the members of socialist society, and so on.

Planned systematic training to raise labor skills is conducted throughout the entire economy of the USSR. Huge numbers of workers study at correspondence and evening courses, in technical schools and institutes. Every year better trained and educated young forces replenish the national economy. Already the levels of skill and education of the main core of workers in the USSR has drawn close to the level of our middle-link engineers and technicians.

The levels of labor remuneration are coming closer to each other on the basis of the gradual drawing together of mental and manual, industrial and agricultural, managerial and performing labor. Differ-

entiation in pay is being gradually reduced as a result of the increase in minimum wages (and also of scholarships, benefits, and so on) and the average level of wages, with greater stability at its upper level. Moreover, a reduction in the number of workers is characteristic of the group in the lower brackets, along with a stable growth for the middle and higher brackets. Thus, in the twenty years between 1946 and 1966, the proportion of workers with a monthly wage of 40 to 50 rubles in the total number decreased by 16.7 per cent, while that of workers with a monthly wage of 140 to 160 rubles increased by 5.6 times; 200 to 300 rubles, by 4.3 times; and above 300 rubles, by 3.3 times.<sup>18</sup>

Instead of the intensification of "inequality" in consumption and incomes predicted by Sweezy and Gustafsson, we have, on the contrary, a substantial drawing together of the living standards of different groups of factory and office workers, of manual and mental workers. In 1946 the level of incomes of the highest-paid 10 per cent of workers was 7.24 times that of the 10 per cent in the lowest brackets; in 1966, this coefficient was only 3.26. Thus, between 1946 and 1966 the differentiation in payment for labor in the highest and the lowest decreased by more than half.

Under socialism, distribution according to work is the main source of income of the working people. But alongside this, forms of distributing goods and services out of social funds are being increasingly developed. These funds are utilized to the greatest extent by the groups with the lower incomes; thus the possibilities for developing people's faculties, irrespective of size of income, are evened out. The share of social consumption funds in the total material goods and services consumed in the USSR by working people and their families amounted to 15 per cent in 1940, 24 per cent in 1960, and about 27 per cent of the entire consumption fund in 1967.<sup>19</sup>

Having examined the attacks of the "Left" on developed socialism—attacks made from positions of "moral purity" and "absolute equality"—let us note that this exploration of their ideological precursors leads, not to Trotskyism and modern bourgeois theories, but to a much more distant past—to the early theoreticians of so-called "primitive egalitarian communism."

The ideologists of primitive egalitarianism, who sought to put an end to age-old crying social inequality, saw in communism an embodiment of the principle of absolute, perfect equality, which was not linked with any real, objective possibilities opened up by a definite mode of production at one or another stage of its development, but was interpreted as some kind of primary regulatory demand. Thus was communism turned into a dogmatic abstraction.

Because it confuses personal interests with private interests, primitive communism, while appealing for the general good, tries to abolish not only private capitalist, but also personal interests, and would fully dissolve them in the social interests. It is not by chance that Marx characterized egalitarian communism as a system which "at every step denies the *personality* of (the individual) man."<sup>20</sup> Crude communism in effect tries to "make poverty the great equalizer," seeking forcibly to narrow and level down the needs of all.

In conclusion we only need emphasize the deep internal contradictoriness of all the theoretical constructions of "Left" critics of developed socialism. Absolutizing the role of the scientific and technical intelligentsia in the economy in the era of the world scientific and technological revolution, they simultaneously advise socialist countries to keep this stratum in constant fear, to suppress its creative capabilities, to place it under the constant control of aggressive ignorance.

Advocating the free enthusiasm of the masses, the spread of moral stimuli and spiritual interests, they extol the army-barracks regime of Maoism in China as the model for the practical implementation of these principles.

Denying the contradictions and difficulties which arise objectively in the building and development of socialist society (the insufficient development of production, the changing level of consciousness of the masses, and others), they simultaneously exaggerate and distort beyond recognition the contradictions of the development of socialism in the USSR and a number of other socialist countries.

Lastly, what is most tragic for those among the "Leftists" who sincerely consider themselves fighters for socialism is that by their arguments, their rabid anti-Sovietism and actual role in the world struggle of the social forces, their theories are closely linked with the concepts of the arch-reactionaries, the irreconcilable enemies of true socialism.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> *Socialkapitalismen*, Stockholm, 1971.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 168.

<sup>3</sup> *Monthly Review*, January 1966, pp. 35, 36.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> I. Deutscher, *The Unfinished Revolution: Russia 1917-1967*, New York, 1967, p. 55.

<sup>7</sup> *Socialkapitalismen*, p. 168.

<sup>8</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 380.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 13, p. 52.

(Continued on Page 30)

## Czechoslovakia: Five Years Later

This year marks two historic events which were crucial to the life of Czechoslovakia. Twenty-five years ago (February 1948) an attempted coup by bourgeois groups in the postwar coalition government was foiled. As a consequence the path was cleared for building the socialist state. Twenty years later (August 1968) a new counter-revolutionary threat of the Right leadership, which attempted to divert the country from its socialist direction was defeated. Both conspiracies met with failure. Both victories, separated by two decades, were vital to the socialist destiny of Czechoslovakia.

The defeat of Nazism in 1945 wrested the country from the Munich group, which had enabled Hitlerism to march East, where it finally met its doom. Twenty years later the new socialist state was again threatened, this time from within, where forces seeking to destroy socialism found an ally in imperialism.

World-wide attention was focused on the critical events of 1968. Its lessons were closely studied by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPCz). They are today applied in all phases of the life of its people. But these lessons are of significance not only for them, but have contributed to the knowledge of the international revolutionary movement.

When on August 20, 1968, the Warsaw Pact military forces (based on the mutual defense agreements of socialist states) moved into Prague they met with wide "indignation" in imperialist circles. The U. S., at that moment, was decimating Vietnam and napaalming its people, while piously voicing concern at the "intervention." Their class response had no ambiguities. They were actually a "silent" partner in provoking the crisis, in an effort to "roll back" socialism.

Differences existed among some Marxist parties as to the procedure which was followed. They reflected differences of opinion as to the analysis of the crisis. It was a phenomenon without precedent, which could not have been foreseen. But the fraternal relations among parties, mutual exchanges and multilateral discussions contributed, to a large extent, to the modification of earlier positions. Many others recognized that regardless of previous differences as to estimation, unity on this, as on other basic problems, could be achieved.

The revolutionary course may require rapid and unprecedented shifts. This is a characteristic of revolutions. They do not conform to established procedures, although they are guided by the general the-

oretical principles of Marxism-Leninism. Each event must be considered in concrete circumstances. Marxism acknowledges that revolutionary transformations may take varied forms, but their objectives remain the same. As this is true in revolutionary transformation, it is also applicable in preserving the achievements of socialism. Internal class conflict does not end with the consummation of the revolution. Nor are antagonistic class forces eliminated in one swoop.

V. I. Lenin, writing after the 1905 Russian revolution, stated: "Marxism demands an absolute *historical* examination of the question of forms of struggle. . . ." He added: "To attempt to answer yes or no to the question whether any particular means of struggle should be used, without making a detailed examination of the concrete situation of the given moment at the given stage of its development, means completely to abandon the Marxist position." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 214.)

As the 1968 events matured it became evident that the Right wing sought to dismantle socialism in Czechoslovakia. Let me recall the estimation of the Communist Party, USA, made by its General Secretary, Gus Hall. Recognizing that serious mistakes were made in the 1960's and in the previous decade, he asserted, the Right was not concerned with contributing to the correction of these mistakes, but set out to exacerbate the situation, in the hope that it would help in eliminating socialism. Hall wrote then that "*in the opinion of these intellectuals* (who were then in leadership-PB), *the mistakes made sprang from the very nature of the system of socialism and came from the misrule originating in 1948*, when the workers took power. They called for wiping out the 20 years of socialism. Is this, or is this not counter-revolution?" (*Czechoslovakia at the Crossroads*, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1968, p. 15.)

Publications designed to sustain the discredited positions held by the Czechoslovak Right-wing forces of 1968 continue to appear. They pose democratic socialism (revisionism) as the alternative to the socialist state. Yet in no country has socialism been established where social democracy has come to power. Where social democracy is in power, monopoly capitalism maintains domination.

Among the many recent publications on this subject, let me refer to two new books. Both are sympathetic to the Right leadership in Czechoslovakia in the crisis of five years ago. They confirm now what the direction was then. Three authors (Andrew Oxley, Alex Pravda and Andrew Ritchie) have collected a number of articles and statements which were made during 1968. We shall not refer to the 1968 material, but quote from the authors' introduction. They conclude that "If the 'experiment' had succeeded . . . the whole world might

have felt the impact of its new interpretation of Marxist-Leninism, and Czechoslovakia might have become a prototype for the future development of both socialist and capitalist countries." (*Czechoslovakia: The Party and the People*, Penguin Press, London, 1973, p. xi.) They are "enthusiastic and optimistic (that) bureaucratic socialism might be liquidated and a new model developed. . . ." (*Ibid.*) Of course, they attribute the longing for the "new model" to the "New Left." A new world-wide impact would have contributed to a "new interpretation" of Marxism-Leninism. The old opportunist ideology would be dressed in new clothes. This is their estimation of what could have occurred.

Another author, Robert Kilroy-Silk, envisioned Czechoslovakia as another Sweden, which would be "humane and respectable." He confides that "The Czechoslovak experiment had opened . . . the possibility that communism, even in Eastern Europe, would seem humane and respectable. . . ." (*Socialism Since Marx*, Penguin Press, London, 1972, p. 283.)

The author expresses the hope that had the Right usurped power in Czechoslovakia it could have served revisionism internationally as Sweden does social democracy. This would have been the new "experiment" of the socialist state. The western model (imperialism) was the reward for the abolition of socialism. These are the current proponents of the theories of the erstwhile Prague leaders whose platform was "socialism with a human face."

The question is still raised: how could such a situation have occurred after two decades of socialism? First, the period was brief. But most important, transformation to the new society leaves many problems still to be resolved. It has to contend with the heritage of its past. Socialism does not develop in abstract circumstances. But its successes, in a brief 25 years, confirm the superiority of the new socialist state.

While Czechoslovakia had a strong Communist Party, rooted in the working class, it also had an influential social democracy whose opportunist ideology penetrated sections of the working class. Social democracy maintained an uncritical alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie. While the merging of the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties contributed to the political unity of the working class, it did not automatically erase social-democratic, opportunist influences. On the contrary, it generated new pressures, requiring the most intensive ideological struggle against the penetration of those influences into the newly united Marxist party.

As long as classes exist, the seeds of opportunism remain. Unless opposed consistently, opportunism will grow and have a deleterious

effect on the working class. Opportunism was and remains a serious danger to the working class movement as a whole, and to the Marxist movement in particular. Whether these pressures are from the "Left" or the Right does not change their basic objectives.

In periods of sharp social upsurge these pressures may arise from the "Left." During partial stabilization the direction may be from the Right. The student upsurge of the 1960's was influenced by "Leftist" ideology. The Right has had traditionally strong roots in the labor bureaucracy, which has had a strong influence in workers' ranks.

These trends take different forms in different socialist countries, as the experiences in Czechoslovakia demonstrates. Therefore the struggle takes on distinct forms under specific conditions. The dangers today flow from a combination of bourgeois nationalism and the underestimation of the historic role of the working class as the chief revolutionary force in society. These factors operated in Czechoslovakia, although the opportunists sought to hide under the cover of Marxism.

That is why from the days of Marx, during the formative stage of socialist revolution, to the time of Lenin when the successful revolution became a reality, revolutionary leaders have directed their sharpest ideological thrusts against every manifestation of opportunism. Lenin said that "*in principle* we must unquestionably demand a complete break with opportunism. The whole struggle of our Party must be directed against opportunism. The latter is not a current of opinion, not a tendency; it has now become the organized tool of the bourgeoisie within the working-class movement. . . ." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 35, p. 197.)

Imperialism adopts methods advantageous to its struggle against socialism. While its military adventures in Vietnam met with failure, future aggressive acts cannot be excluded, although here, too, imperialism may be compelled to readjust to new conditions resulting from changes in world relations. It is a far cry from the days when Churchill sought to "bury Bolshevism in its cradle" to the "Prague Spring" where a Smrkovsky could join a Brzezinski in approving the "new democracy" which would not be impeded by working class rule.

The basic prerequisites for socialist revolutions in our epoch, of which the Russian Revolution was the precursor, are: recognition of the leading role of the working class; the leadership of and the unity of the Marxist-Leninist party and the eradication of factionalism; consciousness of international working-class solidarity; and solidarity with the community of socialist states. In Czechoslovakia these tools were dulled by the Right and became rusty from disuse. It was therefore feasible to smuggle in bourgeois ideology under the guise

of solving problems. It was not the achievements of socialism, but the glitter of imperialism which was encouraged, thereby paving the way for a return to capitalism.

Mass media and educational institutions, so vital in modern conditions, were turned over to anti-Marxist ideologues. Inexperienced youth were treated to Hollywood glamor as a substitute for socialist ideology. An imperialist knight errant, such as a Kennedy, replaced Czechoslovakia's own heroic figures. Julius Fuchik, who died on the gallows, a martyr of Nazism, was forgotten. Delegates to the 14th Congress of the Party spoke with indignation at the criminal eradication of their revolutionary heritage. But this was an essential step in eradicating socialist ideology among the youth and the nation as a whole.

It was therefore not difficult to move from opportunism to counter-revolution. Unless opportunism is fought and defeated it creeps like poisonous weeds destroying all in its path. It is not a long step from efforts to destroy socialism from within to the search for alliances with the external enemy. The object of the Warsaw Pact nations (of which Czechoslovakia is a member) was, therefore, to help eliminate the threat facing the country, thereby creating the opportunity for the government and Party to mobilize the working class and its allies to secure the socialist state.

These are the lessons to be drawn from the 1968 events. The resolution referred to as the "Lessons," adopted at the December 1970 Central Committee plenum of the CPCz was self-critical and worthy of the international attention it received. The 14th Congress further consolidated the Communist Party's organization. It was pervaded by a self-critical atmosphere, thereby assuring new successes for its economic plan.

It was a difficult, historic lesson, learned at great cost. But it confirmed that Czechoslovakia's socialist base was sound and indestructible. Its socialist achievements, its association with its socialist neighbors, could not be bartered away by an opportunist group which had momentarily captured decisive posts.

The Party, in a number of areas, had to reconstitute its organizational and ideological apparatus. This was difficult. But it was aided by the basic Party cadre which remained true to the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

To firm up the Party ideologically required a review of its membership. The organizational practices of the Right leadership had a deleterious effect on the Party, leading to the corrosion of its standards. The principles necessary to a revolutionary party were watered down. Participation in activity and discipline were lax. The Party



members who helped write a glorious page of history found social-democratic practices replacing Leninist principles of organization. Following a detailed examination, in which each member participated, some concluded that they were not prepared to carry out their responsibilities, while others opposed the reconstitution of the Party on sound Leninist principles. As a result about 28 per cent were removed from Party rolls.

Steps were taken to rejuvenate the organization with special attention to attracting young workers in basic plants. Since the fall of 1971, over 91,000 new members and candidates have been admitted to the Party. More than 50 per cent are workers, and over 80 per cent are young people. A new youth organization with over one million members has been established. One cannot visit a factory without finding confirmation of the results of this program. To cite an example, in the industrial city of Kosice in eastern Slovakia, 17,000 were removed from Party rolls. With 6,000 new members added, they now have a total of 74,000 members. This includes a substantial youth force enabling the Party to move forward. Similar situations prevail in other towns and factories. These developments assure a sound guarantee for future programs.

The incontrovertible proof of the correctness of halting the downward turn of 1968 is to be found in the current economic stability, in the growth of production and in the broadening of the political base which the government and Party policies have among the populace. These experiences confirm that a socialist society cannot be built on a revisionist foundation. The Right-wing leaders of 1968 are now ideological scavengers operating in European capitals and in the United States.

A major task, following the '68 crisis, was to assure stability in the price structure and eliminate inflationary trends, thereby assuring confidence in the economy. While some problems remain, this objective has been largely achieved. Gustav Husak, at a Prague Party conference, May 1973, pointed out that ever since 1969 retail prices have remained stable, and prices of a variety of goods have even been cut. At the same time wages remained stable. The U. S. worker has something to ponder upon here.

It is widely recognized that Czechoslovakia was a highly developed industrial country prior to the change to a socialist economy. But the comparison of its former capitalist productivity with that of today's socialist economic organization provides marked contrasts. Concentration of production in large manufacturing units is fundamental to meeting the techno-scientific requirements of modern industry. In the pre-war period 40 per cent of Czechoslovakia's plants were small,

employing on an average 20 workers each. Now, aside from its huge industrial complexes (steel, automobile, mining, *etc.*) the average plant employs 500 workers. This change-over was essential to create the basis for modern industrial production methods.

The economic indicators register not only stability, as we have indicated, but also a rapid rise in production. It was reported that "The gross national product grew by 390 per cent in 25 years (1948-1972), the national income 330 per cent and industrial output almost 660 per cent . . . in recent years [it] exceeded the rate of developed capitalist countries. In the 1964-1971 period it averaged 6.6 per cent in Czechoslovakia, 6 per cent in France, 5.7 per cent in the FRG, 4.8 per cent in the United States." ("Lessons of Our Socialist Revolution," Vasil Bilak, *World Marxist Review*, May 1973.) These results place Czechoslovakia among the most advanced countries.

Slovakia demonstrates the correctness of the application of Leninist principles on the national question. The fraternal unity between Czechs and Slovaks was cemented in the creation of a federal republic of Czechoslovakia in 1969. When reference was made to the industrial position of prewar Czechoslovakia, the Slovaks were the forgotten people. All indicators measured the gains in the Czech lands only. But today's Slovakia is the "miracle" of socialist transformation of a backward land, in a brief 25 years.

Slovakia was the land of hunger. Emigration was the sole escape. In the first decade of the century, 214,846 people left the land in search of work, emigrating to the U. S., Canada and elsewhere. Following the first world war, from 1922 to 1933, during the bourgeois-liberal Masaryk regime, 138,604 emigrated for similar reasons. At that time the total population of Slovakia was about 3 million. Today the Slovak Republic, a constituent part of the Czechoslovak Republic, is a flourishing industrial nation. The central aim is speedily to create complete equality with Czech regions in the industrial development of Slovakia.

While production grew five and a half times in 30 years in the Czech lands, the Slovak growth in the same period was 21 times. Its capital city, Bratislava, is proud of its petrochemical works, and the first nuclear power plant is in the process of completion. Not only new industrial plants dot a number of cities, but new industrial towns have emerged where previously there were merely farm villages.

At meetings, in conversations, one readily discerns a mood of confidence as well as a self-critical approach to problems. Ideological activity in all forms, standards of Party membership, responsibility of Communists in factories, are firmly established on the tested principles of Marxism-Leninism. These factors are encouraging extensive

participation in improving productivity, and in the involvement in the political and social life of the country.

A review of events since 1968 leads to the conclusion that with the defeat of the Right, the Communist Party was able to release the initiative of the working class and people as a whole. Czechoslovakia succeeded in fulfilling every stage of the 5-year plan, reversed the counter-revolutionary threat, cemented closer ties with the socialist community, especially with the Soviet Union, which is supplying, on the basis of mutual relations, large amounts of material decisive to the Czechoslovak economy. It has contributed its share to economic integration, for the immediate and long-term programs of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), from which it will also benefit greatly. And a united Party has been built, which has the confidence of its membership and carries great prestige among the overwhelming majority of its people.

The threat of subversion was real; it had to be met. And it was met in the only way possible under the circumstances. The result contributed towards changing relations in the world today. This is the most viable feature of the present situation. What is frequently referred to as the peace offensive of the Soviet Union is now leading to relaxation of international tensions, an essential to peace. The meetings between Brezhnev and Brandt in Bonn, the exchanges in Washington, contain positive elements for the development of detente.

The agreement between the FRG and Czechoslovakia which invalidates the Munich pact contributes to the peace developments in Europe. The foreign policy of the Right was to detach Czechoslovakia from the socialist community. It therefore made the Soviet Union the major target of its attacks, which were directed at weakening the socialist alliance. Without the defeat of the Right in 1968, agreements towards detente today could not have been realized.

The movement towards detente is greeted world-wide. But it is necessary to recognize that diplomatic agreements cannot lead to an ideological detente. The conflict of class interests of the two systems, based on different social classes, continues. What is realizable is coexistence between them, thereby creating an opportunity of maintaining world peace. The weakening of the ideological struggle could have a negative effect in disarming the forces of world peace.

Unity of the Communist and Workers' Parties has contributed to the retreat of imperialist aggressors. This shift in policy, away from cold war, need not effect the growing struggles on the domestic front. It is not in contradiction to the struggle against increasing monopoly exploitation, nor does it require minimizing the struggles for national liberation.

# COMMUNICATIONS

JAMES DOLSEN

## On the Role of the Soviet Union Today

I remember that for many years after the establishment of the Soviet Union it was the duty of Party members to defend that country and its leadership and this was done to the best of our ability.

Now certainly for many years the Soviet Union has been quite capable of defending itself. The defeat of the fascist hordes in the Second World War and the swift reconstruction of the ruined areas, together with the enormous advances since, have convinced imperialists of all lands of this fact.

There is much misunderstanding, however, among a great many people, including past supporters, of the role of the Soviet Union in today's world. Some contend that the Soviet Union and its Communist Party have become "revisionist," that a "class of bureaucrats" is now in power, that Lenin's leadership met the needs of the early years of the Soviet Union but that with the gradual improvement of working and living conditions and its increasing influence in world affairs the Soviet Union and its leadership are concentrating their attention on the further raising of their own living

conditions to the detriment of the revolutionary struggles in the rest of the world. These critics declare that China under Mao Tse-tung is the world revolutionary center of this period.

In my opinion we must make clear to the American people—particularly to the working class and its allies and especially to the organized labor movement—what is the role of the Soviet Union today in the world revolutionary struggle and be able to controvert the misrepresentations, from whatever source they come.

Lenin declared that the Soviet Union as it developed a socialist society would have as one of its main effects on the world revolutionary struggle the practical example of what the working class could accomplish to transform the world. (This is in effect his statement, although I am not able to quote his exact words—J. D.)

Today the increasingly swift improvements in that country's living and working conditions contrast ever more favorably with the current worsening of such conditions in our own country. Over there the number one objective of the government is to see that every family gets a decent shelter—a place to live.

When I was in the Soviet Union several years ago I noted that everywhere whole new areas of the most modern housing was under construction. All travelers have remarked on the magnitude of this program.

What a contrast to the efforts of the Nixon administration to confine housing construction to the big private builders and to try to put every obstacle even to the fulfillment of public housing programs already under way! A vivid contrast of housing under socialism and under capitalism in this period (especially well illustrated and authoritatively reported) should wake up many American workers, particularly if circulated among the building trades, for it would provide tens of thousands of jobs for them.

What is true of housing is true of education, health, recreation, and every other aspect of social life in the Soviet Union and our country, between what is being realized under a socialist system as compared to what is denied the masses under a capitalist system in ever deepening crisis and decline. Perhaps a series of small illustrated pamphlets vividly showing the contrasts would be most effective.

What I emphasize particularly is the concreteness of such an approach, which should be particularly effective with the American workers, long imbued by the ruling class with the idea that in spite of admitted shortcomings, still the "American" system (capitalism—though it is not a nationalist phenomenon), our institutions are the best in the

world and always amenable to improvement!

Closely connected with the example of what life today in a socialist country means as compared to that in the most highly developed capitalist country is the theory of the possibilities of the success of a socialist revolution in one country and then that country's successful building of a socialist society.

The Bolshevik revolution in Russia and the construction thereafter of the Soviet system proved Lenin's theory correct, fortunately, against Trotzky's defeatist stand of its impossibility. Since its success his followers have striven desperately to prove that the Soviet system has degenerated, that bureaucratism flourishes there, that its leadership has become "revisionist", *etc.* Along with the Maoists they even are ready to help in its overthrow. Naturally these tactics have aligned them with the most anti-communist imperialists and the longer they continue such a line, the deeper they become enmeshed with them.

Leftists and the hosts of amateur overnight revolutionists among the youth and middle-class intellectuals tend to ignore the extremely complicated conditions under which revolutionary movements operate today. They oversimplify situations and mechanically seek to apply—if they know it—Marxist-Leninist phraseology and theories to current situations. Lenin's warning that social revolutions are not "tea parties" applies to them.

Whether there is a revolution-

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

Take the example of Cuba, only 90 miles from the most powerful capitalist nation in the world. Had it not been for the support of the Soviet Union, U.S. military involvement in far-off Vietnam, an unfavorable world balance of power for the U.S. and other considerations including the mass wave of support for Castro within the island, the revolution would have been crushed.

There is the case of Vietnam. American "Leftists," Trotzkyites, Maoists and other variegated elements praise the unexampled mass courage and heroism of the Vietnamese in resisting the enormous power of the U.S., as indeed do all progressive-minded people. What those elements intentionally ignore and belittle are the decisive contributions of military supplies, political support, etc., which came from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Some came from China itself.

These contributions were—summed up—an enormous quantity and became a decisive aid enabling the Vietnamese gunners in the Hanoi area, for instance,

to shoot down many of the biggest U.S. war planes—the B-52's—in the raids on that capital ordered by Nixon after his agent Kissinger had agreed to sign the peace agreement in Paris.

The very fact that the Soviet Union, together with the allied socialist nations, supports the struggles for national independence and for socialism, expands the possibilities for the success of revolutionary struggle in any particular country. That does not mean, however, that such support is given to ill-calculated adventurous moves by little groups which have no contacts with the masses.

During all the years since its establishment the Soviet Union has never stinted in its support of struggles throughout the world that contributed to the weakening of the imperialist system of exploitation and oppression and the strengthening of democracy and peoples' rights, towards the ultimate goal of socialism, and that achieved, onward to communism.

Today, as a highly developed industrialized nation, with its socialist system beginning to develop its citizenry into new types of human beings who believe and practice the fraternity of humans living together in one world, the Soviet Union is better able to carry out its historic role of example, consistent supporter and mainstay in the struggles of the working class everywhere.

# BOOK REVIEWS

JAMES WEST

## A False Picture

When one picks up a book with such an imposing title as *Cradle of Steel Unionism—Monongahela Valley, Pa.*,\* one expects of the author honesty and integrity in presenting his reminiscences as well as *complete* picture, the full truth as it is known to the authors.

Had the author, George Powers, a one-time Communist, confined himself simply to his own role as he himself describes it in the book's 154 pages, he would have needed less than two dozen pages. Actually, he could have written a book of at least 500 pages about himself. But to do that, he would have had to tell about his years as a Communist and all he learned in the Communist Party. He would have had to tell how Marxism-Leninism gave him an outlook on life, how it led him to the working class, how it made an organizer out of him, and lots more.

But George Powers was laboring under a handicap when he started out to write this book. He had left the Communist Party some twenty years earlier. The Communist Party had, heaven forbid, made some mistakes and disappointed poor George. As far as

\*George Powers, *Cradle of Steel Unionism—Monongahela Valley, Pa.*, Figueroa Printers, Inc., East Chicago, Indiana, 1972, \$2.00.

he was concerned, the less said about the Communist Party and his own one-time membership in it, the better. Now that he was no longer in it, the Communist Party had ceased to exist altogether. Now Powers could take comfort in the words of that "new Left" oracle, Staughton Lynd, that "it would have been better if the Communist Party had never existed."

Powers' book has but the one merit of being its own indictment: his complete obliteration of the role of the Communist Party in the historic struggle to unionize steel is so flagrant and blatant that it should arouse the ire of honest people everywhere.

Here is a list of the crimes against honesty and decency committed by Powers:

1. The Communist Party is never mentioned in the book.
2. William Z. Foster is never identified as a Communist, nor is mention made of the fact that he became the chairman of the Communist Party of the United States. He is identified only as secretary-treasurer of the 1919 steel organizing drive, leader of the 1919 strike and as author of *The Great Steel Strike*. Who was he? Where did he come from? What became of him? Not a

word!

3. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn is identified as "a veteran Irish labor organizer known for her beauty, wit and courage . . . who had been *associated* with the organization of the Western Federation of Miners and had been *involved* in a number of strikes in New Bedford, Massachusetts, and Paterson, New Jersey." (Emphasis added.) "Associated" and "involved" can be such convenient words to obscure a person's *leadership* role!

4. The role of Gus Hall, Ben Carruthers, Charles Doyle and numerous other leading Communists in organizing and leading strike struggles of steelworkers is completely omitted.

5. Joe Dallet is described as "a tall, personable looking young man" who was a leader of the Unemployed Councils. But there is not a word to reveal that Joe was a Communist, an organizer of steelworkers and that he fought and died in the struggle against fascist Franco in Spain.

6. The Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union is briefly mentioned and identified as "radical," with no hint that it was Communist-organized and Communist-led, and was a decisive stimulant setting other unions into motion to organize the unorganized.

7. The role of the Unemployed Councils and Workers Alliance is touched upon, but not a whisper of the role of Communists in launching and leading these movements.

8. Powers alludes to the role of the Croatian Fraternal Union, the Polish National Alliance and the

Sons of Italy in helping to found the steel union but you will find no mention of the tremendous role of the Communist-led fraternal organization, the International Workers Order.

9. The word "Communist" is mentioned once in the whole book and then only in connection with "a sturdily built, elderly Irishman named Emmet Patrick Cush, a communist leader in Western Pennsylvania," whose role is dehydrated in the book to that of one "who had for years conducted a one-man campaign to honor these slain workers" (of the 1892 Homestead strike — J.W.)." Thus, the one identified Communist is an "elderly man" occupied only with honoring the past!

10. Old-timers, especially in Western Pennsylvania and the Mahoning and Ohio Valleys would recognize as proud Communists many of the courageous rank-and-filers that Powers mentions, but who else would know it from his book? No one!

In contrast to this "wiping out" of the Communist Party and Communists as though they were — to use a favorite word of the Kremlinologists — "non-persons," Powers presents positive and completely uncritical pen-sketches of John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, David J. McDonald, Joe Germano and other class partnership labor leaders. The fact that they played a positive role in the rise of the CIO is no justification for omitting criticism of their role in subsequently driving the Communists and Left out of the CIO and harnessing the unions to sell-out,



class-collaboration policies.

Powers' book, which begins with the close of the Civil War, ends abruptly with the founding of the steel union. Yet he remained a member of the union for thirty years until his recent retirement. What could he have written about this eventful period? That after leaving the Communist Party he had dropped into obscurity? That he seldom, if ever, used his talents to play a meaningful role in the ongoing struggle to restore the union to the membership and to class-struggle policies? That he never lifted his voice to defeat red-baiting, anti-Communism and McCarthyite repression?

Be all that as it may, it is obvious that what Powers presents to his readers is far from the whole truth and devoid of some decisive facts.

The omission of essential facts produces a distortion, a caricature, to say the least. In the case of one who knows these facts but deliberately withholds them, the result is a deliberate lie.

One might ask, "If Joe McCarthy and the fascists couldn't succeed in exterminating the Communist Party, why get concerned about this picayune literary effort which surely won't succeed where the others failed?"

It is in the answer to such a question that the crux of the matter lies.

What is involved is a militant defense of Marxism-Leninism, a fight for the indispensable role of the Communist Party. Of late, a number of books have been written on labor history. In some

the role of Communists is presented honestly and objectively. In others, some written or edited by ex-Communists or Right-wing social democrats, the Communists are lied about either by outright omission of their role or by a contorted, hate-inspired presentation.

Sometimes, in reviewing these books in our publication, the main point is missed. Thus our very fine paper, the *Daily World*, not long ago published a review of Powers book which was unwarrantedly positive, regretting only that the author failed to give the Communists their due but nonetheless recommending the book.

The criticism of Powers' book must go beyond recording his failure to identify so and so as a Communist, or even his failure to say in so many words that the Communist Party played a tremendous role in organizing steel, auto, rubber, electrical and other basic industry workers.

When you eliminate the role of the Communist Party, you eliminate the role of the conscious element, the organizer, the guide, the one political force that understands the whole line of march and which alone is capable of linking the present with the future to insure a winning strategy and tactics leading to the socialist emancipation of mankind.

Omit this role and you are left solely with reliance on spontaneity and individual, rootless "great" leaders playing a role on the stage of history purely as ad lib improvizers without benefit of script.

Powers, for example, often presents "strategy" as an almost ac-

cidental, spur-of-the-moment inspiration of an individual sitting in a meeting. What considerations go into making strategy? You'll learn nothing of this from Powers.

In this kind of accounting, there is no need to go into why something happened or what caused changes to come about. Thus, in the Powers narrative we find the following "But this was 1934, not 1919. It was too late to dam the discontent—steelworkers were no longer afraid. . . ." (P. 46.)

Why were steelworkers "no longer afraid"? What had caused the change? It was not only objective conditions that had changed. In 1919, the Communist Party was just being born, whereas by 1934 it had built a strong position in basic industry and among the unemployed. By 1934 the Soviet Union, nearing the end of its first Five-Year Plan, had eliminated unemployment, and knowledge of this fact was having a radicalizing effect on the thinking of millions of U.S. workers, employed as well as unemployed. By 1934 the Communist Party, which years earlier had worked out a strategy for organizing the basic mass production industries, had accumulated the muscle to implement that strategy.

*Without the Communist Party the job could not have been done.*

Recognition and militant defense of the indispensable role of the conscious factor in the class struggle, the Communist Party, does not mean negation of the role of spontaneity. The sponta-

neous struggle is an objective fact of life. But it does not take place in a vacuum. It is moved along by the concrete circumstances and influences surrounding it. In the absence of the Party's role it can only end up in reformism (in reconfinement within the capitalist corral.)

To be sure, the job of organizing the unorganized, of bringing the CIO into existence was the result of a coalition of Left (Communist) and Center (diverse reformist) forces.

But without the Communist Party, without its initiatives, without its leadership of strike struggles and of unemployed struggles the reformist leaders would not have moved off their status quos. The Center forces moved only when they saw the Communists take the initiative. Some did so in good faith, others solely for the purpose of taking the initiative away from the Communists. In a very real sense, the Left-Center coalition was forced upon them by the mass upsurge which the Communists helped guide toward the goal of industrial unionism. Among them were some with enough honesty and decency to acknowledge publicly the decisive role, the dedication and effectiveness of the Communists, something Powers is loathe to do.

The question, however, is not whether one tips his hat to the role of the Communists. It is a matter of understanding how the working class comes to political maturity, to an independent class position and initiative, to class consciousness.

Powers, for example, exults in

the thought that in a number of Monongahela Valley towns, the workers attained "political as well as economic maturity" and an "independent labor political action policy." As proof, he offers the election of workers to office as mayor or councilmen on the Democratic Party ticket. To be sure, it was an historic first for the area and it succeeded in ousting some strongly-entrenched company-run administrations. Surely this was progress.

But independent labor political action and political maturity? The potential was there, yes. And had Powers told the story of what happened in the thirty years after his narrative ends, he *might* have been constrained to admit that it was all co-opted into that twin party of capitalism called the Democratic Party. But what is there in common between bourgeois liberalism and an independent, politically mature working class, let alone a mass, la-

bor-based peoples' anti-monopoly party?

There is no party other than the Communist Party which can help bring the U.S. working class to political maturity, to an independent class position capable of taking class initiatives in leading the great majority of the people in struggle against monopoly oppression and exploitation.

This vanguard role, vital and indispensable to our class, cannot be performed by a party which takes no pride in its function, which fails to militantly defend its theory, ideology and history.

The thoughtful and passionate defense of Marxism-Leninism and its organized expression, the Party, requires an ideological struggle against ideas which denigrate the Party, whether advanced in the name of "modesty" about its role, or toleration of downright insults, slander and even attempts at extermination-in-words.

---

*(Continued from Page 4)*

has been proved to be untrue. On February 16 of this year an agreement entitled "Memorandum of Understanding on Hijacking of Aircraft and Vessels and Other Offenses" was signed by the two governments. It begins, "The Government of the United States and the Government of Cuba, on the basis of equality and strict reciprocity . . ." The U.S. government has some way to go to adhere to the principles of "equality and strict reciprocity" in its relations with Cuba; to do that it would need to close down the military base which it maintains at Guantanamo, end the economic blockade, and cease to sponsor activities aimed at carrying out aggressions against Cuba. Yet it can be forced to do all of these things, and with sufficient pressure from public opinion and popular organizations it can be done now.

TRAVEL WITH  
**ANNIVERSARY TOURS**

AND MEET THE PEOPLE FACE TO FACE

*The Travel Agency That Meets All Your Needs  
We Arrange Tours and Individual Travel*

*Come With Us . . . See for Yourself. Our Tours Emphasize People.  
Take One of the Following and You, Like so Many Others  
Who Have Travelled With Us, Will be Deeply Impressed.*

PARTIAL LIST OF TOURS:

*Industries and Farms Tour* ★ Sept. 5-Sept. 26 ★ \$945  
Moscow, Kiev, Kharkov, Minsk, Vilnius, Riga

*Unusual Tour* ★ Sept. 19-Oct. 10 ★ \$955  
Moscow, Tashkent, Bukhara, Samarkand, Dushanbe,  
Ashkabad, Alma Ata, Frunze, Moscow

*November Celebration in Moscow* ★ Nov. 4-Nov. 11 ★ \$475  
7 Days in Moscow and Leningrad

*National Council of American-Soviet* ★ Nov. 4-Nov. 11 ★ \$610  
*Friendship Tour of Celebration of the October Revolution*  
Ballet and opera in Moscow and Leningrad

*Holiday Gala-1973* ★ Dec. 23-Jan. 2 ★ \$530  
Moscow and Leningrad



**ANNIVERSARY TOURS**

Room 1428, 250 W. 57th Street  
New York, New York 10019  
Telephone: (212) 245-7501

Room 211, 1154 North Western Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 9029  
Telephone: (213) 465-6141