

BASICS

FOR PEACE, DEMOCRACY & SOCIAL PROGRESS



by GUS HALL

BASICS

Miss Hall
11-17-81

BASICS

FOR PEACE, DEMOCRACY & SOCIAL PROGRESS

by

GUS HALL



International Publishers, New York

*Copyright © 1980 by International Publishers
First Edition 1980
Printed in the United States of America*

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Hall, Gus.

Basics : for peace, democracy, and social progress.

Includes index.

1. Communist Party of the United States of America—Addresses, essays, lectures. 2. United States—Politics and government—1945—Addresses, essays, lectures. I. Title.

JK2391.C5H35 324.273'75 80-19729

ISBN 0-7178-0580-8

ISBN 0-7178-0578-6 (pbk.)

Contents

Gus Hall, Drawn by Hugo Gellert	viii
About the Author	ix
Publisher's Note	xi

Part 1

Peace

<i>A Bird of Prey—Never a Dove of Peace</i>	5
<i>The Unemployed and the Vietnamese</i>	9
<i>The Anti-Fascist Coalition and the Struggle for Detente</i>	14
<i>The Imperialist Spider Spins Webs of Aggression</i>	18
<i>Trade—for Jobs and World Peace</i>	21
<i>The Arrogance of Imperialism</i>	29
<i>New "Gap," Old Story</i>	31
<i>When People Are Silent War Hawks Dominate Policy</i>	35
<i>On Chinese Aggression</i>	40
<i>Butter, Not Guns</i>	44
<i>But Is That Enough?</i>	49
<i>U.S. War Politics</i>	52
<i>Detente Requires Two Sides</i>	55
<i>Salt II and Beyond</i>	59
<i>Firing Up the Arms Race</i>	64
<i>What Really Happened in Afghanistan?</i>	69
<i>U.S.-Soviet Military Balance—a Must for Peace</i>	82



WVGO/
GELLERT

GUS HALL

About the Author

Gus Hall has been the General Secretary of the Communist Party since its 17th Convention in 1959. An internationally recognized authority on Marxism-Leninism, he is the author of *Imperialism Today*, *The Energy Rip-Off*, *The Crisis of US Capitalism*, *Labor Up-Front*, and scores of booklets and articles which have been widely distributed and translated into many languages. He is also the editor of *Political Affairs*, the Party's theoretical journal.

Born on the Iron Range of Minnesota, he has been a steel worker—a founding organizer of the United Steel Workers of America, AFL-CIO and was a leader of the important Little Steel Strike in Ohio in 1937. He has also been a member of the International Woodworkers of America, the Laborers International Union of America, and the International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Ironworkers. During World War II he was in the armed forces as a sailor in the Pacific.

Joining the Communist Party in 1927, Gus Hall became an organizer for the Young Communist League and later the leader of the Communist Party in Ohio. During the years of the McCarthy fascist danger, in the 1950s, he served an 8-year term in Leavenworth Federal Prison under a Smith Act frame-up.

At its 22nd National Convention in 1979, the Communist Party chose Gus Hall as its presidential candidate for the 1980 election and designated Angela Davis as his vice-presidential running mate.

Publisher's Note

To understand and clearly to analyze the complex present-day problems is at least half the battle won. But problems need not only clarifying analysis but also workable solutions, and the writings in this book by Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party, USA, meet both criteria. This volume presents outstanding articles of a regular feature, "Basics," which he writes for the *Daily World* and *The World Magazine*. The table of contents quickly discloses coverage of an extraordinary range of current issues.

In *Basics* the reader will meet a brilliant working-class intellect combining with a vast store of militant experience to shape solutions in the interest of all the working people of our country.

BASICS

Part **1**

Peace

A Bird of Prey—Never a Dove of Peace

As it is with all things, change is an integral feature of all matters political. And with all matters, a study of the change must include an examination of what has changed, what is the direction of the change and what are the forces and their motives that brought about the change.

This approach is basic when dealing with capitalist politics. In capitalist politics things are hardly ever as they appear on the surface. There is a very fundamental reason for this. The self-interests of the monopoly corporations are not the self-interests of the people. They are in basic contradiction with the self-interests of the working class. Corporate interest is to exploit and the worker's interest is to fight against exploitation.

History's greatest coverup is the effort to hide this most basic feature of capitalism. That is why demagogery and fakery are an intrinsic feature of capitalist policies and politics. In his so-called State of the Union speech Nixon said the United States is "the greatest single force for peace anywhere in the world." What could be a bigger falsehood?

When we speak about U.S. foreign policy it is always important to keep in mind that we are dealing with a policy that is dominated by the large corporate interests. Basically it is a policy that serves their self-interests.

There is some change in U.S. foreign policy taking place now. The important questions are how and why it has changed and what has not changed.

To place the new in clear perspective it is also necessary to place it within the framework of the old. The old foreign policy has been called many things, "The Cold War," the "American Century," etc. But whatever one calls it, the essence of the policy since World War II

has been an attempt by U.S. imperialism to take over by frontal aggression.

The master plan of aggression was based on a world capitalist front pivoted and dominated by U.S. imperialism. The short-lived U.S. monopoly of the atomic bomb was a factor in the plan. This master plan has been the guiding principle of U.S. foreign policy. It also became an important factor influencing U.S. domestic developments. It gave massive power to the Pentagon-Industrial complex and led to the militarization of the country, influencing every institution, the schools, the mass media, the way of life and the politics of the people. Since World War II, \$1,300 billion of taxpayers' money has been spent on arms, the military and war, instead of on the needs of the people. The tax burden has been put on the masses of people while the war profiteers and the monopoly corporations swindle billions through the loopholes.

It was capitalism's response to the new post-World War II reality. It was a refusal to accept the verdict of history, a refusal to accept the reality of a powerful socialist sector. That is why the master plan called for "rolling back the boundaries of the socialist sector." In Europe this was transformed into an active policy of undermining and subverting the East European socialist countries. The events in Hungary in 1956 and the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 were related to the world plan of aggression.

U.S. imperialism refused to accept the new balance of world forces. In the master plan, this was transformed into a policy of nuclear brinkmanship and economic blockade.

It was a refusal to accept the independent position of nations previously oppressed by the old imperialist empires. This led to concrete policies of aggression against movements of national liberation and independence. It led to the U.S. war of aggression in Indochina.

For some 30 years these cold war policies of frontal aggression have pursued the objectives of the master plan.

Because they are policies against the best self-interests of the people, they have always been covered with a smokescreen. Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon kept repeating: "We are not fighting in Vietnam to enrich ourselves." And of course, now the oil corporations are swarming on the coast of South Vietnam like bees in clover.

The policy of frontal aggression ran aground. The central granite-like obstacle blocking the path of imperialist aggression is the Soviet Union. The socialist sector did not believe the "United States dealt from a position of strength." The national liberation movements refused to exchange French oppression for U.S. oppression. The other capitalist countries decided that what was good for U.S. imperialism was not necessarily good for them. Slowly the dream behind the master plan turned into a nightmare. The old policy has become more and more counterproductive. The centrifugal forces of a changing world left the center, the pivot, in isolation. By and large, the people of the United States never supported the cold war policy and, little by little, sections of monopoly capital began to see the futility of the master plan.

So a shift in foreign policy has been taking place. What has changed and what has not changed, what forces are propelling and what forces are resisting, and the motives behind those forces are decisive questions.

The goals of the master plan have not yet been given up. The cold war has been put on the back burner, on a low flame. The policy of frontal aggression has been replaced by policies of retreat and maneuver. The policies of refusing to accept the verdict of history are being replaced by policies more in keeping with the new realities of the new balance of world forces.

Proof that U.S. imperialism has not discarded its dreams of world domination is in the never-ending rise in military expenditures and the continuing growth of the contingency nuclear stockpile.

The change in U.S. foreign policy is not from a war policy to a peace policy, even though U.S. imperialism has been forced to take steps toward detente. It is not a change from an imperialist policy to a non-imperialist policy. Neo-colonialism remains the central feature of U.S. foreign relations in Latin America, in Africa and in the Middle East. Aggression remains the key word in U.S. policy toward Cuba, Cambodia, Laos, Chile, Korea and in many other places.

"Detente" is a new word on the diplomatic front. Webster's New World Dictionary defines it as "a lessening of tension or hostility, especially between nations." Many of the cold warriors have a difficult time swallowing the idea. It is a bitter pill for the cold warriors. It is an anti-imperialist pill.

To the extent that world imperialism accepts reality and the verdict of history it is possible to establish relationships based on detente with the socialist countries.

Detente is a new relationship between socialist and capitalist nations. But they come to detente with opposing self-interests. Detente is possible now because of the historic shift in the balance of forces. Socialism fights for detente from a position of new influence and strength. Imperialism is forced to accept detente because it is dealing from a position of increasing weakness.

To the extent that U.S. imperialism gives up a policy of frontal aggression it is possible to have relationships based on detente.

Where does detente fit into the overall U.S. foreign policy? The overall policy is retreat and maneuver. Kissinger is the new ringmaster in the center ring. He is the master juggler, the great balancer of the imperialist circus. Divide and rule is the motto. He seeks out the forces of opposition that he can use. The tactic is to offset the new balance of world forces within the new world relationships. Nixon and Kissinger work hard to balance West European capitalist countries against the socialist sector. They work to balance off West Germany against France, Israel against the Arab countries, Egypt against the other Arab countries, People's China against the Soviet Union and against Japan, the oil producing countries against the oil consuming countries, using Portugal in Africa, and balancing off the reactionary military regimes in Latin America against Cuba.

How successful this policy will be depends on how many countries are going to permit themselves to be used. Political leaders who have illusions about imperialism must always remember that the juggler discards the balls he does not need. The leaders of Israel have been a part of the imperialist juggler's game. As a result, Israel is totally isolated and at the complete mercy of U.S. imperialism. This is the fate of all who play the juggler's game. In Bangladesh, in Chile, in the United Nations, the Mao leadership, with its vile anti-Soviet campaign, is letting itself be used by U.S. imperialism.

We Communists said years ago that the U.S. policy of frontal aggression would go down to defeat. We said it was a policy that was going against the stream of history. We will now stick our dialectical necks out again, and state that U.S. imperialism's new juggling act will also fail. The same obstacles are in its way: the socialist world—with the Soviet Union in the front row—as the center of gravity for all

progressive forces and national liberation movements around the world. The balance of forces has shifted, and these forces for progress will not permit themselves to be used.

One of the interesting things about this period is that it is the more articulate, the ideologically aware, the anti-socialist elements who are leading in the struggle against detente. The odd bedfellows include *The New York Times*, the right-wing Social Democrats, the Maoists, Trotskyites and Zionists. They are joined by the military brass who see detente and disarmament as a danger to their new power. The concept of detente undermines their main ideological pillar of anti-Sovietism. Detente exposes their big lie of anti-communism.

The cold war policies were against the best self-interests of the people in the United States and the world. The policies of detente are in the very best self-interests of the people.

Imperialism remains a bird of prey. But it is a bird of prey with its cold war wings clipped. At times it is an odd sight to see a bird of prey that coos.

April 6, 1974

The Unemployed and the Vietnamese

The unemployed in Chicago, New York, Pittsburgh and Cleveland and the people in Da Nang, Hue, Camranh Bay and Hon Pheng have a closely related mutual problem. Although it may not be obvious on the surface, there is a very definite link between the 12 million unemployed in the United States and the millions of Vietnamese people who are fighting and winning their struggle for freedom and independence.

In both cases, the basic source of their problem is U.S. monopoly capitalism. In both cases, the root of the problem—the reason for the crisis—is the insatiable drive of private U.S. corporations for max-

imum private profits. In both cases, the suffering and the crisis itself are fed by the \$110 billion U.S. war budget.

The people of Vietnam have fought against foreign oppressors for 1,000 years. They have successfully defended themselves and their homeland against the Chinese, the Japanese, the French and, for the past decade, the U.S. oppressors.

It is clearly not the people of the oppressor nations who have been the source of oppression. (The majority of the people of the United States have resisted the U.S. government's policy of aggression.) It is not the people of the oppressor nations who have gained from them. In fact, the people have paid with millions of lives and billions of their tax money. The foreign troops have not been in Vietnam as guardians of democracy or defenders of people's democratic rights. My Lai and tiger cages are not symbols of democracy!

Throughout the 1,000 years the puppet regimes, including the present Thieu government, have always been brutal, corrupt dictatorships, kept in power solely by the foreign governments and corporations whose interests they represent and protect. And the truth is that even if the foreign invaders were in Vietnam on a "mission" based on the best of intentions, this would not make their presence in Vietnam objectively right or just.

In each case the aggression and the oppression were geared to enslaving the people and to plundering the resources of Vietnam. Symbolic of the U.S. presence and motives in Vietnam are the hundreds of Exxon, Gulf and Shell oil rights that now ring the coastline of South Vietnam. The people of Vietnam are not getting richer from this oil—the Rockefellers are!

Ten years after the French pirates were beaten (even with U.S. aid) and withdrew, the U.S. thieves took over. As with the French, when the U.S. government sent in its troops, it had much more than Vietnam in mind. Vietnam was to be the base of operations for the domination and plunder of the whole of Southeast Asia.

In the criminal effort to make it possible for U.S. monopoly corporations to plunder the resources and to exploit and enslave the people, 55,000 U.S. youth have been killed and millions of Vietnamese men, women and children have been murdered and maimed. In the process, the U.S. government has spent about \$150 billion of the taxpayers' money.

The ripoff of \$150 billion out of the pockets of the people, who paid

for this brutal war of aggression, has been a big factor in the escalation of prices, resulting in the unprecedented inflationary spiral. This ripoff drastically cut down the people's buying power, which in turn has added to the overproduction which has brought on the economic crisis and the loss of 12 million jobs. The prices skyrocket beyond the reach of consumers who are forced to eat less, wear less and buy less of everything.

The economic crisis is fed by the growing gap between the amount of goods produced and the ability of the workers, and the people generally, to buy back what they produce, or to buy what they need. As a result the gap widens. The inventories of unsold cars, farm machinery and other products pile up, the factories close their doors, workers are laid off and the economy is in a crisis.

Thus, the culprit in both cases is the mad drive of private corporations for private profits. In Vietnam, this results in mass murder. In the United States, this means mass unemployment and a cut in living standards.

If the U.S. aggression in Vietnam had succeeded it would have resulted in another mutual problem. The U.S. multinational corporations would have moved into Vietnam as they did into Taiwan, South Korea and Hong Kong. Through a dictatorial puppet government, the working people of Vietnam would have been forced to work for less than \$1 a day, producing for the same corporations the same products formerly produced by U.S. workers before they were laid off. It is therefore in the best interests of both the workers in the United States and the people in Vietnam to put an end to all U.S. overseas operations based on oppression.

The U.S. government has spent more on the aggression in Vietnam than it has for U.S. public education, health, construction of housing, schools, day care centers and all the anti-poverty programs combined. Now it wants to add millions more to the \$150 billion already stolen from the people and their needs.

To put this astronomical amount in perspective let's take a look at the recent tax bill passed by Congress. The rebate that will be returned to the people totals about \$8 billion, as compared to the \$150 billion poured into Vietnam.

It has become obvious that it is in the mutual interest of the U.S. people generally, and specifically the unemployed, and the people of Vietnam to demand and win a \$100 billion cut in the military budget.

This money could go a long way toward putting an end to all forms of U.S. aggression as well as alleviating the suffering of the Vietnamese people and taking care of the needs of the unemployed and the hungry here at home.

Now U.S. imperialism, with the personal participation of President Ford, is writing another ugly page in the history of its crimes of aggression. This time the heinous crime is against the future generations of Vietnam! It must be seen as the continuation of U.S. policies of aggression against Vietnam. It must be seen as a monstrous propaganda campaign and a coverup for continued military aid to the Saigon dictatorship. It is a desperate, despicable attempt to use the infants and children of Vietnam to divert the attention of the people from the immediate issue of ending the war, and to whip up hysteria and support for policies of aggression and oppression.

There is nothing humane in the hysteria and racist campaign of rounding up and shipping thousands of children (including newborn infants) to the United States and other foreign countries. It is an outright crime of kidnapping—of stealing infants and children from their homeland, their culture and, in many cases, their mothers and relatives. They are being sold to the highest bidders to be brought up in a racist society by parents who, they will one day learn, obtained them as a result of this government's brutal slaughter of their people. They will one day learn that they were kidnapped from their homeland at the very moment their country achieved victory, peace and independence.

Would it be unfair to ask why there is no such interest in "taking care of" the children of the 30 million Americans who are forced to live below the poverty level?

Would it be unfair to ask why there is no interest in attempting to provide homes for the 125,000 orphans in this country? Why has there never been a massive campaign to provide homes for U.S. orphans?

Would it be unfair to say that the people and organizations in this country, who are involved in this campaign, would be horrified and angry if U.S. infants and children were kidnapped, shipped off to another country and sold? It is chauvinism and racism at its basest to think and act as if these children will be brought up in an "American dream home," to live in the United States with "a car in every garage, and a chicken in every pot." This "American dream" never existed for

the poor and racially oppressed of the United States. And today, in the midst of an economic crisis, it does not exist for the millions of unemployed and working people generally.

The attitude and actions of many of the people involved in this revolting spectacle are reminiscent of potential buyers around a slave auction block.

This campaign has nothing to do with a concern for the children or for the refugees of Vietnam. If these organizations and people, who claim they are involved in a humanitarian gesture, were really concerned about the welfare of the Vietnamese people and their children they would contribute their money and their efforts toward helping the Vietnamese to rebuild their country from the destruction and devastation wrought by U.S. imperialist aggression.

This campaign is but a continuation of the U.S. policies of racist aggression. It is a policy and program consciously formulated and carried out by the U.S. government and its lackeys to cover up the shipment of war supplies to the crumbling Saigon dictatorship. It is a propaganda campaign to prepare the people of the United States for possible military re-intervention, a campaign to create provocation for such an action. It is a propaganda campaign to divert the people's attention from the immediate need to end all U.S. imperialist aggression and cut the war budget to provide for economic and social needs at home. It is a monstrous campaign to cover up the crimes of U.S. imperialism, past and present, behind a phony "humanitarian" concern for the well-being of children—whose well-being was never given a thought to when the B-52s were dropping napalm and bombs on them and their parents.

As a part of this hysteria campaign, President Ford, Secretary of State Kissinger, Senators Jackson and Goldwater, are attempting to frighten the people by warning about the "domino" effect if the people of Vietnam and Cambodia win their independence. The people of the U.S. have no foreign-based dominos! There are only corporate and profit-related dominos, sustained by the military forces of imperialism. But life and history are removing all these foreign-based dominos. And no massive coverup and propaganda campaign will prevail against this reality.

It is in the best mutual interest of the unemployed and the people in the U.S. generally, the Vietnamese people and their children (the

future generation), to end U.S. intervention and aggression in Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia. It is in their mutual interest to demand a \$100 billion cut in the U.S. military budget to force an end to this aggression and to transfer the money to create millions of jobs and to meet other social needs. One hundred billion dollars would go a long way toward ending the crisis of unemployment and inflation besetting our country today.

April 26, 1975

The Anti-Fascist Coalition and The Struggle for Detente

On board a naval ship on V-E Day cries of joy and cheers were heard as the announcement came over the ship's radio—"The forces of Hitler-fascism have been crushed!" There was joy and there were cheers. But there was also deep thought and the kind of silence reserved for moments of tremendous emotional and historical significance. Everyone who had heard this announcement knew, or sensed, that they were hearing an announcement that marked a qualitative turning point in history.

Today, looking back after 30 years, that turning point stands out in ever sharper focus because history's most serious challenge to social progress was crushed. The price of this victory was staggering. Over 50 million people were killed; twenty-two million were Soviet citizens, and six million of the victims were Jewish.

It would be easy and comforting to sit back and say, "History never repeats itself." But cliches, whether old or new, are only partial truths. It is true that history does not repeat itself in the same way. But certain elements and forces of history do make reappearances.

History does not repeat itself in the same way because objective conditions are not frozen or static. Therefore, whatever does reappear, does so within a new set of objective circumstances.

The fascist threat, therefore, will never again reappear as it did 30 years ago. But as long as monopoly capital is the ruling class in any country, fascism will remain a potential danger. One would have to be extremely naive not to see that this danger is a continuous threat in the United States.

The threat of Hitler-fascism will never again reappear in the same way because the balance of world forces has tilted against the class it represented. Most likely world capitalism will never again be in a position to put together a similar worldwide fascist axis, because these objective factors have changed.

There exists a powerful bloc of socialist nations. The Soviet Union, whose people carried out the major burden of the war 30 years ago, has become today the world's greatest power.

World imperialism has lost most of its colonial bases. It cannot set back the forces of national liberation.

The same kind of fascist monster cannot reappear because there is a new level of anti-fascist consciousness throughout the world. The capitalist countries' working classes have not only been profoundly influenced by the events and experiences of World War II, but have also matured politically and ideologically during these 30 years.

To be alert, to be on guard against the danger of fascism is an important lesson the people of the world, and especially the people of the capitalist countries, must never forget. But there are also other important lessons to learn from the experiences of World War II.

The victorious anti-fascist world coalition was comprised of various class forces and political and ideological currents. Fascism was a force of the monopoly capitalist class of Germany. But the forces of monopoly capital in the United States, Britain, Canada and France joined with the anti-fascist coalition. And this was of decisive significance in the victory over Hitler-fascism.

In order to make a correct assessment of the significance of the anti-fascist coalition it is necessary to understand why each of the coalition forces joined it. They were not all motivated by the same values or aims.

The Soviet Union, the working class of the world, and the people

generally, joined the struggle because they understood the meaning of the challenge that the fascist axis was a threat to all social progress, and many understood that in a very direct way it was a threat to socialism. The working class understood that fascism was a class challenge, a challenge by the forces representing the most powerful and most reactionary sections of monopoly capital. The victims of racism understood that fascism was the sharpest expression of racist oppression. These were conscious anti-fascist forces.

During the pre-war period and for a long period during the war, world imperialism, including monopoly circles of the United States, England and France, saw the fascist axis as the shock troops in the struggle to destroy socialism. The monopoly circles of the United States, England and France encouraged and financed the buildup of the forces of German and Italian fascism. This was clearly evident in the Munich Agreements, as well as in the conduct of the "phony war." These were policies of appeasing fascism. These policies were a reflection of their basic class interests. The policies based on antagonism toward the Soviet Union reflected the basic contradiction between the two main classes—the capitalist class and the working class.

As German fascism grew stronger, its appetite grew bigger. It became a challenge to its imperialist rivals. As German fascism grew the other capitalist powers were forced to face two contradictions—the basic contradiction between the two classes and the contradiction between the imperialist powers. Not until it became obvious that the Soviet Union was at the point of defeating Hitler did the capitalist countries, including the United States, fully enter the war against fascist Germany. By the time the Second Front was opened in Europe, the Soviet Union had already delivered the decisive blow against the fascist hordes.

It is important to keep in mind that while the imperialist powers never relinquished or forgot the main class contradiction, they were forced by the set of circumstances to pursue a policy that, for a crucial moment, coincided with the world struggle against the most reactionary force: fascism.

The pre-World War II Europe-based capitalist world was shattered. The old colonial empires were smashed and many new countries began the turn towards socialism. At the same time, however, U.S. imperialism was able to take advantage of the initially fortunate set of

circumstances and immediately began to rebuild the capitalist countries, with U.S. imperialism as the central core.

U.S. imperialism restructured the capitalist world behind an aggressive policy, in an attempt to resolve the main class contradiction in its favor. This was the aim of the cold war and the virulent anti-Soviet policies. U.S. imperialism was out to build a worldwide anti-socialist, anti-liberation movement coalition, under its leadership. The aggression against Vietnam and Cambodia, now coming to a victorious end for the people of these countries, is part of this policy.

This policy of aggression was based on a historic miscalculation. Step by step the capitalist partners of the United States separated themselves from the United States. Step by step the United States became more isolated. These developments forced U.S. imperialism to make a painful reassessment. Like the challenge of Hitler-fascism, the cold war challenge, organized and led by the United States, was dashed against the rocks of objective reality. These developments became the objective framework in the struggle for the policies of detente.

Imperialism was forced to retreat from its positions of direct challenge and accept the policies of detente.

The fact that the coalition which defeated Hitler-fascism was made up of diverse class forces motivated by different class interests does not in any way minimize the historic significance of its role in the victory over fascism.

This is also true of the struggle for detente. Involved in this struggle are diverse class forces, motivated by different class interests, advocating and pursuing policies of detente. This does not in any way minimize the benefits and the historic significance of this struggle, the aim of which is to prevent war, especially nuclear war. The goal of the struggle for detente is to create the necessary conditions for peaceful coexistence.

Understanding the motivations of different class interests—how and why these different class interests coincide, without, however, having any illusions about the nature and aims of the capitalist forces at such moments—is of great importance.

The United States, England and France fought in an anti-imperialist, anti-racist war. However, this does not make them anti-imperialist or anti-racist.

To learn the lessons of the defeat of Hitler-fascism is to become a more effective fighter for the policies of peaceful coexistence and detente. To learn the lessons of World War II is to become a better, more effective fighter against imperialism, for national liberation, socialism and world peace.

The revolutionary movement must master the art of using the internal contradictions of the enemy. This is another basic Leninist lesson of the victorious war that smashed Hitler-fascism.

May 10, 1975

The Imperialist Spider Spins Webs of Oppression

The ominous nature of the web being spun by U.S. imperialism is now emerging into the full light of day. Kissinger spins the shuttle-weave, Moynihan baits the trap with sugary poison at the United Nations, while the godfather of all corporate spiders directs the spinning from behind the seal of the vice-presidency of the United States.

The president, as if possessed and in great frenzy, criss-crosses the country preparing the people to be calm and docile as the web is being fashioned around their necks.

At the present United Nations session, Kissinger promised to set up no less than 10 new "trusts" and "corporations." The present United Nations session was called for the specific purpose of taking actions

that would help to close the economic gap created by imperialism between the developed and the underdeveloped countries. The Kissinger-Moynihan charade took two and one-half hours to present. The web is designed to trap both the underdeveloped countries and the people of the United States.

What is the basic essence of the U.S. proposals? They are all without exception geared to using U.S. taxpayers' dollars to help the U.S. corporations expand their exploitation and domination of the underdeveloped countries. The real meaning of the spinning is in phrases like: "For industrialized countries it means a more steady market; for developing countries it makes them more desirable prospects in international capital markets."

"The U.S. will support a major expansion of the resources of the World Bank's International Finance Corporation—the investment banker with the *broadest experience in supporting private enterprise in developing countries.*" (Emphasis mine—G.H.)

"The U.S. proposes the creation of an International Investment Trust to mobilize portfolio capital (Wall Street) for investment in local enterprises."

"Investors (Wall Street) would have their exposure to major losses limited by a \$200 million loss reserve provided by governments of industrialized oil-producing developing nations."

In other words, the corporations should have absolute guarantees of maximum profits and for the continuation of their enslavement and exploitation!

The purpose of the proposed 10 new Ford-Kissinger "trusts" is to take U.S. taxpayers' money and make it available to companies and governments who will agree to facilitate the exploitation by the U.S.-based, neo-colonialist, multi-national corporations.

It therefore follows that, of the two-and-one-half hour presentation, almost one hour was spent on a defense of these U.S.-based, neo-colonialist, multi-national corporations.

"Transnational enterprises have been powerful instruments in the developing countries where there is often no substitute for their ability to marshal capital, management skills, technology and initiative. Thus, the controversy over their role and conduct is itself an obstacle to their economic development."

Of course the imperialist spiders want to hide the fact that the

underdeveloped countries do have an alternative source in the socialist countries. The attitude of the corporate spiders is expressed in the following words, that the corporations in "their activities *should* take account of public policy and national development priorities. They *should* respect local customs. They *should* employ qualified local personnel." (Emphasis mine—G.H.)

But then they continue:

"Host enterprises in turn *must* treat transnational enterprises equitably. Governments and enterprises must respect the contractual obligations. Governments must harmonize their tax treatment of these enterprises." (Emphasis mine—G.H.)

"If the world community is committed to economic development it cannot afford to treat transnational enterprises as objects of economic warfare."

In other words, the underdeveloped countries must accept the dictates of the neo-colonialist, multi-national corporations as the final judges on all economic questions.

Most of the underdeveloped countries are already in a condition where they cannot pay the interest on the old "loans" from the banks of the imperialist countries. By accepting the Rockefeller-Kissinger proposals they would only become further enmeshed in the U.S. imperialist web. Thus, the victims of the web would be both U.S. workers and the people and the underdeveloped countries.

In the Mid-east, the shuttle-weave of Kissinger has the same purpose. "But there should be no illusions that the United States can take a less active role in the Mid-east and still hope to protect its own interests." This reference, by the *Wall Street Journal*, is to the interests of the godfather spider, the oil interests.

In the next 12 months the Kissinger deal in the Mid-east will cost U.S. taxpayers around \$3 to \$4 billion. It is impossible at the present time to estimate what the amount will be in the following years. The people of the Mid-east countries, including Israel and Egypt, are not going to get one penny of this huge amount.

These billions are a form of payoff mainly to the military bureaucracies of Israel, but also to the top echelons in Egypt. This payoff in U.S. dollars is to insure that Exxon, Shell and Gulf can continue making their huge profits in the Mid-east. Part of the payoff goes to the U.S. corporations who are in the business of selling death-dealing

military hardware. Again, the victims of the web are the people of the Mid-east and the U.S. taxpayers.

It is ironic that at the very moment when the workers on the city payroll in New York face payless paydays, the Ford Administration contracts to donate \$3 to \$4 billion to the military bureaucracies in the Mid-east while flatly and arrogantly refusing to give a penny to a faltering, bankrupt U.S. city. These same New York workers pay taxes that will be used for the war planes given to Israel while they face payless paydays. This is the diabolical essence of imperialist webs.

Only when they are united, are the people stronger than the corporate web. The enemies of the people of the underdeveloped countries and the web people of the U.S. are the spiders of monopoly capital. Anti-imperialism has become an urgent, domestic historical necessity.

September 5, 1975

Trade—for Jobs and World Peace

I want to thank you for the invitation,* to give my views on some current questions. Perhaps it will be profitable in more than one way. I have been told that after I spoke in some cities, federal authorities promptly rushed funds into the areas to halt "the threat of communism." So, my appearance here may yet be of material benefit to Miami.

In a more serious vein, I would like to discuss with you something

*The Tiger Bay Club, an association of leading Miami businessmen and civic leaders, invited Gus Hall, who was then the Communist Party's candidate for president, to be its principal speaker at a luncheon at the DuPont Plaza Hotel, Miami, Florida.

that Democratic presidential nominee Jimmy Carter said in his acceptance speech in Madison Square Garden earlier this month. You will recall, he said that 1976 would *not* be “a year of politics as usual.” He also said that “it will be a year of . . . quiet and sober reassessment . . .”

Fine. I'm for reassessment. It's high time that we had a serious national dialogue on the direction of our foreign policy and its relationship to our domestic affairs.

Yes, let's reassess frankly what has brought our nation to its present state, with the largest military budget in peacetime history; the greatest unemployment of any industrial country (including a 50 percent unemployment rate among the youth in the ghettos and barrios); decaying central cities; a moribund rapid transit system; declining social services;—in short, a deteriorating quality of life.

Today I want to discuss an issue I believe is central in U.S. life—anti-communism and the 30-year-old cold war—which has distorted the U.S. economy and poisoned our national life.

It is a condition brought on by the cold war that I feel it necessary to tell you that I speak from the viewpoint of the interests of the working class and the working people of *this* country.

The cold war has been the most costly—in terms of money, of human lives and material goods—yes, this is the most costly fraud in all human history. And as long as the cold war falsehood continues, we will continue to pay for it. It continues to spawn policies that are against the best self-interests of the American people.

Our policies then and now are premised on the Big Lie—the alleged danger of external aggression, generally interpreted as coming from the Soviet Union.

And we have a series of other lies, some of which were repeated during the primary elections. They were directed against the concept of detente, and have had a negative effect on the political landscape. These lies have contributed to the atmosphere in which there has been a huge arms buildup. It is a law of war and peace that the continued, uncontrolled buildup of nuclear arms and stockpiles can turn the present situation in which war is *not* inevitable, into a situation in which war *will become* inevitable. This arms buildup is programming the world toward a nuclear holocaust. This is criminal insanity!

Most of these big lies concern the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. The phony “weapons gap” concept has

become a standard Pentagon-CIA shell game. It is reenacted before every Congressional hearing on the military budget and during each Presidential election campaign. Every concept of a "weapons gap" is stated as being in favor of the Soviet Union.

In the early 1950s, the cry was raised about a "tank gap." But once the military budget was passed, the "tank gap" evaporated into thin air.

In 1956, another hysteria was created about the "bomber gap." When the elections were over, and the military-industrial complex achieved its aim of a huge budget, the true facts were admitted; yes, there was a "bomber gap," but it was the United States that had 4 or 5 times as many bombers as the Soviet Union! However, no one was indicted for this criminal fraud.

In 1960, there was the now infamous "missile gap." When the elections were over and, again, the military got its overkill billions, it was admitted that the Pentagon-CIA computers, which are programmed for corporate profits, "overstated" the Soviet arsenal by 30-times the actual number. Again, no one was indicted for this criminal falsehood.

And now, in 1976, there is the hue and cry about a "military spending gap," and a "naval gap." These so-called gaps are as fake as the previous ones.

The bigger the proposed war budget, the bigger must be the "gaps." The CIA provides the computers that determine the size of these phony gaps.

Meanwhile, the American taxpayers are soaked with ever-mounting bills for more and more nuclear arms and conventional weapons, some of which are retailed abroad to fuel wars in the Middle East and other areas of the globe.

Today, there is evident a wide public desire to disengage ourselves from the cold war and its consequences. Detente has overwhelming public support. There is a growing criticism of the Pentagon's swollen military expenditures and the cold-war-spawned CIA.

Some Pentagon critics make cogent points. For example, Representative Les Aspin of Wisconsin pointed out last month that the military intelligence people have "dramatically overestimated" Soviet construction of nuclear attack submarines "to frighten the U.S. public and Congress into approving the Navy's ship-building desires." However, most of the criticism, even by liberal Congressmen, is of the

more-bang-for-the-buck variety. None goes to the root of the question.

What is the fatal flaw in the thinking of liberal critics? The root of their wrong position is the profoundly false concept of an implacable military adversary against whom it is necessary to arm to the teeth.

This false concept about the Soviet Union which, it must be recalled, was our ally in the anti-axis war, and which lost 20 million people in the war against Nazism, is the pretext for not only our armaments but also the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the construction of over 2,000 military bases all over the globe.

It has been reliably estimated that the cost of the cold war to U.S. taxpayers is in the neighborhood of \$2 trillion. If there were no cold war there would probably never have been a Korean War or a Vietnam War, with their losses of about 110,000 American lives and millions of Asian lives.

I know that the immediate question to me at this point would be: but who is responsible for the cold war? It is precisely in this connection that I think Mr. Carter and others ought to do some serious assessment. Is it not a fact that leading financial and business circles in our nation sought, immediately after World War II, to develop a policy of economic penetration of Europe and the creation of strategic bases? Is it not also a fact—which is becoming now a matter of record in the testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee—that the CIA intervened in the internal affairs of Italy, France and other countries with massive sums of taxpayers' money to block leftward currents in those governments?

When someone talks to me about "Soviet aggression," I ask them to do a very simple thing. I suggest that they buy themselves a school-boy's compass and get a map of the United States and a map of Europe. I tell them to take that compass, put the point in Washington, D.C. and draw a series of concentric circles around our nation's capital. Then I tell them to put the same compass point into Moscow and draw concentric circles of the same size around that city.

Then I tell them to look at the two maps and ask themselves how many Soviet bases there are in the circles around Washington? They will find none.

That should indicate who has aggressive intentions and who has not.

I can testify from personal experience that the privately expressed views of the socialist countries' leaders and many third world leaders on peace and disarmament coincide completely with their public policy statements. They want peace and disarmament, elimination of all military blocs and bases, a mutual reduction of forces, nuclear disarmament—in short, an end to the mad arms race and an opportunity to further raise the living standards of their people.

But even more basic is the fact that socialism as a system has removed the compulsion, the urge, or the necessity of policies of aggression and conquest.

There has been some progress made in liquidating the cold war. Today we have on record the summit coexistence agreements, signed in Moscow, between President Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev.

The 1972 Nixon-Brezhnev statement of principles of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union is fundamental. It says the two countries have agreed to as follows:

“First, they will proceed from the common determination that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence. Differences in ideology and in the social systems of the USA and USSR are not obstacles to the bilateral development of normal relations based on the principle of sovereignty, equality, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual advantage.”

That is the centerpiece of the whole process known as detente.

But today the candidates of both major parties, and political spokesmen of the two parties generally, are moving backward from that position toward the dead-end position of the cold war.

They talk of detente as though we are doing somebody a favor. They make a principle of interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, and many other countries.

Isn't it time that our government tries to make detente work, in a positive way?

Take a later point of the 1972 agreement, pledging effort to limit armaments, and “the ultimate objective . . . of the achievement of general and complete disarmament and the establishing of an effective system of international security . . .” Indeed, the idea of nuclear disarmament is given lip service in the Democratic party platform. But in practice, our government, whether under Democratic or Republican administrations, has rejected literally scores of concrete

disarmament proposals advanced in the United Nations or in bilateral negotiations; and with bipartisan approval.

Benefits of Detente

When we Communists say in our program, "slash the military budget 80 percent," we mean that this can be accomplished in the course of international agreement which protects the security of the United States and the Soviet Union, and increases the security of all countries, since it involves ending the vast network of military bases and the multi-billion dollar arms trade that fuels seats of war and aggression in all the continents.

We want the United States to take the initiative on disarmament proposals—proposals for mutual, proportionate reductions in armaments of the United States, the Soviet Union, and other major powers; proposals using the tens of billions thus released for the enormous social needs this country must fill, if all our people are to have a decent life.

This would be beneficial for the economy as a whole. Every calculation shows that dollars spent for civilian purposes provide more employment, more business, than dollars spent for military purposes. Florida has more than its share of military contracts. But this spring, when the national official unemployment rate was 7½ percent, the official unemployment rate in Florida was 10 percent.

Disarmament would mean transferring billions to the construction of homes for the ill-housed; for mass transit systems in our cities to reduce pollution and congestion and enable the people of the central cities to get to jobs; health facilities and funds to provide universal free medical services; a reversal of the cutback for education; and all of the necessary positive measures to end discrimination and segregation practiced against Blacks, Spanish-speaking people and Indians.

After the Civil War in our country, there was a period of Reconstruction to overcome the damage of that war. We need another such Reconstruction period when the rebuilding of our industrial and urban centers will become a top priority.

But it is not just a matter of what we could do internally.

There's a question of trade—the economic side of detente. World trade has become more and more important, not only for ourselves, but for all countries. And the network of world trade has become extremely complex and many-sided.

However, our government has cut our country off from the bulk of trade possibilities with one-third of the world, the socialist world. We keep that trade to a minimum for most socialist countries, and completely embargo it for some.

If the war hawks are defeated, and the U.S. Congress lifts the discriminatory trade restrictions on the socialist countries, and based on the trade that West Germany is doing with these countries, U.S. exports could amount to at least \$35 billion a year. Such a trade would add 3 million new jobs for U.S. workers. I do not view corporate profits as a necessary element in human affairs, but world trade is essential to jobs and world peace.

Certainly the Soviets and other socialist countries would gain from such a trade. Otherwise they wouldn't do it. But that's the idea of trade—both sides gain. It's a fact that industrial spokesmen representing a wide spectrum of major industries have been pressuring the administration and the Congress to take down the barriers.

But the unreconstructed cold warriors, the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex, the political opportunists who thrive on anti-communist prejudices, have so far prevented the opening of that trade.

The Chase Manhattan Bank and Bank of America have branch offices in Moscow, Bucharest and other socialist capitals. They are doing business and making money. But, because of restrictive U.S. government laws, they have to do business through branches of U.S. corporations in Europe and Asia employing local labor. So, the bankers and multi-nationals make money—but it does not add jobs for U.S. workers.

Here in Florida detente means detente especially with Cuba.

The shameful record of U.S. aggression against revolutionary Cuba is one of the worst pages in our history—the Bay of Pigs, the burning of crops and dynamiting of merchant vessels, the many assassination plots against Fidel Castro, the prolonged blockade, all these could not defeat the Cuban socialist revolution, now more stable and stronger than ever.

Can we not agree that many Florida firms that prospered as the main supply base for all sorts of commodities for Cuba lost that lucrative business because of a senseless embargo imposed by Washington?

Can we not agree that it is senseless for the United States to refuse to

trade with Cuba—a natural market and source of supply only 90 miles away—while other capitalist countries are trading with Cuba to the tune of billions of dollars yearly, and have advanced billions in credits to Cuba for the purchase of capital equipment? Is it not senseless for U.S. auto companies and locomotive manufacturers to sell to Cuba from plants in Argentina and Canada because they are forbidden to sell to Cuba from their U.S. plants?

I would like to conclude on this note:

Humanity has made tremendous progress, and with the present revolution in science and technology, and with the liberating socialist and anti-colonial revolutions sweeping the world, humanity is making progress at a previously undreamed of pace. But history has reached a point where there is one mistake we can no longer afford to make, one mistake we cannot correct—that is thermonuclear war.

That is why I conclude as I began:

Yes, let us reassess our past policies. I am convinced that when we make an objective examination of our past policies we will reaffirm the necessity for making detente irreversible and for moving swiftly to disarmament—the guarantee against nuclear holocaust, the guarantee that we, our children and grandchildren will be able to live a healthy, meaningful and productive life on this planet.

August 14, 1976

The Arrogance of Imperialism

There have never been any limits to the arrogance of imperialist spokesmen. It has always been an arrogance rooted in ignorance, pigheaded prejudices and the underlying inhumanity of capitalism. But now this arrogance has sunk to new depths.

Those who have no morals preach morality to the world.

Those who have always existed by trampling on human rights lecture the world about human rights.

Those who represent the most brutal, inhuman socio-economic system hypocritically speak in lofty terms about humaneness.

Those who represent a 300-year history of the most ruthless racist oppression in all of human society's history dare to make self-righteous pronouncements to the world about equality.

Those who represent an economic system that is completely and solely motivated by enslaving and exploiting the people to make a handful of gluttonous, corporate thieves and coupon-clippers richer, arrogantly tell the world about economic justice.

And now, along comes President Carter. Without one ounce of shame or conscience, he places conditions on diplomatic relations and trade with Cuba and preaches to her people.

In his radio talk show, Carter brazenly and arrogantly said that Cuba must "reinforce a commitment to human rights, . . . must make substantial changes in her attitude." Someone must have sent him a note because a number of times on other occasions he added, "and return to the old standards in Cuba." The "old standards in Cuba," of course, were established under the fascist butcher and CIA agent, Batista.

President Carter, representing the one imperialist power that has holdings in every country in this hemisphere, and representing the government and corporations which planned, financed and led the conspiracy that destroyed the democratically elected government of Salvador Allende in Chile, the force that butchered democracy in

Guatemala and invaded the Dominican Republic, and which represents the absentee landlords in Puerto Rico—has the unmitigated gall to lecture Cuba and make demands such as: “I would like to insist that they not interfere in the internal affairs of countries in this hemisphere.”

Who but U.S. imperialism has ever interfered in the internal affairs of the countries in this hemisphere?

Who the hell does Carter think he is that he can, in effect, lay claims of ownership to this hemisphere? His statements expose a basic ignorance concerning what today’s world is all about. King George tried that and failed!

And, as if trying to stake a claim to this hemisphere was not enough, Carter, displaying the epitome of arrogance, continued “that they (Cuba) must decrease their military involvement in Africa.” This from a man who represents the imperialist multinational corporations which are involved, more than any other force, in Africa. This from a man who speaks for a ruling class which has 10 times more overseas military bases and warships in places around the world than all of the other countries of the world put together.

And he has the audacity to denounce Cuba’s “involvement in Africa.” Carter is the Commander-in-Chief of over 2,000 overseas military bases, and he has the effrontery to challenge Cuba’s military involvement.”

Carter speaks about “Cuba’s involvement,” while U.S. imperialism continues to occupy the base at Guantanamo.

Carter speaks out about Cuba “changing her attitude,” when the U.S. government has yet to lift the economic blockade against Cuba.

Carter talks about “interfering in the internal affairs of other countries,” while the U.S. government has yet to apologize or cancel publicly the policy of attempting to assassinate Prime Minister Fidel Castro.

President Carter has yet to learn that the days of colonial masters, the days of dealing with political, economic, or military cards from a position of superiority are over for imperialism.

This is a new day when only relationships based on equality and mutual respect are acceptable.

The arrogance of imperialism is out of step with today’s realities.

March 12, 1977

New "Gap", Old Story

It may not seem so, but the new debate now heating up is in reality about whether life will continue on this planet. The warmongers, of course, deny they are promoting policies and programs that could very easily push the world past the point of no return. But policies have an inner logic. War orientation, war production, war policies, cold war rhetoric, militarism, are processes that lead to war. And war in today's world could mean nuclear war.

The new debate has created new divisions across the board. But all the public opinion polls indicate that the great majority of people are against policies that lead to war. The latest Roper poll shows that 80 percent of the people are for agreements with the Soviet Union on reductions of strategic nuclear arms and missiles, 10 percent oppose and 10 percent are not sure.

The following are excerpts from two statements which appeared in companion articles, *On U.S. Dealings with the Soviet Union*, in *The New York Times*, January 11, 1977. The groups responsible for both statements include important representatives of big business, trade union leaders, scientists, educators and other public figures.

The American Committee on U.S.-Soviet Relations, in its statement, believes:

What is needed, in the first instance, is a resolute abandonment of the stale slogans and reflexes of the cold war, a recognition that this is a new era, with different problems and possibilities and a determination not to be governed by the compulsions of military competition—compulsions which have seldom failed to lead to war in the past, and which in terms of the weaponry of this age are pregnant with the possibility of utter catastrophe.

... we should pursue constructive purposes such as a mutually beneficial exchange in trade, science and culture; preservation of our common environment; . . .

The statement of the war hawks, the Committee on the Present Danger, warns:

The principal threat to our nation, to world peace, and to the cause of human freedom, is the Soviet drive for dominance based on an unparalleled military buildup. The Soviet Union has not altered its long-held goal of a world dominated from a single center — Moscow.

. . . higher levels of spending are now required for our ready land, sea and air forces, our strategic deterrent, and, above all, the continuing modernization of those forces through research and development. The increased level of spending required is well within our means . . .

To support their program of militarization the war hawks have come up with a phony new “gap.” In the past it was a “bomber gap,” a “missile gap,” and a “naval gap.” The new so-called “gap” is the “strategic weapons gap.” This one has a new wrinkle: It needs no concrete evidence because they are talking about “strategic” concepts, about something that will happen in the future!

For decades, the cold warriors have screamed, “The Russians are coming! The Russians are coming!” But the Russians have not come. Very few people believe that malarky today. So, now they are saying, “The Russians will come in the future,” that the “Soviets are creating a strategic weapons gap.”

This charge of a Soviet “strategic thrust” is as phony as were the other “gaps” and “thrusts.”

The so-called “Soviet threat” has always been the basis for the big lie. For some 30 years, starting with the cold war, U.S. foreign policy has been camouflaged behind this fraud, which has cost the U.S. taxpayers some \$2 trillion. It is a criminal fraud because millions of people around the world, including tens of thousands of Americans, have been murdered at the altar of this fraud. The “strategic weapons gap” is but a continuation of this same old crime.

No, the Russians have not come and they are not going to come, except to trade, to exchange scientific information, and as dancers, musicians, artists, etc.

The Soviets, Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Bulgarians, Romanians, and Yugoslavs are not coming for a very good and sound reason: they live in socialist countries. Most people, including the American people, are against war and policies of aggression. The difference between our country and the socialist countries is the social-economic system. In imperialist countries, like the United States, big business

rules the roost. Whether at home or abroad their only aim is to make more profits. At home, they drive for maximum profits through exploitation, speedup, high prices, high rents, high taxes, and through the use of racism. In foreign lands they exploit, but they also enslave and dominate the political and economic life of those countries. That is their only real intention. That is the purpose of the 300 large and 2,000 small overseas U.S. military bases and other installations in more than 30 countries.

In the socialist countries there are no private corporations. Therefore, there is no drive for private corporate profits, either at home or abroad. Policies of aggression and the military buildup to support such policies are an extension of the drive for corporate profits.

Some say, "But what about Angola? Didn't the socialist countries support the national liberation forces there? Didn't the military forces of Cuba commit an act of aggression?" The answer is: they did not. The struggles for national liberation are against foreign domination. They are justified as was our Revolutionary War of 1776.

A thief as well as a friend can enter your house. But their intentions are different. One robs you, the other comes to help you. The capitalist countries and their monopoly corporations enter other countries with the aim of exploiting. Corporate profit is their aim. The socialist countries give support to movements of national liberation because these struggles are just and progressive.

The Soviet Union and Cuba supported the victorious forces of national liberation in Angola. But there are no Soviet or Cuban corporations in Angola. That was not the intent of these socialist countries. Therefore, there is no threat of invasion or aggression from socialist countries. Hence, the war cry, "The Russians are coming," is a historic fraud.

What about the accusations that the socialist countries export revolutions? That is also a falsehood. Communists have a principled position on that question. Ideas can be exported, but the people of each country must make their own revolution. Only people organized and conscious of their historic mission can make revolutions.

Thus, when considering the questions of war or peace it is necessary to take into account the very opposite intentions of the two social-economic systems. Socialism has extracted by its roots the economic, political and social force that inevitably moves toward policies of aggression — the private ownership of the means of production.

It is not surprising that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have placed on the table dozens of concrete proposals that would make detente and peace irreversible. In his latest speech, Leonid Brezhnev said: "The Soviet Union naturally is prepared to advance further any question of limiting strategic armaments."

The socialist countries have made proposals for a worldwide 10 percent reduction in all armament expenditures. They have made proposals for a treaty barring first strike actions by any country. They have made proposals for world disarmament conferences, for general disarmament as well as for concrete and specific steps toward disarmament.

But instead of seriously dealing with these proposals that would lead to peace, U.S. warmongers are heating up the atmosphere behind the demagoguery of "Soviet strategic superiority."

It is not enough to say that this new drive is related to convincing the Carter administration that it must increase the expenditures for war. This is true. But the problem is deeper. The question of whether life on this planet will continue is involved. Mankind's survival is the critical issue at stake in this debate.

But this new war drive can be defeated. The warmakers can be forced to retreat into the catacombs of Wall Street. The new drive for war must give rise to a new movement of the people for peace. In addition to saving the world from nuclear catastrophe, the new drive for peace and detente can result in trade, jobs, scientific and cultural exchange on a new level.

A million Americans signing the new *Stockholm Peace Appeal* can go a long way toward putting an end to the new drive of the war hawks.

March 19, 1977

When People Are Silent War Hawks Dominate Policy

First, let us take this opportunity to express our heartfelt thanks to the Soviet people and leadership for the way they observed and participated in the Bicentennial of our victorious War of Independence. The films, books, exhibits and the visit of the magnificent sailing ships, the *Kruzhnster* and the *Tovarish*, added an important dimension to our Bicentennial celebrations.

The glorious revolutionary explosion 60 years ago was a giant step for the multi-national people of the Soviet Union. But it was a giant leap of epochs on the scale of human progress.

The Great October Revolution signaled the beginning of the end for socio-economic systems under which enslavement, exploitation and robbery of the people are a way of life. It marked the beginning of the end for social systems in which human rights are talked about, but in reality, tolerated only if they in no way impinge upon or adversely affect the profits of the corporate bloodsuckers—the end of societies in which human beings are treated like machines of flesh and tools of muscle, to be worked at inhuman speeds, to be used when needed and profitable; to be discarded when worn out or not needed.

When the dust of the victorious revolt had settled, there, for all to see, was a new social system that by law, thought and political power prohibited and banned forever, racism and chauvinism; a new social order structured to serve only one purpose—the very best interests of all the people.

The Soviet people are celebrating 60 years of working class power, a power that blends with the power of the millions; 60 years of proletarian leadership in harmony with the broadest democratic concepts; 60 years of a society in which human rights are supreme, in which human rights, for the first time, are built into the very fabric of the socio-economic structure.

For 60 years, through wars and aggression waged against them, the Soviet people have proven beyond question that socialism is not only one alternative to capitalism, but that it is the best of all alternatives.

For 60 years the Soviet Union has been the staunchest friend and supporter of all people's movements fighting for national liberation. It has never succumbed either to the pressures or inducements of imperialism.

For the Soviet Union, its working class sense of internationalism has never been a chip on the bargaining table.

For 60 years the Soviet Union has been the most persistent and consistent fighter for world peace.

Two facts illustrate the support given by the Soviet Union to the world liberation movements in their political and economic struggles for independence and against imperialism. This role was highly acclaimed by the peoples of Africa during the recent visit of Prime Minister Andrei Gromyko of the USSR and Prime Minister Fidel Castro of socialist Cuba. The world also applauds the support given by the Soviet peoples to the struggle for a just peace in the Mid-east.

In a sense, it was inevitable that at some point in time a leading country of what remains of the capitalist world, and a leading country of the emerging socialist world, would face each other in a historic eyeball-to-eyeball competition. Whether inevitable or not, this is the reality today.

The most important issue before the world today is U.S.-Soviet relations. It contains all the main questions and contradictions of our times. In a basic sense, it determines the nature of the world we live in. And, even more basically, these relationships, and the nature of the solutions, will determine whether humanity will survive on this planet, or whether we will join the growing list of extinct species.

To gain a clearer perspective, it is necessary to place the most recent eyeball-to-eyeball episode in the continuing U.S.-Soviet dialogue into this broader historical framework.

From this broader viewpoint, the Pentagon-Jackson-Schlesinger-Brzezinski, so-called "arms reduction package," presented to the Soviet leaders in Moscow must be considered as one of the most irresponsible acts in history.

From the viewpoint of diplomatic relations it is indefensible. It is outrageous. From the viewpoint of launching serious negotiations, it is either sheer idiocy or utter amateurism.

Whatever the intent, the U.S. proposal has now become a new obstacle to serious efforts to control and reduce nuclear arms.

Was it a one-sided proposal? Well, if a chicken with one leg, or a hawk with one wing are not one-sided, then the Carter-Vance package is not one-sided.

Incredible as it may seem, the U.S. package proposal did not even pretend to contain a plan for nuclear arms reduction and control. It was nothing more than a proposal for a cutback in Soviet nuclear arms, while leaving U.S. nuclear arms and nuclear arms production and development intact.

What are some of the salient features of this phony proposal?

For example, the U.S. scheme called for a drastic cut in the Soviet Union's basic land-based, multi-warhead, heavy missiles from 308 to 150.

Now, what did the plan propose as the U.S. contribution to arms reduction? The administration's proposals totally ignored the 1974 Vladivostok Accord, and therefore proposed nothing of substance.

The United States would agree to cut some future arms that are now only on the drawing boards. But the plan proposed no cut in the massive, U.S. sea-based nuclear arsenal or the missile-carrying bombers. It proposed no limits on the number of U.S. cruise missiles.

Just one small leak from the National Security Council of the U.S. government gives us but an inkling of the irresponsible nature of this proposal.

A Mr. Lodol, a past director of program analysis for the National Security Council, stated in an article:

"President Carter's proposal, even as an initial starting point, is extraordinarily tough."

What he really means by "extraordinarily tough" is that it is totally one-sided, a fraud.

To back this up, he continued, with numerical details:

"The Russians would have to eliminate 400-600 newer-generation systems, as against 0-100 for the U.S.

The Soviet Union would forego planned deployments of 400-500 ICBM's equipped with multiple independently targetable warheads (MIRV's), and again, against a zero reduction for the U.S."

He went further:

"The U.S. would give up the MX land-based ICBM, now only in the planning stage, while the Soviet Union would eliminate its SS-16

mobile missile, and stop the SS-17, SS-18 and SS-19 deployment programs now underway.”

He concluded:

“The Carter proposal would bring the Soviet strategic nuclear program to a halt, yet leave the U.S. program almost untouched.”

But it is even more one-sided than that. The U.S. package contained proposals to cut the range and reach of missiles, including the U.S. cruise missile, to 1,500 miles. Now, that sounds fair and not one-sided, doesn't it? But, what is the real world situation in which these missiles would operate?

The United States has nuclear bases that surround the Soviet Union in Europe, Japan and elsewhere. All these bases are only a few hundred miles from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has no such bases surrounding the United States.

So, this deceptively fair-sounding proposal would cut the range of the Soviet missiles so they could not reach the United States, while the U.S. missiles would continue to be deployed and operable a few hundred miles away from the Soviet Union. The United States would have unlimited numbers of cruise missiles right on the Soviet Union's borders. This is not only one-sided, it is a fraud.

Thus, the package proposal presented in Moscow is solid proof that so far the Carter administration is not negotiating in good faith. In fact, it is playing a dangerous game.

The nature of the U.S. proposal presents some new and ominous dangers to the United States and to the world, because basically it was the plan of the war hawks. The Carter administration has brought them into the top policy-making councils of the government.

If, in accepting and presenting the package put together by the most reactionary, militaristic warmongers, the Carter administration is also accepting their phony position papers which warn that the United States and the world face some serious new dangers from the Soviet Union, then the United States will be pursuing a foreign policy based on the myth of being able to deal from a position of strength. If we embark on this dead-end road we will be backsliding to the Dulles cold war confrontation policies, to more Vietnams and to \$200 billion war budgets.

If the Carter administration is going to accept and be guided by the “gap hysteria of the Pentagon,” the so-called phony “nuclear strategic arms gap,” then we will be in for an endless escalation of the nuclear

arms race. We will be moving inevitably and dangerously toward the brink again.

The phony gap frauds have already cost U.S. taxpayers something like \$2 trillion. If the fake "nuclear strategic arms gap" position is adopted as the basis of our foreign policy the human race will be fortunate if all it loses as a result is more billions of dollars. The human race itself will be at stake.

The Carter administration may have believed that their presentation of the one-sided arms reduction and control proposal was a good gimmick. But, like the phony human rights campaign, this gimmick only plays right into the hands of the war hawks. Now any serious attempt by the Carter administration to negotiate realistically and fairly will be attacked by the cold warriors as "a concession to the Soviets."

The phony, one-sided U.S. nuclear arms proposal must serve as a warning, a signal to the people. There will be no serious negotiations to cut or control nuclear arms unless the people of the United States speak out and act to demand peace and detente.

Thus, the struggle to relax tensions, the struggle for peaceful coexistence and for detente has taken on a new urgency. The people will have to take on this task—on an urgently new level.

The historic eyeball-to-eyeball competition between the United States and the Soviet Union can be turned around to serve world peace and social progress. Or, it can lead toward propelling the world to the brink of nuclear confrontation and disaster. The full responsibility for this turn of events rests with the Carter administration.

Ultimately, only the people can be the arbitrators. Only the people can make the decisive difference between war or peace, between human survival or extinction.

By default, the war hawks always dominate U.S. government policy when the people are silent. But they do not have a mass base. They do not represent the mood or the will of the people of our country. Mass actions can influence government policy toward peace and detente. Mass actions can drive the warmongers out of public office forever.

Mass actions can bring about serious negotiations that will put an end to the nuclear arms race. Silence now can result in "Silent Springs." Mass actions now will bring about springs of peace, progress and a deeper friendship between our two peoples.

April 20, 1977

On Chinese Aggression

The treacherous, bullying attack by China against Vietnam has opened the eyes further of the people of the world to the true nature of the present Chinese leadership.

Deng Xiaoping proclaimed during his U.S. visit that China “must punish Vietnam,” that Vietnam “must be taught a lesson.” How is that for a reason for starting a war—one that not only brings death and devastation to the people of Vietnam and China, but that greatly increases the danger of thermonuclear conflict that could destroy humanity.

Who, a few year ago, would have said that such a thing was possible? The fact that it has happened is an indication of the depravity of the current leadership of China, of their absolute cynicism.

The current action is, of course, not out of line with the previous actions of Maoist China—such actions as supporting the fascist butcher Pinochet in Chile, helping the CIA-side in Angola, and calling on the NATO countries and Japan to step up their arms budgets.

But there is also an important difference of degree between the attack on Vietnam and the previous actions. Much more than the others, this action shows how far the Chinese leaders will go, how completely irresponsible they are, how much of a danger they constitute for the whole world.

The policies and actions of the Chinese leaders are an expression of a feudalistic warlord mentality. That traits of such a mentality can still exist among the leaders of China should come as no surprise. As Marx pointed out in *Critique of the Gotha Program*, the society that comes into being after a revolution is not one that has “developed on its own foundation,” but rather one which is “in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges.” Pre-revolutionary China was a warlord society, and this left its marks. With a working class that was

large and strong and with a Communist Party that followed a Marxist-Leninist line—a line of class solidarity, of proletarian internationalism—these marks would by now have been all but wiped out. But the working class was small and the Communist Party has not followed a Marxist-Leninist line. It long ago succumbed to a narrow nationalist line which allowed the feudalistic declassed mentality to remain strong.

The leadership of the Chinese Communist Party has been faction-ridden and unstable. Different individuals and factions have fought each other like warlords. Deng himself has been purged and repurged, and he in turn has purged his purgers.

Along with the shifts in factional power have come switches in doctrine and policy, usually from one extreme to the other. The “great leap forward” was supposed to show the world how an economy can be developed quickly, much more quickly than in the other socialist countries. But it fell flat. It was followed by a “cultural revolution” which pooh-pooed the need for economic development in favor of other, supposedly higher, values. Now the cultural revolution is also out.

The Chinese leadership has proved incapable of developing solid, long-range policies that could be followed steadfastly across the years. Once they gave up the proven Marxist-Leninist method of developing the economy, they floundered, they bungled. As they failed with one method, they grabbed desperately for another. Now with the economy, by their own testimony, in an unsatisfactory state, they can find nothing better to do than try to “modernize” with what they hope will be a massive inflow of capital and technology from the imperialist countries.

They are not only willing to make their whole development dependent on the capital and technology from the imperialist countries, they are willing to commit treason to everything they once said they stood for. They are willing to betray socialism, the national liberation movement, the struggle against racism throughout the world. To get capital and technology from the imperialist countries, they are offering themselves as mercenaries who can help the imperialists halt the world revolutionary process.

The Chinese Communist Party has worked across the years to sow confusion among the progressive forces of the world. It is useful to compare what they have said in the past with what they are now doing.

The Chinese party presented themselves as the only true revolutionaries. The other parties and the socialist countries were being soft on imperialism, they were “revisionist,” they were “taking the capitalist road,” etc. But if the Chinese were honest and serious in their criticism of alleged softness on imperialism and deviation from the path of true revolution, how could they be following the path that they are on today—helping the U.S. imperialists in Africa, telling them they must act more strongly and decisively to prevent such “defeats” as Iran? How, for a revolutionary country, is the victory of the people of Iran a defeat?

Alliance With Imperialism

Take another piece of former Chinese doctrine: self-reliance. Every country, said the Chinese leaders, should rely on its own resources. It should be careful of its trade even with the other socialist countries. China criticized Cuba for its trade with the Soviet Union and the help it received from her. But basing China’s development on capital and technology from the United States, Japan, and other imperialist countries—that is now somehow okay.

China’s own actions have exposed what lies behind its leaders’ criticisms of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries: the shameless dishonesty of these leaders, their lack of all principle. These criticisms are cynical lies—lies propounded on the Hitler principle of being so big that many people will refuse to believe that anyone could lie on such a vast scale.

It is crucial now to understand the full meaning of the current policy of the Chinese leadership. China is working to cement an ever closer alliance with the United States, Japan and other imperialist countries. It sees the balance of forces in the world shifting against the imperialists. It sees the imperialists being handed one defeat after another by the peoples of the world fighting for their freedom and a better life. And so the Chinese leaders are saying to the imperialists, we can help you. We can redress the balance of forces in your favor. We can help you handle the Soviet Union, we can help you encircle it, so that the revolutionary process in Africa, the Middle East, and elsewhere can be halted. But in return, and for us to be able to do this, you have to provide us with capital and technology for development and—above all—arms.

The Chinese have been following this policy for a long time. It has been the dominant policy since 1971 with the visits of Kissinger and Nixon to China. The U.S. imperialists were cautious at first about developing too close a relationship with China. The more realistic and sober among them recognize that such a relationship is dangerous. They recognize that the main issue in the world today is the prevention of nuclear war. They understand that an alliance with China carries dangers for detente, for the process of finding a way to stop the arms race, for world peace. The Chinese leaders answered the U.S. imperialists' caution by saying repeatedly, We have patience. They counted on the deterioration of the imperialists' position in the world to strengthen their own usefulness and attraction. They were not disappointed. The United States began moving closer to them by allowing its Western allies to sell them arms and by establishing diplomatic relations.

Part of this process was evident during Deng's recent visit. Deng openly taunted the rulers of the United States for their defeats in Africa and the Middle East. He accused them of weakness, of indecisiveness. He bid for the support of the rightist, fascist elements in the United States who want a more openly aggressive foreign policy.

The Chinese policy is inherently against detente, against allowing the oppressed peoples of the world to win their freedom and determine their own destiny, against a peaceful, progressing world. In such a world the current Chinese policy would collapse. What, in such a world, could they use to promote the China-United States-Japan alliances on which they have placed their bets? That is why the Chinese leaders have an interest in disrupting detente, in promoting tension and war, including a world nuclear war.

Taken in isolation, there would be nothing wrong with U.S. recognition of China. But it can't be taken in isolation. The U.S. recognition is part of a broader move toward forging a closer alliance. The first fruit of this move is the attack on Vietnam.

This attack was undertaken with the tacit approval, encouragement, and even collusion of the United States. Everything surrounding the attack shows this, from Deng's announcements about "punishing Vietnam" while he was still on his visit here to Secretary of Treasury Blumenthal's trip to China and the opening up of the U.S. Embassy there while the attack was taking place.

This attack is itself very dangerous, but it is only a first indication of what the China-U.S. alliance can bring.

The attack on Vietnam and the alliance from which it flows required that people take a stand—that all who love peace, all progressives, all throughout the world who consider themselves socialists, communists, revolutionaries, take a clear stand. The time for confusion, for vacillation, for opportunism on the problem of China is past. A stand has to be taken, a broad, worldwide movement against the irresponsible, adventurous Chinese aggressors has to be built. The stakes are of the highest.

March 15, 1979

Butter, Not Guns

The Carter administration is now deliberately, cold-bloodedly triggering a recession as a means of handling the problems of the falling dollar and inflation over which it had lost control.

This is the real meaning of the technical monetary measures the government announced on November 1—the increase in the amount of cash the banks have to keep in reserve, the rise in the rate the banks have to pay for money they borrow from the Federal Reserve Banks. These measures will reduce the amount of credit available and make it more costly. They will raise the cost of mortgage borrowing to buy a house, price many potential buyers of houses out of the market, and sharply reduce the volume of housing construction. They will raise the cost of borrowing to buy autos, furniture and other goods, and cut into the sale of these goods. The purpose of these measures is to slow down the economy, and even most bourgeois economists are predicting a recession sometime in 1979.

A recession would of course have come anyway sooner or later. Capitalism is unable to prevent recessions and the conditions for the next recession have been maturing for many months now. Nevertheless, there is a difference between a situation in which recessions come by themselves and the government has flexibility to deal with them and one in which the government sees itself forced to deliberately provoke them.

When the government was not faced with acute problems of a falling dollar and inflation it had greater leeway to address the problems of recession and unemployment. It didn't have to worry much about the effects on the price level and the value of the dollar of monetary pump-priming against recession. It could try to delay the onset of recessions before they came and to weaken and shorten them once they were under way.

But with the economy suffering from a falling dollar and inflation the choices are narrowed. The government either has to slash the arms budget or rely on recession and unemployment to control the problems of a falling dollar and inflation.

When the government refuses to slash the arms budget, it is left with a dilemma: It can fight either the falling dollar and inflation or recession and unemployment, but not both problems at the same time. To the extent that it decides to fight the falling dollar and inflation, it loses the ability to fight recession and unemployment. Not only is it unable to try to delay recessions, but it is often forced to bring them on. Not only can't it work to weaken them, to get rid of them as soon as possible, but just the opposite—it has to keep them sufficiently severed and long-lasting to make a dent on the problems they are designed to ease.

This decline in maneuverability due to a dollar problem and inflation has been a key element in the U.S. economy since the Nixon Administration took office in 1968. It is the main explanation why the problems of recession and unemployment have become more serious since then.

The Nixon administration deliberately provoked a recession in 1968 in an attempt to control the problems of a weak dollar and inflation that it inherited from the Johnson administration and the Vietnam war. The Ford administration deliberately provoked a recession in 1974 in an attempt to control the double digit inflation that was breaking out then. Further, it stubbornly refused to take any action

against the recession once it was there—to do anything about the unemployment although it was soaring to levels unseen since the 1930s—on the ground that such action would hurt the fight against inflation. The result was the worst recession since World War II, a weak recovery, a level of unemployment which is still, even according to the lying official figures, at the high level of 6 percent. And now we have the Carter administration once again deliberately provoking a recession.

This story is bad enough even without anything further—recessions and unemployment are monstrous remedies. But there is something further. The problems of the dollar and inflations have not been solved. They are even less close to being solved today than they were when Nixon started using the remedy of recession and unemployment against them.

This gives us a clue to what lies ahead. The problems of the falling dollar and inflation will not be solved by recession. The Carter administration can no more solve these problems this way than the Nixon and Ford administration were able to before them.

A look at the true causes of the weakness of the dollar will make this clear. The dollar is weak because the United States is cheapening it by putting out many more dollars abroad than it is taking in. How? Well, for one thing, it is importing more than it is exporting. It is losing the competition for world markets to countries like West Germany and Japan, which have been putting their research money into modernizing their economies and improving their products while the United States has been wasting the bulk of its research money on the military. For another thing, the United States maintains over 2,000 bases abroad which cause a permanent hemorrhage of dollars. For a third, the government doles out billions of dollars in military and economic aid to its puppet allies—Israel, Egypt, South Korea, etc. Finally, the corporations transfer billions of dollars abroad for investment purposes.

Unless these basic causes are attacked, the dollar will remain weak. A recession, by lowering the standard of living in the United States, will reduce U.S. imports and may ease the dollar problem if other countries don't have an even bigger recession and reduce their imports by even more. But any such easing can only be temporary and cannot really solve the problem.

Nor will a recession solve the problem of inflation. Carter has

announced that he is going to increase the arms budget by “3 percent a year above the inflation rate.” How, with such a policy, is he going to bring the inflation under control? This is a formula for potential economic disaster. Pumping 3 percent a year more of printed money into the economy through the arms budget and at the same time trying to compensate this—to fight the inflation—by restricting the flow of money to the productive sector is to put the economy on a road that could easily lead to a major depression.

What explains the Carter Administration’s economic policies? The answer is simple. Like the Nixon and Ford administrations before it, it is following a class policy. It is defending monopoly capital and its economic, political and military interests. Faced with a mess of problems, it is twisting and turning, trying to heap the cost of controlling the mess on the working people and middle classes—on everyone except the monopolies and their henchmen.

This shows not only in the administration’s acceptance of recession and unemployment as economic tools, but also in the so-called wage-price guidelines. The same Carter who wants to give the Pentagon an adjustment for inflation plus an increase of 3 percent a year, wants workers to limit their wage adjustments to 7 percent even though the price increase this year will be several points higher than this.

To try to sucker the workers into going along, Carter and his latest anti-inflation chief, Albert Kahn—who, by the way, gets \$57,000 per year—are offering to “insure” the workers. If the workers accept increases of only 7 percent and the price increase afterwards exceeds this, the government will compensate the workers by an adjustment in their taxes. Even assuming such a system can be made to work, what about the workers catching up with the price increase in excess of 7 percent that has already taken place?

The government is trying to make the insurance measure look as though it protects the interests of the workers. Actually, it protects the monopolies and is a dangerous gamble for the economy. Suppose the price increase does turn out to be over 7 percent—say 10 percent, which is far from impossible. The monopolies will have made a tremendous windfall gain in only having to pay 7 percent wage increases. And the government will have to pay out an additional say \$40 billion—further unbalancing the budget, further stoking the inflation.

There is only one way to get the country out of the economic mess it

is in: the way the Communist Party has repeatedly called for—to slash the arms budget, change the country's priorities. Slashing the arms budget, dismantling the foreign bases, ending the tax loopholes of the monopolies, controlling their transfers of dollars abroad—that's the only way. That's the way in which the problems of the falling dollar and inflation can be attacked without having to have a recession and an additional wave of unemployment. If Carter were really serious about fighting inflation, he would ask for a law calling for a rollback of prices and rents and a strict limitation on corporate profits.

The logic of this is simple. Dollar for dollar the arms budget creates only a fraction of the jobs that spending on civilian purposes would. The dollars spent on the crazy neutron bomb and the new missiles create far fewer jobs than reconstructing our cities and building mass transit systems would. How many jobs in the United States are created by bases in South Korea, or by rewarding Begin and Sadat with billions for their phony Camp David settlement? All the spending for these bases and giveaways does is to weaken the dollar, which Carter then tries to shore up by creating unemployment. By slashing the arms we could both eliminate the federal deficit and create more jobs, both fight inflation and fight recession.

And of course the inflation is brought to the people by the monopolies and landlords. So hands must be laid on these gougers.

The U.S. economy is now on a dangerous course. Even Kahn and Carter have talked of the possibility of a depression. The direction in which the economy is moving involves this danger. We could on top of the rest of the mess—the mass unemployment of minority youth, the decaying cities, the outrageous health care system, the inadequate social security payments, the highways with potholes—have a depression.

The struggle to change the country's priorities is now doubly urgent.

November 30, 1978

But Is That Enough?

While not pretending to be a literary critic, and certainly not a critic of poetry, I became interested in a poem about workers in the war production industries. This particular poem, "The Armaments-Factory Worker," was written by Karol Wojtyla, who is now Pope John Paul II. This poem is from his collection, *Easter Vigil & Other Poems*.

I cannot influence the fate of the globe.

Do I start wars? How can I know
whether I'm for or against?

No, I don't sin.

It worries me not to have influence,
that it is not I who sin.

I only turn screws, weld together
parts of destruction,
never grasping the whole,
or the human lot.

I could do otherwise (would parts be left out?)
contributing then to sanctified toil
which no one would blot out in action or
believe in speech.

Though what I create is all wrong,
the world's evil is none of my doing.

But is that enough?

These lines have a sense of beauty and sensitivity. They show a deep sensitivity to the real dilemma of tens of millions who work, or have worked, in factories producing instruments of war. This sensitivity obviously comes from personal experience.

The poem probes a contradiction these workers face—a contradiction about between having to make a living and a sense of guilt about producing instruments of mass destruction.

I don't know when the poem was written, but in the context of today's world the words seem somewhat hopeless and unnecessarily pessimistic. It is possible that Pope John Paul would agree with me.

The worker in the poem says, "I cannot influence the fate of the globe," and again, "It worries me not to have influence."

When applied to individual workers that assessment is totally true. but it is not at all true of workers as a class. It has not been true in the past, and increasingly it is less and less true of the present and the future. Workers, as a class, not only influence events, but in today's world they are the determining factor on questions of war and peace. In fact, they are the main force that has kept the world from slipping into a nuclear disaster.

As a class, workers are the leading force in the socialist countries. And the socialist countries are the main force in the struggle for world peace. As a class, workers in the capitalist countries are also the main force in the struggle against policies of imperialist aggression that lead to war. So workers are not without influence.

The poem ends with a very correct conclusion: "the world's evil is none of my doing," and asks a very pertinent question: "But is that enough?"

It does not, however, answer the question—if the "world's evil" is not the "doing" of the armaments-factory workers, then whose "doing" is it? To be a force against war and imperialist aggression it is necessary to pinpoint and answer the question of who is "doing" the evil.

Of course any objective study will come to the conclusion that war and aggression are the "doing" of those who profit from wars of aggression. In the present day world, more than anything else the policies of aggression are the "doing" of the U.S. military-industrial complex.

It is also true that the "evil" is a built-in feature of capitalism. The drive for corporate profits is a constant pressure for policies of war and aggression.

In pursuing their evil goal of maximum profits the corporate coupon-clippers squeeze the workers on the home front and pursue policies of aggression and domination over other lands and peoples. I am sure this did not escape the attention of Pope Paul on his recent visit to Mexico.

The poverty in Mexico, as is the case with most of the poorer

capitalist countries, is largely the product of foreign imperialist exploitation. The foreign corporations get fat on low wage scales and the cheap raw materials in these countries. In our time this exploitation has been taken over by the huge worldwide corporate-banking galaxies.

Socialism, because it is a working-class state, eliminates such pressures by transferring the corporate properties into people's properties. And instead of being motivated by the drive for private profits, they are motivated by doing whatever is possible for the good of all.

The poem asks: "How can I know whether I'm for or against?" Each worker, as is the case with all of us, has to answer that question, both as an individual and as a member of society. The yardstick of fairness and justice, and how one's actions affect the train of social progress, is the only basis for such a judgment. Such an assessment leads workers to oppose exploitation at home and abroad. Such an assessment leads workers to reject the racist and chauvinist concept that corporations of a country that militarily and economically dominate have a right to exploit and dominate workers of another country. In ever greater numbers, workers and peoples throughout the world are "deciding" they are against the evils of capitalism and are "doing" something about it.

Armaments workers today are answering the question of whether "it is enough." There are important trends among U.S. workers in the war production industries in the direction of "doing" more about the question of war or peace. The big unions that represent the workers in the aerospace and war production industries are becoming a powerful force in the struggle for conversion from the production of instruments of war to peacetime production—the transfer of wasted billions from the war budget to human welfare budgets.

For each season and time in history the answer to the question, "But is that enough?" is different. In our time, if we do not work to oppose policies of imperialist aggression, if we do not work for policies of detente, and if we do not work to get the SALT II agreements ratified by the U.S. Senate—then we are "not doing enough."

This yardstick applies to workers in the armaments factories, to workers and people everywhere, to liberals, to Communists and non-Communists. And, needless to say, to such influential public figures as Pope John Paul II.

If the poem, "The Armaments-Factory Worker" serves to stimulate

people to think about the answer to the question: "But is that enough?" then this humane and sensitive poem by the Pope will have served a most important purpose. It will have made a contribution to the betterment of "the human lot."

May 24, 1979

U.S. War Politics

The increased militarization and preparations for war have taken a new qualitative and most dangerous turn. The increase in U.S. naval units in the Indian Ocean presents its own dangers. The military exercises by U.S. imperialism on Guantanamo Base on Cuban soil is an act of brazen provocation and imperialist arrogance. The show of U.S. military strength in the Caribbean area is an act of gunboat diplomacy. The effort to kill SALT II is a dangerous conspiracy by the military nuclear maniacs. The \$40 billion increase in the military budget carries with it grave new dangers. And of course it is an attack on the living standards of the U.S. people.

The scheme to place 600 new cruise and Pershing II nuclear missiles in Europe is a most dangerous attempt to escalate the arms race and it is a direct threat to the very lives of the people living in these Western European countries. The pushing of arms sales to China and Japan also raises war preparations to new levels.

Each of these acts presents new dangers by themselves. But they are not isolated, separate actions. They are all part of a new overall drive for wars of aggression by U.S. imperialism. These actions and plans have raised the danger of nuclear war to a new level. These acts toward war are in the very opposite direction of the acts and statements of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The dramatic and historic proposals by Leonid I. Brezhnev, general

secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, to unilaterally withdraw 20,000 men and 1,000 tanks from the territory of the German Democratic Republic and a public pledge by Brezhnev to cut back medium-range nuclear missiles in the western Soviet Union if the imperialist countries will agree not to add new missiles is an act without precedent.

It is a bold act. *It could open up the process that would remove the danger of war forever.* Millions of people throughout the world are weighing and comparing the actions of the two forces in the world—U.S. imperialism and the socialist Soviet Union. One moves toward war and the other takes bold steps toward world peace.

The world faces the choice of taking a leap that would place it on the brink of total nuclear disaster, or the first big step along the path that would lead to everlasting peace.

It is of the utmost importance to draw conclusions from all the moves the Carter administration has made. There should be no illusions about a number of factors in these developments.

For example, it is clear that Carter and those around him would be willing to steer the world to the brink and beyond if it would win the President a second term. However, it would be a fatal error to think these moves are somehow only pre-election maneuvers. The danger of a nuclear confrontation has greatly increased because it is clear that the nuclear maniacs now dominate U.S. foreign policy.

It is the Brzezinskis, the Jacksons and the Pentagon who now call the foreign policy shots. And this creates a totally new and greater threat to world peace. With a few exceptions, the other forces in the Senate have been frightened into silence. Therefore, there is no real opposition to this disastrous direction of U.S. foreign policy.

It is ironic that these new developments toward nuclear war occur at a moment when the great majority of people—not only of the world, but also of the United States—are for policies of peace and an end to the nuclear threat. But the fact is that these voices are not organized or loud enough at the present time. The fact is that the military nuclear maniacs are a small minority, but they are on the offensive and this presents the big problem for the peace majority of the U.S.

The Brzezinskis, Jacksons and Carter are conspiring to sell the people of the world military snake oil. To the people of Europe they are saying: "You need the 600 cruise and Pershing II missiles for your

defense." And to the people of the United States they are hinting that these 600 missiles will guarantee that the Soviet missiles will fall on Europe and thus spare the people of the United States. Both of these concepts are absolute fakery.

In today's world there will be no regional wars. To expect the Soviet Union to limit its retaliation to the European areas while U.S. missiles are being launched from Europe is a serious self-deception. The 600 new missiles will not spare the people of the United States. And they will not add to the defense of Europe. Any illusion about nuclear war is the most dangerous of all illusions. The cost of such illusions could be the extermination, the incineration, of the human race.

It is one thing to be reactionary. But to be reactionary and ignorant is the most dangerous of all conditions. The U.S. military strategists who plan on the basis that the Europeans, the Japanese and the Chinese are going to do the fighting and dying while the U.S. monopolies reap the profits, as they did in past wars, is also an illusion. It is based on the military strategy that reflected the conditions of the colonial wars of past years.

The new developments present a special danger because the Brzezinskis, Jacksons and Browns are pushing military preparations without taking into consideration political developments since World War II. This is nothing but ignorance. Military policies that do not take into a special account the contemporary political and military situation amount to ignorance of present-day realities. President Brezhnev's peace proposals and actions provide the U-turn for world developments. It is now up to the peoples and nations of the world to follow this lead and make that U-turn away from the nuclear brink.

It is up to the peace-loving peoples of the world to take the steering wheel away from the warhawk nuclear maniacs and proceed in the reverse direction from the one the world has been moving in for some time. *This is a moment when the peace majority in the U.S. must put aside all differences.* This is a moment when united mass actions are a must and when they can have tremendous influence on world developments.

The forces of peace must now let every politician know (whether they are running for re-election or for the first time) that they will become an active force for their defeat if they either support or remain silent about the new acts of war by the administration. These politicians must be made aware that only those who take an active part in

the struggle against the war provocations and military preparations will get the support of the people and the peace majority.

It is true that the peace majority must campaign against the arms race and the escalation of the arms race. But it is more involved than just the arms race, as important as that is, because the arms race has its own laws of development. Therefore, the question of the danger of war and especially nuclear war must now be raised as a serious threat to the very survival of humanity.

November 8, 1979

Detente Requires Two Sides

The developments in Afghanistan and Iran cannot be understood if seen in isolation from the realities of world developments. The events in both countries are directly related to the long-term foreign policies of world imperialism. They are reactions to policies of imperialist aggression.

In Iran, the developments have their roots starting with the counter-revolutionary plan directed and carried out by the CIA and the Rockefellers 26 years ago. At that time the people of Iran democratically elected a government that nationalized the oil resources of Iran. The CIA, openly and directly, and the Rockefellers overthrew the Mossadegh government, replaced it with the murderous Shah, backed up by the infamous CIA-trained SAVAK and took back the nationalized oil fields.

For 26 years the Rockefellers and the U.S. government directed, supported and participated in one of the most repressive and brutal campaigns of murder and torture of anti-imperialist and progressive Iranians.

Today's events cannot be understood or dealt with in isolation from

that 26-year history. Thus, the events of today are a direct reaction to a long history of U.S. imperialist aggression in Iran.

For 60 years the main pillar of U.S. foreign policy has been to encircle, undermine and destroy the socialist world, and in the first place the Soviet Union. This is an aggressive, imperialist class-war policy. Except for the short period during World War II, all the alliances set up by the United States have been aimed against the Soviet Union. The strategic goal has always been to encircle the Soviet Union. With this aim in mind, the United States was the main force that built up the war machines of Germany, Italy and Japan, which directly led to World War II. Up to the 11th hour, the United States, England and France were still maneuvering to form an anti-Soviet alliance with the fascist axis.

After World War II, this policy reemerged in the efforts to "roll back the borders of socialism." It is this policy that brought on the cold war. U.S. foreign policy has been overt, as well as covert. It has been a policy of infiltrating, arming, promoting and instigating all opposition, especially in countries which border the Soviet Union. It has been a policy of working to destabilize the socialist world.

During this same period, the Soviet Union has made over 100 concrete proposals for peace and disarmament. These include proposals for total destruction of all nuclear stockpiles, banning the manufacture of all nuclear and chemical weapons, a proposal for step-by-step reduction of all military weapons and a proposal for a declaration by all nations not to be the first to use nuclear or hydrogen weapons.

These proposals and others have all been rejected out-of-hand by the imperialist governments, because disarmament does not serve a policy of aggression.

The most recent Soviet peace proposal was made in Berlin on October 8, 1979, by Soviet President Leonid I. Brezhnev. He announced the unilateral withdrawal from GDR territory of 20,000 troops and 1,000 tanks, which has already begun.

In addition, President Brezhnev also announced the readiness of the Soviet Union to withdraw some of its medium-range missiles from the western part of the Soviet Union if NATO simply does not deploy the cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe.

What was the imperialist response to the unprecedented peace initiatives? The United States, West Germany, Great Britain and Italy

announced their agreement to add some 600 war-making cruise missiles and first-strike, nuclear-armed Pershing II missiles in Western Europe aimed at the Soviet Union. Western Europe already has more missiles than any other area in the world. The new missiles are *strategic* missiles with a 1,500-mile range, and their deployment will radically change the strategic balance in the world, increasing the danger of nuclear war. The United States already has more than 2,500 military bases in 114 countries, including Pakistan. These bases completely surround the Soviet Union. This new NATO development is in keeping with the imperialist policy of encircling the Soviet Union.

The U.S. Senate has refused to ratify SALT II, and U.S. imperialism has refused to lift the old discriminatory trade bans against other socialist countries. This is also in keeping with the imperialist policy of working to undermine and destroy socialism.

Thus, a continuation and intensification of war moves was the response of U.S. imperialism to the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union.

Playing the China card is also a feature of U.S. policy to encircle the Soviet Union. The willingness of the Maoist leaders to become a partner in these imperialist efforts has added a new and dangerous dimension to this policy.

The events in Afghanistan are not unrelated to these developments. In fact, they are a reaction to them.

The CIA, in concert with the reactionary forces of Great Britain and China, have been actively undermining and destabilizing the forces in Afghanistan for many years. This should not be news to anyone. There have been dozens of articles in the U.S. press dealing with the activities in the special training camps in Pakistan, as well as in Iran.

In the last two years, but especially since the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan, these counter-revolutionary camps have been training and arming the brutal landowners, other petty feudal tyrants, the imperialist hangers on and many honest, but misled Afghan refugees. But mainly these forces are counter-revolutionary elements who are dead set against the democratic people's revolution in Afghanistan. In the last period, these reactionary forces were trained, armed and sent back across the unguarded Afghan border as military detachments. These activities reached the point where a reversal of the Afghan revolution was imminent. This was clearly another attempt in the process of encircling the Soviet Union.

When the present Afghan leadership concluded that their revolution was in danger they asked the Soviet Union for moral, economic and military aid. This was given in keeping with the Treaty of Friendship and Good Neighborliness between the two countries.

The Soviet Union's action was based on two considerations: whether to permit a development on its border where Afghanistan would have become a military staging area against the Soviet Union and the socialist world in general, and assistance to the Afghan people in defending their revolutionary gains and to prevent a reversal.

Because the Soviet Union is a socialist country it is not out to conquer, dominate or exploit the resources or people of Afghanistan. Once the situation is stabilized and the people's revolution is secured the Soviet forces will be withdrawn.

However, in general the world is going to be faced with similar situations as long as the policies of imperialism, and especially of U.S. imperialism, continue to be policies of undermining and halting the national liberation movements, of stopping and rolling back the borders of socialist states. As long as the United States persists in its policy of confrontation and aggression, of trying to hold back and sidetrack the world revolutionary process, there will be reactions. The detention of the hostages in Iran is but one consequence of U.S. imperialist practices.

The world revolutionary process, which includes victories of national liberation, independence and socialism, is an historically inevitable process. It is the path for civilization to move up the ladder of social progress. The policy of imperialist aggression is a reactionary policy. It is an attempt to turn back the clock of history and progress. It must fail.

The events and developments in Iran and Afghanistan must be seen within the framework of this historic struggle. The policies of detente, relaxation of tensions and peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems are policies initiated and fought for mainly by the socialist and liberated countries, with the Soviet Union in the forefront. The forces of imperialism have either reluctantly accepted or rejected these policies.

Detente cannot be a one-way street. It requires two sides. The revolutionary process can be a peaceful one. The only prerequisite is that imperialism gives up its aims and policies of aggression and confrontation.

It is the best self-interest of all peoples, including the people of the United States, to demand and fight for policies of detente and world peace. Today, the U.S. policy of imperialist aggression is costing the people of our country \$160 billion dollars yearly in military budgets, soaring inflation, unemployment, higher taxes and cutbacks in vital services.

The recent measures by the Carter administration against the Soviet Union will be very costly for the people of the United States, and will not achieve its aims.

The decision to embargo the wheat shipments to the Soviet Union, for example, will damage the wheat market, the farmers, longshoremen, truckers, the railroad industry and increase the weakness of the dollar.

On the other hand, policies of peace and detente can reverse this process of undermining the overall quality of life, while insuring the very survival of life itself.

January 10, 1980

Salt II and Beyond

To be fully understood, SALT II can make the difference of life and death on our planet.

SALT II would do several things:

1. It would place a cap on some of the systems of nuclear armaments.
2. It would establish ground rules for an orderly mutual reduction of nuclear stockpiles.
3. It would retain the necessary strategic nuclear parity between the Soviet Union and the United States.

However, SALT II must be seen not just by itself, but as part of a larger process. The signing of SALT II would open the way for

strengthening detente, for further agreements, for putting further caps on the arms race and moving toward further, bigger reductions in the weapons stockpiles, for strengthening the barriers to the outbreak of a nuclear catastrophe.

On the other hand, failure to sign SALT II would be not just giving up all those things, not just standing still, but strengthening a process that works the other way. A big dose of poison would be injected into U.S.-Soviet relations. Detente would be seriously weakened. The arms race would not just continue, but would be accelerated. A continuation of an unchecked arms race, to say nothing of an accelerated arms race, would be the height of danger.

An uncontrolled nuclear arms race contains within it a very strong possibility of an explosion that would turn this earth into a lifeless, dead planet.

An unchecked, accelerated arms race would by itself work to destabilize relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. The present nuclear parity between the two countries is a stabilizing factor. The more certain it is that the two sides are militarily equal, that the very notion of nuclear superiority is now meaningless, the clearer, stronger, and widespread will be the idea that a nuclear war is unthinkable, that there is now no alternative to peaceful coexistence.

But an unchecked arms race would fuel the hopes of those in the imperialist camp—like Zbigniew Brzezinski, Henry Jackson, and others—of regaining the strategic nuclear superiority the United States once had. These elements want nuclear superiority to use it—to use it offensively. At the very least, they want to use nuclear superiority to try to overawe the Soviet Union so U.S. imperialism can have greater freedom to intervene in places like Angola, Ethiopia and Iran where the people fighting for their freedom have been inflicting defeat after defeat on it.

Some of them would even go further. They are unreconciled to the existence of socialism anywhere, including in the Soviet Union, and even at this late date are still dreaming of wiping out this socialism. It is obvious that strengthening the hand of these elements is dangerous because they keep pushing for actions that could easily lead to a nuclear war.

The claim that SALT II would damage the security of the United States is an absolute falsehood. It would enhance that security, it is essential to it. The whole history of the arms race shows this. The U.S.

started the arms race. It has repeatedly taken actions which have added to the momentum of the arms race. A U.S. defense analyst has calculated that the United States has initiated the development of 25 major weapons systems during the postwar period, and the Soviet Union only two. And what has been the end result? Not more security, but much less.

On the basis of phony, trumped up, lying claims that the United States was behind the Soviet Union—that there was first a “bomber gap,” then a “missile gap,” etc.—the Pentagon and the arms monopolies have promoted the development of one new weapons system after another. But these weapons have a destabilizing effect and therefore bring less security. They cannot bring more security because they increase the danger of war, while true security means peace.

It is absolutely necessary to end the arms race. The bigger the steps we take toward this goal, the better, of course. But it would be a serious mistake to insist on an all-or-nothing approach. All steps are useful.

Some people don't see this. They look, for example, at SALT I, signed in 1972, and ask what good is it, we still have the arms race. It is true we still have an arms race. But this is far from meaning that SALT I didn't accomplish anything. It has great accomplishments to its credit. For example, SALT I banned anti-ballistic missile systems. This removes one big destabilizing factor from the arms race. It removes the argument that one side is building up a defense against attack so as to be free itself to make an attack. Besides the increased security the banning of anti-ballistic systems has brought, it has also saved us many tens of billions of dollars. And, to repeat the earlier point about arms control and disarmament being a process, it was SALT I that made possible SALT II.

Parity is a Stabilizing Factor

We also have to look beyond SALT II toward further steps to end the arms race. Here we have to ask ourselves, who is trying to end the arms race and who is responsible for maintaining it?

The Soviet Union has made a large number of proposals for moving toward disarmament and strengthening peace. It has, for example, proposed:

- A treaty binding all countries to repudiate the use of military force except for defense;

- A treaty by the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries never to use nuclear weapons in Europe;
- A treaty to disband both the NATO and Warsaw Pact military blocs;
- A U.N. resolution for an immediate 10 percent across-the-board cut in military spending by all countries;
- A U.N. resolution calling for a three-stage disarmament program leading to complete disarmament;
- A resolution to set up an 18-nation body to negotiate general and complete disarmament;
- A total ban on the production of all nuclear weapons;
- A public agreement and a pledge by all nations never to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

These are but a few of the many proposals made by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been willing to move by smaller stages or more rapidly, more narrowly or more comprehensively—by whatever methods the other side would agree to. These proposals reflect the whole history of the Soviet Union and the nature of the Soviet society.

The first legislative act of the Soviet government, *The Peace Decree*, passed in November 1917, called for “recognition of the full equality of all peoples; respect for their national and state independence; good neighborly relations with all states irrespective of their social or political systems; and non-interference in other countries’ internal affairs.”

The Soviet Union makes peace proposals because its interests lie in peace. What would it gain by war? It is peace that enables it to go on with the task of further developing its economy and enriching the lives of its people.

We could ask ourselves, what if the United States had made a series of proposals like those made by the Soviet Union? If this happened, the whole world situation would have been different. The Soviet Union would have accepted such proposals because it is in agreement with them. And the world would not be in the dangerous arms situation it now finds itself in.

But far from making such proposals itself, the United States government goes to great lengths to distort the proposals made by the Soviet Union. With the help of the monopoly-controlled media, it spreads arguments such as, “the Soviets are not really serious,” “their

proposals are only propaganda," and "you can't trust the Russians." Large sums of money and great skill in molding public opinion are dedicated to the propagation of this type of argument.

But there is only one way to find out whether the Soviets are serious, whether you can trust them, etc. And that is to say: Let's sit down with them and try to work out their proposals. Until the United States does this, its protestations cannot be taken seriously. Until it does this, we have to consider that the U.S. protestations about the Soviets are a smokescreen to cover up the fact that it itself doesn't want to end the arms race.

The basic question is, who refuses to accept military parity? Leonid Brezhnev and other Soviet leaders have stated that the Soviet Union, as a matter of principled policy, is not striving for superiority and will not do so. If one thinks of the interests of the Soviet Union, they can be believed. The interests of the Soviet Union lie in disarmament and peace, not in promoting an arms race. The Soviet leaders have also stated that they will not allow the Soviet Union to fall behind either. They can also be believed in this. The Soviet Union has to be able to defend itself. To allow the Soviet Union to fall behind would be dangerous both for itself and the peace of the world.

It is the United States that keeps pushing ahead in an attempt to gain superiority. The United States has been doing this from the beginning, when it started the arms race, and it is doing it today. With cruise missiles, the neutron bomb and Trident II nuclear submarines, it is trying to break the nuclear balance.

But to end the nuclear arms race, a strategic nuclear balance, strategic parity, is absolutely necessary. The United States must end the drive for nuclear superiority. It must free itself of the concept of trying to be No. 1. The No. 1 syndrome is deadly. Nuclear balance with the Soviet Union means being No. 1 together. In today's world it is not possible or necessary to be No. 1. It can only lead to the nuclear graveyard.

So it is vital not only to get SALT II through but to halt the government on cruise missiles, the neutron bomb and the Trident II submarines. Only by doing this can we make further progress toward controlling the arms race as opposed to having it become even stronger and more dangerous.

It is also vital to counter the "linkage" argument that the United States should not sign a SALT II agreement unless the Soviet Union

changes its policy of being on the side of the forces of national liberation. National liberation is a historic process. They are movements propelled by the forces of each country. What the Brzezinskis and Jacksons want is that the Soviet Union should stand aside as the forces of imperialism and, in the first place, U.S. imperialism re-establish their colonial holding over the newly liberated countries.

SALT II can be linked only to an end to the nuclear arms race. It can be the link between life or death.

March 22, 1979

Firing Up the Arms Race

The Carter administration's renewal of an open-ended arms race not only increases the danger of war, but is going to exact a terrible economic price from the people of the United States. And from the viewpoint of national security the arms race, the military buildup, is totally unnecessary. Therefore, the squandering of our money and resources is a complete waste because no one is preparing to attack the United States. No one is planning to take over the sea routes or the oil pipelines.

The press has been publishing articles about how the jacking up of the military budget will be good for our sick economy, will shorten the recession into which we are moving, etc. These articles are deliberately misleading. The increased military expenditures will exacerbate all the major economic problems from which we are suffering. They will cause our economy to go even further out of control.

Here are some of the specific things that pouring still more billions into the military budget will do:

- Spur the inflation to still higher levels. Last year the Consumer Price Index shot up by over 13 percent. Over the next several years the

increase can easily be pushed to much higher percentages, percentages that now seem unthinkable.

- Cause a further decline in the international value of the dollar. This would have many ramifications. For example, it would aggravate the energy crisis. The oil exporting countries would increase their prices still more to compensate for the dollar's reduced value. And, reluctant to exchange any more of their oil than they have to for such a bad investment as the dollar, they could limit their output and exports even more than they have already been doing.

- Burn up billions that should be going into attacks on our innumerable economic and social problems—into putting our millions of unemployed Black and other minority youth to work, rebuilding our decaying cities, creating the mass transit systems necessary for a serious attack on the energy problem, setting up a decent health care system, giving our social security system an adequate financial base so that benefits don't have to be cut or taxes raised.

Yes, someone might say, but how about unemployment and recession? Don't military contracts create jobs? Won't increased military expenditures reduce unemployment and keep us out of recessions or, at least, reduce their strength?

Many people have past experience in mind when they think of the relationship between military expenditures and the economy. They remember or have read about how World War II pulled the United States out of the seemingly endless depression of the 1930s. And it is true, it was the war which pulled the United States out of the Great Depression. But no analogy can be drawn between then and now. The economic situation is different. The nature of the military expenditures is different.

In talking about the economic effects of military expenditures we have to distinguish between the specific effects on a particular industry, locality or group of workers and the overall effects on the economy as a whole. A military contract can create jobs for a particular group of workers in a specific industry and locality. but military expenditures cannot, given the present state of the U.S. economy, significantly reduce the overall rate of unemployment—but they are the main factor keeping it high.

Similarly, military expenditures may be able at some point to bring about a temporary, artificial flare-up in economic activity. But they can do so only at the expense of weakening the economy, of aggravat-

ing the problems of inflation and a weak dollar, of lowering—not raising—the underlying rate of growth. It is the bloated military budget that bears the main responsibility for the low rate of economic growth in recent years, for the sideways movement of the economy in 1979, for the recession into which we have been moving.

How does this work? Why does the military budget aggravate unemployment, hold back economic growth?

First is the fact that, dollar for dollar, military expenditures create on the average only half the jobs that civilian expenditures do. Studies by respected university economists have shown this. Most of the money for the fancy, crazy weapons that now take up such a large part of the military budget go into costly special metals and other such materials, into super-high salaries for the highly specialized scientists and technicians involved, into very fat company profits—not into the wages and salaries of ordinary working people. Government expenditures have their limits, especially at a time of inflation. Pre-empting money for the military budget from the limited funds available means preventing that money from being used in other ways that could create twice as many jobs. So the military budget costs jobs.

It also aggravates the problems plaguing our industries. Take the sick steel industry which has been closing down plants, throwing tens of thousands out of work and devastating whole communities.

A good part of the reason for the sickness of the steel industry is that the demand for steel is artificially being kept low by the priorities which favor the military budget. We could use a great deal more steel if we had programs to rebuild our cities, construct mass transit systems, fix up our bridges, etc. Such programs would also help put the unemployed to work and help ease the energy crisis. But the military budget stands in the way of putting such programs into effect.

Government Creates Recession

The second point is that by spurring inflation and making the dollar still more shaky internationally the increase in military expenditures will, regardless of temporary, short-run effects, basically reduce economic growth and make for recession rather than the opposite.

The government has to try to keep inflation and the weakening of the dollar from getting out of hand and the capitalist way of doing this is to deliberately reduce economic growth and create recession. The government hopes that the decline in demand that comes with reduced

growth and recession will reduce inflation and strengthen the dollar.

The government produces reduced economic growth and recession by hiking interest rates and tightening credit. This makes it much more expensive for businessmen to hold large inventories. To cut the inventories they reduce production. Rising interest rates also reduce housing construction. They price buyers out of the market by raising mortgage payments. In similar ways, rising interest rates and tight credit choke the entire economy.

All recent administrations have used the credit mechanism to deliberately create recessions. The Vietnam War got a big inflation going and with its gigantic expenditures overseas gave body blows to the international value of the dollar.

The Nixon administration deliberately created a recession in 1970 in the hope of containing the problems. In 1974, double digit inflation erupted and the Ford administration worked to create a recession. In 1979, the inflation zoomed up again and there were dollar crises.

The Carter administration took measures to reduce growth and bring on recession. Economic growth was low throughout the 1970s. The recession and low growth rate are part of the economic cost of the Vietnam War and the high military expenditures that have continued even after it ended.

The damaging effect of military expenditures on growth can also be shown by one or two international comparisons. If military expenditures were good for economic growth the United States ought to have the highest growth rate of the capitalist countries. It is far from doing so. West Germany and Japan, for example, have been having far superior higher growth rates. West Germany has caught up with the once far superior U.S. economy, and Japan is rapidly doing so. It is no accident that these are countries that were defeated in World War II. They have had no wars since then. And their military expenditures have been far lower than those of the United States.

In the United States the standard of living is now declining. Workers' *real* wages (that is, taking rising prices into account) are now lower than they were 10 years ago and are falling faster than ever.

As if this weren't enough, the inflation is also pushing us into higher and higher tax bracket so that taxes are steadily, year-in year-out, taking a bigger and bigger bite out of our incomes.

I don't have to say what this steady erosion of our standard of living means to people. It hurts the great majority of our people and

especially hurts our working class with a particularly devastating impact on Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican and other oppressed peoples. The big business-dominated government has been dumping the costs of the wars and the crazy armaments on the backs of our people, especially the workers and racially and nationally oppressed peoples.

The firing up of the arms race means still more of the same. The spokesmen for the government haven't bothered to hide this. Carter has already announced wage cuts for 1980-81, and they have the gall to say that the standard of living of the people of the United States has to be lowered.

The firing up of the arms race means still more recessions, reduced economic growth and unemployment, still lower real wages, still less money for dealing with the crises of the cities.

This is the minimum that will happen: a further eating away of the standard of living and the quality of life, a further worsening of the many terrible problems.

But more—much more—could happen. Our government has already lost a great deal of its control over the economy. The increase in arms expenditures could easily be the blow that can break the helm and rudder down altogether. An economic explosion could occur—a complete collapse of the dollar, a breakdown of international trade, a big prolonged depression.

And now the Carter administration wants to re-establish the draft to match the huge military budget. It is a policy of wasting our precious resources—human, material and financial.

The ancients had a saying: "Whom the Gods would destroy they first make mad." Firing up the arms race is madness, not just from the viewpoint of peace, but also from that of the economy. It is up to the people of the United States to put a stop to this madness. The more quickly this is done the less will be the damage, and the sooner we can begin an attack on our real problems. As a starter there should be a transfer of \$100 billion from the military budget to useful, peacetime, job-creating projects, including the rebuilding of our cities.

February 14, 1980

What Really Happened in Afghanistan?

The propaganda blitzkrieg, orchestrated and personally led by President Carter from the White House, has reached an unprecedented, hysterical level. It is so irrational and unbalanced as to reach levels of insanity, madness.

The aim of this frenzied barrage is to whip the American people into a state of hysterical nationalism and anti-Sovietism, into a pro-war, military psychosis.

The propaganda blitzkrieg is based on complete fabrication. No one is preparing to attack the United States, in the first place not the Soviet Union. No one is preparing to take over the sea lanes or the oil routes. No one is after the oil fields *except* Exxon and Shell. And no one is "pushing the United States around."

Not since Hitler and Goebbels has a government been the source of such sinister lies and deception.

The White House and the mass media have abandoned all pretense of principles and human decency: honesty, integrity, and morality.

As U.S. imperialism loses its grip on the world, it is also losing its grip on sanity. The loss of Iran as a cheap source of oil was a blow, but the events in Afghanistan sent them reeling over the precipice of reason.

U.S. imperialism now stands before the world nakedly and brazenly brandishing the Big Stick and the Big Lie, in a desperate attempt to hold back the tide of revolution and national liberation. But it is a lost cause. The clock of history cannot be turned back.

Still, every hour on the hour we are subjected to new horror stories ground out by the White House. The mass media, serving as the pipeline for this mad frenzy, admit that reports from Afghanistan cannot be verified, that there is no evidence to sustain them. Nevertheless, they make daily headlines. And our president, who promised he "would never lie to the American people," has turned into a president who lives by the Big Lie.

But the truth is that the White House witches, who are frantically cooking up these horror stories and feeding them to the media, are failing to poison our people. The American people are not swallowing their witches' brew.

It is true that this brew of slander and lies has created confusion. There is a rising tide of nationalism. But the people have not been swept up into the hysterical headlines.

On the international level, the Carter administration has also failed in its frantic efforts to gain support from its allies for actions against the Soviet Union, or the economic sanctions against Iran. The time has long passed when U.S. imperialism can command the whole capitalist world to obey its orders. It is no longer a winning game, and the U.S. allies are refusing to play a losing game,

But the Carter administration, refusing to live in the real world, continues to play the classical imperialist game. The Carter administration has been talking about detente and SALT II, but in practice has been and still is hell-bent on making it possible for the United States to strike first with nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union.

Last night, Carter outlined his so-called "Carter Doctrine." In it he turned history on its head. He accused the Soviet Union of not reciprocating the U.S. moves toward peace and detente. What could be farther from the truth? Events of just the last year are proof enough of who is not reciprocating.

The Soviet Union proposed a total ban on the production of any new ballistic missiles. The United States rejected it. The Soviet proposal to end all nuclear weapons testing, which included on-site inspections, was rejected by the Carter administration. The Soviet agreement on mutual balanced force and equal troop reductions in Europe, which was a NATO-U.S. proposal originally, was rejected. Some months ago a story was supposedly leaked to *The New York Times* about a new Carter policy which said among other things:

The United States should not enter into new negotiations until it is thoroughly satisfied that talks would not harm existing military programs.

After the Soviet announcement of unilateral withdrawal of 20,000 troops and 2,000 tanks from the territory of the German Democratic Republic and a proposal for unilateral withdrawal of Soviet missiles from the center of Europe, the Carter administration forced NATO to accept the 572 new, medium-range missiles, targeted on every major

Soviet city. In the same period, the Carter administration decided to go ahead with the MX mobile missile system. At the same time, through visits and agreements with China, the Carter administration was preparing the China card. And each month, Carter announced additional increases in the military budget.

And to top off these actions, there was a scuttling of the SALT II treaty.

From these actions the Soviet Union could only draw one conclusion: the Carter administration had abandoned the balanced, equal approach and had accepted the concept of nuclear superiority and a policy of nuclear first-strike. This proves that Carter's claim the Soviet Union did not reciprocate U.S. moves toward peace is a total falsehood.

Carter went even further in standing history on its head. He claimed that the formation of the NATO military alliance was a response to the formation of the Warsaw Pact alliance. Here again, the reverse is true. The only way to defend imperialist policies of aggression is to stand history on its head.

U.S. Policy of Encirclement

Carter sets up a hue and cry about Soviet "aggression," while U.S. imperialism actually speeds up its 60-year policy of encircling the Soviet Union.

The decision made three months ago to deploy 572 additional cruise and Pershing II missiles in West Europe—missiles that can reach and obliterate all Soviet cities—is nothing but an act of encirclement. It is an aggressive act against the very existence of the Soviet Union. What would the U.S. reaction be if the Soviet Union decided to place missiles in Mexico and Canada?

The decision to place additional nuclear missiles in West Europe was the Carter administration's response to the latest Soviet peace initiative. The Soviet Union is unilaterally withdrawing troops and tanks from Europe, and also announced its readiness to withdraw some of its medium-range missiles from western USSR. Thus, proposals and moves toward peace are answered by moves toward encirclement and war. In its own defense, the Soviet Union is forced to draw some conclusions from such actions.

Giving China and Pakistan modern weapons and war technology is an aggressive act of encirclement. Pushing Japan to re-arm and to

form a U.S.-China-Japan, anti-Soviet axis is nothing but a further move toward encircling the Soviet Union.

Carter slanders Babrak Karmal, the prime minister of Afghanistan and hypocritically covers up the fact that the U.S., China and Egypt have been recruiting, financing, arming and training the Afghan counter-revolutionary insurgents ever since the 1978 people's democratic revolution.

Carter objects to some airfields in Afghanistan, while the U.S. has been and is increasing its forces and military hardware in over 1,400 military bases around the world—which completely surround the Soviet Union.

Carter self-righteously condemns Soviet troop movements, while more U.S. nuclear warships are heading full-steam toward the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf to join the world's largest naval armada already in place.

Carter rails about Soviet bases, but on the same day he signs an agreement with Turkey for 26 new bases on Turkey's soil, adding further to missile encirclement of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union is completely surrounded by U.S. nuclear missiles and submarines, but the Carter administration is seeking new military bases in Egypt, Israel, Somalia and Oman, to supply and service the 100,000-man "rapid deployment force," to be used for intervention in the Middle East and Indian Ocean areas. Can these be anything but acts of encirclement and aggression?

The president's State of the Union message to Congress was billed as the new "Carter Doctrine," a so-called "Framework for Regional Cooperation." But the content and tone of his speech and the recent actions of his administration clearly show that there is *no new policy*. It is more open and stepped-up, but it is a continuation of the same old policy that led to the years of aggression against Vietnam, that overthrew democratically-elected governments in Iran, Guatemala and Chile. It is the same old policy that brought on the cold war. And it is the same policy of undermining and destabilizing the socialist countries, of holding back and reversing the national liberation movements around the world. It is the same policy that holds Puerto Rico in colonial bondage. It is the policy of Guantanamo, the Bay of Pigs and the invasion of the Dominican Republic. The crises in Iran and Afghanistan are a direct response to this same long-term policy of intervention, adventurism, interference, subversion and aggression.

It is the same policy of aggressive anti-communism that sustains the 60-year, selective economic blockade against the Soviet Union, the 21-year blockade against Cuba, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries.

In Afghanistan, this very same policy of actively undermining and destabilizing has been in effect for years, and especially since April 1978. It is a policy of subverting, infiltrating, recruiting, training, financing and arming of counter-revolutionary insurgents—feudal landlords and their hirelings—in gross violation of the sovereignty and independence of Afghanistan. It is flagrant interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

Is there proof of these activities? Before the blanket of secrecy was clamped on them, reporters for *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post* and *Christian Science Monitor* wrote openly about these activities. They reported what they saw and witnessed.

A year ago, on February 2, *The Washington Post* correspondent described "Guerrillas trained in Pakistan to oust the Afghan government." Further, he wrote, "Afghan dissidents are undergoing guerrilla training at a base near here—in Afghanistan—in a bid to intensify armed opposition to the government in Kabul." Quoting a former major in the Afghan army, he continued, "We are training them to be familiar with all the weapons of warfare."

Referring to the support for the counter-revolutionary forces from the outside, Joseph Harsch wrote in the *Christian Science Monitor* of August 9, 1979, that:

Pakistan has received the backing of China and the United States. The Afghan rebels have been trained and armed inside Pakistan, and *no reprisals made by Moscow.*

It is also known that two of the top leaders of the counter-revolutionary forces in Afghanistan are U.S. citizens—trained and sent back to Afghanistan by the CIA.

In April of last year, *The New York Times* correspondent in Pakistan confirmed that China has been using the territory of Pakistan as a base for anti-Afghan activities:

The nerve center of the rebel campaign is at Miram Shah in northern Pakistan. A system of couriers carries information and orders back and forth between the rebel fighting units in Afghanistan and the planners of the operations at various bases on the Pakistan side of the border.

And this, from a report published in the Canadian magazine, *McLean's*, about the activities of Chinese specialists on Pakistani territory, shortly after the 1978 Afghan Revolution:

They are here to help train and equip right-wing Moslem guerrillas for their holy war against the Moscow-backed Kabul regime of Noor Mohammad Taraki. (Taraki was the first democratically elected Prime Minister of Afghanistan.)

Last summer, the French magazine, *Courrier de Politique*, wrote:

The road built by the Chinese, linking the Sinkiang Region with Pakistan, is being used for the transport of weapons, ammunition and propaganda material designed for the carrying out of subversive activities on Afghan soil.

The infiltration, the training and the arming of the counter-revolutionary forces and the acts of betrayal by Amin reached a point of crisis.

U.S. Subversion

The Afghan Revolutionary Council had to make a choice: either permit total defeat of the people's democratic revolution, the loss of independence and being turned into another anti-Soviet base, or call for help. They chose to fight and asked the Soviet Union for aid, based on the Treaty of Friendship and Good Neighborliness between the two countries.

I happen to agree. But whether or not one agrees with the Afghan assessment of the crisis does not matter, because the Afghan Revolutionary Council—representing all sections of the population—is the only body that has the right to make such decisions and they acted on their assessment. Some think that only England, Japan and West Germany have the right to invite troops, but not Afghanistan.

The policies of imperialist aggression, adventurism, subversion and missile-encirclement are the world realities the Soviet Union has to deal with and respond to. To ignore this would be to do so at its own peril. This is also the framework in which every honest person has to deal with developments in Afghanistan and Iran.

In this kind of situation the question of intent and motive is crucial. There is the old story of two groups entering a neighbor's house. Superficially it would seem they have the same motives, the same intentions. But it is quite possible that the intention of one is to rob a

neighbor and the intention of the other is to be neighborly and helpful. These are always difficult questions to assess. But the same analogy can be applied to the intentions and motives of imperialism and those of the socialist countries.

Imperialist policies of aggression have but one motive, one intention: to gain riches and huge profits for the corporations, monopolies and banks, to plunder the resources and exploit the labor of its neighbors. That is the motive and intent of all policies of aggression. That is the intent and motive behind Carter's sabre-rattling speech last night.

When Carter talks about "our national interests," what he is really talking about are the interests of U.S. big business.

The intent of the actions of U.S. imperialism has three specific interests in Afghanistan:

1. To reverse the people's democratic revolution and bring back the old feudal society of landlords and oppression;
2. To turn Afghanistan into an anti-Soviet military staging area;
3. To build a base of operations against Iran and some of the other OPEC countries, in order to secure the oil interests of Exxon, Gulf and Shell.

The Soviet Union, because it is a socialist society, has the very opposite interests and intent:

1. To prevent Afghanistan from losing its independence and being turned into an imperialist military staging area on the USSR's southern border, and,
2. To assist Afghanistan in repulsing aggression from outside and to save the Afghan people's revolution.

One is a reactionary policy of enslavement and imperialist oppression. The other supports a progressive policy of national liberation and socialism.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is also not a new one. Since its birth in 1917, Soviet foreign policy has been one of peace and solidarity with the forces of national liberation, and an unflinching and a staunch defense of socialism.

In fact, structurally, politically and ideologically the socialist countries are *incapable* of plundering other countries for profit or riches.

In a socialist society there are no individuals, no corporations no

monopolies who can benefit from such profits. Therefore, one can accept as true the Soviet statements that Soviet troops will leave Afghanistan once the causes that made the Afghan leadership request their introduction disappear—as soon as the dangers of direct subversion, aggression and counter-revolution are over.

The question has been raised: who in Afghanistan asked for Soviet military and economic assistance? There is no mystery about it. It was the Afghan People's revolutionary council. And who are the members of the Revolutionary Council? They are representatives of every sector of Afghan society. The great majority are people who have long histories of struggle against the old society of feudal landlords.

The question has also been raised: who disposed of Amin and his tyrannical government, which was destroying the base of the revolution? It was the same Afghan People's Revolutionary Council. And who elected the new cabinet, headed by Prime Minister Babrak Karmal? It was the same Revolutionary Council.

The mass media keep raving about the Soviet troops in Afghanistan, but we should keep in mind that there are more U.S. troops in each of the countries of Great Britain, Japan and West Germany than there are Soviet forces in Afghanistan.

The Maoist leaders of China are increasingly giving their support to policies of counter-revolution and imperialist aggression. They are serving as an imperialist channel to the counter-revolutionary forces throughout the world. They serve as a conduit for arms to these reactionary forces. That is the role they are playing in Afghanistan.

A few days ago, with a lot of fanfare, the Maoist leadership announced it was calling off discussions with the Soviet Union on the normalization of relations. The truth is they never seriously undertook such negotiations. The hypocrisy and fakery of the Maoists knows no bounds.

Two months ago, a Chinese delegation went to Moscow, not to discuss or negotiate, but to present a list of outrageous *demands* which included:

1. A *demand* that the Soviet Union make a public declaration that it had given up its hegemonism;
2. A *demand* that the Soviet Union unilaterally withdraw all its military forces from the USSR-China border, including from Mongolia;

3. A *demand* that the Soviet Union withdraw all aid and support and break all relations with Vietnam and Kampuchea.

Now they announce they are calling off these so-called negotiations.

Anti-Sovietism Serves as Smokescreen

The Carter administration's feverishly stepped-up anti-Soviet crusade serves the purpose of a smokescreen for pushing policies of aggression, to build up military forces and bases for intervention in the Indian Ocean and Middle East regions.

Anti-Sovietism serves as a smokescreen to deflect the rising anger and militant fightback of the people against the twin monsters—the unprecedented military budgets and unconscionable corporate profits—the real enemies of the American people. It serves as a smoke-screen to persuade the people they must accept more sacrifices, more austerity, more belt-tightening—and to create the image that to reject this assault on their standard of living would be anti-American, unpatriotic and against national interests and national security.

Anti-Sovietism also serves to divert the American people from policies and practices of increased racism and oppression at home. And, at the same time, it serves to whip up prejudice, bigotry, nationalism and false patriotism aimed at the Iranian and other oppressed people.

Fanning the flames of racism and chauvinism serves the overall class purpose of pitting one group against another—the capitalist weapon of divide and rule—to prevent the people from uniting to fight the common enemy, monopoly capital.

Anti-Sovietism and anti-communism provide a smokescreen for stepped-up attacks against liberals, progressives, Communists and the democratic rights of all the people, when the only real threat to our national security and national interests—as well as to our very survival—is an *internal* one. The threat is coming from the born-again hawks and cold warriors in the White House and Pentagon who are working to turn the clock back to the cold war era. The threat to world peace does not come from Kabul or Tcheran. The danger emanates from Washington.

Carter's State of the Union speech was *not* about the state of our nation. He told us more about the state of the presidency than

anything else. There is one thing Carter has mastered in the White House. He has become a shrewd and skillful demagogue. He is obediently and efficiently carrying out the directives of the Rockefeller-led Trilateral Commission—that in order to put over policies that are against the best self-interests of the people it is necessary to *create* an external foe, a fictitious enemy that supposedly threatens the very life of our nation.

Recently, the “external foes” have been the Oil Producing and Exporting Countries (OPEC) and Iran. Now the “external foe” is the Soviet Union in Afghanistan.

Previously, U.S. imperialism claimed that South America, Asia and much of Africa were vital national interests. Now, Carter adds the Persian Gulf. Together, these areas encompass the whole world. And anyone who threatens these “national interests” is an “external foe.” This is precisely the concept of world domination—one which the world will not accept.

The real meaning of Carter’s State of the Union speech was to get across the message that the people must silently and passively accept: the ever-increasing taxes, the escalating prices of meat and gas, the \$1 per gallon heating oil, the skyrocketing rents, the continuing decline in real wages, the huge corporate profits, the decay of our cities, the cuts in social services, the closing of hospitals, day care centers, schools and plants, the growing unemployment, the \$200 billion military budgets, a renewal of the military draft and a new cold war, cuts in state and city budgets, racism and discrimination, attacks on trade unions and the labor movement. Carter talked about sacrifices, but not one word about sacrifices by the fat cats.

In other words, we are asked to tolerate a drastic deterioration of our standard of living and overall quality of life because the Soviet Union sent military forces to help the people of Afghanistan.

Yes, our country is in grave danger, but it is not coming from the Soviet Union. The threat to our nation is right here in our own country, in the White House and the Pentagon. And now we are being asked to re-elect this peanut vendor to another term so he can carry out these policies.

People are asking whether we are now entering another period of cold war, with its accompanying repression of democratic rights, whether we are actually going to see a resurrection of McCarthyism.

Of course, one can never rule out such developments as long as we

have capitalism. But it would be premature and unwarranted to draw such conclusions at the present moment.

There are many obstacles monopoly capital would have to overcome in order to move in this direction.

The American people have not forgotten the terrible experiences of McCarthyism. Nor have they forgotten Watergate. As a result the people do not trust the government or the monopolies and have therefore not succumbed to the hysteria. This is a most powerful safeguard against Cold War II. Although not everyone agrees on Afghanistan, most are strongly against a return to cold war which can lead to a nuclear war.

Also, the ruling circles are not of one mind about moving in this direction. Although there are elements that would set in motion a period of repression, there are also loud voices among the ruling class who strongly favor peace, detente, increased trade and peaceful coexistence because these policies are in their self-interests—because they make more profits from peace and trade than from war and embargoes.

We must also never forget that there is a great, swelling reservoir of potential fightback, of anti-monopoly power, in the mass movements of our people. And of course there is the basic change in the balance of world forces. U.S. imperialism can no longer proceed in the same way as in the past in its attempt to dominate, control and plunder the countries of the world.

The actions of the Carter administration to impose sanctions, blockades, embargoes and boycotts on the Soviet Union are backfiring. The NATO allies, as well as others, are refusing to participate. They know it is in their self-interest to maintain and increase trade relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. So some will give lip service, but they will not change their policies and practices. The cold war policies are bankrupt and the capitalist countries are not going to blindly follow the United States into bankruptcy.

Domestically, the embargo actions of the Carter administration in the sale of grain, technology and trade generally are not receiving the support of the majority, including many who are losing profits and also stand to lose their businesses and farms as a result of the trade sanctions against the Soviet Union.

The whole country will suffer, but especially the working class will

be forced to shoulder the cost of the new measures, which will speed up the development of economic crisis, further weaken the U.S. position on world trade, the dollar, and deepen the world monetary crisis.

But the state of the union is not half as bad as the state of the presidency. The level of Carter's frenzy is dramatically highlighted in his attempt to boycott the Olympics and turn the Olympic games into part of his war game. His attempt to intimidate U.S. athletes into boycotting the Olympics, and to force the International Olympics Committee to move the games from Moscow is a good example of his hysteria, hatred and blindness.

The irresponsible actions of Carter are going to cost the American people tens of billions of dollars. The effects are going to be felt for years to come. These measures have already added \$32 billion to the federal budget.

Can't Halt World Revolution

In his approach to the Soviet Union, Carter makes the same mistake as Hitler made. It is a total underestimation of the inherent, inner strength of socialism.

The socialist community is a basically self-contained, vibrant community of states. Therefore, basically its development and growth do not depend on imports or exports. Science, a high level of technology, economic and social planning provide socialism with a protective shield against the maneuvers of imperialism to in any way stifle its development. Capitalism has been trying for 60 years, without any success.

As was the case in the past, it is the United States that will become more isolated and weaker. It is the United States that will be caught holding the bag again.

As Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev said in a recent statement:

The unilateral measures taken by the United States are tantamount to serious miscalculations in politics. Like a boomerang, they will hit back at their initiators, if not today then tomorrow.

Developments in the recent period were a surprise to many. They should not have been a surprise to members of our Party.

Almost six months ago, in a report to the 22nd National Convention of our Party, we stated:

As long as U.S. policies of aggression are directed against the forces of the world revolutionary process a number of results will follow. The world will continue to face the danger of war and nuclear catastrophe. The war budget, taxes and inflation will continue to escalate.

And further, we said:

But U.S. foreign policy line remains: that is, to mobilize the maximum forces against all sectors of the world revolutionary process, with the aim of halting or reversing that process. U.S. imperialism especially works to separate these movements from the Soviet Union. U.S. imperialism continues its efforts to reverse the Mideast sector of the world revolutionary process. They are especially focused on Iran, Afghanistan and South Yemen.

The recent actions of U.S. imperialism are very much within this framework.

The most dangerous aspect of the present moment is that the recent developments, the irresponsible actions and serious miscalculations of President Carter can inch the world toward a nuclear confrontation, a nuclear holocaust.

The danger is that Carter will use the UN resolution on Afghanistan and Iran in the same manner as President Johnson used the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to escalate the war against Vietnam.

There is a new, heightened danger. But there is also a new strong sentiment for preserving peace.

It always takes a while for the people to get their bearings in a new situation. But as soon as they realize that the so-called dangers are artificially created and that the actions and policies of the Carter administration add up to a new threat of world war, they will move resolutely and militantly to reject and resist such policies.

So what about the future? The Carter demagoguery will become exposed. The crisis in Afghanistan will be solved. The people in Afghanistan will go on building a new life. The Soviet forces will be withdrawn. The Summer Olympic games in Moscow will be the greatest. And we will have one helluva election campaign.

History is full of crises. They come and go. But the world revolutionary process—the world process of national liberation and socialism—will continue to be the same track for human progress.

The pressures for detente, for peaceful co-existence, relaxation of tensions, disarmament and SALT II will continue to accelerate. They

will not go away. They have become features of the new world reality.

And when history looks back in retrospect at this moment historians will once again be asking: "Jimmy who?"

January 30, 1980

U.S.-Soviet Military Balance A Must for Peace

The most important task facing the people of the United States today is to turn around the present U.S. foreign and military policy. This policy can only lead to disasters of one sort or another. It not only increases the danger of war. By pouring hundreds of billions of dollars down the armaments rathole it makes it impossible to mount a serious attack on the exploding economic and social crisis in the United States. It feeds the problems—runaway inflation and a declining standard of living, heavy unemployment, decaying cities, a shaky social security system, an inhuman health care system, etc.

Yes, some people might say, but do we have a choice? What about Soviet armaments? Do we want the Soviets to be able to push us around? What about Afghanistan?

The corporation-controlled U.S. media are constantly swamping us with myths and lies on all these questions. They miss no bets. They take advantage of our natural love of country to get us to believe what they want us to believe. But now more than ever it is important that the people of the United States think these things through for themselves. That's the only way we can get on the road to solving our problems.

A good point to begin with is: Who started the arms race? Who has been the first to develop the deadly new weapons? Who keeps the arms

race heated up? We have to try to get honest, accurate answers to these questions because only such answers serve the interests of the people of the United States.

There can really be no question—especially for people old enough to remember the early 1950s—about who started the arms race. *The U.S. did.* The Soviet Union was suffering from the devastation of World War II. Thousands of their towns, villages, factories and farms had been destroyed. The last thing the Soviet Union needed or wanted was an arms race. The United States was preparing for a possible war to “roll back” socialism. It was convinced that an arms race would retard the economic growth of the Soviet Union.

The same answer holds for the question: Who has been the first to develop the deadly new weapons? Of the 30 or so such weapons, all but two or three were first developed by the United States. For example, the United States developed the atom bomb. It was the first to develop MIRVs (independently targeted re-entry vehicles), by which a number of separate nuclear warheads can be delivered by one missile. The United States is the one who is now developing the cruise missile and the neutron bomb, which kills people with minimum damage to property.

Faced with the U.S. arms buildup the Soviet Union had no choice. It had to develop its own weapons and build up its armaments to be able to defend itself.

During these same years the Soviet Union has made over a hundred concrete proposals to stop the arms race and to cut back nuclear stockpiles. The United States has not responded.

The arms race has not had the results intended by the U.S. militarists. What has come about is a situation in which if nuclear war broke out both sides would be destroyed and life on earth could easily be wiped out completely.

A recognition of this situation has to be the central principle of the foreign policy of the United States, the Soviet Union and all other countries. A thermonuclear war simply cannot be allowed to happen—no matter what. There is no alternative to peaceful coexistence between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been and is today for such policies.

Many leaders of the United States have at least partly recognized this. Detente, which got under way in 1972, was based on this recognition. It was no coincidence that detente happened when it did.

By the end of the 1960s the leading U.S. political and military experts had come to the conclusion that the Soviet Union and the United States were militarily equal. Military equality helped to produce a lessening of tensions, helped make it clear that the arms race was senseless and should be controlled and ended. By the same token, any attempt to achieve military superiority makes for instability and is dangerous.

The present crisis in U.S.-Soviet relations is the direct result of the Carter administration-Pentagon decision to destroy the military balance between the two nations.

During the last three years opposition in the U.S. government to detente and arms control has grown. The Pentagon, Brzezinski and Carter are unhappy with military equality with the Soviet Union. They want military superiority.

They want military superiority not because they are worried about an attack by the Soviet Union on the United States, Western Europe, the Middle East or anywhere else. They know better than this. They know the Soviet Union isn't going to attack anyone. If they really thought the Soviet Union was going to attack, they—and the countries of Western Europe which have been reluctant to increase their military expenditures—would be acting very differently. *The reason they want military superiority is to increase the ability of the United States to intervene in other countries around the world. The so-called "Soviet threat" is a fraud.*

The imperialists have been watching with great concern the spread of revolutions of national liberation throughout the world—in Africa, the Middle East, Central America and the Caribbean. The imperialists don't care that the peoples of these areas are fighting to free themselves from racist oppressors, as in Southern Africa, or murderous dictatorships, as in El Salvador. They want to be able to defend the interests of the multinational corporations and the Pentagon, to hold back or control the revolutions. They want to be able to intervene militarily if need be. And they feel that to have a free hand to do this they need military superiority over the Soviet Union.

This isn't all. The imperialists also want to get rid of what they call the "Vietnam syndrome"—the opposition of the people of the United States to intervention in foreign countries. They remember how Kissinger prodded Congress for support for the idea of sending U.S.

forces to Angola four years ago, and how he was told that the people wouldn't stand for it. They don't want this sort of thing to happen again.

And so they have deliberately decided to move away from detente, to increase tensions. They feel that tension creates a better climate for getting support of the people for U.S. intervention abroad.

However, a return to policies that are based on a U.S.-Soviet military balance are essential for detente and world peace and they are in the interests of the people of the U.S.

The sending of Soviet troops into Afghanistan was not the cause of the Carter administration's actions to increase the military budget and try to create a climate of hysteria. It was the pretext.

This can be seen clearly from the pattern of its actions long before Afghanistan became an issue.

Over a-year-and-a-half ago the U.S., at a meeting of NATO countries, twisted the arms of its allies to get them to agree to large increases in their military expenditures, and promised in return that U.S. military expenditures would be greatly and steadily increased over the next five years.

The United States also worked to get its West European allies to agree to the stationing on their territory of Pershing II and cruise missiles directed against the Soviet Union. Both are first-strike weapons. During this same period, the United States began to build up and train a "rapid deployment force," mainly for possible intervention in the Middle East. And finally, the United States began to play the so-called China card more strongly, to move into a more open military alliance with China against the Soviet Union, to provide China with modern weapons, etc.

It doesn't take a military strategist to see what the pattern underlying these actions is. It is an attempt to build a nuclear military ring around the Soviet Union.

The events in Afghanistan have been shrewdly presented and demagogically used to promote both Carter's re-election campaign and a previously decided policy of increasing tension and the military budget. Carter and the media didn't tell us of the massive U.S. intervention that long preceded the Soviet action—of how the United States, in cahoots with China, was training and arming tens of thousands of guerrillas in Pakistan and sending them across the

border to try to overthrow the government of Afghanistan. What they did was to invent fables about the Soviet Union wanting to acquire a warm water port or control Middle East oil. Afghanistan has had close ties with the Soviet Union since 1921. By preparing to overthrow the government of Afghanistan the imperialists were out to change these relations.

These anti-Soviet fables are reminiscent of the fake Tonkin Bay resolution which President Johnson used as the pretext for escalating the Vietnam War.

The foreign and military policy of the U.S. is our country's central problem, the key to being able to attack the other problems.

The working class cannot reverse the decline in real wages and the standard of living, Black and other racially and nationally oppressed peoples cannot mount an effective attack on their terrible economic problems, the people cannot change the situation in which everything from subways to roads to water supply systems is going to pot—unless the foreign and military policy is turned around.

And, of course, only by turning the policy around can we stop Carter or any other president from irresponsibly playing games with detente and disarmament, from flirting with war. We need a clear, consistent, reliable policy for disarmament and detente. And war, especially nuclear war, is not something to be flirted with. It is flirting with death and destruction.

March 22, 1980

Part **2**

Democracy

The Roots of the Watergate Crisis

From this overflow meeting we can see that there is one election promise Nixon is keeping. As you remember, he said he will “bring us together.” And he’s doing that in more ways than this meeting itself. He’s “bringing the people together” in the struggle against the very policies that he represents. There is growing a new mood of struggle and unity against the Watergate conspiracy in defense of the democratic institutions in our land.

Kissinger has asked the people of the United States to show “compassion” for the Watergate criminals. Agnew has asked the people not to “prejudge” the criminals and their crimes, John Mitchell, now known as “Big Honest” John, said: “I didn’t steal a penny.” Haldeman and Ehrlichman keep saying: “In our own minds we did nothing wrong.” And Nixon takes a forthright stand. He says: “I didn’t do anything wrong,” but if someone comes up with the truth, with some evidence of wrongdoing, then, “I did it because of national security.”

To Kissinger we say: Yes, you and Nixon are just the right twosome to speak to the world about compassion. You demonstrated it when six months ago you stood at the Paris airport asking the Vietnamese representatives to please extend a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year from you and Nixon to the families in Vietnam at the very moment when both of you had ordered the murderous U.S. B52 bombing raids.

You and Nixon showed your kind of compassion with the now infamous three weeks of Christmas carpet-bombing while the negotiations were in an agreed recess. At the very moment of your “peace on earth” chit-chat, mass death was on the wings to Hanoi. You showed your compassion when you said at the airport to Comrade Le Duc Tho, “We will keep in touch.” Your “compassion” is that of war criminals. Your “compassion” is that of a rattlesnake.

To Agnew, who has now become an innocent bystander, we say:

You are the very one to speak to the world and to the people of the United States about not prejudging the case before trials and not trying people by headlines. You are the one because you are so experienced. You are an expert. You have the experience of Nixon, your president, when in a public statement he convicted Angela Davis even before she was indicted.

You have the experience of convicting—without trial—reporters, judges and all who opposed your crimes, and labelling them “pinkos.” It now turns out that you and your Watergate conspirators are the “nattering nabobs of negativism,” as you were so fond of saying. Now that you are caught, Agnew, it turns out that it is you and your cohorts who are the “pusillanimous pups,” as you used to call all who opposed you.

And for those of you who do not know—the words “pusillanimous pups” describe a whimpering, grovelling puppy on a dung heap. And listening to the “new” Agnew, nothing fits better than a whimpering puppy on a dung heap, a Watergate dung heap.

To “Honest” John Mitchell we say: Of course, we believe you when you say, “I didn’t steal a penny.” After all it is an insult to such a big man to be accused of stealing pennies. We know better. We know that you were involved in swindles in which hundreds of millions of dollars were involved. It’s an insult to accuse a man of stealing pennies when we know, and you know, you were involved in stealing the United States Constitution. You always said you were a big man. As attorney general, you said that you had the right to wiretap and bug anyone you wanted to. Of course, it was, as your boss always says when he gets caught, “in the interests of national defense.”

Because outside of prison you have been such a “big man,” it is rumored—now mind you, it is only a rumor—that if you get convicted and go to Attica you will be given a job not just making license plates in general, but making license plates only with small numbers—plates that are only available for your class.

The rumor is that the Watergate criminals will have to be distributed, some in each of the nation’s prisons, as they did with Communists and radicals for years. If all of you are convicted, it’s obvious that we will have to have a new building program—a building boom in the building of new prisons. But on the other hand, maybe a good honest day’s work would be worse for you.

Because of the better facilities, we understand that the Nixon

Memorial Library will be transferred to Leavenworth—that is, if the prisoners will permit it.

When the members of the Watergate set meet—it is said in Washington—as they pass each other they say: “Pardon me.” But I think it’s wishful thinking; they will not be pardoned.

To the Haldemans and the Ehrlichmans we say: How in your own mind could you ever think you were doing anything wrong, because you were doing it for Nixon.

That’s what the thugs and the hoodlums under Hitler all said—they were doing it for the Fuehrer. They were under orders to commit crimes. With your “Gestapo mentality,” as Senator Ervin now says, how could you think it was wrong to destroy the United States Constitution?

To Nixon we say: It’s understandable why you don’t think you did anything wrong. You have nothing to compare it with, because you have been wrong all your life. But you are consistent. You have had a Gestapo mentality all your political life. You speak about national security, but events now have exposed the fact that it is you and your criminal conspiracy that is the only real danger to our national security. Events are now exposing you as the clear and present danger to the national security of the United States.

Nixon, Agnew and Mitchell may be accidents of history, but Watergate is not. Just as stinkweed grows in a pile of manure, the process that led to Watergate has its roots in the heart of monopoly capitalism. The fact that should stir every living soul in this country—should stir every living soul to action—is that right here in our very midst, under the dome of the White House, there has grown to an advanced stage a police-state structure, a contingency structure for a fascist takeover. That’s what should stir everyone into motion and into action.

What should be even more unsettling is that, more and more, this police-state structure was put into use. More and more, it took over the functions of government. That includes usurping power, uncontrolled and unaccounted-for money, and the largest police-state network of intelligence forces in the world—in the history of the world. What should unsettle and stir everyone is the fact that this center had complete and detailed plans for T-Day, for Take-Over Day.

In all this there is one piece of evidence, one document that comes closest to disclosing how dangerous and how far this plot, this

criminal conspiracy, had developed. It is the document, obviously, that Mr. Dean took out of his safe when he left the White House. It is the document which Nixon said must never see the light of day. Nixon keeps saying that he knows nothing of what went on; but when this document was mentioned, he said it must never see the light of day. He knows what is in the document. It is a Nixon document. This is the document that Senator Ervin said exposes the "Gestapo mentality of the Nixon Administration." This document was drawn up in 1970 and, parts of it, even before. Senator Ervin, who has read it, said that it would surprise and shock everyone in this country. But the Senate Committee has not released it to the public.

Let me say that it would not surprise everyone, because exactly in 1970 we Communists said publicly that there was such a conspiracy and such a movement toward fascism. The document is a master plan for massive provocations in the spirit of the Reichstag fire. It is a plan for massive roundups of thousands of Americans to be held without trial. It is a plan for frameups of every kind. It is a plan for massive burglaries and buggings. It was considered as a contingency plan by many who agreed and saw it as a plan for a future time. But for Nixon it was not. Part of the overall concept was the Nixon-Agnew Rand Corporation study calling off the 1972 presidential elections under some provoked and staged "national emergency."

Who Backed Conspiracy?

It is of the highest urgency that, in the name of national security, this plan for T-Day see the light of day. It should be one of the demands of every citizen—that in the name of national security this criminal document must be revealed. Nixon, Agnew, Mitchell, Halde-man, Ehrlichman set up a special police-state apparatus to carry out these foul deeds. Criminal acts were carried out all over the country, including the Watergate. A plan to disrupt the electoral process on all levels was in this plan. The Committee to Re-elect the President (CREEP) became the instrument of superseding the two-party system, the main tools became provocations, corruption, extortion and terror—yes, including physical terror.

Basic questions, of course, come to one's mind. How was it possible that, in our very midst, within the White House, this process took place? Who backed the conspiracy? This is a very important question, but many don't want to talk about it. And how did it take place is also

a very important question. The question of who backed it, who financed it, is relatively, a simple question.

All that one has to do is put on the scales the \$200,000 from Vesco Corporation and the \$250,000 from IT&T, and the huge "donation" from most of the 500 biggest corporations in this country. They backed it, they financed it, they paid for it all the way through. It was a conspiracy of the 500 top monopoly corporations. They started with a 10 million dollar nest egg.

What happened in the political superstructure in government is an accurate reflection of what has happened in the economic part of the U.S. capitalist structure. In the economic field the process is called "monopolization." It's a big word but it simply means that in the world of business and banking the bigger fish keep on eating the smaller fish. They feed on the blood and sweat of the working people but they also keep on crushing their smaller corporate competitors.

The corporate fish that are left keep getting bigger and bigger. As they get bigger they get more parasitical and rapacious. So we have a few huge corporations, a few big fish, who monopolize the economic and the political scene of our country. Like a swarm of locusts they covered the domestic landscape. When they reached the borders they swarmed across and over the seven seas. Imperialism became the ruling force in this country and sought to police the world. They murdered, defiled and robbed—including from each other.

In all this, the role of the state—the government—became more and more important. Step by step the big fish turned the state into an instrument that carried out their policy of robbery and exploitation. But elected government bodies, even when they support the big corporations, are somewhat cumbersome. They are somewhat influenced by the voters and the populace. So the big monopolies support movements that are for a state authority, a government that eliminates the elected bodies—a government that rules by edict, commits burglaries, buggings, murder, provocations and framing of people—that's what in a general sense, fascism is all about. It is government by the iron heel of the boot. That is why the Krupps and the Thyssens of pre-war Germany supported the fascist movement and Hitler.

The Watergate explosion has exposed the fact that the wiretapping lines lead to the processes that have set up the contingency structure, the police-state structure in the White House. The crisis has exposed processes that are weaving the web for a fascist takeover. The outlines

are very clear. The patterns are uniquely U.S.A.—they are made in U.S.A.

The crisis has exposed a creeping process of building a government within a government—a police state structure within a constitutional government structure. The process has involved—through a creeping step-by-step movement of transferring the authority of one government from the elected bodies to the beefed-up executive branch—operating behind the presidential shield. This is what the big corporations want. This what they paid for and this is what they have insisted upon. They want an executive body with full dicatorial powers to rule by edict. This makes the corporation-state relationships direct and efficient.

Thus, the executive branch has usurped the powers, step-by-step, to govern society by edict. It has taken over, usurped, the power to make war by edict. It has taken over the power to freeze worker's wages by edict. It has taken over the power to give tax money to corporations—by hundreds of millions of dollars each year—by edict. It has taken the authority to bug, burglarize, imprison, to commit and cover up, any kind of crime—by edict—all in the name of national security.

This dangerous process has been going on through many administrations—of both of the old parties. Truman gave it the excuse by declaring a “national emergency.” This “national emergency” is still on the books, and this process goes on under the authority of this phony “national emergency.”

But Nixon gave the process a qualitative push. He qualitatively changed its role. Nixon gave this executive authority the greatest power, the most fascist-like orientation of any president. He formulated the secret plan for the total takeover. It's not just that he knew about it. He formulated that plan. He restructured the executive branch for the takeover.

Big business has always dominated the policies of government. Eisenhower had the “Cadillac Cabinet,” and each of the cabinets have had big business in them. But most of the present key government officials in the Nixon Administration are on a short sabbatical leave from the biggest corporations. They will go back into the corporations once they have done their dirty work.

The executive branch became a nerve center of a network of government-within-a-government. That's the source from which police-state danger arises. There is, for instance, a National Security

Council that rules without any Constitutional authority whatsoever. It was set up under the "presidential authority." There is the continually growing CIA apparatus, the FBI, and the military intelligence apparatus and the ever-growing huge military complex—all under the aegis of presidential authority.

The president has, for instance, even at the present time, 531 full-time staff members just for the purposes of controlling Congress. They are the enforcers. They use coercion and extortion. When the old assistant of J. Edgar Hoover said that Hoover was a master of extortion, he was right. These enforcers are all students of Hoover, are all masters of extortion. They use it against every public official.

The plan of take-over and the conspiracy, of course, included and tied into it the labor bureaucrats Meany, Lovestone, Abel and Brennan, who are all cogs on the wheels of this reactionary conspiracy. They are willing cogs. There's no extortion needed there.

Monopoly Capitalism Is Robbery

So, it is clear, the roots of the conspiracy are in the bowels of monopoly capitalism. No place else. It is monopoly capital that wants a government which brutally pursues policies that will result in ever-increasing profit—and that's the motive of the conspiracy. They want a government that pursues policies that do nothing when the corporations raise prices, but freezes workers' wages. They want a government that destroys any opposition against those policies.

Monopoly capitalism—as capitalism in general—is robbery. It robs the workers of the products they produce. The last three months, which are the so-called "exemplary Watergate months," in the economy—January, February and March—these are the months in which the profits of the corporations went up 26 percent. That's what Watergate means in the economy. What is 80 cents for a dozen eggs, \$1.30 for a pound of hamburger, \$250 per month for a rat-infested slum apartment, \$100 a day for a hospital room, if not robbery?

But this is Watergate-style robbery. Monopoly capitalism robs people not only in the United States; it robs the people in Puerto Rico, in Africa, Asia and Latin America. And it has made the state—the government—into a partner in these crimes. That's the root of Watergate.

The U.S. government passes about 100 billion dollars to the big corporations a year. One hundred billion dollars—that's robbery! The

government binds the hands of the workers by wage freezes while the corporations rob them. The administration promotes racism to increase the loot of the corporations. They want a state apparatus that is as coldblooded as they are. The mass media talks about Vesco buying his way in Costa Rica; Vesco is doing in Costa Rica what monopoly capital has been doing for some 200 years in the United States.

Nixon's nephew is an insider in the Vesco corporation whose operations are tied in with Howard Hughes, who turned over a huge sum to Nixon's brother. The web is endless. They've been buying their way.

As the government role becomes more open and necessary in this crime, it becomes less democratic. As the thieves get into greater difficulties, the government becomes more of a policeman—the police state. And that's the process that has been going on. Without this process, this fundamental process of transition of power to the beefed-up executive branch of the government, without a police-state apparatus Watergate would never have taken place.

For all honest people it is necessary to think about many things because of the explosion in Watergate. It is necessary to take a new look at how anti-communism and racism have been used as a smoke-screen, as a drug in this conspiracy. Racism was a major factor in the fraudulent elections—the last presidential elections. Nixon's busing fraud must be exposed again. It is clearer now that he was not interested in busing. He was only interested in how he could use it to promote racism amongst whites. Nixon's conspiracy becomes a magnet for all the racist forces in the country.

The southern strategy of Nixon is a part of the conspiracy and this take-over. Wallace and Thurmond are cogs of the wheel. I'm sure many of you heard the testimony of a Barker—the Cuban Bay of Pigs mastermind. His testimony should go a long way in convincing the people that anti-communism is the opiate served up by the forces of reaction. It's not that they take the drug themselves. They just serve it to the people. They use it to confuse and disorient the people.

Some people worry whether the Watergate affair is going to have an effect on foreign policy. I hope so. It certainly should. It should help to put an end to the cold war. It should help to make aggression more difficult for U.S. imperialism. Because it is being exposed, it should be more difficult for U.S. imperialism to follow its policies of aggression.

But there are some other foreign-policy matters. Most people in the

United States welcome a visit by Leonid Brezhnev. I think more people welcome this visit now by a leader of the Soviet Union than at any time in the history of our country. But I must say that I have never seen *The New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* so skittish about an event as they are about this visit of Leonid Brezhnev. One would think that the coming visit of Comrade Brezhnev will bring with it some kind of a disaster, about which they have to issue a warning.

It's difficult to say what brings on the editorial warnings by *The New York Times*. They've had two, one after the other. And what's interesting is that, first, they had an editorial that was talking to Nixon, and they said: Look here, Nixon; you're at the wrong end of the stick and you're going to get licked. They say, Brezhnev speaks from strength, you speak from weakness. Cancel it. Cancel this trip before it's too late—or at least postpone it. So it was a warning to Nixon.

But a week later they had an editorial, and they were talking to Brezhnev. And they say: My dear Comrade Brezhnev, we agree about many things with you. We are also for lessening of tensions and all that. But this is not the time for you to come. We want you to sign new agreements—but this is not the time for you to get them, so why don't you postpone your trip or call it off? You will get better results later. So it's hard to say exactly what *The New York Times* is worried about.

The *Wall Street Journal* had an editorial, and they do not go so far as to say, "Call it off." But they keep warning Nixon: Look out, you're speaking from a position of weakness. Brezhnev is speaking from a position of strength. Therefore you've got to be very careful. Well, that is a new thought to hear in these United States because it's always been the reverse. It used to be the club, the policy of containment, the United States dealing from a position of strength. But here are the same voices of big business warning Nixon that Brezhnev is going to speak from a position of strength. In a sense, this reflects the change in the relationship of world forces.

There are also some others who are against the visit of Comrade Brezhnev. They are active more on the basis of what I would call conditioned reflexes. Their reflexes have been conditioned by the cold war and they still act on the basis of these conditioned reflexes. George Meany has become one of the campaigners against the visit of Brezhnev. Meany's reflexes are so conditioned that, as soon as he hears the word "Communist," he is flat on the ground crawling and

kissing the first boot that comes along. That's Meany—and it's just a kind of reflex condition left over from the cold war. If George Meany's reflexes were reconditioned and turned to the interest of the working class, he would welcome Comrade Brezhnev as a working class brother. He would welcome the jobs that the trade agreements will bring to U.S. workers.

Then there are also some "liberals" whose reflexes are conditioned by the cold war. They are conditioned to buy protection and respectability. And the payoff is anti-communism. The payoff for respectability and protection is that somehow they must show some anti-communist reaction. So, when some liberals heard that Brezhnev is coming, automatically their reflexes went into action.

How can they show their protectors that they are anti-Soviet? That was the only question that came to their minds. Not that the cold war is dying out—not that world tensions are being relaxed—not that war is receding further into the background, but rather how they can show their anti-Soviet position. So they are collecting money and trying to get signatures to put ads in *The New York Times*, so that they can raise questions with Brezhnev.

What's So Terrible About Peace?

But it is clear that they are not interested in speaking to Brezhnev. If that were the case, all they would have to do is write to Brezhnev. They don't have to waste money for ads in *The New York Times*. They can just write to him, and I'm sure they'll get a reply. But that's not what they want. They want to speak to their protectors—the ones from whom they are seeking respectability—they want to show the ruling class that they are anti-Soviet. It's just too bad that, in this day and age, their conditioned reflexes behave that way.

As far as I know, Brezhnev is coming here for some very practical businesslike reasons. He's coming here to increase trade between the Soviet Union and the United States. And we all know, especially those who work, that it means more jobs. I don't know why *The New York Times* is so skittish. What's so terrible about more jobs for our workers? What's so terrible about coming here to build up trade which will mean more jobs! In the meantime it will mean more profits for the corporations, too, because that's the only way you can do business with a capitalist country.

Brezhnev's coming here to push for peace, for disarmament; he's

coming here for defusing the nuclear stockpiles of both countries. So what's so terrible about that! Why should *The New York Times* be worried about this?

He's coming here to further the joint projects of fighting cancer, heart disease and the many sicknesses that industrial society suffers from. He is coming here to further the struggle against pollution. So what's so terrible about that! I really don't see why *The New York Times* is so negative about his visit.

Brezhnev is coming here as a representative of a working class in power. He's coming here as a representative of socialism and, of course, it will prove that socialism works—and not only that it works, but that it works well. He is coming here as a representative of a society—a new society—that is building a totally new life, a life on a higher plane of civilization. He's coming here as a representative, symbolically, of the working class of the world, of the peoples struggling for national liberation and for socialism in the world.

So again, what's so terrible about that! But maybe that is the clue. Maybe that is the clue to why *The New York Times* wants to postpone or call off the visit by Brezhnev. It is not terrible for working people, for ordinary citizens; but the more reactionary sections of monopoly capital, the racist and the Zionist leadership consider it terrible, and therefore *The New York Times* wants to postpone it.

Needless to say, this is an important moment in all our lives, in the life of all the people's movement. It is important because the conspiracy has been—is being, and can now be—exposed. It is an important moment because reaction can now be set back. Nixon talked before the election campaign about how they want an electoral victory that will change the political landscape for the United States for 200 years. The real truth is that, with this expose, and with proper initiative by the people, it is possible not only to set back reaction: we can change the political landscape for the next 200 years in this country in a progressive direction.

Let me just say—in this sense—that Yorty, the Los Angeles Nixoncrat, is the first Watergater to hit the dirt as a result of this exposé. The reactionary Watergaters can be defeated in every election. The conspirators can be defeated if the advanced political forces will now take initiatives to build a network of forces of political independence, people's committees for political action, committees to start the process of organizing a new mass party based on the working class.

There are many who are now starting to sweep the conspiracy under a rug. The cry is going up: "Stop the investigation, the government is at a standstill!" With the kind of government Nixon has structured, it's just as well it is at a standstill. Even the new special prosecutor, Mr. Cox, wants the public hearing stopped. He wants the case to revert back to the private chambers of the grand jury where they can quietly deal with these ugly matters.

The master plan for T-Day, everyone agrees, is the height of deceit—a conspiracy—but no one wants to show it to the public. That is why there must be a demand for it to see the light of day.

It is perfectly clear that only the intervention of the people will clear this mess. It will be swept under the rug if we do not have the means of intervening in this situation. There is a need now for a people's inquiry, for a people's tribunal—to try the Nixon administration for its war crimes, for its anti-labor crimes, for its crimes of racism, its crimes of attempting to destroy the Constitution, its crimes against Africa, Asia and Latin America and its crimes against the people of the United States.

There is need for a people's congress now to establish a democratic structure—a structure that has never existed—a structure that would include the redrawing of all the lines for congressional districts, the remapping of state and county and city districts. But redrawing those lines must be with the specific purpose of guaranteeing representation of our multinational working class and oppressed peoples, representation of Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Indian and Asian-Americans on the basis of proportional representation.

There is a need for a people's congress to draw up an election bill, setting limits on all electoral spending—like one million dollars in a presidential election; for a bill that would give equal free time for all candidates on TV, radio and press on an equal basis.

It is a time to organize movements, to raise a number of demands—for instance, a demand to impeach this fraudulent administration, not just Nixon, but the Nixon administration; to impeach this fraudulent conspiratorial administration and then call for new presidential elections on the basis of remapped electoral districts. The demand must go up to indict and prosecute the whole Watergate administration from top to bottom!

We must demand an end to all permissiveness about these "pusillanimous pups," as Agnew would say. We must demand no amnesty

for the Watergateers under any circumstances. We must demand the stripping of the executive branch, and the stripping of most of the presidential powers.

I understand that in Washington the slogan is coming up: "Four more years, with six months off for good behavior!"

And this morning, in a Central Committee meeting of our Party, someone suggested what I think is a very good slogan that should be printed and put out on all garbage cans all over the country: It would say: "Make USA clean again! Dump the Watergate administration into the garbage can of history!"

Five years ago John Mitchell, the U.S. Attorney General, made a prediction: "This country is going so far to the right that you won't even recognize it." The Watergaters tried hard to make that prophesy come true; but life has intervened.

Of course, as it is with everything under capitalism, you can only go so far. We can go a long way in cleaning up this mess, in setting up a real democratic structure. We can go a long way with struggle, with people's movements, with action. But, by now, more of our people are beginning to realize that to really clean up this mess—to really clean up our land—and to really get on the right path, what we need now more than ever is socialism.

June 2, 1973

Who Endangers Representative Government?

The condition of representative government in our country is questioned even by *The New York Times*. In a lead editorial titled "Democracy at Bay" (Dec. 26) the question is posed like this: "In the late stages of World War II, Thomas K. Finletter drew on his considerable Washington experience to write a thoughtful book, 'Can Representative Government Do the Job?' An appropriate question for that uncertain period, it is even more pertinent today . . ."

"Thoughtful Americans," the *Times* editorial writer points out, "are debating not merely whether the President can survive politically, but whether the system can endure."

After reading this *Times* editorial one wonders why the question was posed, because the same question can be asked with opposite suggestions in mind. Hitler based his demagogy on the premise that "representative government cannot do the job." One must assume, when *The New York Times* editors ask "whether the system can endure," they do not have in mind the system of capitalism, but rather they are talking about the democratic structure.

In order to seriously seek for answers one must ask "pertinent questions" such as: What are the alternatives to "representative government?" What class or political groups are for the destruction of "representative government?" Why do these forces want to destroy the democratic institutions? What kind of government do they want in its place?

Surely one cannot say that the danger to "representative government" comes from the people or the working class.

The New York Times editors give examples where "representative governments" have suffered defeats. "Watergate offers abundant evidence of eroding public confidence . . . The year 1973 saw the destruction in Chile and Uruguay. Hopes soared for a return of democracy in Greece, only to be dashed . . . Even in Britain disillusionment is manifest."

It is virtually impossible to ignore these developments, so the editors of *The New York Times* set out to distort the meaning of these events. They became accessories to the Nixon gang's coverup around Watergate.

Does the threat to "representative government" in the United States come from the "eroding public confidence?" If Watergate proves anything it is that big business and its political henchmen in government have set out to destroy "representative government" through the process of building a police-state structure by using political power of a beefed-up executive branch operating beyond the Constitution, hiding behind a self-proclaimed executive privilege; an executive branch staffed by "gestapo-minded" loyal sons of the military industrial complex.

It is the executives of the "top 500" corporations who want a government that can dictate to the people; dictate policies that will result in ever higher profits for the monopolies.

So, in a very basic sense the threat to "representative government" comes from monopoly capital in a period of decadence. The editors speak about "eroding public confidence" because they want to point the accusing finger at the public. This is a coverup for the real culprits.

What is the force that destroys "representative government" in Chile, in Uruguay or in Greece? It would be naive and, in a sense, more kindly to say the editors are ignorant and don't know the culprits. But to say they are political swindlers is to "tell it like it is."

In each case the direct orders, the finances, and the plans for the destruction of "representative government" came from the officers of the "top 500" U.S. monopoly corporations. This has become public knowledge. The headquarters of the imperialist conspiracy are Wall Street and Washington. In Chile, Greece, Uruguay and, one must add, in South Africa, Spain and the Phillipine Islands, the local businessmen are involved. But their power headquarters were Wall Street and the Pentagon. So the enemy of "representative government" at home and abroad is the alliance of the "tops": top 500 companies and top Pentagon Brass, in a conspiracy with the top domestic bankers and landlords of every capitalist country. And their role against "representative government" has been demonstrated by the military grabbing, the policy-making power positions in the Pentagon and Defense Department. They scuttled the traditional civilian control. More than that, they also extended the arm of the military surveillance to include

military spies in the area of the White House, which resulted in spies chasing spies. These facts are surely available to the editors of *The New York Times*.

Anti-communism is history's most massive coverup, used by the ideological defenders of capitalism to cover up the crimes of the most evil society order ever devised. Hitler used it openly. The editors of *The New York Times* use it brazenly and slyly. The methods differ but the effect is the same.

Since anti-communism is usually spearheaded by anti-Sovietism, they initiate and peddle the grossest fabrications, the outrageous slanders, the stupid falsehoods, from the pen of a degenerate Solzhenitsyn. They also slyly inject anti-communism into editorial reporting of the election news. Thus, in the same editorial they exposed their "top 500" fangs: "In Sweden the Social Democrats, in power for decades, must now depend on Communist votes to even gain a tie." From this the reader is supposed to draw the conclusion that it is "the Communists" who are a threat to "representative government."

Of course the editors overlook the fact that "representative government" in Sweden has not been destroyed. The fact that the editors slip in the mickey of anti-communism slyly does not make it a lesser falsehood. Just as anti-communism was a coverup for Hitler and Mussolini, it is a coverup for the fanatic, murderous juntas in Chile, Uruguay and Greece. And, in its own way, anti-communism is a coverup for the editors of *The New York Times*. It is one of the lessons of history that not all of the mass media in pre-Hitler Germany supported fascism as the alternative to "representative government." But it is also a fact that most, if not all of the mass media, including the press, covered up for monopoly capitalism and spread the anti-communism falsehoods. Whether consciously or not they became fellow travelers with fascism.

There is an immutable law of the development of coverups, including anti-communism. This law has pushed the Nixon administration from the original coverup to a continuing process of coverup; a process of covering up for the past coverups. This becomes a part of the process of building a police-state structure. The law of covering up for the defenders of capitalism leads from the covering up of the crimes of big business of supporting and using the techniques of the "big lie" and anti-communism, to openly supporting fascism when all

the other coverups have failed. One can give the *Times* editors the benefit of the doubt. Most likely they are not now, even in their private chambers, advocating the establishment of fascism. But the logic of their position leads to the support of movements and forces who are for the destruction of "representative government."

As capitalism decays it needs ever bigger coverups. And this means that the most reactionary, brutal sections of capitalism, in their drive to put the burden of its crimes and crises on the backs of the people, take extra measures to destroy, or render powerless those institutions which reflect the sentiments and fight for the needs of the people. These include the trade unions and mass organizations of the people, especially those in the struggle against racism, the political parties and especially the Communist Party, movements which are independent from ruling class controls, and those legislative sections of government which can be most representative of the people, including the U.S. Congress, the state legislatures, and the city councils.

Because it is decaying and in crisis, monopoly capital develops a stronger, built-in antagonism to "representative government." Democracy and "representative governments" have always been trophies of people's movements and struggles. Other classes have at times joined in. But the power base of the anti-fascist movements has always been the people—led by the working class.

Anti-communism is a central weapon of all reactionary forces. We take a stand against the forces of anti-communism for many reasons. We reject it as total falsehood. We condemn it because it is a coverup for the crimes of capitalism. We expose it because it is a weapon of splitting and dividing the forces of democracy. We are against it because it is a weapon for the destruction of "representative government." We warn against it because it leads to the support of fascism.

So, "Can Representative Government Do The Job?" is indeed a "pertinent" question. And the answer is intertwined with the struggle against monopoly capital. In today's reality the struggle against monopoly capital is the struggle for the extension and preservation of "representative government." What bothers the editors and other spokesmen of big business is that people are more and more beginning to demand that political movements and government bodies must be of the kind that represents their self-interests. Because forces like the editors of *The New York Times* are periodic peddlers of virulent anti-communist slanders, they become victims of their own "big lies,"

victims of the anti-communism weapon of monopoly capitalism, and then become ensnared into the reactionary alternative that leads to fascism.

The question of democracy will continue as one of the issues in the struggle for socialism. The removal of monopoly capital will remove the basic source of the danger to "representative government." The new socialist democracy in a socialist USA will be rooted in the fact that the new "representative government" will be serving the collective interests of a people who will then be the new owners of the industrial, financial, cultural complex. This fact will give the concept of "representative government" a new meaning, a new dimension. Under monopoly capitalism, to a great extent, the concept of "representative government" is appearance only. Under socialism the appearance will become reality.

For most of the defenders of capitalism "representative government" means a government with some electoral concessions to the people, but a government in the grip of big business. But whenever the political movements of the people threaten to destroy monopoly's grip on the state structure they are for cancelling the democratic concessions.

When the people of Chile used the democratic apparatus and elected an anti-monopoly government, the same *New York Times* raised serious questions as to whether the Chilean people's mandate should be permitted to stand. They are for a "representative government" only when it is in the grip of monopoly capital. The basic fact is that "representative government" can be preserved only by the people. As long as our government and political process remain in the grip of monopoly capital it will not be truly representative or safe.

In order to extend and to preserve "representative government" the people of the United States need an independent political movement. The working class needs an independent class movement.

"Representative government" can be extended and preserved only by a militant people's alliance of the broad, democratic-minded masses, the working class, and the oppressed Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano and Indian Peoples. Only then can we answer the question. A representative government reflecting such a people's force can do the job.

February 2, 1974

The McCarran Act Is Dead Capitalist Oppression Continues

The McCarran Act was the most fascist-like law ever passed by the Congress of the United States. It outlawed democratic thought and action. It was a catch-all dragnet law directed against any and all who dared to express opinions against the reactionary policies and practices of monopoly capital.

Its sharp edge was directed against the Communist Party. But it was a law affecting militant trade unionists, peace advocates, fighters against racism and all democratic-minded people.

The anti-communist section of the law outlawed the Communist Party and provided for life imprisonment for refusing to register under its provisions. Comrade Benjamin Davis and myself were indicted under that section of the law. Our reply was: "We would rather spend the rest of our lives in prison than comply with its provisions."

Because of the mass resistance and the brilliant legal defense by John Abt, Vito Marcantonio and others, the McCarran Act was defeated section by section. Now, after 25 years, the last section of the fascist law has bitten the dust.

While hailing the victory we must alert the public to the fact that the same forces in the Nixon Administration are pushing for the enactment of another fascist-like law, HR-1400.

The lessons of the struggle against the McCarran Act are many. But the number-one lesson of the struggle is that only mass actions can defeat the efforts of the racist and fascist forces.

It is for this reason that the mass demonstration against racism and repression in Raleigh, North Carolina, on July 4th, is a most timely

action. It is in the tradition of the struggle against the McCarran Act.

Comrade Gene Dennis, who was the General Secretary of the Communist Party in those crucial years, expressed the vanguard position of the Party in that historic struggle. In his first speech after being released from his imprisonment under the Smith Act, Gene said:

The valiant fight to prevent passage of the McCarran Act was lost. But the scope and power of the people's fight left their mark. What might have happened didn't happen. Pro-fascist action had to alter its time schedule. The people's resistance has delayed all-out enforcement of the act. Some people figured that by now we would have come to the end of the road. Instead we have arrived at a new crossroads. A new front of struggle is opening up around the appeal to the Supreme Court and if that fails, around the illegal hearings themselves. If there is a resurgence of mass activity, if a broader, more militant united front struggle is forged against the McCarran Act then this Hitlerite monstrosity can yet be nullified and wiped off the books by the popular will. In any case, win, lose or draw, the struggle will leave its mark and help to keep open many avenues of democratic expression and mass action.

Life has proven the correctness of that assessment.

The McCarran Act was geared to force the homefront into a straightjacket in support of a policy of military aggression. Comrade Dennis correctly linked the struggle for peace with the struggle against the McCarran Act:

To speak realistically of influencing events means to raise our sights and broaden our horizons, means to think in terms of influencing not only thousands and millions, but of tens of millions of people. It means not only recording their pulse but organizing the peace sentiment and helping it find effective public expression and action. We have to think in terms of winning not some of these, but the majority of all of them and enlisting them in one way or another in the struggle for peace . . .

We will support and join with anybody, anywhere who struggles against the Wall Street monopolies, the warmakers . . .

Because we are Communists, we look on every struggle as a means of advancing the welfare and happiness of the people, and as a school in which the millions and tens of millions learn from experience. Now more than ever before, it is our task to help the tens of millions to understand their own experience. The tens of millions will move, and move together, when they really understand what this fight for peace is all about.

So it is our task to explain, and explain again. Those who turned a deaf ear yesterday will perhaps listen today. Those who today are still deceived by the Wall Street propaganda lies, by the enemies of the people's unity, will have become wiser by tomorrow, especially if we work effectively.

Before going to prison, in his farewell speech, Comrade Dennis said:

We are entering a period of sharp and acute struggles. Let us march forward courageously, determined and with supreme confidence in our Party, in our class and in our cause . . .

The strengthening and building of our own Communist Party is vital to the growth of a truly broad united front, and of great importance in advancing unity of action for peace, to winning whole shops, whole communities, whole mass organizations . . .

All of us can be justly proud of our Party, its leadership and its membership. This is more than an impression. It is a considered and unqualified statement of fact.

And returning to the theme of mass struggle Gene states: "It is struggle which decides everything. This has been true always and everywhere. But it is especially true for our time and our country."

July 6, 1974

The Unhappy Liberal

Fascism is monopoly capitalism minus the democratic superstructure. This open, brutal dictatorship of big business never makes its appearance as a full-blown system from out of the blue. Throughout history it has made its entrance stealthily behind extreme demagogy. In its initial stages the claws of fascism are carefully kept out of sight.

The groundwork for its acceptance is prepared far in advance. The public is ideologically conditioned by stages. It is cleverly presented as an inevitable alternative, as a solution to the problems that people face. The Watergate affair has given us some good indications of how the groundwork for fascism is prepared.

For example, the concept of "a strong presidency" has become an accepted idea. But behind this argument for "an effective govern-

ment," protected by a self-proclaimed "executive privilege," a police state structure has been built. The transformation of this structure to a fascist structure would be achieved under the argument of the need for an even stronger presidency.

As a part of the process of conditioning masses, the ultra-Right and racist forces inject fascist ideas openly. By and large, because they are in the open they are rejected by the masses. But there is the conditioning that proceeds at a more subtle, minimum level behind a more refined demagoguery. This has its own dangers because the masses do not expect it from what they consider a more democratic and liberal source. Thus, ultra-Right propaganda from a liberal source has its own sinister dangers and objectives.

As capitalism decays, the reactionary pressures increase. And as long as liberals remain basically defenders of capitalism they also come under greater pressure. They have the option of either moving to the Left, taking a stand against reaction, or succumbing to the reactionary pressures. Very often yesterday's liberals can be found in the ranks of today's reactionary forces. But no matter how reactionary they actually become they continue to maintain a liberal image. At times this takes on unbelievable corkscrew-like contortions.

In the February 9, 1974, issue of *Saturday Review*, Archibald MacLeish, the poet and playwright, performs such a corkscrew defense of Ezra Pound's fascist ideas and activities by proclaiming, "If ever a dead man needed living men to help him, it is Pound." And from this MacLeish concludes that Pound "was a master poet for whom a mound should now be raised on the shore of the gray sea." One can agree with MacLeish that a mound should be raised, but my proposal would be not of granite. Manure is more appropriate.

From the above one could assume that MacLeish was only going to commit the error of saying that Pound was a bad politician, but a good poet. He does make that mistake. But MacLeish's tribute to Pound is in fact a defense of Pound, the fascist propagandist.

Before going into the corkscrew defense there are some preliminaries we must look into. MacLeish compares Pound's fascist harangues during World War II to a speech by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, made in Hanoi in 1973: "Twenty-odd years later, toward the end (if it was the end) of the Vietnam war, a former attorney general of the United States did in Hanoi precisely what Ezra Pound had done in Rome. He attacked the policy and conduct of his

own country in the capital of a country with which the United States was at war. The effect on world opinion was the same and far more serious." It is not "naivete" to put a defender of fascism and a defender of the victims of imperialist aggression in the same category. It is not "naivete" to place a propagandist for racism and a fighter against racism as if they were one and the same. Pound spoke in opposition to the U.S. policy and the struggle against fascism. Ramsey Clark spoke against a U.S. policy of brutal, imperialist aggression. Pound glorified and defended mass slaughter by forces of imperialism. Ramsey Clark raised his voice against the mass slaughter of the people of Vietnam by U.S. imperialism. To speak about laws and violations of laws, as MacLeish does, in the abstract without reference to the social content of the moment is subterfuge, an effort at deliberate liberal coverup for fascism.

In this sense the defense of Pound becomes an expose of MacLeish. Characterizing some of Pound's criminal activities as "sadly true," MacLeish says that "he never protested against the nasty little triumphs of Mussolini in Ethiopia and Spain." These two examples of the most brutal and heinous mass murder of women and children by aerial bombardment up to that point in history was only a "nasty little triumph of Mussolini" to MacLeish. It was only a "nasty little triumph," "Guernica" was Pablo Picasso's reaction to the same events!

After World War II Ezra Pound was committed to an institution because he copped a plea of insanity. Pound's American friends wanted to give him an award, but when word of this got around the whole idea boomeranged. Because of this MacLeish is in a dilemma. On the one hand, to defend Pound and his fascist propaganda he must be declared sane. On the other hand, how can MacLeish now write about an American intellectual "dissenter" who was not insane but served years in an American mental institution? How else but to rationalize the corkscrew defense that has nothing to do with truth, with principles, or even the subject matter. MacLeish says: "The Soviet Union had not, at that time, begun the use of mental institutions to silence artists and intellectuals, but the possibilities of such a practice were evident even then. The conscience of mankind would, it was hoped, take fire."

Fascism stays in power only if it can destroy the people's resistance. It attacks trade unions, churches and democratic organizations, but it

directs its sharpest fire at the Communists, the most consistent and dogged fighters against reaction. On the world scene its main target has always been the Soviet Union. The conditioning of people to accept fascism follows the same route. Anti-communism in general, and anti-Sovietism in particular, are major themes of the continuing process. That it need not make any sense is demonstrated by MacLeish. He takes the present-day big lie of the supposedly Soviet use of mental institutions as political prisons and attaches it to his defense of a fascist propagandist, "because the possibilities of such a practice were evident even then." The only thing that was "evident even then" was that MacLeish and other defenders of capitalism would continue to manufacture stories to sustain the big lie of anti-communism.

It is impossible in the United States to deny Pound's fascist ideas and his active role in propagandizing them. So how do you defend a man like this? Because it is impossible to hide the facts, in a sense MacLeish starts by admitting the obvious into evidence: "If he was not a traitor, was he, as is constantly said, a fascist? That he was an admirer of the Fascist government of Italy is obvious. That he was often anti-Semitic is only too clear. That he never protested against the nasty little triumphs of Mussolini in Ethiopia and Spain or the monstrous behavior of Hitler in Germany or even the Gestapo terror and torture in Paris—that he never protested against any of this . . . is sadly true." But as you can see, MacLeish puts even the obvious evidence into the mildest of terms and his corkscrew defense continues: "But was he a Fascist? Certainly he never thought he was."

What trash! As if it matters what Pound thought he was. What matters is what he did, what he was. What matters is that he did everything in his power to glorify, excuse and justify an ugly political, economic and military concept that maintains power on the basis of racism, chauvinism and mass murder. What matters is that Pound worshipped and worked to give dignity to assassins and cutthroats. MacLeish continues: "He thought of himself as his books prove, as an old-line American Jeffersonian, a believer in the American Republic as its founders conceived it." So Pound, the fascist, becomes just an old-line "Jeffersonian" Democrat. As the corkscrew keeps turning, the defense of the fascist fiend becomes even more unbelievable. "In the Old Red-hunting days of Sen. Joe McCarthy, American newspapers used to talk about 'conscious' Communists, 'card-carrying'

Communists. Certainly Pound was never a Fascist of either variety.”

This attempt to compare Pound, the fascist, with the Communist leaders who were persecuted by the ultra-Right and fascist forces is a continuation of MacLeish’s total disregard for truth or even simple honesty. Thousands were persecuted and prosecuted, hundreds went to prison. But to MacLeish it was only “some American newspapers used to talk about ‘card-carrying’ Communists.” And the defense of the fascist propagandist goes on: “But how then are the Roman broadcasts to be explained? Quite simply, I think, by that peculiar naivete that is the occupational disease of intellectuals: that infatuation with ideas at the expense of experience that compels experience to conform to bookish preconceptions.”

“Naivete,” “bookish preconceptions”! What utter rubbish! Pound, the fascist propagandist, a public defender of a gang of thugs, the glorifier of a system of mass murder, this man who hailed the murder of some 50 million human beings, is excused because of his “bookish preconceptions.” “Insofar as fascism filled his preconceptions he admired it.” Yes, he admired the anti-Semitism, the gas chambers, the gallows, the mass graves. “To be wrong, even monstrously wrong, is not the same thing as to be a Fascist.” But to be a fascist and to defend those who glory in fascism is monstrously wrong. What was wrong with Ezra Pound is wrong with fascism.

In order to defend the fascist propagandist, MacLeish is ready to slander all intellectuals. “Which means, not that he was himself a Fascist, but simply that he was an intellectual capable of the intellectual’s characteristic mistakes: a total misreading of his own time.”

This corkscrew defense of a fascist propagandist proves that it is MacLeish who is “misreading his own time.” The great majority of intellectuals are not misreading the times. They are not going to join MacLeish in the reactionary sewer. They are not going to join him in glorifying fascism.

Whether he fully realizes it or not MacLeish’s corkscrew defense of Ezra Pound becomes an instrument in the ultra-Right, pro-fascist conditioning process. It is in keeping with the trend—an increasing number of books and articles that glorify Hitler, Mussolini, Goebbels and Goering. The glorification of these fascist personalities is a feature of the preparation, the groundwork for the acceptance of fascist ideas.

Dead fascists do not need a defense. The purpose of MacLeish’s

piece is not to defend Pound, but to defend the reactionary ideas Pound expounded. MacLeish excuses Pound's fascist ideas behind "naivete" and "bookish preconceptions." "Naivete" is no excuse or defense of Pound's actions and it is also no excuse for MacLeish.

March 2, 1974

Racism—Monopoly's Hammer Against All Workers

The economic crisis magnifies and brings into sharp focus all the contradictions of capitalism. It is a moment to expose and lay bare the class roots of economic and political policies. The crisis brings out the basically cruel and inhuman character of monopoly capitalism.

The present plant layoffs, the closing of the second and third shifts in many industries, exposes the 200-year pattern on the-last-to-be-hired and the-first-to-be-fired. Because of this, for Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano workers the economic crisis is deeper and will last longer.

It does not take a depression to convince the victims of racism that they are oppressed and exploited. They are aware of this every moment of their lives. For proof of the racist patterns all one has to see is the overwhelming number of Black workers in the departments of the dirtiest and hardest work, the most dangerous occupations, and the greater number of white workers in the more skilled and higher-paid jobs. So the problem is not to convince the Black workers that they are victims of racism.

The crisis does make it easier to prove that the source of racism is the capitalist system of exploitation for corporate profits. The real problem is to convince white workers that while they are the carriers of racism, and while they acquiesce in and support racist practices

against Black workers, they are themselves victims of racism. The crisis presents new possibilities for convincing white workers that racism is against their best self-interests.

This is one of those moments when racism can be dealt a devastating blow. But the struggle against racism must be integrated into the fabric of the struggles and issues arising from the economic crisis.

What is Racism?

Elementary truths must be repeated at each turn of events.

Racism is an ideological poison that induces white workers to act against their own best self-interests. It is a case of fighting according to the rules set by the enemy. It is believing that you are better than your fellow workers because the enemy has conned you into it. Racism is a device, a means by which the corporations make extra profits from the work of the racially oppressed. But it is also a means of increasing the rate of exploitation of the whole class and thereby squeezing higher profits from all of the workers. This is the starting point, the foundation upon which the struggle against racism can be built.

The decadent rich of the Roman Empire provided themselves with entertainment by having the gladiators fight each other. But in addition to fighting each other in the arenas they also fought each other as slaves in the fields. It is not so different now. The wealthy U.S. capitalists enrich themselves by having workers fight each other over jobs, housing, education, and now over jobs, layoffs and seniority. It is a basic truth that as long as workers fight each other they will not be in the strongest position to fight the bosses. As long as white workers support the policies and practices of discrimination against their fellow workers based on racism there can be no class unity. Unity is possible only on equal terms, based on the old axiom that "an injury to one is an injury to all." This is a fundamental starting point that must be repeated at each turn of events. The idea is elementary but basic.

White workers must draw some special lessons from this economic crisis. Their compliance with the racist practices against their Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano brothers and sisters in the unions or in the shops has not given them job security. Millions of white workers are being laid off without any ceremony or without compensation for their acquiescence to racism. They are joining Black workers on the unemployment lines. Their support of racism has not stopped the escalation of prices and rents they have to pay. Their rents and taxes

keep going up. They get the same cuts in real wages, they work in the same unsafe conditions of employment, most of them are victims of the same polluted cities. Because racism keeps the class divided the corporations are able to speed up production. The production line does not slow down where white workers toil. Racism is one of the key factors that makes it possible for U.S. corporations to maintain the highest rate of exploitation and the highest profits in the world.

Who Benefits From Racism?

The income gap between Black and white households has now reached the astronomical \$4,640 level. When multiplied by the total number of Black households it is easy to see that this super-exploitation results in something like \$35 billion in extra profits each year. But 98 percent of these superprofits goes into the coffers of the corporations, the oppressor of the class as a whole. By not fighting racism, white workers are helping the corporations pocket these extra profits. The extra profits monopoly capital rakes in as a result of its racist policies and practices are much greater than the \$35 billion.

The steel industry is a good example. Workers are paid on the basis of job classifications. The classifications from 1 to 8 pay around \$4 to \$5 per hour. The higher classifications pay around \$7 per hour. There is no reasonable explanation why some jobs are in one or another classification. But the system is a perfect structure for racist policies. Most Black workers are in the 1 to 8 classifications. The Black workers—but also the white workers—in these classifications work for the \$4 to \$5 per hour wages. This is clearly a case where the steel corporations get extra profits in the first place from the racist exploitation of Black workers, but also to a degree from the white workers. If white workers joined in a struggle to put an end to the racist classification structure it would also serve their self-interests. Racism has been a factor in making it possible for the steel corporations to cut 10 man-hours worth of work in the production of each ton of steel!

This increase in the rate of exploitation and the racist patterns in the steel industry are closely related to the blatant toadying, bootlicking, groveling class collaborationist policies pursued by Abel and his gang in the leadership of the steel union.

U.S. workers also face a new problem because the corporations, especially the multinational conglomerates, are transferring their production facilities to the lower-wage areas of the world. But the

workers in the northeast and west still face the old problem of runaway shops moving south. The reason is a chain of causes and effects. The corporations move their operations to southern states because for 200 years there has been a wage differential. The wage scales are lower because the southern workers have been largely unorganized. They have been unorganized mainly because of the racism of white workers. And because of racism, class consciousness has been at a low level. And because class consciousness is at a low level there is lack of trade unions which is a basic requirement for a struggle that would wipe out the regional wage differential, that would then put an end to runaway shops.

So the dual culprits are imperialism and racism. In both cases the winners are the corporations. The wage differential is a source of extra profits from Black but also from southern white workers. The lower wages in the southern states are paid to both Black and white workers.

Many changes are taking place in the south. There is significant progress towards working-class unity. Black and white workers are uniting in local trade unions. But even during the last months there have been elections in some big unorganized shops where the issue has been between a union or no union. The votes have been close. But in a number of cases the workers have voted for no union. Racism still blinds enough white workers to vote against their best self and class interests. When white workers vote to maintain the wage differential they are victims of their own racism.

So what is the only working-class approach to resolving the problems that have now surfaced because of the economic crisis? The "gladiators" must unite and turn the struggle against the corporate monsters. The working class must take up the battle against all layoffs. This must include the demand for a shorter work week with no cut in pay so workers need not be laid off. It must include the concept of refusing to close down the plants. Let a union committee run the plant. The workers must fight to establish a limit to speedup. There must be a united struggle for a government program of building houses and apartments on a massive scale, and the building of schools and hospitals to make it possible for every family to have a decent home, a school where their children can get a quality (integrated) education and where there is a hospital bed and quality medical care whenever needed. Such a struggle is in the self-interest of the working class. It would turn the struggle in the right direction against the real

foe, monopoly capitalism. This will create the basis for unity, but it still would not yet eliminate the inequalities.

Special Adjustments Necessary

In order to wipe out the effects of racism, white workers must join in the fight for special adjustments. There must be special steps of adjustments taken to erase the inequalities of the past hiring practices and lack of promotion to higher-paid, skilled jobs. Workers must fight to end the maneuvering by the bosses and many trade union leaders in their attempts to bypass the Fairfield decision.* They must fight to reject any "consent agreements" which basically leave the overall racist patterns intact. In order to wipe out the patterns of discrimination in housing all workers must fight for a government program that will make a decent house or apartment a reality for every family, wherever they choose to live. In order to carry out such adjustments it is necessary to work out the concrete steps that meet the concrete problems in each situation. How to approach these adjustments is a key question in the struggle to end racism. It is a key question in relation to molding working-class unity.

The economic crisis has sharply focused on these question and the capitalist establishment is definitely not interested in solutions. They continue their racist policies in the layoffs as they have in their racist policies in hiring. They rejoice and revel in the fact that the layoffs are creating new obstacles to labor unity and have stimulated new racist attitudes and divisions.

Next year will mark the 200th year since the people of the colonies saw their varied self-interests culminate in the war to end British colonial rule. But it will also be the 200th year of slavery followed by a special system of racist oppression against the black community. The question is not only the ending of the racist system. To establish true equality it is necessary to wipe out the effects of 200 years of discrimination. There have to be special adjustments to compensate for the inequalities that are the results of racist oppression.

In industry, the adjustments must be made in hiring, in advance-

* The *Fairfield* decision, a ruling by a U.S. district court, found the U.S. Steel Corporation (in collusion with the U.S. Steelworkers of America) guilty of discriminatory hiring and promotion practices. In a consent decree, April 12, 1974, the company was compelled to institute an affirmative action program and a more democratic seniority system.

ment to higher skills. The depression has made the struggle for these special adjustments urgent.

These are not simple matters. But when the struggle for adjustments is placed in the overall framework of the struggle against monopoly capitalism then it will be easier to convince white workers of the need for special adjustments. When the overall struggle is against the class enemy, when the basic demands go in the direction of making the corporations pay for all reforms, including for the special adjustments, when the demands are to make the corporations pay from the superprofits they have accumulated as a result of racist exploitation, then it will be easier to make white workers see that it is in their class interests to fight against racism. It will then be easier to make white workers see the need for special adjustments that call on them to make personal adjustments also.

On the basis of this workingclass approach to the struggle against the patterns of racism in the economic structure it is possible to simultaneously take on the ideological monster of racism. Once white workers see racism as a tool of the corporations, as a means for a higher rate of exploitation of the class as a whole, it will be possible to make them see racism as their enemy as well.

Socialism Destroys the Roots of Racism

This struggle against racism is very much in keeping with the patterns of world developments. The peoples throughout the world have made great strides in repelling racism. The United Nations resolutions condemning racism in all its forms are reflections of the growing strength of the anti-racist forces—in the first place the countries of socialism. The economic crisis of world capitalism brings into sharp focus the fact that there are no economic crises in the socialist countries. They have eliminated the causes for crises. The socialist countries stand out in sharp contrast because they have not only erased racism, but they have destroyed its roots. The socialist countries are setting an example of life without race prejudices or race hatreds.

In the field of economics the demand must be to make monopoly capital pay for the crimes that are the cause of the economic crisis, and make the corporations pay to correct the injustices that result from their policies and practices of racism.

Struggle is a stimulant to deeper thought. A confrontation compels

one to ask—who is my enemy? What is the ideology, the politics of my enemy? The answers lead to a deeper class consciousness. Struggle forces workers to think in terms of class unity, and in turn to see what the obstacles are to unity, such as racism, class collaboration, etc.

Within each experience, with each class battle, there is a spark, a tendency that leads to class consciousness. But left to itself the spark never ignites into a flame, the tendency never reaches its potential. By itself the process is one of trial and error.

The crisis makes working class unity an absolute and urgent necessity. The main obstacle to this unity is racism. It is the most effective weapon that monopoly capital has against the United States working class. This is the moment to uproot, to reject this poison that is brewed in the ideological caldrons of big business.

March 1, 1975

The Fight for Human Rights

Our war of national liberation, like all wars of liberation, was inevitable, anti-imperialist in essence, and an historic step in the right direction.

But looking back from this point in time it is clear that as a nation we have not kept the faith with the rebels of 1776.

The United States of today is not what the valiant fighters who defeated the British had in mind. Their ideal of “the home of the brave and the land of the free” has become tarnished and tattered.

The ideal that the rebel army had in mind did not include \$105 billion war budgets. It did not envisage 10-12 million people unemployed. They fought in poverty, meagerly clothed and fed. But they could not foresee that 200 years later, in the country they fought for,

the elderly would be forced to eat dog food and 50 percent of our senior citizens would be living below the poverty level.

The rebel army fought for national liberation, never dreaming that 200 years after victory 40 million Americans would be the victims of racial oppression, forced to live in ghettos and barrios.

Their passionate spirit was undefeatable against the foreign oppressor. They never dreamed that 200 years later the land they freed would itself become the exploiter and oppressor of more nations and people than any other in history.

The People's Revolutionary Army of workers and farmers at Valley Forge and Bunker Hill fought for the town and farms. Their dreams did not include a future of bankrupt cities engulfed in poverty and slums. They did not, and could not, have foreseen that the farms would become dominated by huge monopolies. Where the British troops failed, the agribusinesses have succeeded in driving the small farmers off the land.

The young people in the volunteer army did not fight for a country in which 200 years later there would be surplus generations of unemployed youth—with 50 to 60 percent of the Black youth permanently excluded from the work force.

The rebel army freed the people from the colonial prisons, never imagining that 200 years later the only part of the construction industry working would be those building prisons.

To be serious about history is to ask—What went wrong? The answer is that the seeds of what went wrong were already planted 200 years ago. The British were kicked out of the country, but the seeds of the economic and political system they had imported remained planted in the soil and grew. The names and titles of the exploiters changed, but the system of exploitation and slavery for private profits remained. The system quickly gave rise to a new class of exploiters. The domestic ruling class became as profit hungry as the foreign British oppressors.

Step by step the domestic variety of capitalism evolved into the huge monopoly corporations of today which now have our nation, economically and politically, firmly in their greedy grip.

This new domestic class of despots were and are as alien to the interests of the people of the United States as were the British colonialists. These new monarchs—the monarchs of big business—are as dictatorial, reactionary and racist as were the old British monarchs.

The British exacted hundreds of thousands of dollars in duties and taxes from the people of the colonies. Today, the U.S. monarchs of finance-capital collect a levy of \$40 billion annually, just as interest on past and present government bonds and loans that they hold.

The British held the new land in colonial bondage. The Wall Street pirates now hold the country in financial bondage.

We must learn the lessons of history from our great forefathers. Instead of a Boston Tea Party we need to organize a People's Party to gather together all of the hundreds of billions of dollars in bonds and loans, all of the mortgage papers and notes held by the banks, cancel and recycle them into wallpaper.

Two hundred years ago the people rebelled against high taxes. Another tax rebellion is in order. Today, out of every eight hours of labor a worker has to work two hours and 35 minutes just to pay taxes. On a yearly basis this means that a worker must work four months, from January to April, just to pay taxes for that year.

Two hundred years ago the British colonialist despots expropriated bales of cotton from the people of the colonies to enrich themselves. Today, the capitalist despots expropriate bales of dollars in private profits for their own private coffers. Like the British of yesterday, today's coupon-clippers and the idle rich do nothing to earn one penny of the money they expropriate as private profits from the exploitation and oppression of the people.

Again, we must learn from our forefathers. In 1776 the American ruling class converted the British corporate properties into American corporate property. What is needed today is to transfer the U.S. corporate-owned property into U.S. people-owned property.

And let me tell you we can do this based on good authority. Only a few days ago, speaking in Boston, with Rockefeller sitting at his side, President Ford said:

Let it be said that those of us who came to Concord, today reaffirmed the final words of the Declaration of Independence. Let me quote those final words: "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

The only lives monopoly capital ever pledged were the lives of our young people in imperialist wars of conquest.

As to the part of the pledge concerning "sacred honor," we should deliver a copy of that as a memento, as a part of the Watergate

memorabilia, to Nixon, Agnew, John Mitchell and Robert Halde-
man.

Nixon can have his framed together with President Ford's infamous phrase, "total and unconditional pardon."

History will record and frame them as examples of the decay, the cynicism and the utter corruption of big business politics.

But we, the people, should seriously take up the part of the pledge concerning the "fortunes." We can start by transferring ownership of the Rockefeller fortune to the people. This can be justifiably done because, after all, Rockefeller did take the pledge.

We can begin by nationalizing the energy industry, which includes Rockefeller's fortune in oil, coal and uranium. As a down-payment we should "nationalize" Rockefeller's \$3 billion personal fortune. Because we are a generous and considerate people we will permit him to keep his new custom-made \$35,000 bed which he just bought.

Not so long ago Rockefeller was asked whether he thought that becoming the vice president of the United States and holding on to a \$3 billion personal fortune in any way created a conflict of interest. His reply was that the very question "questions my integrity." This oil bandit, this inheritor of the loot of three generations of thieves and robber-barons, this trigger-man of Attica, whose grandfather led the slaughter of women and children in the Ludlow Massacre, this slavemaster, this rip-off artist, has the gall to resent the questioning of his integrity. Of course, it is true that you cannot really question the integrity of someone who never had any!

The British also resented the question as to whether they had a conflict of interest while serving the British colonial empire and lording it over the 13 colonies. The rebels resolved that conflict of interest.

We want to do as much for Rockefeller to resolve his conflict of interest. We will nationalize and return to the people the oil wells, coal mines, refineries, power plants and all of the stocks and bonds he owns and controls—which are resources, land and property stolen from the people by three generations of Rockefeller-thieves. Then the conflict of interest will be permanently resolved—and resolved in the interest of the people.

Again, we can learn from our forefathers. We can appropriate the \$105 billion being wasted on war production and do with it what our early American ancestors did. The rebels forced the British colonial-

ists to pack up their weapons and close their war production in the United States.

Speaking recently at the Army base headquarters in Georgia, President Ford attempted to minimize today's problems by saying: "Inflation, high prices, unemployment and recessions were all serious problems in 1776."

This is an ironic commendation for capitalism today. He is right. They were problems 200 years ago, and they are still problems today!

Is not 200 years of the same problems proof that there must be basic flaws in such a system?

And, is it not also clear that if we do not change the system these same problems, compounded many times over, will be with us for the next 200 years?

Racism and National Unity Can't Be Reconciled

I am in full agreement with the President when, in his Bicentennial speeches, he states: "We do need a renewed sense of national purpose," and "America needs new ideas and efforts from our people." Or when he talks about, "our commitment to human rights." And when he says, "We must again become a united people."

Yes, we desperately need "a renewed sense of national purpose"—a renewed sense of national purpose which is truly committed to "human rights." And to achieve this it is going to take some "new (basic and revolutionary) ideas from our people."

We are more than anxious and willing to present these "new ideas" that the President has asked for.

However, the new ideas must begin from the basic premise that a national purpose and the purpose of big business can never mesh, can never be a common purpose. They are and always will be in an insoluble and irreconcilable contradiction. Therefore, the national purpose can be served only by clipping the wings of the corporate purpose—the purpose of big business, of private profits.

The commitment to human rights is also in basic contradiction with monopoly capital's commitment to corporate rights. Therefore, human rights can be served only by fundamentally and permanently curtailing corporate rights and privileges.

And, as to uniting the nation, it is a basic truth that we simply cannot be a united nation when 200 corporations own and control 56

percent of all industrial production. How can there be unity between the parasitic, insatiable corporate stockholders and the 10 million unemployed? How can we talk about a united people as long as 25 million Black Americans are the victims of a special system of superexploitation and racist oppression, and when 8 million Chicanos, 2 million Puerto Ricans, along with millions of Asian and Native American Indian peoples all suffer under these brutal systems of superexploitation, racist and national oppression? Racism and national unity are irreconcilable opposites.

Yes, we can achieve a national purpose, a united people, when we take the necessary action that will make human rights number one on the list of all national priorities.

What is a more basic human right than the right to a job? If a 30-hour week for 40-hours pay will do it, why should that not be the national purpose?

What is a more basic human right than to live a life without racist oppression, without being discriminated against because of race or the color of one's skin? Why should not the elimination of this racist poison be a national purpose?

Why should not a decent life of respect and security for all the elderly and retirees be an achievement of national purpose?

What is a more basic human right than the youth having a chance—a chance to “earn, learn and live” and to love?

What is a more basic human right than to be able to live in peace and equality with the world? The concept of detente and peaceful coexistence with the socialist countries of the world is the only policy that can serve our national purpose.

The revolutionary rebels of 1776 had a national purpose. They became a united people when they unified themselves into a force that took the British colonialists by the scruffs of their necks and threw them into the sea.

We will have a national purpose and a united people, dedicated to human rights, when we take the monarchs of big business by the scruffs of their necks and throw them into the same sea.

Our war of independence was a progressive action. But because of today's domination by the monarchs of monopoly capital we have lost that progressive momentum, especially during the last years.

As a nation, there was a time when we were number one in many areas of the quality of life in the world: The United States was number

one in the number of doctors per 100 people. Now we are number 18 on the list of nations.

There was a time when we were the number one nation in literacy. Now we are rated number 15 in the world.

There was a time when we were the number one nation having the lowest rate of infant mortality. Today we rate number 15.

Some time ago we were number one in life expectancy. Now we are rated 26. In a sense this is related to the fact that there was a time when our country was way down on the list of military powers. Now we are the number one military power.

The British colonialists viewed the people of the American colonies with contempt and disregard for their social welfare.

Does the indiscriminate setting of a cutoff date for receiving unemployment benefits, the cutting off of food stamps for the hungry, or the impounding and vetoing of funds for construction of housing, hospitals, schools and the cutting of funds for education and the vetoing of bills that would create jobs show any less contempt by the government for the people of our country today? Is this not a total disregard of the people's welfare?

The British despots said that the people of America expected too much.

This is exactly what the Ford Administration and the monarchs of monopoly capital are saying today—the people's expectations are too high.

If the Tories, the slavemasters and the varieties of silk-stockings, parasitic minuet-waltzers of 1776 could see how the monarchs of big business—the bloated leeches of 1976—rip off the people through high taxes, high prices and rents—in total and callous disregard for their welfare—they would arise from their English graves and declare: "We won after all. Our class brothers are on the throne."

We are now learning some new facts which will go down as one of the despicable pages in the history of human society.

At least four U.S. presidents and their cabinets—while making demagogic speeches about law and order, about a society governed by laws and not by men—have made policies of assassination of political leaders, who oppose U.S. imperialism, into official governmental policy. These fiendish and ghoulish butchers in tailcoats and striped pants conspire together with the assassins of the underworld to commit these monstrous acts of political assassination.

The CIA is the assassin on a global scale. Now it is revealed that the FBI is in the same business on the domestic scene. As inconspicuously as possible, Attorney General Levi revealed that through forgery and provocation the FBI worked for years to incite the underworld hit-men to assassinate Communists.

For years the CIA pursued a policy of mass assassination against political leaders in Vietnam. The instructors of the notorious Green Berets were underworld hit-men.

We demanded it three years ago, and we renew the demand again—a padlock must be permanently put on the doors of the chamber of evil, the headquarters of mass murder, the offices of the snoopers, the lair of the assassins in the interest of democracy and peace, the doors of the Pentagon, CIA and FBI should be padlocked—or they could be turned into Museums of Horrors.

All the great events of today are related to the explosive historic transition from capitalism to socialism. One after another exploited and oppressed countries are winning their independence. Most of them are quickly turning to the building of a socialist society. Ford, Schlesinger and Kissinger call this process “the fall of the dominos.” More than dominos, there is a bandwagon effect of history. There is a new tempo of events which seems to be saying to the people of the world: “Get on the bandwagon of socialism and national liberation NOW.”

Social progress is a relentless, and now irreversible process. The old society prepares the soil for the new.

A quote from John Adams about the Revolution of 1776 is an apt description of the process toward socialism today:

The Revolution was effected before the war commenced. The Revolution was in the hearts and minds of the people . . . This radical change in the principles, opinion, sentiments, and affections of the people, was the real American Revolution. [from letter to Hezekiah Niles, February 13, 1818]

The real United States socialist revolution is now clearly “blowing in the wind.”

July 12, 1975

Corporate Fangs

At times, the fangs of monopoly capital are withdrawn out of sight, but they are always ready to strike. The corporate fangs appear especially during periods of crisis. There are now increasing reports of their probing attacks. Based on past experience, it is necessary to conclude that if they get away with these initial, probing attacks they can lead to an overall reactionary drive against the working class and especially against the progressive, militant section of the working-class movement.

Before the organization of trade unions in the mass production industries, the private, corporate police departments were the "law." They were also in full charge of "all labor relations." They screened all workers and kept the militants out of the industries. If they had even the slightest suspicion of dissatisfaction, or of attempts to organize trade unions, militant workers were summarily fired. They kept lists, on a national scale, of workers who were barred from all industries coast-to-coast. Provocations, frameups, violence and imprisonment were the weapons of the rule of corporate power.

In spite of the corporate terror, supported by government and anti-labor bodies, the workers in basic industries organized themselves into the industrial unions. Because of the terror, the initial forms of organization were secret and underground. But once the basic structures were set up the unions were able to fight for their legal status. As a result of struggle some important legislation was passed which established minimum rights for workers, including the right to organize trade unions, and placed some restrictions on the corporations. Thus, for a period the corporations had to at least give the impression of "living within the law." In fact, they were forced to pull in some of their fangs.

Then came the cold war and the accompanying reactionary McCarthyite campaign. The fangs lashed out again. The terror of anti-communism, anti-labor hysteria, the anti-democracy drive and racism

were codified into the Smith Act, Taft-Hartley (anti-labor) Act, Landrum-Griffin and McCarran Acts. These laws were passed in the midst of a period of whipped-up hysteria.

The corporations used these reactionary laws to drive Communists and other militants out of the industries and out of many of the trade unions. Within the sweep of the cold war, McCarthyite hysteria, many of the trade unions inserted anti-communist clauses into their constitutions. Now the corporate fangs had the support of reactionary laws and the anti-communist clauses in the trade union constitutions. Many trade union leaders capitulated and joined in the drive against militant trade unionists.

A few years later another turn of events took place. McCarthyism went too far afield. A broad opposition developed against this fascist-oriented, reactionary drive. Finally, even the Supreme Court had to drain some of the poison from the fangs of this McCarthyite campaign.

And so for a period the corporations again were forced to limit the use of their poisonous fangs.

At the present moment they do not have laws behind which they can hide their attacks. Therefore there is an all-out drive to take care of this oversight. Out of the Mitchell-Nixon-Haldeman-Goldwater conspiracy came a proposal for a law (S-1), which would incorporate into a single law most of the reactionary, anti-democratic, anti-labor, anti-communist and racist features of all the past laws. The reactionary forces of the country are now pushing, on an emergency basis, for passage of this fascist-oriented law. The proposed revival of all anti-democratic legislation and agencies strikes at such a broad area of people's rights that it therefore also provides the base for a massive people's movement to guarantee the defeat of this fascist-enabling act.

But the corporate cobras are not waiting for the passage of this law. They are moving to strike in the spirit of S-1 even before it is passed! These assaults are geared not only to slowing down the process of radicalization, to destroying the rising militant rank-and-file movement, but also to creating the atmosphere for the passage of the reactionary S-1. In other words, they are attempting to destroy the opposition that is developing against the passage of S-1.

There is now a new pattern of frameups and provocations taking place in too many areas to be brushed off as isolated incidents. There are provocations in the steel, copper, iron ore, coal mining and

automobile industries. The pattern indicates central direction. And based on past experience the pattern indicates FBI and CIA involvement. The attempted frameups and provocations are taking place in numerous forms and ways. Militant workers are deliberately provoked into individual actions and then fired. There are blatant cases of drugs planted on workers and then "discovered by the authorities." For example, a young worker, an active, militant rank-and-file leader, drove his car into the company parking lot. A few hours later he was called into the management office and told by city and company police that they found drugs in the hubcaps of the wheels of his car. A clear case of frameup! This took place at the very moment when the militant rank-and-file movement was spearheading a campaign to take over the leadership of the local in that plant.

There are increasing reports of cases where corporate stooges use racism as a means of provoking conflicts. The Ford Motor Company now has a system of requiring prospective employees to sign a waiver giving the corporation the right to obtain from the FBI any files they may have on such individuals. A clear case of violation of workers' civil rights and attempted harassment by the corporations. It is evident, also, that this is a corporate-FBI-police department conspiracy.

There have been instances where the corporations used the FBI method of sending forged letters. The FBI has admitted forging the name of the Communist Party on letters to gangster elements in the hope of creating provocations against Communist leaders. So far, the Department of Justice has refused to reveal the content of these letters.

Policies of class collaboration create the conditions for frameups. Class collaborationist agreements rule out the right to strike. When workers strike, the corporations and the courts use the no-strike contract clauses as the "excuse" to fire militant workers.

There is enough accumulated evidence of this type of activity to warrant the concern of all militant and progressive workers.

However, the corporations are quickly learning that 1975 is not the 1930s. Workers are not falling for the frameup attempts nor the provocations. They are rallying in defense of the victims of the provocations. Because of the militant mass reactions, in most cases the corporations have been forced to pull in their fangs.

They can be defeated in all their attempts. The best defense against

such frameups and provocations is to expose them and to alert workers and members of unions in advance. The best defense against such attacks is an alert, knowledgeable, united working class.

The assaults by the corporate fangs are in a sense proof of the fact that rank-and-file initiatives with policies of class struggle trade unionism are making their mark on the class struggle scene. With struggle, the working class and the trade union movement can extract all the poison and force the withdrawal of these corporate fangs.

A united, militant, organized trade union movement in a broad alliance with other democratic forces, and in the first place in alliance with the victims of racist oppression—Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano and American Indian people's movements—can defeat the attempts to pass the fascist-oriented S-1 law and can corral the cobras of monopoly capital.

October 11, 1975

***You May Not Kill, Terrorize or
Harass—Except in Case of . . .***

The exposure, although far from complete, of the illegal, immoral, unconstitutional and inhuman activities of the FBI and CIA is a positive development. For the first time the public is hearing that these sacred cows of the government and mass media have killed, spied, harassed and used frameups and provocations as a basic policy of their operations. Even though this is but the tip of the criminal iceberg, the people now see the open savagery and brutality of U.S. monopoly capital. This is all to the good!

However, for the tens of thousands of us who have been the victims of the FBI and CIA these revelations are not new or surprising. We (the Communist Party) have been exposing these activities for some

30 years. The mass media, which now expresses surprise and horror, has for these past 30 years been covering up and refusing to publish our charges—charges which are now being proven true by these investigations.

Senator Frank Church and the Senate Select Intelligence Committee have done a public service, and their exposés help to defend the democratic institutions of our country.

But, there is a basic flaw in the report on assassination plots by the intelligence agencies. The flaw is in the way the investigation is being conducted and in the way the mass media is handling these revelations. And this is not accidental! They are deliberately continuing to cover up the basic framework within which these illegal and sordid activities take place. In a sense the report and the mass media are continuing to do what they have been doing for some 30 years. They are protecting and covering up this framework.

Before these anti-democratic forces (CIA, FBI and the multitude of other so-called intelligence units) were able to do their dirty work they had to do what the Hitler-fascists did before they were able to establish their regime of murder and violence. They had to create an atmosphere and an “excuse” for making anything permissible and justified, as long as they were able to say the victims were Communists. Once the door was open, once the “Communists” were placed beyond the pale of law, then all acts were permissible and justified against “suspected Communists.” These were followed by actions and harassment of people who were suspected of associating with “suspected Communists.”

This is the same framework within which the FBI and CIA have been operating. Within this framework each bigoted, reactionary, mentally defective, racist CIA and FBI operative has been able to set his own criteria of “suspicion.” That is how the McCarthyite hysteria worked. Before McCarthy was able to attack a broad spectrum of the people he had to create an atmosphere of suspicion in which such conduct was acceptable to a large sector of the people.

This basic concept, or mode of operation, is being continued and is still acceptable, as reflected in the Senate Committee’s report. It is the accepted framework within which the TV commentators operate and newspaper editorials are written. The framework is that the FBI and CIA have done “wrong” and must not continue to harass or use dirty

tricks or assassinations, unless of course the victims are suspected Communists.

The provocations and harassment of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. were outrageous. The Committee's report mildly condemns them. But, the report and the mass media leave the framework within which these activities took place intact. The report excused the actions of the FBI as long as they thought "Communists were influencing Reverend King's movement."

This same concept is still defended in the FBI's activities against McGovern's campaign for the Presidency, which led to the Watergate affair. It was condemned only in so far as it went beyond investigating "suspected Communists."

During the recent hearings only Senator Mondale of Minnesota asked the question: "Is it not true that the Communist Party is a legal organization?" All of the other members of the Committee accepted the concept that the activities of the FBI, even if they were illegal, were alright as long as they were directed against suspected Communists.

Testifying before the Senate Committee, the FBI spokesman stated:

The first effort, or the forerunner for the so-called COINTELPRO (dirty tricks-GH) effort began with the decision to initiate an effort against the Communist Party, U.S.A. The decision grew largely out of the frustration with the lack of success in attempts to enforce the Smith Act, and the FBI's determination that law enforcement in a traditional sense was simply not enough to neutralize or discredit the Communist Party.

So, in 1956 the Bureau directs a counter-intelligence program against the Communist Party, U.S.A., designed to "capitalize on incidents involving the Party and its leaders in order to foster factionalization, bring the Communist Party and its leaders into disrepute before the American public, and cause confusion and dissatisfaction among rank and file members." (Senate Select Committee hearings on COINTELPRO.)

This became the framework!

The same holds true for the way that the so-called "Freedom of Information Act" is being applied. The FBI determines and decides what part of the information about its activities it will release to the victims of its harassment.

What is the result of this continuing coverup? It leaves the basic framework for the operation of these illegal and brutal activities intact. When the hearings are completed and the public attention

abates, these bigots will still be completely free to reestablish their illegal practices. As Mr. Kissinger said this past week: "It is high time that the intelligence agencies be given the opportunity to go back to their business." Back to the business of harassment, provocations and assassinations.

There is conclusive evidence that during the very days the Senate Committee was conducting its hearings FBI agents were busy harassing and trying to intimidate people whom they "suspected of having Communist leanings." They felt completely immune. They can afford to feel this way because the hearings and the report protect the framework within which they operate.

What happens when this framework and the atmosphere it creates is permitted to influence events is clearly seen in the introduction of and efforts to pass into law the most anti-democratic of all legislation, the S-1 bill. This proposed law is now being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is clearly a police-state bill being pushed behind the smokescreen of anti-communism. It must be fought and defeated in defense of the democratic rights of all the people. It must be defeated because the provisions of this fascist-like bill would endanger not only the democratic rights of Communists, but of all who would assert their rights—rights which may be in conflict with the policies and practices of bodies or agencies of the government.

Another feature of the framework within which these activities have taken place is the acceptance, the promotion, of racism in the operation of government bodies. This was an admitted factor in the way the FBI conducted its harassment campaign against Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. There is no attempt in the report, nor in the way the mass media handled this question, to fight against or to eliminate this racist feature of the overall framework.

Unfortunately, liberals and many trade union leaders have not drawn the lessons from this past history. In the past many of them were instruments of the FBI in helping to create the atmosphere that "anything goes as long as it is directed against Communists." They have not drawn the lessons in spite of the fact that many of them became the victims of the very atmosphere they helped to create. Most of them are now applauding the exposes. But many are continuing to accept, defend and cover up the big-lie excuse for the illegal, undemocratic, fascist-like activities of the FBI and CIA. Too many are still swallowing the bait thrown to them by the right-wing fascist

forces. These reactionary, anti-democratic elements will remain a danger to all progressive forces until they are compelled to drop the camouflage of anti-communism.

Anti-communism, therefore, is the refuge of all reactionary, right-wing, fascist scoundrels!

It is a law of social development that you cannot successfully fight for democratic rights in general while accepting the anti-communist framework, because this is the very framework through which the reactionary forces fight to destroy all the democratic rights of all the people.

December 6, 1975

Demagogy—the Art (and Craft) Of Hoodwinking People

Demagogy has no limits. It is not restricted by any concern for truth. Political demagogy is based on the simple proposition that some of the people will believe some of the falsehoods some of the time. Demagogy is the art of hoodwinking people.

The aim of right-wing demagogy is to get mass support for reactionary, pro-big business programs behind a demagogic smokescreen. They have achieved their goal when others in the political arena begin to repeat their slogans. They have then succeeded in creating the necessary atmosphere of confusion.

For a number of years the right-wing reactionary forces have campaigned on the slogan, "The evils of big government spending." This has now become the theme song of most Republican and Democratic politicians. It was the theme of Ford's State of the Union message. And Senator Muskie, speaking for the Democrats on na-

tionwide TV, hummed the same tune. In that sense the mass media does not provide equal time for real opposing views.

They have to some degree succeeded in achieving a mass popular sentiment for "cutting federal spending." Many are now convinced that government spending in general is the cause of most if not all of the economic ills. The demagogic, reactionary campaign has created the atmosphere of confusion and the corporate cobra is ready to strike. They have a two-edged sword. They are hoping their rabble-rousing cries to "cut government spending" will drown out all opposition to the cuts in the areas concerned with people's welfare. And they hope the masses will be confused enough so that while they doubletalk about "cutting government spending" they will be able to push through increased spending in the area of the military-industrial complex.

The demagogues create confusion and then appeal to the perplexed masses by declaring, "See, we are cutting government spending." Reagan declares, "I'm proposing a \$90 billion cut!" He wants to "cut government spending" by closing down all social security offices and completely end governmental responsibility for social welfare. Ford proposes to do the same, but one step at a time. While all this is going on not one of the Republican or Democratic candidates speaks about cutting military spending. In fact, they all talk about increasing it.

the "new realism" the politicians of big business talk about is austerity for the people while increasing government spending for all sections of the military-industrial complex through huge military orders, tax subsidies and gifts to the rich.

Yes, "government spending must be cut." But the list of priorities must be reversed. There must be increased spending on human welfare programs and a huge slash or an end to government expenditures for the military-industrial complex. A \$100 billion slash in the \$120 billion per year military budget is a meaningful cut! Another \$100 billion trimmed from the various programs which subsidize big corporations is a meaningful cut! A \$50 billion savings by curtailing or ending all programs of imperialist military aggression, including the massive para-military and intelligence operations would be a meaningful cut! Such steps would substantially "cut government spending." These are the only cuts that make sense. Military spending does not create jobs. Because military spending does not produce useful products the

people can buy, it is the biggest single factor causing inflation—high prices, rents and taxes.

When the demagogues speak about “cuts in big government spending,” they include the money that has been collected through payroll deductions from the workers for social security programs. The Reagans want to confiscate this money and turn it over to the military-industrial complex.

So the problem is not “government spending” in general. The question is: spending for what, for the people’s welfare or for the corporate fat-cats? The economic ills and the resulting problems are related to the system of capitalism that has grown into a monster; into an oppressive, gluttonous, all-devouring state monopoly syndicate.

The people must erect anti-monopoly barriers with signs that read, “Don’t feed the monster,” “Cut all government welfare payments to the military-industrial complex.”

Adopt meaningful programs such as:

—Government projects for the construction of badly needed housing, schools, hospitals, day care centers, recreation and sports facilities;

—End the unjust policy of levying taxes on the poor;

—Make 6-hours the legal work day, without any cuts in the paycheck;

—End all practices of discrimination because of race, age or sex.

Adopt a guiding rule; increase government spending wherever it helps people and cut government spending wherever it makes the rich richer and where it goes down the bottomless military pit.

March 6, 1976

Beginning or Beclouding

The biggies of Wall Street are now busy setting down the basic guidelines for the operation of the Carter administration. These guidelines are passed on by way of a series of editorials in *The New York Times*.

One of these editorials has the laudable headline: "A New Beginning. . .and Liberty" (*The New York Times*, 12/27/76). But a closer reading clearly shows that these are not guidelines for a new beginning but a rehash of the same old stuff.

The editorial does what has become a new, widely used method of coverup. It is impossible for these forces to deny Watergate, the illegal wiretapping, break-ins, burglaries and assassinations by the FBI and CIA. So they admit the undeniable, but cover up by saying these crimes were committed during the Nixon administration. Once the coverup is in place they then proceed to blame the people or "the nation." This editorial argues that all of the FBI and CIA crimes could not have taken place "if the nation had not become immunized to the idea that objectionable means can be justified by lofty aims."

Therein lies the first hooker—"lofty aims." What lofty aims? That is what they said about the criminal bombing of the population centers in Vietnam and the destruction of the elected people's government in Chile. The editorial and those behind it do not say one word about the hundreds of millions of dollars that were illegally passed on under the table by most of the big corporations to the Nixon war chest. Their "lofty aims" were to enable them to continue their greedy hold on the state and political apparatus, to continue exploiting the people and milking government funds. Their "lofty aims" were and are maximum corporate profits at all costs. The "lofty aims" of the FBI, CIA and the Nixon administration were the "lofty aims" of big business.

In pursuit of their "lofty aims" they set out to destroy and to eliminate the influence of Communists and other militants in the trade union movement because it was a way to weaken the trade unions.

And weaker trade unions make it possible to cut wages and speedup production.

The same editorial states, "Attorney General Edward Levi has made a commendable start in curbing the domestic intelligence agencies." What "commendable start"? In fact Mr. Levi has done a "commendable" job in preserving the basic system of the police state—the wiretapping, break-ins, burglaries and assassinations. He has done what *The New York Times* editorial says should be done. Consider these hookers in the editorial: "There are risks in such efforts to limit the powers of the domestic and foreign intelligence apparatus, . . . effective investigative police operations at home are essential protections against. . . political subversion."

What is meant by "political subversion"? It is a police-state term. It is whatever the authorities interpret it to mean. It can be any opposition to the policies of the party in power. It can be any expression against the power of monopoly capital. It can be any expression against racism. It can be any expression against the policy of imperialist aggression. "National security" has lost much of its usefulness as a smokescreen. So it is being replaced by the term "political subversion."

The fact remains that after all the investigations and exposes the same legal subterfuge for the police state setup continues. In fact, Ford and Levi have made the illegal practices of burglaries, break-ins and wiretapping by the CIA and FBI, without a warrant, official policy. They do it more secretly and carefully, but they have not given up the practices.

Just recently, in a brief filed in federal court, the Department of Justice said: "It is and has long been the Department's view that warrantless searches involving physical entries into private premises are justified." To cover up this official policy of destroying the Constitution Mr. Levi has coined such phrases as: "trespassery microphone surveillance," or break in by "minimum intrusion." (*American Police State*, by Dave Weiss.) This, to *The New York Times* editors, is a "commendable start." The new name "trespassery microphone surveillance" is still the same old break-in and burglary.

The same editorial correctly states: "The abuses were only the culmination of a trend set in motion by the distortion of internal security that started in the Cold War Era." But it is not because of an oversight that the editors do not discuss that "distortion."

The cold war itself was the most basic of all "distortions." It was based on the same big lie of anti-communism that Hitler used. The propaganda line was that the cold war measures were necessary because of the "clear and present danger of Soviet aggression." The truth is that the cold war policies were a feature of the U.S. policy of imperialist aggression. The cold war policies were in support of Dulles' stated policies of "rolling back the borders of the socialist countries."

The second basic distortion on the domestic scene was the drive to destroy all opposition to the war policies and the destruction of democratic rights. This action was done behind the demagogy of anti-communism, but always spearheaded by an attack on the Communist Party. Why are these distortions of the past so important now? Because *The New York Times*, while covering up, advances the concept of retaining the basic political distortion of anti-communism that led to Watergate.

Our own history makes this very clear—the big lie of anti-communism is the most effective weapon in the destruction of democracy in general. The distortions of *The New York Times* editorials are the calculated distortions of monopoly capital.

There can be a really new beginning by rescinding Levi's anti-democratic, anti-communist diktat.

A new beginning calls for the disbanding of the FBI and CIA.

A new beginning call for defeating the anti-democratic, anti-communist S-1 bill.

January 15, 1977

Did Esquire Run Out of Space?

I received the following letter early this year from *Esquire* magazine:

Dear Mr. Hall,

Finding a job will be the subject of a section in the July issue of *Esquire*, and the editors thought it would be instructive to inquire of a number of prominent Americans what their first jobs were and then publish their replies.

Would you tell us. . . what your very first full-time job was, how you got it and anything else about it that might be useful, informative or entertaining to those of our readers who are (or will be) seeking employment.

As our deadline for this article is March 25, we would appreciate hearing from you by or before March 21.

Cordially,
Managing Editor

My reply was as follows:

Managing Editor
Esquire magazine

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your request that I submit a short piece on the recollections of my first job, to be published in your July issue.

I welcome this opportunity, and thank you for selecting me as one of the people requested to respond on this subject.

Below is my response, which I have written in "flashback" form:

Bitter flashbacks of my first job

—Age 14—a lumberjack in northern Minnesota;

—An all day and night ride in an unheated boxcar, 30-40 degrees below zero;

- Hired, given a number, assigned to a bunk, and a work crew;
- \$1.00 per day, no set hours of work, from dark-before-dawn to evening-darkness, often in weather 40-50 degrees below zero.

Vivid impressions

- The irresponsible destruction of the most beautiful virgin forests in the land, by profit-hungry corporations; the aftermath—like a war zone, or the debris after a tornado, with no concern or attempts at reforestation.

Odors, sounds, smells & tastes

- Eating frozen baloney sandwiches for lunch;
- The early morning fragrance of pine and spruce;
- 60 men hanging their dirty, wet clothes to dry in a frame bunkhouse covered with layers of tarpaper walls;
- The smell of 60 men, their wet clothes, with no bath for 6 months—living with no ventilation of any kind;
- The smoke from a heating stove made from a 50-gallon oil drum with welded legs;
- The putrid odor of the spring thaw from the melting mountain of the winter's accumulated urine back of the bunkhouse;
- The greatly exaggerated, beautiful, humane and humorous Paul Bunyan-like stories always related as self-exploits—as a way of passing time and self-entertainment.

Sights

- Hundreds of quarters of beef hung between trees, out of reach of wolves, but not of maggots—in the spring the beef and maggots made their way into stews;
- A teenage lumberjack drowning, trying to cross thin ice, because of homesickness—the frozen, dead body of a worker waiting for a spring burial.

Memories

- The attempt to organize a union—a strike that failed—a union demand for clean linen every other month;
- Fired for “disturbing the peace” in the woods;
- The jobless, filthy and poor, returning to the cities—first stop a bath—shaving of all hair for application of blue ointment, and fumigation to get rid of six-month crop of human lice, crabs and dirt;

- The accumulated wages, \$140 for six months work;
- The rot-gut moonshine sold by people set up by the company;
- Isolation—no mail, newspapers, magazines or radio for six months;
- The racism against Indian-Americans—who were paid less than the \$1 a day.

Recap and resolution

- Hired at 14, fired at 14½, determined to dedicate my adult life in the struggle to change conditions of work and life so future young generations will not have to remember their first jobs as “bitter flashbacks.”

Sincerely,
Gus Hall,
General Secretary, CPUSA

On April 25, I received the following letter from *Esquire*:

Dear Mr. Hall:

Thanks very much for responding to our query regarding your first, full-time job. Unfortunately, a combination of limited time and space necessitated the elimination of several pieces that we would have liked to run—yours among them.

Please accept our apologies. We sincerely appreciate your contribution.

Cordially,
Managing Editor

I have no way of knowing whether *Esquire* actually “ran out of space.”

December 31, 1977

CIA Coverup

On Christmas Day, *The New York Times* started a three-part series on the CIA. The obvious question that comes to the mind of any knowledgeable reader is: Why would this newspaper, which has knowingly published false and misleading material furnished by the CIA and, in turn, supplied the CIA with information it collected, now run a series of articles exposing the CIA?

The answer becomes clear from reading the very first page. "The recurring allegations have led the House Select Committee on Intelligence to schedule hearings on this matter beginning this Tuesday."

It is clear that *The New York Times*, in typically CIA fashion, wanted to take the public shock out of facts that will be revealed by giving them an advance coverup interpretation.

What is the aim of the series? First, to serve as a special coverup for the slimy, irresponsible and reprehensible role of *The New York Times* and other mass media organs in misleading the people of the United States.

Second, the aim is to convince the public that the gangster-like ideological activities of the CIA and its mass media flunkies are something behind us and in the past.

The New York Times hastens to state editorially: "Information that is more than ten and twenty years old, . . . the CIA *once used* the credentials of reporters," and "these contacts developed in the years of bitter cold war hostilities." (Emphasis mine—GH.)

This is an obvious effort to give the impression that such activities are not going on today. The series mentions names of people who are dead and names of CIA fronts, newspapers and news services which are now out of business.

This is a deliberate coverup for currently existing fronts, including the very-much alive double-agents, reporters and CIA agents.

In the same issue of *The New York Times* there is a typical example of how the *Times* continues to work with the CIA today. It publishes

an article on the “serious problems” in the oil fields of Saudi Arabia. It is clear the CIA did not want this article (for which it furnished the material) to be published before the meeting of the OPEC countries because such news would have cut the influence of Saudi Arabia in the meeting in Venezuela last week. So the dirty tricks of the CIA and *The New York Times* are not a thing of the past.

Third, the aim of the series is to cover up the fact that the CIA and *The New York Times* deal in totally calculated falsehoods.

This coverup is aided by use of sub-heads in the articles such as, “Efforts to Mold the World’s Views,” or “CIA Secret Shaper of Public Opinion.” And in a special coverup story, *The New York Times* states that the reporter’s relationship with the CIA “is a legitimate relationship for a reporter.”

It is obvious *The New York Times* wants to pass over the campaign of falsehoods and lies as just “propaganda,” or simply “an attempt to influence people.”

It is apparent that in the eyes of *The Times* editors there is no difference between “influencing people” and lying. While it is inexcusable it is also understandable why organs that defend capitalism can do so only by lying. The truth would expose their anti-social, anti-people nature as paid defenders of a dying, inherently anti-human system.

Nevertheless because of its fear of what will come to light in the Congressional hearings, *The Times* series is forced to admit some of the facts:

- That the CIA spends billions of U.S. taxpayers’ money on spreading lies and distortions to the people of the United States and throughout the world;
- That the CIA does this by paying off hundreds of newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations;
- That this is being done by having thousands of reporters, commentators and editors, both in the United States and overseas, on the CIA payroll.

In fact, the question is not which reporter or commentator is on the CIA payroll, but to find some who are not.

The series states that the CIA was and still is paying for the writing, publication and distribution of hundreds of books, and also pays for “good reviews” of these books in newspapers like *The New York Times*.

The series admits that the CIA rewrote a number of paragraphs in the speech that Khrushchev made in his criticisms of the excesses of Stalin. But the fact is that *The New York Times* was the chief pusher of this CIA version of Khrushchev's speech. This is but an example of the special role of *The New York Times* in spreading the falsehoods of the CIA.

What is the basic nature of the falsehoods and distortions of these criminal, ideological gangsters? Day in and day out, in their most fundamental sense, they are anti-working class, racist, anti-socialist and in a special, vindictive way anti-Soviet. These falsehoods are manufactured to support policies of imperialism and colonialism.

In many cases the CIA sees to it that the articles they provide the material for get widely circulated.

It is a sad commentary on the so-called "freedom of the press," on "objective reporting." Examples of this Big Lie journalism are the relationships between *The New York Times* and the CIA, and the FBI and its house organ, the *New York Daily News*.

The main issue in all this is that the CIA, the FBI and the mass media spend billions of dollars to spread the Big Lie, to put over a gigantic fraud on the world and the American people.

Never in history have so many mass media organs spread so many lies and falsehoods for so many years.

December 29, 1977

Honor History by Making History

To celebrate past struggles and honor heroes and heroines while doing nothing about the issues and injustices that gave rise to the struggles and the heroes and heroines is meaningless lip service to history. Any meaningful observance must serve the purpose of continuing the struggles and raising the movements to new levels. The past must serve the present.

Big Business does not like May Day observances because they are demonstrations and protests against the injustices and problems the working people face today. Big Business slobbers over Labor Day because it is not linked to the struggles of today. The Labor Day events are meaningless—and in fact serve the purpose of screening out the problems of workers today.

The same is true regarding the annual meetings in honor of the Warsaw uprising. They serve a meaningful purpose when they are related to and concerned with the struggles against anti-Semitism, racism and policies of imperialist aggression, and when they are demonstrations against the occupation and annexation of other people's lands. Not to take a stand against such policies is to dishonor the heroes and heroines of the Warsaw ghetto uprisings. Many "honor" the Warsaw uprising with a great profusion of words, but overlook or defend Israel's unjust occupation of the Arab people's land taken in the 1967 aggression.

February is observed as Black History Month. The observance of Black History Month serves a very positive purpose. In most cases the events are linked to the struggles against racism today. In most cases it is a month of protest against racism. It serves as a month of discussions and assessments about the advances, as well as the task of removing the remaining obstacles on the path of totally eliminating racism in all the walks and crevices of life.

In general, the month's activities serve to raise the consciousness and the struggle to new levels. The events tend to strengthen Black-white unity.

Black History Month helps to correct the distortions and fill in the racist deletions on the role of Black Americans in the struggle for democracy and economic security.

But there are forces who would like to take the element of struggle and protest out of the February observances. This is true with many liberals and is especially the case with some white liberals.

There was a time when a public recognition of the role of Black people in the history of our country by white Americans was considered a step forward. But it does not even begin to measure up to the tasks and responsibilities of white Americans in the struggle against racism today.

To observe Black History Month, without taking active part in the struggles against today's racism becomes, in reality, a screen that hides racism. It becomes a substitute and meaningless lip service.

A Black History Month observance that is not related to and concerned with developing, initiating and supporting struggles for affirmative action turns into empty ceremony. The very meaning of affirmative action is to get away from hypocritical, empty ceremony and get into action against both the very real effects of past racism and against the concrete manifestations of today's racism.

Not to use the February events to bring pressure on the Supreme Court, the Carter administration and the Congress on the precedent-setting Bakke case is to "sing psalms for pretense" and a dishonor to the heroes and heroines of Black liberation.

For white Americans Black History Month must be a time of rededication to burn out the cancer of racism, a time of deeper understanding of the critical and key nature of the struggle against racism in the context of the overall struggle for democracy and social progress.

Racism affects the lives of Black, Latino, Indian, Asian and Mexican Americans. But it is the white Americans who are afflicted by it. We have a special responsibility in the struggle because, in a sense, the crimes of racism are committed in our name. Racism continues because white Americans tolerate it, make excuses for it. To speak about Black-white unity without white initiatives against concrete manifestations of racism in the shops, neighborhoods, schools, is meaningless, empty rhetoric. The fact is that racism remains our country's most dangerous pollutant.

The struggle against racism must take place on many levels—social,

economic, political, ideological and moral. It is related to most issues and phases of life. But in a basic sense the struggle against racism can be victorious if it is related to the struggle against the evils of capitalism. Many liberals would like to observe Black History Month without any reference to racism and corporate profits.

Any idea that what is good for monopoly capital will somehow be beneficial for the victims of racism is a dangerous illusion. It is a variant of the old trickle-down theory that if a government passes enough money to the big corporations in the form of gifts, tax cuts, government contracts and price increases, that, somehow, some of this will trickle down to the workers in the form of wages or jobs. This has always been a part of the class collaborationist gimcrackery. It is a scheme to convince workers that their class self-interests are best served by giving Big Business whatever it wants. This is very much the essence of President Carter's proposed federal budget. In fact, most government programs and policies of most administrations are based on the trickle-down theory. This has been going on for years and years. But the workers are still waiting for the trickle to begin. The flow of cash into the coffers of Big Business keeps gushing. But the expected trickle remains a dry-run.

The roots of racism are imbedded in the system of the corporate drive for ever-increasing profits. The increased profits have never resulted in less racism.

For example, besides the record one-half trillion dollar Carter federal budget, of which most is pumped back to the corporations, this past year also broke the profit record. The after-taxes profits of Big Business went over the \$100 billion mark. In fact, one of the factors that makes it possible for monopoly capital to amass such unconscionable, gluttonous wealth is the extra profits it reaps from the policies and practices of racism. So more of the same evil is no solution to the evil.

The roots of racism are in the exploitative system of capitalism. The victories against racism, therefore, are best served by relating the struggles against racism to the struggle against the evils of capitalism.

February 18, 1978

Capitalism's Fascist Mentality

After 30 years of protective procrastination, the U.S. government is carrying out “deportation proceedings” against a Latvian Nazi, Vilis Hazners.

During World War II, Hazners was an admitted police chief of a district near the Soviet border, and a decorated senior officer in the Latvian SS Legion, a counterpart and affiliate of the German Army's Waffen SS.

He is now accused by a number of eyewitnesses of participating in the torture and murder of hundreds of Jews. Hazners' lawyer says that he denies participation in the attacks on Latvian Jews. Latvia was occupied by Germany.

Note this. Hazners doesn't deny that he participated in attacking and killing Soviet Jews. He just didn't participate in attacking and killing Latvian Jews. This is the line of defense. Apparently only attacks on Latvian Jews would have been a crime. Attacking and killing Soviet Jews was permissible. That is the basic essence of his defense. Hazners' reasoning is the ultimate in ethical and moral degeneracy—the product of a warped Nazi-fascist mentality.

But this butcher's legal defense raises some bothersome questions about the moral and ethical climate in the United States. On what basis did Hazners and his attorney come to the conclusion that by creating, by inference, the impression that he committed the crimes against the Soviet people, including Soviet Jews, he could develop a successful defense? The fact is that it would be a mistake to dismiss Hazners' reasoning as completely exceptional.

Fascism is an outgrowth of capitalism. In a less extreme form, Hazners' line of reasoning pervades our own society. Fascism does not invent a new ideology. It does not give birth to a new set of values or a new morality. It extends the ideology, values and morality that monopoly capital gives rise to.

To accept the practices of “last-to-be-hired” and the other barriers to skilled jobs as long as the discriminatory policies are limited to Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, Indians, Filipinos and Asian-Americans is to accept racism. Fascism takes this concept, rooted in the capitalist system, and extends it to acceptance of mass murder and genocide.

Let's take a few other examples.

The week in which this was written, in Houston, Texas, three killer cops were convicted, for the second time, of cold blooded murder. Each time, a judge gave a one-year sentence—suspended. In the judge's book murder was not murder because the victim was of Mexican descent.

Aren't there landlords, storekeepers and others who feel that when they are dealing with Blacks, Puerto Ricans and other racially oppressed peoples they have a special license to rip them off? Somehow stealing from Blacks and Hispanic peoples isn't stealing. Just as, for Hazners, murdering Soviet Jews isn't murder.

Aren't there people who would get very upset at any manifestation of anti-Catholic or anti-Jewish prejudice, but who would look the other way when it comes to injustices to the Palestinian people? Somehow the suffering of Palestinians, thrown off their ancestral lands and living for decades in the misery of refugee camps, doesn't count.

Then there are the actions of the FBI and CIA. These agencies engage in illegal activities against Communists—harassment, dirty tricks, etc. But against Communists, illegal activities are permissible. Was not the concept that Communists have no legal or Constitutional rights the basic tactic of Hitler and McCarthy in getting the public to accept their general reactionary drives? Did not many liberals justify their support to McCarthy and his illegal activities as long as the drive was directed “only at Communists?” Is this not a shadow of the same kind of morality and ethics that Hazners and his attorney are using in their defense?

Ultimately all these things flow from the class nature of our society, and from the needs of its ruling class. Our society is supposed to operate on the principle that “all men are equal.” But nothing in our capitalist society really operates according to that principle.

The system of education is a class system. Great care is lavished on

the education of an upper class elite. But if workers, Blacks, Chicanos, or Puerto Ricans don't learn how to read and write, what does it matter? What happens to them isn't important.

The system of medical care is a class system. Tens of millions can't afford adequate medical care. But in our society the very fact that they can't afford medical care is supposed to be proof that it doesn't matter if they don't get it.

The judicial system is a class system. Big-shot criminals like Nixon and former CIA chief Richard Helms get pardoned or get away with a symbolic punishment, while people who are poor and oppressed and commit lesser crimes are sent to jails in which they are treated as less than human.

The attitudes that lie behind all this do not arise by themselves, any more than Hazners' attitude toward the Soviet Union and Jews arose by itself. Hazners' attitude was created by Nazi-fascism to serve its policy of aggression against the Soviet Union. Racist and anti-working class attitudes and practices, the view that if directed against Communists anything is permissible, are consciously promoted by monopoly capitalism because they are its main weapons of exploitation and rule.

In a way, the U.S. ruling class operates more insidiously than Hitler's Germany did. Hitler was an avowed racist, militarist and aggressor. The U.S. government talks about equality and freedom. It uses far more guile, cunning and demagogy than Hitler did. U.S. monopoly capital in this period is more flexible, more willing to make concessions, to retreat when absolutely necessary. But still it supports racist South Africa, pushes the arms race, and conspires to overthrow regimes it doesn't like.

Just like Nazism, the U.S. ruling class is shooting poisons into society—poisons which spread immorality and rottenness, which promote hypocrisy and cynicism. The government can prattle about freedom, equality and human rights. The reality all around us is different, and people know it.

Just as with Nazi Germany, there are many today who go along with the perverted, immoral reasoning of monopoly capitalism because they do not feel themselves hurt or threatened by it. Nazi Germany provides a terrible lesson of what can happen when people do this. Repeatedly, the Soviet Union called for unity, for collective security, against the fascist menaçè while there was still time to

prevent world catastrophe. The calls went unheeded and the world paid a disastrous price.

Those who do not feel themselves hurt or threatened by racism, by illegalities committed against Communists, are wrong. All, with the exception of the monopolies and their lackeys, are hurt and threatened.

Racism divides the working class and the people, and its cost in holding back the progress of the people is incalculable. And illegalities against Communists are just harbingers of illegalities against liberals, against all people who want peace and social progress.

The only sensible, as well as moral, position is to recognize that an injustice to one is an injustice to all.

The struggle for social progress, the struggle against monopoly capital, the struggle against the policies of nuclear war, the struggle for world peace, the struggle for the extension of democratic rights and the struggle for socialism, all demand that we raise to new levels the struggle against the influences of racism and the poisonous fog of cold war anti-communism.

April 20, 1978

The Million Conspiracies of Racism

Racism, in everyday life, is a million conspiracies. The racists resort to conspiracies and camouflaged maneuvers because racist practices violate established legal, constitutional and moral rights.

The Supreme Court decision on the Bakke case was deliberately wrapped in a maze of seemingly contradictory statements. The legal gobbledygook was meant to confuse and hide the racist essence of the decision. This is a feature of many legal conspiracies. The courts have become a refuge for racism.

The full force of the Bakke conspiracy emerges only in the dozens of

legal cases around similar challenges that have been filed in many parts of the country.

A clear example of the conspiratorial, dirty tricks nature of racism is the Weber case. The Weber case was hatched in a Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation plant in Gramercy, Louisiana.

About 40 percent of the adult work force in the city of Gramercy is Black. But in the Kaiser plant only about 15 percent of the workers are Black. Of the 290 skilled workers in the plant, five were Black. Of the last 28 workers admitted into the skilled trades at the Kaiser plant only two were Black workers.

Some time ago the corporation set up an on-the-job training program for skilled workers. On this basis the United Steel Workers local and the management of Kaiser negotiated an agreement to take the first steps to counteract the obvious effects of generations of racist practices in hiring, promotion and training at the plant.

This agreement was designed to open the skilled training program to workers based on seniority, but also based on the concept of "one to one," by admitting an equal number of Black and white workers, selected from two established seniority lists. This was clearly a very minimal approach to affirmative action.

But before the program even got started, Brian Weber, a white worker, filed a suit which challenged the legality of the program on the basis that a Black worker, with less seniority, had been admitted to the on-the-job training program ahead of him.

Within a matter of days the legal conspiracy was fully developed. Attorneys and legal documents appeared on the scene, as if from nowhere. The conspiracy had been hatched before the case hit the court docket.

On the basis of the challenge, the district court and the court of appeals have decided that because "there was no evidence presented about past discrimination, therefore there was no need for the program of affirmative action." And this is where the wider conspiracy began to emerge. Because the affirmative action agreement was made between the union and the Kaiser Corporation, they were the defendants in the case. Weber charged them with "reverse discrimination." But neither the corporation nor the union presented evidence of past discrimination. In fact, Kaiser lied. They said that Kaiser had always "hired and promoted workers on the basis of the most qualified." They neglected, of course, to explain how it came about that of the 290

skilled workers, only five were Black. Neither the union nor its attorneys said anything about this. Whether by design or otherwise they became partners in the conspiracy of racism.

The tentacles of this conspiracy of silence reached even into the Officers' Report read to the last National Convention of the United Steel Workers. The written report said: "We want to do the fair thing, so we have to sit it out and let the courts decide what is fair." That's the racist element of the policies of class collaboration.

This is a conspiracy of silence against Black workers because there would have been no problem in presenting plenty of evidence of past discrimination, and therefore in justifying the affirmative action agreement.

But it is also a conspiracy of silence about the violation of some very basic trade union rights. In their decisions the district and appeal courts have, in effect, ruled that trade unions have no right to negotiate affirmative action agreements. In fact, their rulings put serious limitations on the process of collective bargaining.

In his dissenting opinion on the Supreme Court's Bakke decision, Justice Thurgood Marshall clearly saw the implications and the conspiratorial nature of the case when he wrote:

... it is more than a little ironic that, after several hundred years of class-based discrimination against Negroes, the Court is unwilling to hold that a class-based remedy for that discrimination is permissible . . . It is unnecessary in 20th century America to have individual Negroes demonstrate that they have been victims of racial discrimination; the racism of our society has been so pervasive that none, regardless of wealth or position, has managed to escape its impact. (Justice Thurgood Marshall, "Dissent in the Bakke Case," *Freedomways*, 18, No. 3, 1978, 133-134.)

We must alert the working class and the people to the dangers inherent in these new conspiracies of racism. We must not permit the Weber case to silently establish legal precedents for racism. On the contrary, there must be a storm of protest demanding that the Weber case be sent back for review, where evidence of both racial discrimination and the conspiracy can be presented.

The members of the United Steel Workers must demand that the leaders of their union end their conspiracy of silence by taking up the struggle for all workers, and in this case with full support for affirmative actions in defense of Black workers and in defense of basic trade union rights.

November 16, 1978

To Hell with Injunctions

May Day was born in the struggle of workers who said to hell with injunctions and anti-labor laws. Since then there has not been a major victory in the history of the working-class struggle without a mass disregard of injunctions. The unionization of the mass production industries, the sit-down strikes, the mass picketlines, all took place while disregarding injunctions issued by the courts.

Anti-labor injunctions provide one of the best proofs—for those who need it—of the basic nature of our court system, and who the courts serve. The overwhelming majority of court injunctions in labor disputes are against the workers. Injunctions against employers—for example, injunctions against lockouts—are almost as rare as a blue moon. So much for the so-called independence and impartiality of the courts.

The service that the courts provide the monopolies through the anti-labor injunction is invaluable. The injunction goes after labor's key economic weapon—the strike. It is designed to disarm the workers. It is like prohibiting an army from shooting its guns.

Experience confirms that a strong militant labor movement can greatly weaken, even do away with, the anti-labor injunction power of the courts.

During the great upswing of the labor movement in the 1930s, not only was labor able to disregard injunctions and make this disregard stick, but the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed, asserting the right to strike and limiting the power of the courts to issue anti-labor injunctions.

But, by the same token, experience also confirms that when the labor movement is divided and weakened, when union leaders collaborate with the monopolies, the ability of the monopolies to get away with anti-labor injunctions becomes stronger.

After World War II, the Taft-Hartley Act forbade the closed shop, the secondary boycott and mass picketing, and restored the anti-labor use of the injunction.

It is not an accident that this same law worked to purge unions of Communists, requiring that every union official from international union president to local executive board member file an affidavit "disclaiming Communist membership." If even one official failed to file the required non-Communist affidavit, the entire union lost its right to represent the workers in collective bargaining.

There were other laws, such as, for example, New York's Taylor Law, which prohibits public employees from striking, and similar laws for other states and for the federal government. And there was also the action of the courts throughout the postwar period, which chipped away at restraints on their ability to issue anti-labor injunctions.

The class collaboration policy followed by certain trade union leaders goes hand in hand with the anti-labor injunction. The leaders of the United Steel Workers, for example, put through the Experimental Negotiating Agreement (ENA), in which the union voluntarily gives up the right to strike without even waiting for an injunction which tries to force it to do so. From the viewpoint of the monopolies, this is even better than an injunction. The first line of defense for the monopolies becomes class collaboration. The reserve weapon is the injunction.

Class collaboration supports the power of injunction. Suppose a union enters into an agreement in which it agrees to limit its right to strike, and then a strike breaks out among the rank and file, or among some locals, etc. The agreement provides a convenient handle for the courts to use in handing down an injunction. They cite the union's own agreement against the striking workers. Also, the existence of agreements in which unions agree not to strike helps create a general atmosphere in which it is easier to put through injunctions.

Class collaboration means a sellout of workers. But it means even more than this. It means connivance by union leaders with the monopolies and courts in controlling, in putting down workers, through the injunction.

As part of their general offensive against labor and the people, the monopolies, the government and the courts have, in recent years, gone on an injunction rampage. Everywhere the workers go out to defend themselves, the other side gets an injunction. Often they don't even wait for the strike; they get the injunction ahead of time.

Recently there have been the injunctions against the milk drivers,

the bus drivers, the steel workers in Newport News. Last year the Carter administration got an injunction against the miners in the big coal strike. The miners gave the right answer to this: "Taft can mine the coal. Hartley can haul it."

Besides the use of the injunction the ruling class uses the threat of injunction, as was the case with the recent Teamsters strike.

The increased use of the injunction is part of the general use of the machinery of the state for anti-labor purposes. The Carter wage guidelines are another example. The rate of inflation over the last three months has been 15 percent. But never mind this. The workers are supposed to limit their wage increases to 7 percent. They are supposed to take an 8 percent cut in their real wages.

To help make the workers swallow this, the government uses all the many instruments at its disposal.

For example, in the recent Teamsters strike, it used its power over trucking rates and the threat to allow more firms into the trucking industry by deregulating it, to support its guidelines. Again, as in coal, the government's actions didn't work—the guidelines were breached. How, with the inflation rate, could it be otherwise?

With the U.S. economic situation worsening and the class struggle becoming steadily sharper, the time has now come for a full-scale attack on the injunction, for a new labor charter that will wipe the slate totally clean of all anti-labor laws. The laws prohibiting public employees from striking should all be done away with. Why should public employees be left defenseless? The power of the courts to issue anti-labor injunctions should be done away with. The full right of labor to strike to defend its livelihood should be established by law. Why should the monopoly-dominated courts be allowed to interfere with and control the bargaining process?

While we are on the subject of injunctions we should also note that the labor movement is not alone in suffering from them. The Black liberation movement and those of other oppressed minorities also get to feel them. The injunctions have a clear racist edge.

Throughout the civil rights movement—the marches, the boycotts, the demonstrations—one of the key weapons used to hold back the struggle was the injunction. Here again the power of the courts to issue such injunctions should be eliminated. There is no more reason to allow racist judges and courts to hobble the fight against racism than

there is to allow the pro-monopoly, anti-labor judges and courts to hobble the labor movement.

There is a lesson in the fact that the injunction is so generally directed against mass action by the people. Mass action is the key, and the monopolies and their cohorts recognize it.

We have to fight against the injunction on all fronts, including the legislatures and the courts, including the political front generally. But for everything mass action is the key. That is the lesson not only of the growth of the labor movement in the 1930s but also of the civil rights movement and the fight against U.S. aggression in Vietnam. And to mount mass action we all have to say, **TO HELL WITH THE INJUNCTION.**

April 26, 1979

An Open Letter to Mike Wallace

Dear Mike Wallace:

As one who has been indicted, convicted and served time for "thinking," I was interested in the Supreme Court decision in the case in which you are a defendant (*Herbert v. Lando*).

You may not recognize the underlying theme in the Supreme Court decision against CBS and Mike Wallace, but in its basic essence it is the same as the underlying theme was in the infamous Smith Act. It is basically the same theme for which Henry Winston, Gil Green, myself and others served eight-year prison sentences. Over 100 other Communist leaders were harassed and indicted and served three- and five-year prison sentences, including: Ben Davis, Eugene Dennis, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Betty Gannett, Arnold Johnson, George Meyers, Irving Potash, Jack Stachel, Robert Thompson, Alexander Trachten-

berg, William Weinstone, John Williamson, Carl Winter and many others.

We were accused, indicted, tried and sentenced for “thinking.” The key words in the indictments were, “conspiracy to teach.” In other words, thinking about teaching, and nothing more. In this context it doesn’t really matter what the thoughts were because the indictment was not for teaching or advocating, or for conspiracy to commit any kind of act.

Based on the new Supreme Court decision, now you and others writing for or speaking on TV are asked to testify as to what your thoughts were when you prepared articles and scripts for TV and radio programs. I suppose there would be some justification for saying, “serves you right.” But such are not my thoughts. Rather, there is a lesson that should have been learned from the Smith Act cases, as well as from the rise of fascism in Germany, put so profoundly by Pastor D. Martin Niemoller:

In Nazi Germany, they first came for the Communists and Jehovah’s Witnesses, but I wasn’t a Communist or a Jehovah’s Witness, so I didn’t speak up.

Then they came for the Jews and I didn’t speak up because I wasn’t a Jew.

Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn’t speak up because I wasn’t a trade unionist.

Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn’t speak up because I was Protestant.

Then they came for me, and by that time no one was left to speak up.

Under the Smith Act, when they came for the Communists—for “thinking”—most of you working and writing for the press, radio and TV went along with the anti-communist, McCarthyite hysteria. Most of you went along because of the pressures and because the thoughts were Communist thoughts. Most of you kept silent, or covered up the fact that the attack was basically against the First Amendment. There may have been some exceptions that I missed, because while in Leavenworth Penitentiary I didn’t have access to radio and TV, and to only one newspaper. But I do not recall any of you speaking out or writing about the fact that we were convicted for “thinking.” The convictions in the Smith Act cases became the legal precedent for thought control.

Your anti-communism blinded you, and so you went along with the

attacks on the U.S. Constitution and especially on the First Amendment.

In an attempt to harass and intimidate people who do not agree with the establishment, the Supreme Court is again moving toward thought control and the destruction of First Amendment rights. This is being done by forcing people in the mass media to release all their research material, and compelling you to testify as to your “thoughts.” Most likely you will not go to prison. But your case could set a legal precedent for other cases.

Let me indicate to you an important lesson from our Smith Act experience on how the courts deal with indictments for “thinking.”

Let’s say you will be asked to take the stand and testify as to your thoughts. Even though your testimony about your thoughts may be self-incriminating and in violation of the Fourth and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution, under the threat of imprisonment for contempt of court you will be asked to reveal your thoughts. That is how things were handled in our case.

And how are you going to prove what—in fact—were your thoughts? The prosecuting attorneys will say that what you claim to have been your thoughts were not your “real thoughts.” The attorneys will read quotations from any writer or TV personality, anywhere in the world, as proof of your “real thoughts.” They will say your testimony, or copies of your broadcasts, were “self-serving.” That is what they did in our “trials.” They read quotations from Marxist writers, some of whom have been dead for 100 years. The quotations were accepted as “evidence” against us because the books in which the quotations appeared were sold in bookstores which also sold our writings and literature. It did not matter that these books were for sale publicly, or available in public libraries. They were “proof of our thinking about teaching.” That was the basic nature of the evidence used against us. What we had written was ruled out as “self-serving.”

If that does not convict you, the “state” will present a trained professional liar, on the FBI payroll, to testify: “Mike Wallace did not tell the truth. In private conversation he said—so and so.”

And further, in order to create the atmosphere—before, during and after your trial—the press, radio and TV will totally block out anything you say in your defense. Instead the mass media, including the “investigative reporters” and talk show hosts, will make heroes out of the paid FBI stoolpigeons. That’s what happened in our Smith Act

cases. I am sure you haven't forgotten those heady, hysterical McCarthyite days.

If you are fortunate and you get out on bail, the people who put up the money will themselves be imprisoned for refusing to reveal the source of the bail money. That's what happened in our case with people like Dr. Alphaeus Hunton, Dashiell Hammett and Fred J. Field.

I disagree with you on most questions, including on the issues in the case against you. I believe you and CBS are wrong. But I also firmly believe you should have the right to think, a right to your own private thoughts.

Fascism is a defense of capitalism. It is the state power of Big Business when other forms do not seem to work.

Reaction and fascism see thinking people as the enemy because thinking people are critical of the injustices of capitalism.

It is interesting that the Supreme Court, on the same day they ruled against the privacy of your thoughts, came to the defense of Chrysler Corporation to withhold information under the Freedom of Information Act.

I don't think you or the CBS are the real targets of the Supreme Court. Through your case today they are moving to suppress criticism and prepare the groundwork for tomorrow's control of thoughts which monopoly capital considers a challenge to their rule. It is the "dangerous thoughts" they are after. The overall purpose of the majority on the Supreme Court is to silence criticism and to create an atmosphere of fear in the land.

We who have been on the receiving end of the reactionary attacks have always been aware of the limited, shallow and tenuous nature of democracy within a society ruled by the big corporations. What we are now seeing is the Nixon Court in action. They are attacking thinking people, who Spiro Agnew called "the nattering nabobs of negativism."

Instead of saying, "you had it coming," I say, we have differences—about capitalism, about socialism and about many other questions. But we can join in the struggle to preserve the right to think, including the right to think and advocate revolutionary thoughts.

Sincerely,

Gus Hall

General Secretary, Communist Party, U.S.A.

May 17, 1979

Loathsome Duo and the Rosenbergs

There is now literature affirming the guilt of Joe Hill, of Sacco and Vanzetti and of Dimitrov and most of it is putrid. But now a new low has been reached by the *New Republic* (June 23, 1979) and by Messrs. Stern and Radosh in the editorial and article on the martyrdom of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg.

The editorial refers to “the careful and disinterested work” of Radosh and Stern. How careful, we shall examine in a moment, but “disinterested”? Apparently this is inserted in the interests of comic relief.

The “disinterest” of the *New Republic* in questions of communism has been manifest ever since the magazine was founded as an organ of Wilson’s “New Freedom”—symbolized in that hypocrite’s institutionalizing of jim crow in Washington, his naked aggressions and invasions of Latin America, his attorney-general’s witch-hunting “Palmer raids,” and his leadership in the murderous intervention against the young Soviet Republic.

It was this *New Republic* which last year rushed to the defense of Allen Weinstein’s concoction called “The Hiss-Chambers case,” and denounced *The Nation* for publishing a devastating review by Victor Navasky of that abortion. Now Weinstein and the publishers of the book have been forced to pay \$17,500 to one of the people lied about and defamed—Sam Krieger—and the *New Republic* has been ordered by a court to publish a retraction for spreading lies and libels.

In a recent issue of the *American Historical Review*, the *New Republic’s* “disinterested” Professor Radosh published a glowing review of this Weinstein book and declared it to be too “definitive!”

This Radosh had been on the fringes of the “New Left” as a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin. Back then, even a brief meeting with him demonstrated his deep anti-communism. Since

then—and so adorned—his rise in academia has been swift and undisturbed; one learns that he is now a full professor at a community college and at the Graduate Center of CUNY.

His books have falsified the U.S. labor movement, treated with utmost delicacy ideologists of the Right, including fascists, and, in collaboration with a major apologist of the Right, Murray Rothbard, offered “A New History of Leviathan” (1972), which is about as “new” as Herbert Hoover.

So much for “disinterested.” Now let us turn to the “care” with which our scholars proceeded.

They examined the FBI files; they questioned deserters from the Communist Party like Joseph Starobin, James Weinstein and Junius Scales; they kicked aside slimy rocks and dug up O. John Rogge and with him as guide they found the Greenglasses in some miserable hole and listened again to those pathological liars.

They themselves found—what was well known—that the Department of “Justice” had phones in the cells of the Rosenbergs and let them know that neither would be executed if they “talked” and “informed”; that these “Justice” people themselves knew that the mother of two children, that the saintly and fierce Ethel, was guilty of nothing except nobility, and they stood by hoping to break her for love of the little ones, and hoping to break Julius for he knew that if he “talked,” if he “informed,” she would be spared. These heroic people would not lie; they stuck to the truth.

These magnificent people did not break under this duress—worse than that practiced by Hitler—and this Stern and this Radosh, these scholars, these ghouls dare write about them and express opinions about them and even find one “guilty” and the other “naive.” They get paid for this and Holt, Rinehart and Winston hopes to make a killing with the book it is producing.

All of them—the whole gang at the *New Republic*, the whole gang at Holt, Rinehart and Winston, and the two “careful and disinterested” scribblers taken together, are not worth the paring from one toenail of a Julius or Ethel Rosenberg.

We live in a society in decay; we live in the midst of rot; we live in a land where a Kissinger can be a presidential adviser and a Nixon can be a president. We live in a society where the deeds of those who rule makes one constantly nauseous. But this befouling the sacred memory

of the Rosenberg couple—and in the name of “the truth” and in the guise of scholarship—this is the nadir.

Imaging shoveling up O. John Rogge—the provocateur and informer who sought to frame the late Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois and sent that 82-year-old hero to prison—and getting his help in a “disinterested” investigation! Imagine questioning the Greenglasses—again—for hours; finding again that what they said at one moment they contradicted in the next moment—and then deciding that when they damned the Rosenbergs they told the truth!

Imagine giving the names of four or five people who—since the 1950s—are no longer able to be located, adding that “there may well be a plausible innocent explanation for all these sudden departures” and then charging that “pro-Rosenberg” people have not explained these departures—and this the professor offers as “evidence” of guilt!

Thousands of people undertook “sudden departures”—to England, to Mexico, to Canada—during the McCarthyite terror, and dozens killed themselves, too—and the blame or the shame or the mark of guilt is placed upon them and not the manufacturers of the right-wing terror!

In the midst of that terror, some people cancelled their subscriptions to the *Daily Worker*, and that is supposed to indicate “espionage” activity! In the midst of that terror, some folks took precautions against being followed, against being wire-tapped, against implicating friends so that they might not fall into the disfavor of the FBI, against exposing comrades to the tender mercies of “justice,” as manifested in its treatment of Bob Thompson and of Henry Winston—for example—and behavior patterns resulting from such considerations are offered as evidence of “guilt!”

The “case”—to the extent that any at all is manufactured—depends entirely upon the reports of FBI agents and stool-pigeons. Indeed, the main fountain for the “truth” in this article comes from what the authors call a “remarkable source”—namely, the reports to the FBI of one Jerome E. Tartakow, serving time as a thief, and planted near Julius with the explicit purpose and role of informing on him.

And it is these reports from such a person—operating with such a purpose—whom even the FBI at one point admitted to be an “informant of unknown reliability”—that form what substance there is to the professor’s verdict that Julius was “guilty”!

Of course, this informer—like all informers before and after him—reported exactly what he knew his bosses wanted him to report and of course those bosses adorned these reports with details to give a semblance of reality to them.

To make the connection to the Communist Party, the thief Tarkow is made into a “confidant” of Eugene Dennis, the then general secretary of the Communist Party. Eugene Dennis had a lifetime of unblemished, honorable service to the working class, to the people of the United States.

Eugene Dennis had a lifetime experience of not trusting the fakers and phonies, and to infer that he talked to one is an absolute and despicable lie. It is in keeping with the gutter level of the *New Republic* to especially attribute actions to those who are not in a position to confront them now.

That a professor of history can participate in such a procedure and get paid for it and do so in the name of “truth” is almost beyond credence. This is a professor of twistory, not history; no wonder his tenure is secure in the academia of this society.

If anything, the editorial preceding this Stern-Radosh garbage is even worse. Here, one finds desecration of the last letters of Ethel and Julius written from the death house; here, one learns that the couple, in those letters, wrote “in a distorted shorthand about American democracy, the Jewish heritage, the Declaration of Independence.”

“They did not mind,” these jackals write, “appropriating and distorting these ideals.” They did not, for Communism had taught them to defend “transparent lies and shallow pretense” and, even facing death, these robots displayed “the ritual guile and ruses” of their comrades.

The point of the whole charade—the “scholarly” article and the forthcoming book and the hoopla in the *New Republic*—is given away in the final paragraph of its editorial. And that paragraph is a denunciation of the Left and especially of the Communist Party, which makes the diatribes of Nixon and J. Edgar Hoover and Pat McCarran and Joseph McCarthy sound like love letters.

We of the Left and especially we Communists have nothing but “contempt for scruples,” and we are people who cannot be trusted for our “word was their dishonor.”

And then the clincher, to make of us Communists pariahs and to keep all away from us—to undercut any possibility of left unity in the

face of the right danger and the war threat, we have the final line: "Those who see them as heroes can't be trusted either."

This is "history" based on Hitler's Big Lie. This is "journalism" of the gutter. It is "history" and "journalism" that are on the way out; it is being flushed down with the other excrements of capitalism, that which is decaying and dying.

July 26, 1979

Part **3**

Social Progress

May Day Honors the Rank and File

When George Meany said, "I never walked a picketline," he was articulating a most basic policy of the top leadership of the AFL-CIO. But it is also a most convincing argument why there must be an organized rank-and-file movement.

To walk a picketline is an act of class struggle, an act of class loyalty. A lifetime principle of not walking a picketline is class collaboration expressing class treachery.

The rank-and-file movements in ships, unions and industries are unique U.S. phenomena. At every critical moment in the history of the trade union movement the rank-and-file movements have made the decisive contributions; they have been the decisive factor between victory or defeat. They have been the propellant, the motive force in raising the working-class movement to higher levels. They have always served as the basic force of action; in organizing the unemployed, political action, in the struggle against racism, in the fight for the right to strike and in the struggle for the shorter work day, wage increases and better working conditions. It is a fact of life that without rank-and-file organizing committees, the mass production industries would not have been organized.

The rank-and-file movements are a unique reaction to a unique trade union movement. They are a working-class necessity because the top leadership of the trade union movement is controlled by a corporate fifth column. Where else can you find a trade union leadership that openly, publicly and without shame defends capitalism and the corporate exploitation of the working class. Instead of struggle they talk about "equality of sacrifice." It is tantamount to asking the thief and the victim to make "equal sacrifices."

Their defense of capitalism is based on the fraud that corporate profits are the source, the fountainhead of everything, including the workers' wages. This is of course the big lie of capitalism. It is like

saying milk and cream come from butter. What the big lie tries to cover up is that the only source of all values, and in the first place the corporate profits, is the labor power of the working class.

The central fact about the capitalist system is that profits come from the unpaid labor power of the working class. The attempt of the trade union leadership to hide this fact has given rise to and perpetuates a trade union movement with unique policies, a unique structure and a unique practice. It is a bureaucratic corporate-like structure. Like corporation stockholders, the membership in the unions have very little to say about policy matters. Like corporate presidents, the union officers get outrageous salaries.

After they accept the basic fraud that capitalism is a "just" system, it is logical for them to accept concepts of "partnership." For the largely self-perpetuating bureaucracy, trade unionism has become a "business." Labor-management contracts have served an important purpose, but the corporate fifth column in the leadership turns them into instruments of the "business partnership."

Dues checkoffs served an important purpose when the working class fought against great odds. But the bureaucracy tends to turn it into a system of taxation without representation. In a basic sense the trade union movement led by a corporate fifth column, based on the fraud of the justice of capitalist exploitation, has resulted in a structure and policy that separates and fences off the membership from policy-making positions. Membership tends to be isolated and powerless. The policies, the structure, the tactics are geared to class collaboration. It has also added new problems for the rank-and-file movements. In this stage the government has become a more decisive force on the side of the corporations. The class collaborationist policies are carried through the state monopoly setup. These policies increasingly tie the trade union movement to the state monopoly system. Through government boards, through systems of arbitration, and the labor contracts, the trade union movement is intertwined with legalities serviced by attorneys. All this further isolates the rank and file and makes them even more powerless.

The basic "partnership" concept is followed through in the field of political action. COPE, which had a great potential as an independent working-class political instrument, has been turned into a system of political partnership.

The class collaborationists have always accepted and pushed for the

racist line of the corporations. It is part and parcel of accepting the "partnership" concept.

From the above is it not crystal clear why the rank-and-file movements are necessities, why the rank-and-file movements have always made unique contributions, why such movements are even more of a necessity now, why the trade union bureaucracy fights against such movements?

The rank and file of the trade union movement have no choice in the matter. In most trade union locals a single member standing alone cannot fight against the bureaucracy or the class collaborationist policies. There are thousands of cases where members have been driven out of the union and the industry for having the courage to get up and fight for working-class policies, but not having an organized rank-and-file base.

Whether such movements should be encouraged in the trade unions that have a leadership that is not part of the corporate fifth column is a legitimate question. The trade union movement as a whole is forced to operate in the context of the state monopoly, class collaborationist structure. In order to be able to resist the pressures of this set-up, trade union leaders who move in the direction of class struggle policies need an ally in the rank-and-file movements.

It goes without saying that when the rank and file feels it is not isolated or powerless, when it feels that it is in control, or is a dominating influence in the trade union decision-making bodies, then it will not seek additional forms. When Black workers begin to feel that the trade union body is fully fighting against racism and for the rights of the Black workers, they also will not seek additional forms. But that assessment will have to be made by the rank and file.

The rank-and-file movement must be seen in its multitude of forms, around the multitude of issues. They often start as one form only to advance into new and higher forms. But the threat that runs through all these forms is the question of class struggle and working-class unity. It is in this sense that the variety of caucuses such as Black caucuses, shop caucuses, women and youth caucuses, local and industry caucuses are not a source of division. On the contrary, they are the centers for the development of a more basic class unity.

As long as the trade union movement is dominated by the policies and the personnel of the class collaborationists the membership and everyone else in the trade union movement who support the concepts

of the class struggle have no other choice but to organize rank-and-file movements. In this sense the rank-and-file coordinating committees on an industry-wide basis and movements like Trade Union Action and Democracy (TUAD) are making a historic contribution to the working-class struggle.

Within this overall class struggle concept and the development of rank-and-file movements there is a need to fight for the unity of the left-progressive forces as well. The corporate fifth column elements like Abel in the steel workers union, because of desperation and fear, have openly joined forces with the corporations in an attempt to smash rank-and-file militancy by terror, firings and expulsions from the unions. As usual it is directed against all militant progressive elements. It is shades of the witch-hunting McCarthy days.

In those days, the corporation and industrial overlords used the FBI, the HUAC investigations and McClellan hearings, the McCarran, Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts, to break strikes and co-opt weak-kneed union leaders. They scuttled progressive legislation won by the unions in earlier struggles.

Besides being an obstacle to class struggle trade unionism, the class collaborationist policies of the trade union leadership present some unique ideological problems as well. Class collaboration is an obstacle to the development of class consciousness. It is a hindrance to the burning out of racist influences. It is an obstacle to the outlook of internationalism, and the development of socialist consciousness. Therefore, it is not surprising that the members of the Communist Party have always been a part of most rank-and-file movements.

There are cases where the rank-and-file movements have been misused by opportunist elements who see them as stepping-stones into leadership. Such efforts must be fought. The best assurance against misuse is for the rank-and-file movements to stick to programs and issues based on the policies of class struggle.

The aim of the rank-and-file movements is to change the basic policies from class collaboration to class struggle. It is the only basis on which the trade union movement can be strengthened and developed.

In the process, this power of the working class will send the corporate fifth column into the corporate compounds where they rightfully belong.

April 27, 1974

Poverty of Thought

One may ask, "Why do writers who defend capitalism say such asinine things?" Because there is no sensible way to defend an asinine system, and as it decays, capitalism as a way of life makes less and less sense.

For the ideological defense of capitalism the road ahead looks bleak. Therefore, to cover up for monopoly capitalism becomes an ever more difficult task.

The April issue of *Fortune* magazine carries one of those asinine editorials called "The New Poverty." The questions it asks are correct but the answers are asinine.

The editorial laments, "The Western world presents a disturbing landscape." And in sadness it asks, "Why so much unhappiness, unrest and violence? Why the low morale in Western societies? Why the lack of social cohesion? Why the sense that things have gone wrong?" *Fortune's* answers are asinine but they are also foreboding and evil.

There is a new and a very dangerous theme that is emerging from the ideological stables of monopoly capitalism. This theme runs like a thread through editorial after editorial. The theme is to admit that there are problems but that the fault lies with the people, and because the people are the culprits it follows that they must pay the bill for the crisis. When the cry for "a change in the life-style" is spelled out, it is a cut in the people's standard of living. *The New York Times* repeats this theme over and over again. On April 7, a *Times* editorial stated:

To cope responsibly and effectively with an age of scarcity is going to require some sacrifice and some new forms of self-discipline in the ways in which Americans and other free people work and spend and live. Neither congress nor the administration has distinguished itself in providing leadership in developing a conservationist ethic, a new style of cooperation to cope with the exigent problems of famine, energy and inflation. Important and necessary as government leadership is, however, ordinary

citizens have to show themselves responsive to changed conditions and make decisions in their private spheres of activity that reflect their recognition of those conditions.

The editors of *Fortune* touch all bases on this theme. There is a “deep erosion of religious faith, traditional values, standards of craftsmanship and ideals of service and a sense of membership in a social order . . . In the last couple of decades a great inflation in demands, claims and rights,” and a “deflation of duties and responsibilities.”

So now you know why “the Western world presents a disturbing landscape.” The people, especially the workers, have lost the “ideal of service” because they now refuse to work for starvation wages. The Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican and Indian-American people are responsible for the “deep erosion” because they now demand the right to equal opportunity in jobs, housing, education and an end to racism. The young people add to the “unhappiness” because they refuse to fight imperialist wars and instead insist on jobs and a right to an education. The poor are adding to the “inflation of demands and claims,” with their insistence on living above the poverty level. And the people generally are adding to the sense that “something has gone wrong” by demanding a full exposure of Watergate, by not accepting the corruption or the cover-up.

In pursuing their theme the *Fortune* editors say that there are “the new poor—men and women and children whose poverty is not material but social, psychic, spiritual.” That is both evil and asinine.

Before coming to the central theme of their solution, they re-state that “the burden then has to fall on the individuals.” And here is where the editors come to their basic solution to the problems of “deep erosion”:

“The first step for those who want to help, whether as parents, teachers, preachers, business executives, members of organizations or individual human beings, is *to dare to be backward-looking.*”

What an admission! “Dare to be backward-looking.”

That is an ideological mirror of the fact that capitalism as an institution has no future. When there is no future one “looks backward.” It is also an admission of the fact that because capitalism as an economic system has no future, it is determined to halt all progress and to throw society as a whole “backward.”

Whether by coincidence or otherwise, the very next editorial in

Fortune is entitled "Oil and Emotion Don't Mix." It starts off by saying, "'The oil industry,' one annoyed U.S. Senator commented, 'is selling less and making more.' This emotional reaction is wrong-headed, for high profits and high prices happen to be what are needed to draw investments into the oil industry. . . . High prices help to restrain consumption." In short, that is the key to the "deep erosion" of the capitalist system. The cause is the "inflation, not demand" for ever higher profits by the corporations and the total "deflation of duties and responsibilities" by monopoly corporations.

The editorial quotes Thomas Burke as saying, "Men are qualified for civil liberties in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites." A social system solely motivated and based on maximizing private corporate profits can never "qualify for civil liberties."

The new ideological theme of monopoly capital serves as a cover for an attack on the living standards of the people. It is an ideological theme that serves monopoly capitalism in this new stage of its crisis.

Fortune talks about "the new poverty, the new poor," but the editorial clearly shows the "deep erosion," the poverty of ideology, the poverty of thought reflecting the decaying "landscape of capitalism."

The solution to the problems under capitalism is not in daring to look backwards. Historic necessity is to dare to look forward. This new stage of civilization with its new level of science and technology needs a new major social and economic structure. With socialism the human race will not only dare to look forward but is already moving forward with giant strides along that path.

June 4, 1974

The Crises in Medical Care

I see from the (conference) materials, as well as from discussions with people in the medical field, that in the profession you speak about “system of delivery” and you speak about how the results of medical science are not delivered to the people. It takes a little while to get used to such a phrase because in a sense it is a military term. The Pentagon talks about the delivery systems of military hardware.

While reading the material, and because I was so impressed with it, I began to think about how we are going to deliver the fruits of this material and this conference to the people. Because we can be history-making only if our ideas are made available and are adopted by the makers of history. So we must find ways of delivering our ideas to the masses who are the makers of history. Unlike medical prescriptions, our prescriptions must be stated clearly and convincingly. They must not be geared only to the pharmacist; the patients must understand them.

As it is with many other matters, in the context of the present level of science and technology, the maintenance of health demands increasingly larger expenditures, more personnel, long range planning and, above all, a society that places the problems of health among the top items of priority. The present level of human activity demands this from every society.

A social system that gives human welfare a top billing will give health a top priority.

We, of course, must deal with these problems in the context of the present stage in the development of monopoly state capitalism in the United States. In a very basic sense, what Engels said about the problems of housing and capitalism I believe can be said about health, medical care and capitalism. That is, that its basic solution will remain one of the unsolvable contradictions of capitalism. In fact, it is more or less inevitable that this contradiction will sharpen as capitalism decays.

A delivery system that will provide medical care to the people on a mass scale is contrary to the very basic values of capitalism. The maximizing of profits—ethic of capitalism leads inevitably to minimizing human welfare. In matters of human welfare, including health, capitalism has a built-in cut-off point. It is limited to the level where the work force is able to reproduce its labor power.

You comrades are now working in one of the crisis areas of monopoly capitalism. On the one hand the need for medical care continues to grow, in every area of medical science. But on the other hand, the availability to the people continues to decline.

And again, the science of medicine continues to make breakthroughs, but the delivery system breaks down—except for the affluent.

But even in the field of medical research and science the emphasis is not in the areas that would benefit the broad spectrum of the population. For example, the United States lags in the area of preventive medicine and science. So I want to emphasize again that we are not dealing with health and medicine in general. We must see the problems in the context of the present new state in the development of state monopoly capitalism.

Much of the deterioration in the field of health is unreported and unseen. In many cases the facts are not immediately noticeable but the accumulated results are most serious. Therefore one of our tasks is to give leadership in exposing that which is not reported and that which is unseen.

Among the many crises of U.S. capitalism—in many ways the most severe, most immediate—the crisis affecting the largest numbers is the crisis of medical care, the crisis of health. And in many ways, if there is a jungle, the medical jungle is the most brutal and outrageous. More than in any other area, the inhuman nature of corporate monopoly control shows up in the arena of medical care.

This medical crisis has become an explosive, anti-monopoly political issue and there is a deep and growing concern about problems of health in our country.

This immediate crisis of mass medicine is fed in the first place by the inflation in medical costs. Along with the prices of food, they are the most outrageous. The number of Americans for whom medical care has been priced out of reach is not at an all-time high.

This crisis is fed by the monopoly control of drugs. And in addition

to the monopoly prices, there is the monopoly disregard for detrimental and negative side-effects.

There is a crisis of hospitals and hospital beds. As we all know, there are cases where people die while waiting for admittance. The crisis is fed by the shortage of doctors and other medical personnel. The crisis is fed by the anarchy of specialization that is not related to any overall system or plan.

There is a crisis because health is expendable in the drive for profits. It is expendable for a state machine that is controlled by the monopolies. Health and medical care are the last to get government appropriations and, usually, the first to be cut off. Nixon's axing of money for health projects, including heart and cancer research, is proof of this.

Within the overall crisis, there are special critical areas where the effects are most severe. It is in these areas that we must make our special vanguard contribution.

In a basic sense the medical complex has an anti-working-class bent which, in the first place, serves the more affluent and ignores the poor. Malnutrition and hunger are not viewed as problems of health. There are no health studies on the effects of inhuman speedup at Lordstown. Lordstown is a testing ground of human endurance. General Motors is testing to see just how far speedup can be pushed before the human body and its nervous system break down.

It has taken the coal miners 200 years to force a study of the black lung problem.

There are no studies on the effects of the environment in the factories. Beyond the cutoff point, the lives and health of the workers are expendable. This is an anti-working-class structure.

In a very basic sense the medical complex is a racist structure, adding to racist oppression. Some of the facts related to racism in the papers that have been presented to this meeting are explosive. The ugly fact is that by and large the delivery system simply does not reach the ghettos, barrios or the Chicanos working in the agricultural fields. Medical facilities are not physically present where the poor are, and if they are present, they are priced out of reach for most.

The hospitals and other medical facilities that are in a crisis, or in bankruptcy, are in the working-class areas, in the ghettos, or in areas close by. Every inhuman feature of racism stands out in sharp relief in the area of health and medical care.

The crisis has a special sharpness for the elderly. To capitalism, they

are openly expendable. The runaway inflation has turned their meager fixed incomes into nothing more than pill money.

Then there are the special crises of youth, who are not covered by medical plans and of small towns and farmers, who live beyond the borders of the medical complex.

Public Control—a Central Need

Capitalist values in the field of health are clearly visible in employment policies. Aside from doctors, the medical workers are still among the lowest paid. In many areas they are still looked upon and paid as if they were volunteers. As we know, this one of the new areas where the unorganized have been organized. The drive of District 1199 has made some important changes, especially in the East. In this connection the organization of the Columbia Presbyterian complex, in which our comrades played an important role—in fact a leading role—was a very important breakthrough. Some progress has been made in the union drive in the Boston area and some in Connecticut.

But the organization of the largely unorganized medical workers remains an important task. This task is important of course because they are workers. But its importance is also related to the task of struggling to get the medical complex out of the grip of the monopoly corporations. Organized medical workers can be an important factor in relating medical facilities to community control. To carry on their work most effectively, the medical workers need the protection of a union. The protection of a union would make it possible for the medical workers to give greater weight to human values of medicine, to resist the policies of monopoly corporations which are not in the interests of the patients.

One cannot speak about the crisis of medical care in a capitalist society without saying something about corruption. And corruption is one of the elements in the crisis. Monopoly control, as we know, extends from the manufacture and distribution of drugs to the control of most hospitals and medical schools. Most of the federal and state regulatory agencies, as well as the medical plans, and of course the insurance corporations, are controlled by banking and monopoly interests.

Corruption also affects doctors' and hospital fees. In the very center of this corruption is the conspiracy between the top leadership of the American Medical Association (AMA) and the monopolies that

produce and service the medical industry. What is wrong with the medical complex, including the corruption, came into focus around the scandal concerning the Mt. Sinai hospital complex at Miami Beach. All of the elements were present, including the corrupt conduits with Watergate.

The most powerful new factor on the world scene is the growing impact of revolution by example. We must understand the new element, the new level in the competition between the two social systems in a new way. Capitalism has reached a new stage of decay, and socialism has reached a new stage of growth and development. It is a decisive turning point in history that on the scales of the overall quality of life, socialism has now overtaken and surpassed capitalism. This fact has thrown a new factor on the scales of the struggle for social progress, and has emerged as one of the key elements in the ideological struggle.

One of the areas where this contrast stands in sharpest focus is in the field of health. Capitalism has a built-in roadblock to a medical delivery system when it involves the masses; socialism has concern for the health of all, the best possible medical care for all is built into the system itself.

We have explosive ideological material in the comparison of the costs of hospital beds, drugs and doctors. Socialism has eradicated the economic worry, taken the price tag off being ill. It has raised preventive medicine to new heights. It has placed top priority on industrial health and safety.

Facts about medical care and developments in the socialist countries can influence the ideological thinking, the ideological thoughts, of a great majority of Americans. We need more material written by our comrades in this field; more delegations and tourism.

The revolution by example will grow in importance. We must find ways of utilizing it.

Now, finally, I want to come to the question of what to do. For us it is not only a question of what to do, but who pays the bill. The cost is a very basic question. That is what is bugging Kennedy, Griffiths and Corman.* It is not enough to be for reforms; even reactionaries are for reforms as long as the people pay the bill. It is not enough to say "federally funded" or "government sponsored."

Because so much of the reforms in the field of medicine and health must come through the governmental structure, this question is of

special importance. Not to raise the question of who is going to pay the cost is to let monopoly capital off the hook. Not to raise the question of cost can add to illusions, including about a welfare state. By not raising the question of who pays the cost we can misdirect masses. Therefore, our proposals must include the concept of taxing the corporations, corporate profits. This is a class approach to the problems. This gives our approach to reforms a revolutionary class content.

It is also clear that in all of the proposals and solutions, the element of people's participation, public control is very central.

(1) In our approach the key is to find forms for moving people, for creating movements.

(2) In working with workers in the medical field, trade unions have become important factors. As in all industries, our base must be in the rank-and-file, and rank-and-file work is united front in its very nature. So the task is to create united front movements around the issues that we project.

(3) In the field of health, legislative work is of special importance. As we know there are a number of bills in Congress, including the original Kennedy-Griffiths Bill.

(4) The struggle against racism must take place on all levels—schools, professions and delivery systems.

(5) Industrial health and safety involve working with trade unions. And again, our work must be mainly with the rank and file. There is a need for new health laws for workers in industry. We should consider working out some new ideas that would be projected as part of the labor-management contracts.

June 29, 1974

*The original National Health Security Program bill (S-3/HR-22) was sponsored by Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass) and Rep. Martha Griffiths (D-Mich), and the fight to restore it in place of a weaker bill now proposed is being led in the House by Rep. James Corman (D-Cal). The original bill was good in many respects, but it stipulated that the workers were to pay a one percent payroll tax to help finance the program. The position of the Communist Party, and several unions, is that the program should be financed solely by the employers.

Poverty on a Rich Mountain

Appalachia, more than a point on the map, has become an accepted term meaning poverty, slums, illiteracy, a life of perpetual hunger, of destitute, debt-ridden, decaying communities imprisoned in mountain gullies. Amidst these vast areas of devastation, of man-made yawning craters and ugly sites of slate and dirt live children in rags in communities without roads, schools, hospitals or other necessary social services. Appalachia is home for millions of refugees. They are the poor in the big city slums who have escaped from Appalachia but not from poverty. "Appalachianization" is a new word denoting the process of creating a region of poverty and destitution.

What turned this once beautiful mineral-rich mountain area, populated by hard-working people, into a hellhole of misery is an important and basic question. Important, because the same forces are at work in most of the United States. Why, in this region so abundant in natural resources, should the people not be well off? Why should this poverty exist on the mountains of nature's resources?

Appalachia stands as a monument to capitalism. There is hunger in Appalachia because the private corporations who dig the coal have expropriated the wealth of this region. There is no money for education, medical care, for the very minimum of social services because the corporations have taken, and continue to take, the coal without payment to the people who inhabit the area. There is poverty and unemployment because those same corporations brought in automated mining machinery without any compensatory adjustment or concern for the coal miners and their families. There is destitution because the miners' wages have always been on the subsistence level.

Appalachia is a direct product of capitalism. The corporations have one aim—profits. They take no responsibility for what happens to the people, to the land, or to the environment.

Appalachia is also a monument to the two political parties of capitalism. Like a seesaw the Democratic and Republican parties take

turns "representing" Appalachia. It is the two-party conspiracy that passed the laws the corporations lobbied for. They tax the poor while the corporations pay only nominal taxes. Appalachia is a perfect example, a showplace of how the two-party system operates in the service of the corporations. Under the two-party system the coal miners and their families have been politically powerless.

Appalachia is also a monument to the class collaboration style of trade unionism. Under the leadership of Lewis and Boyle the United Mine Workers became a loyal collaborator in the system of exploitation by the corporations. Behind the slogan, "make coal competitive", they gave the corporations a free hand. Because of this, corporate profits have zoomed and union officers have become corrupt.

In a short span of time automation has eliminated approximately 80 percent of the coal miners' jobs. Lewis and Boyle became the architects of a policy of permitting automation without demands for any basic changes in class relations, in work rules, in working conditions, in hours of work or wages. As a result prices and profits have escalated while the people and the communities of Appalachia have continued to get poorer.

The culprit, of course, is not automation. What adjustments must be made and how the fruits of automation are distributed is a very real question.

The forces that gave birth to Appalachia are at work in most of the other industrial centers throughout the United States. Industries like steel, automobile, machine building, rubber and aerospace are all run by the monopoly corporations. Automation is being introduced in these industries also. And these corporations have the same disregard for human welfare and the communities as the corporations that mine coal. The old two parties of capitalism operate and serve the interests of the corporations above all else. In most industries there are the same kind of class collaborationist trade union leaders.

These are the basic ingredients for the creeping Appalachianization of all mining and industrial regions.

What is the solution, the antidote, to Appalachianization? Of course the starting point is the organization and struggles of the workers and the people. In this sense the growing rank-and-file movement in the United Mine Workers Union is a most promising development. They have already won important victories. In order to be able to step on the necks of monopoly corporations there is a need

for an independent political movement that will be outside the clutches of the two old parties.

There is a need for a stronger Communist Party that will give Marxist-Leninist leadership to the struggles. There is a need for a strong rank-and-file movement that will fight for and sustain policies of class struggle trade unionism. With such organizational forms it will be possible to tackle the basic questions.

It is possible and necessary to make the corporations pay for the wealth they extract from the regions through some form of royalties or taxes. The people's movements, of necessity, will have to take up the removal of the basic evil at some point. And why should the people who work and live in these regions not own and operate the coal industry? There is no good reason why the coal mining industry should not be nationalized. This would take the private profits out of coal mining. It would be possible to cut the work day to match the level of automation without any cut in the standard of living or wages. This would also make it possible to turn the profits resulting from automation over to the building of modern housing, schools, hospitals and mass transit.

In the process of building a people's movement that can carry out such meaningful reforms, the people of the Appalachias of this country will have to overcome some ideological hangups. There can be working-class unity, a people's unity, only if white people, especially workers, reject racism as a poison the corporations have used in dividing the people and creating the Appalachias. The people will have to reject red-baiting and anti-communism as basic tools of corporate rule.

After the human problems are on their way to resolution then the communities of Appalachia can move to fill up the ugly craterous landscape and restore nature's beauty to the valleys and ridges of these magnificent mountains. They can then provide work for the unemployed and make it possible for the refugees, who now barely subsist in the big city slums, to return home again.

August 17, 1974

The Biggest Coverup

A few months ago, in a statement on the economic situation, our Party stated: "This is a crisis of overproduction and inflation." President Ford continues to say, "We are not going to have a recession." The basic truth is that we are in an economic crisis brought on by overproduction and inflation. This is a stark reality for the seven to eight million unemployed, for the 40 million hungry, especially in the ghettos and barrios, for the generation of unemployed youth, for the old people who are forced to live on dog food, for the meatless, fishless millions, for the desperate farmers.

Since our statement, one by one many of the defenders of capitalism have had to concede that this is indeed an economic crisis. About a month ago Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve Board threw in the towel. And now even *The New York Times* is forced to admit, "It is becoming increasingly clear the American economy is in a recession."

However, even these admissions are made not to enlighten or warn the people, or to seek for solutions. As always, the editors of *The New York Times* are using the admission to put over its own anti-working-class, anti-people solutions. It is a line of protecting corporate profits. It is not accidental that within the last week all of the big business organs projected the same approach to the crisis. *Business Week* said, "Workers' wage demands are on a collision course with business conditions. . . . Unit labor costs are soaring. . . . Will a recession economy put the squeeze on labor demands?" The *Wall Street Journal* states: "The cost of labor is soaring. . . . Labor cost outlook alarming. . . . Labor costs are exploding." And *The New York Times* adds, "The Administration should be moving to hold off what is becoming a level of wage settlements that could build high inflation." And, ". . . if the sharp upturn in labor costs is to be brought under control in both union and non-union sectors of the economy . . ." And they go on and on with the same anti-workingclass emphasis. The *Times* calls this a "cost push inflation." Instead of a cost-push inflation, it is a corporate profits push crisis inflation. It is obvious what these corporate

mouthpieces are up to. They want to convince the public that high wages are the cause for the inflation and the crisis, and therefore the solution to the crisis is to cut the living standards of the people.

What are the real causes, and what are the real solutions to this crisis of inflation and overproduction? This is emerging as the most burning of all questions. The big business propaganda machine is in full swing covering up and creating diversions by pointing the finger at everyone except the real culprit. These big business mass media organs point their accusing finger at the working class. That of course is a total falsehood. The present inflationary spiral has been zooming for five years. But during the same five years the real wages of workers have declined. Prices and rents have had their sharpest increases in periods when wages have been tied to labor contracts.

Some blame the farmers. That is also a diversion. During the last year, the same products whose prices have skyrocketed at the supermarket have declined when the farmer sold them. So that is not the cause of inflation.

One of the other new big lies repeated by the news media is that the cause of inflation is the oil-producing countries. Basically it is the U.S. oil corporations who are jacking up the prices of gasoline and oil. The oil and gas pumped from U.S. fields is not cheaper at the gas pump than the foreign oil. The oil producing countries have nothing to do with oil pumped from these domestic wells.

When nothing else prevails in their efforts to cover up for monopoly capital, these political swindlers are even willing to point the finger at the politicians of one or the other of the two old parties of capitalism. That is one of the reasons for the two parties—both serve big business. So *The New York Times* can say, "Mr. Ford's politicalized economics may become known as Gerryiatrics." These corporate jesters, of course, are aware that the government policies are not "Ford's economics." They are the economics of monopoly capitalism.

What is it that these editorial propagandists are covering up? They are covering up the fact that we are in a capitalist-bred economic crisis, that this crisis is a feature of the capitalist production process. Fundamentally, there is inflation because the corporations and the banks make over \$40 billion in special profits each year by raising prices. Inflation is a corporate profit-creating device. It is an instrument for cutting real wages. There is overproduction because the corporations do not pay enough wages to enable the workers to buy

what they need or what they produce. Basically, there is inflation and overproduction simultaneously, because the monopolies now have such a tight control over the economy that even when there is overproduction they are able to conspire to hold up and in some cases even to increase prices. In past periods overproduction resulted in a lowering of prices. This became an avenue through which the excess products were used up and the crisis was overcome.

We have just witnessed the Ford "Summit Conferences" attended by corporate jesters. They produced volumes of printed matter. But they never as much as mentioned the real causes of the crisis. There are two items that were never even considered. And, of course, they are the two main causes of the inflationary spiral. They are the huge, mammoth corporate profits and the \$100 billion war budget. The capitalist system suffers from old age and a bad case of phlebitis. The basic cure must include massive surgery.

The question of what is the cause of the crisis is key because it determines the approach to the solutions. If the workers, the consumers or the farmers are causing the economic crisis, then it would follow that the solution is lowering their living standards. That is exactly what the summit conference and the Ford Administration is doing. They are saying, "Have a daily inventory of your garbage can." "Clean your plate." "Eat two meals a day." "Eat less, drive less, heat less." But they did not mention a word about corporate profits and they put up a total defense of the exorbitant war budget.

Is there a way to reduce the effects of the crisis on the people? Of course there is. The solution is to take away from where it is and redistribute it to where it is needed. The solution can be in three steps. First, we can start with peeling off some of the excess corporate fat. Let's cut off the special subsidies for big business. That is \$80 billion annually. Then let's cut off the special tax privileges for big business and the rich. That is \$100 billion annually. Then let's cut off the special profits from inflation. That is \$40 billion annually. Let's cut off the thievery that goes on within the military-industrial complex, called "cost overrun." That is \$35 billion annually. Let's cut off \$90 billion by stripping the war budget. Cut off the billions that go into supporting fascist, racist, military dictatorships. The total would amount to \$300 or \$400 billion.

Step two—corporate profits are the biggest in the history of the country. Corporate profits can be trimmed by simultaneously rolling

back prices while increasing wages and putting a graduated income tax on the rich.

Step three—nationalize all banks, the energy industry, medical supply industry, transportation and communication. This can be the beginning of the process of nationalization.

Such steps can minimize the effects of the crisis on the people. Such steps can reduce inflation and hold back the crisis developments. Such steps can begin the process of uprooting racism and ending ghetto living conditions.

For example, the price of sugar is now sky high. The Federal government should now seize all sugar inventories, roll back the price of sugar to last year's level, release the sugar to wholesalers based on last year's prices, instruct the wholesalers to do the same to the retailers, and the retailers to do the same to the consumers.

This crisis has already proven many things including the total bankruptcy of the two-party system. They are both involved in covering up for their masters, monopoly capital. The need for a new mass people's political vehicle has become an urgent matter.

There is great concern among the people. There is frustration and anger throughout the land. The solutions to the crisis will come about only as a result of mass struggles. The November 16 anti-inflation actions across the country should be the beginning and the signal of the mass actions to come.

November 16, 1974

The Nature of the Economic Crisis and Its Solution

Who in his right mind can now deny that the United States is in an economic crisis, a deep depression? This crisis is now engulfing every major capitalist country in the world.

The apologists for capitalism, including President Ford, can call it a "recession," a "slump," "stagflation," or anything else they damn please. But they cannot cover up the suffering or the basic fact that crises are an inherent characteristic of capitalism. The periodic crises are a built-in feature of the capitalist economic cycle. Since World War II these plagues have swept the country—in 1949, 1954, 1958, 1969, and now again.

The factors propelling the present crisis began to appear about a year ago. The economic decline has not yet reached the bottom. This crisis will most likely last the rest of this year and possibly even longer.

The suffering, the devastation, is deep and widespread. The great majority of the people are victims of this crisis. But the workers and those who are already the victims of racist oppression, the small farmers, the small businessmen, the people on pensions and social security, on welfare, the youth who are now excluded from employment suffer the greatest hardships.

Only the rich do not suffer. They have their silver-and-gold-lined nest eggs. Corporate profits are not in a slump. In the very midst of this crisis the rich are getting richer.

What is the cause of this crisis? What brings on these economic plagues? This particular crisis is fed by two basic factors. It is fed by the inflationary rise in prices. As prices rise beyond the reach of the consumers, they are forced to eat less, wear less, drive less and buy less of everything. Because of the escalating prices, it is estimated that the corporations are annually adding \$40 billion to their profits.

The crisis is also fed by the growing gap between the amount of

goods produced and the ability of the workers and the people generally to buy back what they produce and to buy what they need.

As a result of these two factors, the gap widens. The stocks of unsold cars, clothing, farm machinery, and so forth, pile up. The consequence of this process is that the production cycle reaches a point where production and sales are out of balance. The factories close their doors, workers are laid off and the economy is in a crisis.

The crisis has its inner law, the law of a vicious economic circle. Workers are laid off, and because prices are high they are able to buy less. And when they buy less the factories work less and so on. How to end this vicious circle is key to breaking the back of the crisis.

Why are the workers unable to buy back what they produce or what they need? Workers as a class produce many times more value in the form of products than they get back in their pay envelopes. This is what basically creates the gap. This gap between the value of the products the workers produce and what they get in wages has been building up for some time. Speed-up and automated production have escalated year after year. The rate of exploitation of workers has increased 100 times faster than in any similar period in history, while during the same period the real buying power of wages has declined to the 1965 wage level. This clearly results in a widening gap and in the accumulation of unsold goods. This is not an overproduction of goods when measured by what the people need or want. Forty million of our people live below the poverty level. It is overproduction only in relation to what the consumer can afford to buy. The crisis results from the gap between the workers' paychecks and the amount of speeded-up, automated production.

Who gets the difference between what values, what products the workers produce and the very small amount of those values that appear in the workers' pay envelopes? The answer is only too obvious. The lion's share of what the workers produce is confiscated by the rich, the monopoly corporations. The gap between what the workers produce and what they get in their pay envelopes is what the monopoly corporations get—profits. This is the only source of their corporate wealth. If this lion's share was passed on to the workers it would take care of the "overproduction." But, of course, that would not be capitalism. So the basic cause of the crisis is corporate profits. It is corporate profits that create the gap and the crisis.

Each crisis has its unique features. One of the unique features of this

crisis was clearly reflected in the actions of the president of the Ford Motor Company. During a single week the Ford Motor Company announced the closing of production facilities, the laying off of thousands of Ford workers, and an increase in the price of automobiles. Common logic would dictate, "We have too many unsold cars, we must cut the price in order to be able to sell them." But automobile production is so tightly monopolized by the Big Three that they do not have to worry about anyone undercutting their monopoly prices. Therefore, they will sell less cars at higher prices and end up with as much profit as when they sold more cars. The announced "rebate" by Chrysler and Ford is nothing but fakery. Whatever "rebate" they return to the consumer has already been added to the price of the car.

Because the General Motors and the Fords of most industries have a monopoly grip, it is possible to have inflation and a crisis of overproduction at the same time. This explains why this present crisis is going to last longer. The monopoly-dictated high prices are an obstacle to cutting back on the piles of unsold goods, and thus the crisis will continue.

The present crisis is also unique because it is emerging at a stage in history when the foundations of capitalism have greatly deteriorated, at a moment when the reserves of capitalism have further dried up. The continuing inflation during the crisis, the new stage of the general crisis of world capitalism, and the fact that this crisis is affecting all capitalist countries have the cumulative effect of prolonging and deepening this present crisis.

What, then, are the solutions? The defenders of monopoly capitalist profits are out to make the workers and the people pay the cost of the crisis. This is the essence of President Ford's call for "sacrifices." It is symbolic that the first to get Ford's economic ax are those on social security who already live on the edge of poverty. Ford proposes to cut their promised increase from 9 percent to 5 percent.

Congress and the Ford administration are proposing to give mini tax cuts to the people, while giving super give-aways to the rich.

They want to add "not more than 23 cents" to each gallon of gasoline, but even more to the price of fuel oil, while adding to the already highway robbery profits of the oil corporations. This is what Rockefeller calls "a fair return for his dollars."

The only solution that has an element of justice is to cut into the

stolen wealth, into the swollen profits of the corporations who are the cause of the crisis. Once this basic principle of taking from where it is at is established, then it is not difficult to come up with practical ideas of how to carry a program out. For example, why not a 20 percent across-the-board cut? Why not eliminate all taxes from families making less than \$25,000 per year? Why not take the extra \$40 billion a year the corporations make in profits as a result of high prices? Why not end the tax privileges of the rich and the corporations and take the \$100 billion that would bring in? Why not take \$100 billion annually from the corporate profits? Why not a 6, 5, or even a 4-hour day with no cut in pay?

Once these priorities are established it is not difficult to come up with ideas for needed projects—the building of millions of needed homes, schools, hospitals, colleges, mass transportation facilities, the cleaning of our rivers and lakes. Such a program would take care of both inflation and the crisis.

Because the basic cause of the economic crisis is the corporate profit system, the only program that will ease the suffering of the people must be paid for out of the profits of the wealthy.

The relief of human suffering must be placed at the very top of the list of priorities. Private ownership of the factories and the banks is an obstacle to programs in which human needs are the top priority. Therefore, it is necessary to project the idea of transferring the industries and the banks from private to public ownership through the process of nationalization. The crisis has placed the need for nationalization on the order of the day.

The economic crisis affects all of the capitalist countries. The socialist countries are immune to these plagues. Capitalist economic crises are an inherent, built-in characteristic of the system. Socialism has a built-in warning system and a built-in system of correction. As production increases, wages go up. There is no gap between what is produced and what the people are able to buy. There is no gap because there are no private profits or greedy fat-cats that get rich by taking the difference between what the workers produce and what they get in their pay envelopes. Under socialism, whatever is produced is reflected in the pay envelopes of the producers, the workers.

Socialism is the inevitable solution to the economic crises that are inevitable under capitalism.

February 1, 1975

Planning—for What Purpose And for Whom?

In the corporate lexicon and in our textbooks the words “planned economy” are dirty words. They are synonymous with “bureaucratic bungling.” They have always been associated with anti-socialist propaganda. The mass media have slandered the planned economy of socialism and plugged the “free market economy,” the system of “individual initiative.”

Now, it seems, the worm has turned. “THE NEED TO PLAN,” “THE NEW PUSH BEHIND ECONOMIC PLANNING,” are not headlines from *Pravda*. They are headlines from *Business Week* and *The New York Times*. Some big business executives are even proposing five-year plans run by an Office of National Economic Planning. But the ghost of their past propaganda returns to haunt them. Commiserating with his colleagues, a big business supporter of economic planning laments that he “understands the antipathy of businessmen toward governmental planning since it seems to smack so much of socialism.” In trying to overcome this “antipathy” *The New York Times* makes a historic admission: “Planning may have its flaws and dangers, but the traditional planless approach has already proved its capacity for producing disasters.” (Editorial, *The New York Times*, 2/23/75)

However, with capitalism things are very seldom what they appear to be on the surface. This is true with the new corporate interest in “planning.” There is a new interest in planning, but their concept has nothing whatsoever to do with the planned economies of the socialist countries. They are pushing for a more “planned” state monopoly capitalism. The purpose of their planning is to make it possible for big business to reap a harvest of ever-greater profits. The same *New York Times* editorial makes this very clear:

“Efforts by government to look further ahead and to gather, analyze and publish the information on which it is basing its policy decisions would help private industry to make its own planning decisions—*without government coercion of the private sector*. Industries would still be free to make their own investment decisions, but they would do so on the basis of more complete information about long-term trends as affected by government policies.” (Emphasis mine—GH)

The key words are “without government coercion of the private sector.” What these monopoly planners want is for the government to make longer-term commitments that the State will pump more of the people’s tax money into programs that will benefit the corporations. They want planned commitments for greater tax loopholes, tax writeoffs, depletion allowances and for greater planned military procurements, as well as increasing government expenditures for science and technology. They want longer-term commitments of the kind that the Federal Reserve Bank just recently made. They would like the Federal Reserve Bank—an institution that is supposed to be a watchdog over public governmental monies—to make a commitment to bail out any large corporations in trouble because of the economic crisis. They would relish a more firm and well-planned commitment by the government to help them raise labor productivity, intensify speedup, and a government commitment to increase efforts to hold down workers’ wages, social security benefits, Medicare, etc.

The same *New York Times* editorial lets the corporate cat out of the bag by stating there is the “need to learn to live with dwindling supplies of oil and other materials, and hence there is a concomitant need for national planning in order to *match scarce resources with consumption* in an equitable and efficient manner.” (Emphasis mine—GH) The emphasis here is that there is a need to learn to live with *less* consumption. What they really mean is that the *people* will have to learn to consume less, or, in other words, to further reduce their standard of living. In another editorial in the same vein, *The New York Times* feeds us a mythological, pseudo-historical rationale:

“On a personal level Americans respond to economic misery by drawing upon ancestral memories of austere living and self-denial—their family roots may be in hardscrabble Yankee farmers or African slaves, in pioneers on the sod-house frontier or in European peasants. Whatever their cultural background, Americans are not strangers to

adversity and they are not made of cotton candy. They readily put into practice the harsh folk-wisdom expressed in the jingle, ‘use it up, wear it out, make it do, do without.’” Thus, *The New York Times* is the Pied Piper of poverty. This is their ideological campaign to prepare the people to accept the consequences of a crisis that has been brought on by the unlimited greed of monopoly capital. Notice that the *Times* does not even mention “austere living and self-denial” in relation to monopoly capital. These Pied Pipers of capitalism are playing a tune to lure the people back into the bare existence of frontier days. But in today’s situation they are playing the wrong tune off key. The people will not follow capitalism down the road to ruin. The people will apply their “folk wisdom” by telling these ideologues of capitalism: “As far as you and capitalism are concerned we can easily ‘do without.’”

Yes, state monopoly capitalism has a growing “capacity for producing disasters.” It is this that forces the spokesmen for capitalism to consider some elements of planning. But their planning is in the interest of the giant monopolies and against the interest of workers, of all the people and of small business. But all the planning in the world will not change or alleviate the “capacity of monopoly capitalism to produce disasters.”

Anarchy is a basic law of a society in which the means of production (the raw materials, tools, machinery and factories) are privately owned and which is motivated solely by private profits. A society that lives by the law of dog-eat-dog cannot be planned.

The social character of production followed by the private appropriation of the products is the structural base of an insoluble contradiction that rules out any concepts of overall planning. The very inner-nature of capitalism rules out overall planning. Writing about the nature of capital, Marx quotes a British trade union leader:

“With adequate profit, capital is very bold. A certain 10 percent will ensure its employment anywhere; 20 percent certain will produce eagerness; 50 percent, positive audacity; 100 percent will make it ready to trample on all human laws; 300 percent, and there is not a crime at which it will scruple, nor a risk it will not run, even to the chance of its owner being hanged.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, International Publishers, 1967, p. 760.)

Monopoly capital’s greed for surplus value, which is the source of all profits, cannot be boxed-in or limited by even the strongest or most carefully thought out plans. The only “plans” monopoly capital will

abide by are their conspiracies against the working class and the people.

Private ownership of the means of production corresponds with a society based on exploitation for the benefit of a few. In such a society overall economic planning is inconceivable. On the other hand, social ownership of the means of production corresponds with a society that is motivated solely by serving the interests of the people. In such a society overall economic planning is an absolute necessity.

In the socialist countries the economic plan ties together and synchronizes production and distribution of all products. The ability to plan production and distribution gives socialism a tremendous advantage over capitalism. A planned economy can take advantage of all resources—science, technology, manpower and the riches of nature. It can eliminate waste, unnecessary overlapping and duplication.

The present crisis in the capitalist countries is a classical case study in the comparison between the anarchy of capitalism and the planned economy of socialism.

The socialist countries are not suffering economic crises. On the contrary, there is no unemployment, and prices for necessities have remained stable or have been reduced. The quality of life is becoming richer every day. Under socialism, a planned economy in the interest of the people, *there will be no crises in the future.*

This crisis is not the last that the capitalist countries will suffer. Under capitalism economic crises are inherent in the system itself. The socialist countries have a built-in, planned guarantee against ever suffering an economic crisis.

Monopoly capitalism is forced to consider some steps toward a planned relationship between the State and monopoly capital. The ideologists of monopoly capitalism deliberately use the words “planning” and “planned economy” in order to create confusion among the people. They are aware that because of the great successes, the historic advances made by the socialist countries, these words have a very positive, alluring ring in the minds of millions of Americans. Monopoly capital’s ideologues use these words because they know that in the minds of the masses a planned economy is synonymous with the progressive development of society under socialism. They are aware that among the people the idea is growing that if our country wants to avoid the constant cyclical crises—if we are to move along a steady road toward prosperity and well-being—we will have to do away with

a social system that is an obstacle to a planned economy. Only the removal of this crippling obstacle will make such progress possible.

It is clear, therefore, that a social system whose sole motivation is to satisfy the growing material and cultural requirements of the people must and can utilize overall economic planning. On the other hand, a system that is motivated solely by the unbounded greed for private profits will not and cannot implement overall economic planning.

March 29, 1975

The "Purpose" of World Monopoly Capitalism

What is wrong with capitalism? There is a growing consensus that something is wrong. The differences are over specifically what the ailment is. According to some new big business studies, capitalism has lost its "purpose" in life. As is the case with an individual, when a socio-economic system does not have a "purpose" it flounders, it slides from one crisis to another, it becomes demoralized and it loses its thrust. But outside of the "purpose" of providing a handful of corporate coupon-clippers with huge personal fortunes, what possible purpose could capitalism have?

In its recently released "Summary and Conclusions," the Trilateral Task Force, composed of representatives from all of the major capitalist countries and headed by David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski, concluded that present-day world monopoly capitalism is in a crisis because it does not have a "purpose." Of course, they dare not define what the "purpose" of modern capitalism should be. Therefore, only by deduction of what is has been can one define what they have in mind.

These fossils of world monopoly capitalism bemoan that their economic system has lost its “purpose” because:

In wartime or periods of economic catastrophe common purposes are easily defined. During World War II and then the Cold War, there was a general acceptance in the United States of the overriding priority of national security as a goal. . . . World War, economic reconstruction, and the Cold War gave coherence to public purposes and imposed a set of priorities for ordering government policies and programs. Now, however, these purposes have lost their salience. . . ; the imperatives of national security are no longer obvious . . .” (*Wall Street Journal*, 8/1/75, p. 6, “Are Democracies Governable?”)

The study states that world capitalism has difficulty in finding a “purpose” because:

Internationally, confrontation has given way to detente, with a resultant relaxation of constraints within societies and of the impetus to collaborate among societies. There has been a substantial relative decline in American military and economic power. (Ibid.)

Coming from the horse’s mouth of big business, this is quite an admission. What they are actually saying is that world capitalism cannot find a “purpose” around which it can rally support unless it is involved in acts of aggression, in wars or preparations for war. It is an admission that sections of monopoly capital are trying to conjure up a “purpose” by creating crises of “national defense.” Because capitalism is in a stage of decline and suffering from the infirmities of its general crisis it cannot give rise to any positive, popular purpose.

The truth is that capitalism has but one basic built-in purpose. The “purpose” that motivates its very existence is corporate profits. It has no purpose that is not related to the accumulation of these private fortunes. Wars of aggression, exploitation, racism, cold and hot wars are all vehicles in the pursuance of capitalism’s main “purpose”—corporate profits. Human welfare and concerns (economic, social or cultural) have no place in the world or the “purpose” of world monopoly capitalism. The Trilateral Task Force makes this clear when they say that the crisis is even deeper because the people have “escalated their expectations and aspirations, thereby causing a more intense reaction if these are not met in reality.” And big business is not about to meet the “expectations and aspirations” of the people.

The real crisis of "purpose" for monopoly capitalism arises from the fact that it is in a period of decay. The contradiction between its purpose of corporate profits and the interests of the great majority of the people continues to sharpen. The cause of the crisis of world capitalism arises from the fact that capitalism has lost its ability to dominate the direction of world events and is therefore having increasing difficulty in pursuing its "purpose" of maximum profits for the top circles of finance and monopoly capital.

Besides raising questions about whether capitalism can revive its "purpose" in today's world, these same big business studies continue to raise a related question: "whether democracies have become ungovernable." They are of course limiting the scope to capitalist democracies. When big business circles start to raise questions about the uncertainty of "the future of democracies" the people must take this as a serious warning. The crucial issue they are raising is whether it is possible for capitalism to continue its profitable "purpose" in a period when the resistance to its policies is on the upswing; whether it is possible for capitalism to continue permitting the people to pursue their rights of expression and action.

This same question was raised by the big business elements in Germany and Italy when they were preparing for the advent of fascism. From the viewpoint of their "purpose" the "democracies" were "ungovernable." When the inner circles of monopoly capital raise questions as to whether the "democracies are becoming ungovernable" they are, in fact, releasing ideological trial balloons for fascism. Each step in the process that was exposed around the Nixon-Watergate affair was taken behind the "excuse" of making the affairs of the government more governable.

The same Rockefeller-Brzezinski study hints that our "democracy is becoming ungovernable" because "broadened political participation has increased the demands on government." One can only conclude that, in their opinion, things would become "governable" if, by brute force, this "broadened political participation" is stamped out.

In governmental affairs the Ford administration is vigorously pursuing policies in support of the purposes of monopoly capital. Ford has taken over where Nixon left off. The "purposes" of big business call for the destruction of all social programs that are of any

help to the people. The Ford-Rockefeller team is proceeding to do exactly that. Ford calls the \$100 billion-plus arms program "the most important social obligation of government."

The small businessmen who in Chicago applauded Ford's statements about "getting the government out of your business, your affairs, your pockets and your hair" are behaving like sheep being led to slaughter. The fact is that the Ford administration is giving a free rein to big business to pursue its "purposes." They will then have their hands in the pockets of people and small business even deeper. The policies of the government will be in support of big business "purposes" as long as it is dominated by the politicians of the two old parties of monopoly capital.

The historical process is that the basic "purpose" of monopoly capital and the purposes that will serve the interests of the people are on a collision course. Whether the "democracies" will become "ungovernable" depends on which of the purposes these government institutions serve. And, even more basically, on how well the people are organized to make them serve the interests of the people.

The countries that have organized their economies and lives along socialist lines have no crisis of purpose. the purpose of the socialist system is motivated solely by the basic law of serving the best interest of all the people. The socialist societies have a unified purpose.

We in the United States can relieve monopoly capital of its crisis of "purpose" by fundamentally changing the purpose of our economic and government structure to serve the interest of the people's welfare. This, of course, in general terms, spells socialism.

September 6, 1975

An Open Letter to Joseph Odorcich Redbaiting—Refuge for Sellout Scoundrels

A number of members of District 15 of the United Steelworkers of America have sent me your recent bulletin, *Labor Lines*, in which you engaged in some irrational, deceitful, irresponsible and unsupportable claptrap.

I cannot accept the possibility that you would spew forth such idiocy out of ignorance. Therefore, I must assume that your bulletin was calculated to mislead the workers in your district.

You say your article is based on a telephone call from someone who said he was a member of the “American Labor Party.”

Concerning the call you state:

Finally, I asked him who was sponsoring him. Does he belong to a ‘left-wing’ group? Who finances their activities and how? Specifically, I asked him if his group was communist controlled. I received no definite answer except again a lot of jazz that made no sense whatsoever.

Mr. Odorcich, as a District Director you must be aware that the so-called American Labor Party is but a name used by a small sect: an anti-labor, anti-union and anti-communist group which calls itself the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC). It works under a left cover, but it is a “right wing” group, concerning which you state:

However, in my opinion, the less of the two evils would be the ‘right wing’ groups. At least we know that they are American controlled and financed.

Therefore, you should know who your “caller” was since he was of your political persuasion. The main purpose and work of the NCLC is to do exactly what you do in your bulletin: through provocation and misrepresentation to stir up anti-communism. You used their fake front to carry on a redbaiting tirade.

Let me respond to some of your irresponsible statements beginning with this one:

“If the communist controlled systems are so wonderful, why can’t an ordinary citizen visit these countries, talk to their people and find out for themselves where the differences are?”

The truth is that “ordinary citizens,” including steelworkers from District 15, can and do visit the socialist countries, and they are welcome at all times. In fact, approximately 100,000 Americans are doing so every year. The obstacles to visiting the socialist countries are not in the socialist countries. The problems are here. George Meany and others of your right-wing friends carry on a daily struggle to prevent such visits, especially by trade unionists from the United States. The question is: Why are George Meany and his right-wing gang so worried about trade unionists visiting socialist countries?

Let me make a suggestion: Why don’t you organize a delegation of “ordinary citizens” and steelworkers from each of the steel mills in your district to visit the socialist countries? Or are you also afraid of what the impressions would be?

Further on in the bulletin you state:

If you think things are bad here, consider this. Who would you want running your government? Hitler or Stalin?

That statement, Mr. Odorcich, is also cheap fakery. By such statements you insult the intelligence of the members of your union. The “choice” is not between Hitler and Stalin. What you are trying to slip in is the idea that the choice is between fascism and socialism. The truth is that now, at this point in history, this is not the choice in the United States. But because there are times when history has and will present such choices I want to discuss them.

What you want to hide behind your “Hitler-Stalin” formula is the fact that your “right-wing” movements are kinfolks to fascism. In fact you may not know it but many of your arguments against socialism are straight out of Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*. Fascism is capitalism. It is the raw rule of the big corporations. It is the rule of big business; without Congress, without trade unions, without civil rights or civil liberties. It is the open, terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, most imperialist and racist elements of finance capital. The top and most reactionary sections of the big steel corporations

hold fascism in abeyance as an option to be brought into play when the crisis problems become sharper. Is this what you are recommending to the steelworkers as an option?

You may also not be aware that your “right-wing” politics, your redbaiting, your big lie technique lays the basis for fascism.

Socialism is a working-class solution to the growing problems under capitalism. Socialism, and later communism, is a social system geared to getting the best out of life for all people. Under socialism the steel mills belong to the people. They operate not because some lazy moneybag makes a profit, but because the welfare of the society requires steel. The steel mills and the government are run by workers. Socialism is a working-class setup. Under capitalism, as we know in the steel industry, when new, automated machines are brought in workers are kicked out. Under socialism, because the mills are owned by the people, when new machines are brought in the number of hours of work are shortened, without a cut in pay.

Your bulletin continues:

Granted there are a lot of wrongs here; however, we, the people, have the power to correct them within our system if we use our intelligence and common sense to do so. Just as we, in the labor movement in the 1930s, got tired of being just a check number and forged this instrument, the United Steelworkers of America, to correct low wages, loss of dignity, right of redress of wrongs and all the other benefits our labor agreements contain, so can we correct our other ills without the help or advice of the ‘paid puppets’ of foreign countries.

On one point you are right. We do not need “paid puppets of foreign countries.” However, if by paid puppets you are inferring that members of the Communist Party USA are “paid puppets,” or puppets of any kind, this is a slanderous innuendo and another of your big lies. We Communists, including steelworkers who are Communists, are as much a feature of life in these United States as you or anyone else. If you want to speak about “paid puppets,” the most dangerous kind from the steelworkers’ point of self-interest are the puppets who are on the union payroll but who, in fact, serve the interests of the steel corporations. The people in the union leadership who negotiated and pushed for the Experimental Negotiating Agreement (ENA) contracts and the people who redbait against militant workers are truly corporate puppets.

You speak about what “we” did in the 1930s. The “we” in the first

place included hundreds of Communists, including myself. The efforts of Communists in organizing steelworkers goes back to the 1919 steel strike led by William Z. Foster. I was a steelworker in Youngstown in the 1930s and organized the first delegation of steelworkers to meet with John L. Lewis in Pittsburgh to urge him to organize steel. The CIO established the Steelworkers Organizing Committee and I was a member of it as an organizer in the mill. I was in the steelworkers organization during the 1937 strike, and a delegate to the first convention which established the United Steelworkers of America. During the strike I was arrested on a frame-up. I do not know where you personally were in the 1930s, but all of your "right-wingers" to the last one were active anti-union forces. In the steel industry they were the stoolpigeons and scabs who tried to get me convicted on a fake dynamite charge. They were stooges for Tom Girdler.

The "instrument, the United Steelworkers of America," was forged by the united forces of the steelworkers. It was built by Communist and non-communist steelworkers, Black and white, and by almost every militant, progressive force. In those days the kind of irresponsible, divisive red-baiting you indulge in in your bulletin was not permitted. During the organizing days of the steelworkers' union the corporations had to do their own red-baiting, their own dirty work. The steel corporations even tried to make John L. Lewis and the CIO into "agents of the Soviet Union." Trade union leaders in the CIO did not provide this service to big business.

Your "parting shot" states: ". . . with all our faults in the USA, we can speak out even against our government . . ."

We Communists do not take second place to anyone when it comes to fighting for democratic rights. But your statements about rights and freedoms in the United States and the lack of them in the socialist countries is but another big lie promoted by big business. I served an 8-year prison sentence in Leavenworth Penitentiary for the crime of "thinking."

There is also another danger in your false statements. At this very moment there is before Congress a bill, vigorously supported by the Ford administration and by all your "right-wing" friends which, if passed, will be a dangerous step toward fascism. And the big business forces of reaction need statements like those in your bulletin to help influence passage of this bill.

Almost all of the criticism of this bill (S-1) has been leveled at its politically repressive and prosecution-broadening provisions and the fact that it would immunize prosecutors and law enforcement officials from liability for their unlawful actions. However, I want also to emphasize that none of the commentary on S-1 has yet noted the drastic incapacitation of the labor movement which Sections 1722 and 1723 of the bill would accomplish.

For your enlightenment, and to demonstrate the dangerous implications this proposed law has for labor, let me outline and explain certain sections of the bill especially applicable to the labor movement.

Section 1722 of S-1 would make a person guilty of the crime of extortion if he "obtains property" by threatening "that any person will be subjected to bodily injury," or "that any property will be damaged." "Property" is defined as "anything of value" and includes wages or other benefits to workers. The bill makes extortion a Class C felony, punishable by up to 15 years in prison. This section circumvents the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Hobbs Act (passed in 1937) and broadens the definition of extortion to include any actual or threatened violence in the course of a strike.

The Hobbs Act defines extortion as the "wrongful" use of violence to obtain property. In 1971, the government indicted members of the Communication Workers under this act for violence in the course of a strike for a new collective bargaining agreement. In 1973, the Supreme Court dismissed the indictment, holding that the term "wrongful" limited the Hobbs Act to the use of violence for a wrongful purpose, i.e., a payoff, so that it did not apply to the use or threat of violence in a strike for better wages or other legitimate trade union demands.

S-1 deletes the key word "wrongful" from the definition of extortion, thereby making it a federal crime to use or threaten violence in the course of a legitimate labor dispute.

S-1 goes even further. Section 1723 defines the crime of blackmail as "threatening" to "subject any person to economic loss or injury to his business." Again, by omitting the key word "wrongful," this provision would make any strike or threatened strike for higher wages or better conditions "blackmail" punishable, like extortion, by up to 15 years in prison.

It should be quite obvious to any trade unionist, to any steelworker, that the kind of red-baiting slander which you indulge in plays right

into the hands of the very forces which are pushing for the passage of this fascist-like bill—the right-wingers and big business. Which side are you on, Mr. Odorcich?

This is an open letter which is being published in the two greatest working-class newspapers in the United States, the *Daily World* and *People's World*. I challenge you, Mr. Odorcich, to publish it in your bulletin!

You end your tirade by saying, "I think I have said enough for this month." This is only too true! It is more than enough because your bulletin contains nothing but falsehoods, distortions and irresponsible slander which do damage to the cause of the steelworkers, to all workers and to the whole trade union movement. But you can be sure the right-wingers sitting in the plush corporate offices of the steel corporations will appreciate and applaud your big-lie, red-baiting campaign. Red-baiting by officers of trade unions has always been a coverup for their cuddling-up to the corporate bosses.

In a recent interview, I.W. Abel, who sounded off militantly until the day after he was elected President of the USWA, again stated his class collaborationist views. As always, in the attempt to make them palatable, he first red-baited and then tried to rewrite history.

Referring to the victories of the steelworkers, Abel made the following statements:

And we've done it not on the picket line, not in the great struggles that they talk about.

As an example we lost the Little Steel Strike . . . We had people killed in Massillon and the Chicago massacre. We lost on the picket line, no real progressive steps were made.

We lost it on the picket lines.

None of the outstanding agreements as you go down our history, none of these achievements came about on the picket line.

. . . we'd been on the picket line over and lost, but Harry Truman, through his intervention, got the steel industry to concede to an 18.5 cents an hour wage increase.

These statements, of course, are total nonsense. Anybody with even a speck of honesty would have to admit that the steel corporations have never, under any circumstances, given up one penny of their profits without a fight. To say that the Little Steel Strike was not responsible for the breakthrough in forcing the steel companies to sign contracts is either consciously lying or distorting the truth. A day

before the strike Tom Girdler said he would "rather pick apples on his farm for a living than to sign a contract with the union." But the strike forced him to change his tune. Abel desecrates the honor and the memory of the workers who have given their lives on the picket line.

Of course it is not history that Abel is concerned about. Using distortions of history he attempts to convince steelworkers that they should give up struggle and support the Abel-steel corporation sell-out ENA contracts. It is a noose they are trying to put around the necks of the steelworkers.

Finally, the reporter interviewing Abel asked: "But there is much criticism over your yearly salary of \$75,000. Is this criticism valid?" Abel's answer was "certainly not." The \$75,000 annual salaries, with huge expense accounts, are all a part of the setup of union leaders who sell out the interests of the workers and conspire with the corporations behind the backs of the union members. It is but another element of straight-out class collaboration!

November 8, 1975

It's Time to Raise Hell

The economy is slowly moving out of the economic crisis cycle, and big business propagandists are busy using the economic upturn to create an illusory euphoria. They want the people to believe that the economic problems are all being resolved, that the people should simply wait with confidence in the system and the politicians. This is but another fraud.

As the crisis recedes some will return to their jobs, but, as is already the case in the automobile industry, many of those who got their jobs back will have periods of lay-offs.

The crisis is receding, but there are no signs that the upturn in the economy will result in jobs for the more than 10 million unemployed.

In fact, all of the signs point in the opposite direction. There is no outlook that the 40 percent of the youth in the ghettos and barrios will even get their first jobs. Instead of jobs, big business propaganda argues that the reason the young people do not have jobs is because of the Minimum Wage Law. In other words, they argue that if the young people would work for "peanuts" they would be hired in place of other workers.

U.S. capitalism has created an economic deep-freeze for millions of our people. Now that the crisis is receding big business wants the public to forget these prisoners in the economic deep-freeze. They want the public to forget the 10 million unemployed, the 30 million living below the poverty level, the millions of retirees and elderly who live on the margin between poverty and starvation. They want everyone to forget the millions of youth including the new millions from each generation who are barred from a job before they are born. They are born into the economic deep-freeze.

They want you to forget that there are whole cities in the deep-freeze, like New York City, Newark, Buffalo, Yonkers and other cities. They want you to forget that there are colleges in the deep-freeze and millions of youth are now frozen out of a college education. Big business propagandists are working to create the illusion that inflation is now under control, that taxes and rents have reached their apex. This is also a fraud. They are working to make high unemployment, high prices, high rents, high taxes acceptable. There is not talk about cutting prices, rents or taxes.

The facts are that while the cyclical crisis is slowly receding, the after-effects are going to stay with us for a long time. They want to convince the people to "take it easy," "be patient, there is no need to protest," "stay at home and wait." This would be the most serious mistake! It would be a mistake for the people affected by the economic deep-freeze and it would be a mistake for all workers. Big business has other long-range plans. The mass media is full of propaganda about the need for "austerity."

They say, "Our capitalist system cannot afford such a high standard of living." "It cannot afford social security." That in itself is quite an admission. They are going to push this austerity line against the six million workers whose unions are now starting wage negotiations. As an additional line the Ford administration is putting out wage freeze balloons. This austerity drive is based on another big fraud. What this

country cannot afford is the high corporate profits and the \$120 billion war budget. Let the politicians talk about austerity to big business and the banks.

The present economic crisis has not yet left the scene, but there are already many developments that will bring on the next economic crisis. That's in the nature of capitalism. It moves from one crisis to another.

So now is not the time to stop fighting, Now is not the time to let up on the mass pressure.

If big business succeeds in creating the illusion of euphoria they will be able to keep the millions in the deep-freeze and succeed in their drive for austerity.

Now is the time to basically change priorities from the corporate profit-oriented priorities to a people's welfare-oriented priority.

The six-hour day and 30-hour work week without a cut in weekly pay would by itself make a big dent in the number of unemployed. Without such an approach the young generation will stay on the outside of the labor force from now until the end of capitalism.

A massive housing construction program and the financial means through which the people can afford them is needed on an emergency basis.

The construction of schools and hospitals on a scale that will make a modern school and a modern hospital available to all who need them must be a priority item.

What this country cannot afford is the domination of monopoly capital. What this country cannot afford is the two-party politics that places corporate profits at the top of the list of priorities. This is no time "to be patient," no time "to stay home." This is a time to raise hell!

April 3, 1976

The Wage Differential Rip-Off

Things you can't see or touch rarely make the news. But one did recently—the mysterious disease in Philadelphia. It killed 30 people, but no one can locate the cause. Or else they're afraid to, in case it turns out to be one of the government's germ warfare experiments gone wild.

I'd like to talk about something that has destroyed more lives and ruined more cities than the Philadelphia disease. Though it goes by different names—"the Southern differential," "the income gap," "the wage differential,"—we know what it is, and I'm going to try to make it very visible. The differential is the link between unemployment in the North and the open shop and runaway plant in the South.

If I'm elected president I'll propose to Congress a law prohibiting all wage differentials except for skill, difficult or dangerous work, bad climatic conditions, night work. I would bar the following:

- All differentials from one region to another, from big cities to small.
- All differentials between white and Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Indian.
- All differentials between men and women.

Wage differentials are a major weapon of big business for super-profits.

Wage differentials are leaving in their wake dying cities, closed plants, millions of unemployed.

Wage differentials and the runaway shops are the road to the open shop, to union-busting injunctions, to the murder of union organizers, to anti-labor "right to work" laws.

The lowest factory wages in the country are paid in North Carolina, the home of the union-busting J.P. Stevens textile empire and the revived Ku Klux Klan, where Ben Chavis and the Wilmington Ten are imprisoned, where scores of Black and poor white prisoners are on death row. It is the state with the lowest percentage of union membership.

Last year average weekly wages of employed factory workers in North Carolina were \$116 less than in Michigan. That adds up to \$6,000 per year. It means \$6,000 extra profits per worker for the corporation running away from Michigan to North Carolina. It means \$4.5 billion extra profits from the 750,000 factory workers employed in the state.

Now let's see how that goes for Michigan. Last year a material handler in Saginaw, Michigan, averaged \$3.64. A company running away from Saginaw to Memphis would make an extra \$4,100 on that single job alone. And that's part of the reason Detroit and Flint still have an official unemployment rate of 10 percent—it's actually double that—far higher than the national average, despite the fact that automobile production has recovered and profits of General Motors are back in the billions.

Now let's look at the automobile industry. In large factories in the North, assemblers, class B, averaged \$6.12 per hour. In large factories in the South they averaged \$3.37 per hour—a differential of more than 40 percent, worth \$6,000 per year to the company that moves the work South (1974 figures).

But that isn't all. There was just as large a differential in the North between large shops and small shops. More and more, big companies subcontract work to small-town subcontractors, who pay substandard wages and chisel on all safety and health provisions, and on all fringe benefits, in order to be able to sell parts or sub-assemblies to the Big Three cheaper than the big companies can make them—and still eke out a small profit. It's why General Motors closed down the Fisher No. 23 die-building plant in Detroit and distributed the work among ten plants scattered around the United States.

The amount of extra profits from these regional differentials is growing each year. To protect these extra profits, extracted from low wage labor, an assassin was hired to murder the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., in Memphis when he was assisting the struggle against non-union, low-wage conditions of the Black sanitation workers there.

The tens of millions of dollars necessary to elect a Ford or a Carter to protect the southern differential are peanuts compared with the extra profits payoff to the corporate capitalists who put up the election funds.

The southern differential started as a deal between the northern

capitalists and the defeated slaveowners after the Civil War. In 1975, the per capita income of Black people was \$2,500 less than the per capita income of whites. Applied to the 25 million Black people in the country, that meant a loss in purchasing power for the Black people of \$70 billion. And a loss of more than \$100 billion when the Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, Indians, and Asians are added in.

There's a federal equal opportunity act, and a state law, and there are government commissions, and the union has a fair employment clause in its contracts. But none of the laws are really enforced, and the union leadership does not insist on positive action to make equality a reality in the shops.

For example, a Black auto worker is much more likely to be unemployed. Because the auto industry is a cyclical industry, the last-to-be-hired, first-to-be-fired rule applies with particular force. The otherwise strong seniority system won by the workers becomes a mockery for many of the Black workers because it lacks the special provision necessary to break the last-to-be-hired, first-to-be-fired vicious circle.

If I'm elected president, I will urge Congress to pass legislation ensuring that when there are layoffs the principle of compensatory seniority comes into play. That is—as even some courts have begun to recognize—there must be taken into account the fact that many Blacks and other minorities and women would have had greater seniority were it not for the brutal discrimination in hiring policies. In its own interest, labor must avoid a situation, for example, where if Blacks constitute 20 percent of the work force, they are all fired first because they are hired last.

It is the corporations that have made bigger profits from these practices. It is the corporations that must be made to pay for correcting this. One way is, when layoffs take place, for the workers with longer seniority to be given paid sabbaticals to rebuild their health and to learn higher skills.

To return to the auto industry. Every auto worker knows that the Black workers are still assigned the worst jobs—the hardest stations on the line, the paint stations that ruin their lungs, the jobs where they have to work in the pits, and the hot, heavy, dangerous foundry jobs. Add to that the lower wages and the added unemployment time, and you have a total racist pattern. All this is by the deliberate design of the auto manufacturers.

The strategy is simple enough. It's to make the white workers feel safe and superior, to feel that their security is threatened not by capitalism, not by the company, but by Black workers trying to take their jobs and their homes.

Any such feeling is an illusion. When the crisis hits, Blacks are laid off first, but white workers are also laid off. Right now there are tens of thousands of white auto workers who have not been rehired since the 1974-75 layoffs.

The speed-up on the line hits white workers as well as Black, shortens their lives as well as the black workers' lives. The worst speed-up in the country was in the Lordstown, Ohio, plant, which was nearly all white.

And once a company can get away with racist discrimination anywhere, it will go where it is worst. Economic discrimination against Blacks is still worse in the South than in the North; and the whole southern wage differential is the result of hundreds of years of slavery and near-slavery in that region.

You have to look at the South to see what racism costs white workers. In 1969, the income of southern white workers was one-eighth less than the income of northern white workers. And the reason is that racism pulls down their wages more than it does the wages of northern white workers. Applied to all the whites in the South, it came out to a loss of more than \$20 billion. By now it is more than \$30 billion.

White male factory operatives in the South make 23 percent less than white operatives in the North, and even 18 percent less than Black operatives in the North. Yes, they make a lot more than Black operatives in the South. But the southern differential hits them so hard that they make less than Black workers doing the same work in the North, even though these workers are themselves discriminated against.

General Electric, Ford, General Motors—many big companies—are moving more and more of their work to the South, setting up new factories there, in non-union conditions. The auto companies agreed with the United Automobile Workers to automatically recognize the union in new factories opened up in the South. But they are violating that agreement, and fighting the union throughout the South. Most plants in the South are non-union.

Along with wage differentials go tax giveaways. Capitalists in the

southern states and small towns can cash in on the runaway shops' subcontracts. They give tax exemptions to the runaway factories, and the workers of these states pay for it, in higher taxes and in curtailed municipal services. And now the northern states are beginning to compete with the southern states in tax giveaways, with the same harmful effects.

Wage differentials against Black and other minority workers are matched by differentials and discrimination against women. Average earnings of women working full time are 40 percent less than average earnings of men. This costs women workers the enormous sum of \$150 billion a year.

And then there is the vicious attempt of big business and the Democrats and Republicans to cut wage standards for youth, to take advantage of the huge volume of unemployment among youth and to hire them at less than the minimum wage, thereby hoping to crack the entire wage structure.

Also, taking advantage of the sex differential, employers replace men with women at lower wages in occupation after occupation.

All this, however, doesn't take into account the international runaway shop. The profits are highest of all in low-wage countries where the multinational corporations operate. More and more, work is being transferred to these countries. Sales of U.S. companies from their foreign plants and mines came close to \$400 billion in 1974, which was four times as much as it was eight years earlier.

Workers of the United States are beginning to struggle against these differentials. In a number of cases, militant unions have won fights to defeat the runaway shop, to prevent employers from moving out machinery. Such fights can be won, through militant actions, through forcing cooperation by government officials and members of Congress.

In the South, Black workers with organizational experience in the civil rights struggle are getting into the factories and showing outstanding leadership in the struggle to establish trade unions. Some of the big Westinghouse and General Electric plants have been successfully organized with this Black and white unity. This is also key to the ultimate victory of the southern textile workers.

And the struggle is beginning in the trade union movement against the international runaways.

Let me tell you the Communist program for dealing with this evil. I

have already said that I would propose legislation outlawing all differentials except as applied for reasonable skill, hardship, etc. I've mentioned the steps I would take to assure real equality of employment for Blacks, other minorities, women. I would assure that youth got decent wages, also.

That isn't all. I would propose to Congress that all state and local property taxes and income taxes be consolidated into one nationwide tax system, and the revenues distributed according to need. This would put an end to the use of competitive tax giveaways, which encourage the runaway shop and help big business shift the entire tax burden to the workers.

Finally, we would put an end to the international runaway shop. I would insist that Congress remove all tax privileges for foreign investments. We would withdraw all troops from foreign bases and return the U.S. fleet to home waters. And I would declare a 100 percent embargo on the racist South African and Rhodesian regimes, with severe penalties for all U.S. companies that did business with them.

Now let's see how the Communist program against wage differentials fits in with our unemployment program. Elimination of wage differential against Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Native American Indians, and women will increase the wage and salary income of the country by more than \$100 billion, directly. This additional mass purchasing power will generate an additional 5 million jobs in consumers goods industries, trade and services.

Slashing the military budget by 80 percent and using the funds to build houses, schools, hospitals, mass transit and recreational facilities for the people will add another 3 million civilian jobs.

Ending all restrictions and discrimination against trade with socialist and developing countries will provide an additional 2 million jobs.

What about our very basic demand—to reduce the workweek to 30 hours without reduction in pay. This is a very appropriate demand, considering the extra high level of productivity of American labor and the intensity of labor in industry. When you consider that U.S. production workers produce \$3.50 in added value for each dollar they receive in wages, then you can see that even with a 6-hour work day and the same total wages received, they would still be producing \$2.60 for each dollar they receive in wages. It is clear that not only can the country afford it, but the country needs it.

What effect would this have on employment? There are about 50 million wage and salary workers on full-time schedules. Reducing the basic workweek from 40 hours to 30 hours without reduction in pay would require an additional 12 million workers.

From all these sources, then, the total increase in jobs would be 10 million.

Thus, the Hall-Tyner program provides for employment, at a much higher level of total employment and total income and with a much higher level of mass living standards, than ever before.

To vote for Ford and Carter is to vote against yourself. You would not elect your boss as your shop steward. So why vote to put his man in the White House?

September 27, 1976

An Open Letter to the New Governor Of Minnesota, Rudolph G. Perpich

Dear Governor:

As a former Minnesotan I want to congratulate you on becoming Governor of Minnesota. Like all states, Minnesota has had its share of lousy governors. It has also had some outstanding ones, like Floyd B. Olson and Elmer Benson, as well as Congressmen like John T. Bernard. These men were public servants in the best traditions of the Farmer-Labor Party. As you take office you have, in a sense, a choice of traditions you can follow.

I decided to write this letter for a number of reasons. First because we both have our family roots in the iron mining and bankrupt farming region of Minnesota. Incidentally, a new element has been added to my family tradition: my young niece is now one of the first women to work in the iron mines.

I was intrigued by some statements you made, and some made about you by reports. A *New York Times* reporter, in an article on December 7, 1976, said: “. . . he is a man of unquestionable honesty, rare in politics.” This is indeed a sad commentary on establishment politics—that it is rare to find a politician of “unquestionable honesty.” The reporter quotes you as saying, “I want to do a lot of things. I want to help people.” In the same article he said of you, “it was the mining background that shaped Rudy Perpich, that led him to champion the poor and the minorities. He marched for civil rights in the 1960s and for peace in the 1970s.”

That is certainly a record you can be proud of. However, I am sure you are aware that being governor is going to be the acid test because the pressures to deface that record will be enormous. Business interests will use their considerable weight to have your administration help them extract maximum profits. That is their nature, in Minnesota and everywhere else, and their aim is at odds with your expressed aim of “helping the people.” And addressing yourself to their needs, to the needs of the iron workers, the taconite workers, the farmers, the youth, the Black people, is your key responsibility.

In a sense what is happening on the iron range is a case study of the problems you will have to deal with as governor.

The “dumps” on the Range have become taconite “gold mines” for the iron ore and steel corporations. They pay nothing for the people’s valuable minerals and a pittance in taxes. Directly related to this, as you so well know, is the fact that in the past Minnesota was one of the states with low taxes on people and small properties; now it is a state with very high taxes on the people. Also related to this is the fact that the Farmer-Labor Party, which championed the interests of the people, is defunct and the Democratic Party has taken its place.

Minnesota, as we both know and take pride in, has great progressive and liberal traditions. But there are serious questions now that must be tackled in a new way. For example, in between the “dumps” that have become corporate “gold mines” there is the indescribable poverty of the Indian people. And in the “cities,” as the people of the Range call them, there are the slums and the racist terror directed against Black citizens. I believe most Minnesotans would say racism is morally wrong. But experience teaches that moral condemnation is not enough. Cities, states and the Federal government must pass laws with teeth in them, laws that will make all acts of racism punishable

crimes. As governor you will have new authority and power to give leadership in the struggles against these evils.

As you tackle the problems of Minnesota you will face the inevitable—in practice you cannot be all things to all people. You can reduce the taxes the people pay if you raise the taxes on those who are able to pay, namely the rich and the corporations. You can guarantee the rights of those who suffer because of racism by taking away the right to commit racist acts. You can allocate money for public housing, schools and hospitals if you help to stop Congress and the Carter administration from spending the \$120 billion a year on military hardware.

Perhaps you can convince your fellow Minnesotan, Robert Bergland, who has moved up to the post of Secretary of Agriculture, to push for farm programs that would help, that would save those remaining small farms in Minnesota and other states. Whatever the details, they have to be programs that guarantee a basic yearly minimum income for the family farmer. The U.S. government guarantees the investments of monopoly corporations overseas. Why should the government not guarantee the investment of our small farmers on a yearly basis? Most of the present farm programs ultimately enrich only the wealthy. The new farm programs must reverse such priorities.

It is a lesson of Minnesota politics that if you make the choice of aligning yourself with the corporations and the rich, then you will inevitably ally yourself with the establishment political machines. If, on the other hand, you make the choice of siding with the people, you will need a political movement of the people. Without a grass roots political coalition in the spirit of the old Farmer-Labor movement that is not dominated by the politicians of big business, you cannot do much about "helping the people." Your source of political power can be either the people or the corporations. That is a choice you will be forced to make. Without such a grass roots people's movement you will be making the wrong concessions to the wrong people. A public official of the people can be only as strong and effective as the political movement of the people he or she represents. For you, and other public officials like you, to be able to fulfill your commitments to the people, it is necessary to make the best traditions of the Farmer-Labor movement live again. A network of local, precinct and

wardpeople's clubs can radically change the political scene in Minnesota.

There is one other remark you made that I want to say a word about. While taking the oath of office you said: "Only in the USA could this happen," meaning that a poor miner's son can become governor. As you and I know this is an old cliché, one that is repeated very often. Most likely it was your intention to dramatize the role of working--class families in politics, and I can go along with that. But as you know, factually that old cliché does not measure up to world realities.

It is a rarity in capitalist countries, including the United States. But it is the accepted norm in socialist countries. The great majority of the members of parliaments, including regional and city governments, in the socialist countries are workers and farmers. This is also true of the members of cabinets, including the prime ministers. As you know, Leonid Brezhnev was a steelworker. The leading political personality in Poland, Edward Gierek, worked in the coal mines most of his life. Also, leading political figures such as Le Duan in Vietnam, Janos Kadar in Hungary, and Gustav Husak in Czechoslovakia were all workers. It is a rarity in the United States because ours is a country where big business rules the roost. It is the norm in the socialist countries because it is the working class that occupies the dominant political position.

You may wonder why, as a member of the Communist Party, I am not proposing to you the establishment of socialism in Minnesota. I am not doing so for many reasons, including the basic fact that socialism cannot become a reality in one state. Socialism is a more radical, revolutionary restructuring of society. The majority of Americans, including the people of Minnesota, are not as yet convinced or ready to make such a basic change. I say, "as yet," because the coming of socialism in the USA is inevitable.

However, while the people of the United States are not yet ready to adopt socialism, there are many lessons that socialism provides for us in the capitalist world. For example, it is becoming clear to millions that we could have cheaper gas, fuel, electricity and much greater guarantees of safe nuclear power if we nationalized the whole energy complex. I am convinced that we are going to be forced to do this sooner or later. Under socialism, of course, not only the energy

complex but all the basic industries are social-people's property.

I hope you have no objection to my writing this as an open letter. I do so in the conviction that there is very little you or I, or anyone else, can do about the problems of the people unless the people themselves are involved. So in a sense the openness of this letter is an effort to involve people.

The progressive traditions of Minnesota were established by the people. Only they can write new chapters of progress. But a decent governor can help them do it.

February 12, 1977

Shortages

When the evening headlines read: "Frost hits Florida," "Cold Spell in Brazil" or "Sub-Zero Weather in the Midwest and Northeast," the next morning's TV news programs will announce price increases for orange juice, coffee, gas and fuel. The day following, the price of tea and cocoa will start to climb. This takes place in the name of "shortages."

Most people accept as normal the concept that shortages automatically result in price increases. Such beliefs are the product of big business brainwashing. The fact is that while it is not necessary for prices to go up, it is normal under capitalism.

The real question is: Why should prices go up, even if there are shortages? And an even more basic question is: Why should society permit prices to go up just because there are shortages?

Whether the shortages are deliberately created by big business or are real, the fact is that there is no cause and effect reason for prices to go up. When there are shortages there is no increase in the cost of production. The farm workers in Florida and Brazil do not get wage

increases. In fact, they are often laid off. The petroleum workers, truck drivers and railroad workers do not get higher wages because they are working on products that are in short supply. The basic truth is that the higher prices which we are told are due to "shortages" are nothing but cold-blooded corporate rip-offs! It is planned robbery, a stick-up.

Big business economists say it is a matter of "supply and demand." In a sense that is so. But saying it does not make it just or right. The price robbery behind the charade of shortages exposes the basic, unmistakably anti-human, criminal nature of capitalism as a social system. It is a socio-economic system based on the concept of a rip-off.

Whenever the corporations have the people over a barrel, according to their morality it is perfectly acceptable to rip them off. To charge whatever the traffic will bear is normal for capitalism.

Raising prices as a result of shortages is a way of cutting the poor people out of the market so that the affluent, who can afford to pay the prices, can continue living high off the hog. It is a way of rationing for the rich.

Creating artificial shortages has always been a practice of capitalism. Monopoly-dominated industry has made it a major weapon of maximum profits. "Shortages" are an instrument of state monopoly capitalism, a tool to manufacture inflation.

In the present "energy crisis" the gas and fuel corporations are sitting on their reserve supplies while people suffer and freeze to death. They have been cold-bloodedly sitting on their reserve stocks waiting for the Carter administration to give its official sanction for the new price rip-offs. Extortion is in the works.

One hundred and forty years ago, in 1837, Abraham Lincoln in a speech to the Illinois State Legislature was on target when he said, "These capitalists generally act harmoniously and in concert to fleece the people."

Highway Robbery

The stage for the energy rip-off was set years ago. It was carefully planned by computers. The corporations, acting in conspiracy, capped old wells and refused to drill for new ones. The gun for the hold-up was loaded. The weather was just an additional factor.

But this is not the end of the crime. When summer comes the same corporations are going to raise the price of gasoline. They will claim a

“shortage” of gasoline because the refineries were so busy producing fuel oil during the winter months.

The corporate ideologues keep saying, “The days of cheap energy are over.” They carefully cover up the fact that the main reason for the high cost of energy is the ever-increasing corporate profits. The energy corporations use the long-term problems of producing energy for reaping windfall profits today.

The cost of producing gas from the Texas wells is no higher than the production costs in any other state. It is highway robbery, pure and simple. The cold weather put the people over a barrel, and the gas barons proceeded to rip them off as planned.

How the socialist countries deal with the same type of problem is a dramatic example of the basic difference between the two systems. It is further proof that socialism is a superior economic system. It is an illustration of how one system is motivated by making the rich richer and the other is motivated by serving all of the people on an equal and just basis. In the socialist societies human welfare and human rights are indivisible. They are the foundation stones of socialism.

During the present stage of construction the socialist countries still have shortages. But they do not approach the problem from the viewpoint of profits. The question of raising prices because of shortages does not even come up for consideration. The main concern and motivation of the socialist system is the just and equal distribution of available resources. As production increases, the overall quality of life improves for all of the people.

Of course, socialism is better equipped to deal with these kinds of problems because it works on the basis of economic planning. As a result, when there are shortages there are no rip-offs. When necessary, the available goods are distributed through means of rationing.

When the frost hit Florida the big agribusiness operators publicly hailed the “blessed event” because they “could use it to raise their prices.” In the socialist countries such statements and rip-offs would be considered crimes against the people. For capitalist agribusiness corporations it was a normal response.

This same anti-human, criminal nature of capitalism was dramatically demonstrated during the economic crisis of the 1930s. Millions of Americans were starving, but the government paid farmers a minimum price to bring their very best, most productive young hogs to the slaughterhouses where they were destroyed, not for the purpose

of feeding the hungry but to be turned into fertilizer. In St. Paul, Minnesota, a truck transporting the hogs tipped over. A hungry unemployed worker was sentenced to six months in jail for picking up one of the hogs that ran away from the truck.

This corporate crime was also committed in order to create a "shortage," in order to raise prices. Of course, the only result of such an operation was to make it more difficult for the poor to buy pork products. In the socialist countries, this would also be considered insane and a crime against the people. For capitalism it was normal.

However, for capitalism there is one shortage that is never permitted. Capitalism works diligently in order to prevent any shortages in labor power. Capitalism does not want and does not work for full employment. It works to create a reserve labor pool. And just as it uses shortages in other products to demand higher prices, it uses unemployment figures to keep wages down. This is but another example of the basic, but normal, anti-human nature of capitalism. It uses the unemployed in its rip-off of the workers who are working.

Many people ask the question: What can we do to stop the rip-offs? The truth is there are a lot of things people can do to fight back. The U.S. Congress, state legislatures and city councils can be pressured—forced—to take steps to halt the rip-offs. There ought to be laws that specifically forbid any price increases because of shortages, whether artificially created or real. This would take the profit out of artificially created shortages. Picket lines, boycotts, demonstrations and mass people's lobbies can all have an effect on putting an end to the rip-offs. Anti-rip-off laws are necessary in the struggle against the monopolies.

The sources of energy—gas, oil, nuclear—belong to the people. The leasing of these resources to the corporations by the government is itself a rip-off. The time has come to cancel the leases and proceed to nationalize the whole energy complex. It is time for the people to take back and operate these resources for the good and welfare of all.

February 26, 1977

May Day Flashbacks

For some 90 years workers throughout the world have been celebrating, demonstrating and marching on May 1. On this special day workers hold their heads higher and walk with a jaunty spring to their step. This is their day. In many small ways they reflect a deep pride and unwavering confidence in their class. Some consciously and others instinctively feel that our class has the task of clearing the path, providing the main force, in the struggle for social progress.

On May 1 hundreds of millions of workers bask in the sunlit grandeur of the achievements, the victories and the historic role of our class. It is the day when class consciousness is on display.

The mass demonstrations are public expressions of the meaning of May Day to workers. But the depths of May Day's roots can be more clearly noticed in the actions of individual workers who were not or are not in a position to take part in mass actions.

The class roots of May Day have a special meaning for me and can be best illustrated in these flashbacks:

For 40 or maybe 50 years Andy was a barber in his one-man shop in the heart of a working-class neighborhood. His shop was open six days a week. Andy's barbershop was also a center for working-class education.

Andy the Barber

On the first of May every one of those 40-50 years, Andy did his special, unique May Day thing, and it was done with dignity and "class." Andy, who ordinarily never wore a tie, would come to work wearing a bright red one. Not even the McCarthy cold war hysteria stopped Andy from observing May Day. He would open his shop and put up the old sign, "May Day—No Work Today." Of course all his working-class customers knew that while Andy was not cutting hair on this day, the shop was open, including the door to his backroom

apartment. It was open for coffee and donuts and interesting and lively conversation. The *Daily Worker* and Communist literature were always present in Andy's shop. Besides being a good barber, Andy was an excellent teacher, propagandist and fighter. He used to say, "When a worker leaves my shop he has much less hair, but much more understanding and class consciousness." All one had to do was sit in his shop and observe to be convinced that what he said was true. Andy's customers were politically advanced. They were his students.

During the McCarthy hysteria days, the FBI tried to harass Andy and his customers. For instance, a few would come and sit in his shop. But when they returned the second or third time Andy decided to do something about it. He took out his razor strap and hung it on the wall next to the two agents. Then with very deliberate, calm strokes he began to sharpen his long razor. Years later, with a twinkle in his eye, he would relate how quickly the agents left his shop. Of course everyone who knew Andy also knew that he would not harm a fly; the FBI agents were not so convinced.

The Iron Miner

Matt, the iron miner and lumberjack, never worked on May Day. He lost jobs because of this. But, for Matt, it was a matter of working-class principle. Instead of going to work, Matt would get a clean shave and put on his one good shirt without any fuss or planning because in a sense May Day was a special family day. Susan, his wife, who was fully conscious of the political meaning of the day, would add an extra egg for the breakfast and a few extra pieces of meat to the stew for dinner. But more than anything else, it was a day when the family conversation invariably drifted to political matters. It was a day when, more than at other times, Matt would talk about his experiences in strikes and other mass actions of the workers. As he related his experiences it seemed that the workers had lost most of the struggles. But Matt never referred to them as defeats. He would mention with obvious pride how he had been arrested for his strike activities and with a mixture of anger and sorrow he told of the time when the National Guard broke into the home of strikers and bayoneted them to death in their beds. They had been friends of Matt's. After 25 years he still refused to have anything to do with those who had scabbed during the strike.

May Day was the day when socialism and the first working-class state, the Soviet Union, were the centerpiece of family conversation. Racism was also a subject that was discussed on this day more than others—racism and its effects on the nearby “Indian Reservation.”

In this household there was a May Day atmosphere and a May Day family closeness. This was Matt’s and Susan’s way of instilling in their family working-class history and traditions, and pride in the working class.

These warm memories of past May Days are reflections of my family’s May Day roots.

Bank Robbers

In jails and prisons one gets to know many bank robbers. For most of them robbing banks is not a profession. More than likely it is a one-shot gamble. The fact that their address was Leavenworth Penitentiary was proof that the gamble did not pay off. Most of these prisoners came from poor working-class and farm families.

Possibly because of some specific experiences before being sent to prison, or as the result of some reading while in prison, some of these prisoners knew that for the Communist prisoners May 1 had a special meaning.

There were some who wanted to express their sympathies and, in a sense, to join in and share this day with us. So one May Day the prisoners who worked in the prison bakery secretly baked a cake for us.

On another May Day, a Black prisoner who had worked at the air field in Galveston, Texas, had smuggled some candy wrapped in red paper into the “hole” where we were—at the risk of being thrown into the “hole” himself.

And one year a young bank robber from Cleveland, who had obviously given some serious thought to what he would say to us Communists when we met in the prison yard, greeted us with “You and Gil and Irving can’t observe May Day here in Leavenworth. But I’m convinced that the time will come when the whole world will celebrate and honor the thoughts and ideas for which you’re in prison.” I must say it sounded much more forceful when he said it in what we called “prison lingo.”

Bristles and Brouhaha

There is one more May Day prison story I will never forget. About a week before May 1 there was a lot of commotion in the prison brush factory. Security guards were frantically rushing around. That evening, through the prison grapevine, I was told what all the commotion was about. The brush factory was getting hog bristles from the People's Republic of China. The workers who unpacked the bristles knew they were addressed to the prisoners at Leavenworth. When they opened one of the big wooden crates on this day, in addition to hog bristles they found a hand-made sign that said, "May Day Greetings to Gus Hall." The fact that it arrived or was opened a week before May Day was the reason for the alarm in the brush shop.

Rat in the Mine

John Hudak's favorite May Day story actually had nothing to do with May Day except that the events took place on May 1.

John was a Pennsylvania coal miner. One of his fellow workers did what many miners have done for generations. He did not trust the banks because "they were for the mining company." So the few dollars he saved he put into an old salt sack and hid it in a dark corner of the mine.

One morning when the miner went to check on his life's savings he found the salt sack had disappeared. He was beside himself with anger and frustration. But his friend John was not a man to give up so easily. The next day John put a piece of cheese into an old Bull Durham bag and tied a long string to it. The following morning, just as he expected, the bag was gone. They followed the string for hundreds of yards. At the end of the line was a rat's nest and part of it was the salt sack with the money in it.

That would have been the end of it except that it was May Day and John was a Communist. He was not about to let such an opportunity pass. Each year after that he would repeat that story and the little speech he gave to his fellow miners on that day: "That same thing happens to us miners every day. The mining company rats steal from us every day we work. If we were to put a string on the values we produce it would lead us to the bank. And there in the corporate vaults we would find the loot in the world's biggest salt sacks."

May Day's roots are in the class consciousness of workers—in the history, the experiences, the memories handed down through generations, the treasured traditions and pride in their historic role.

May Day is and will always remain a day of tribute to the Andys, Matts, Susans and Johns—to the working class of our country who have sunk these roots. The roots of May Day belong to every worker. They are forever a part of the past, present and future of the working class.

April 30, 1977

Nuclear Energy

Q: Although today's energy crisis is a trumped-up one, we still face the question of nuclear power. Even under socialist planning is it dangerous to use? Is it dangerous under capitalism? Is there a difference in its use under the two systems?

Frank Asher
Southbury,
Conn.

A: In a recent article in his column, Jack Anderson, began by saying: "There is depressing, new evidence that some of the nation's great corporations are more concerned about their profits than the lives of their workers."

As a defender of capitalism, Mr. Anderson does not want to admit that this is not only the case with "some" of the corporations, the fact is that the "depressing . . . evidence" applies to all the corporations and the system of capitalism as a whole. And, it is not a matter of the corporations being "more" concerned about profits than workers; the reality is that their *only* concern is profits and never the workers.

Nuclear power is a major breakthrough in science and technology. The basic safeguards for its use as an energy source have been worked out. But there are three major problems in using nuclear energy under capitalism:

- 1) The utility corporations, wherever possible, cover up the hazards.
- 2) Because the necessary safeguards cost money and therefore may cut into profits, wherever possible they cut corners and always at the expense of the safety of nuclear workers and the public.
- 3) The utility corporations take this scientific breakthrough and use it to extract ever greater corporate profits.

Socialist lands face the same technological problems in relation to building safeguards for the use of nuclear power. But, because socialism is mainly concerned with people and not profits, they will take every step possible to make nuclear power as safe as the present level of technology permits.

So, the real problem is not whether science has worked out all of the safeguards; the basic problem is, as Mr. Anderson stated, that the corporations because of their drive for profits and because they are not concerned with human welfare cannot be trusted with the management of a technology that presents possible dangers to human beings.

Therefore, the demand for people's watchdog safety committees is a just one. And of course an even more meaningful safeguard would be to nationalize the whole energy complex, including nuclear power. This would remove the obstacle of private profit from the energy field.

Gus Hall

General Secretary, CPUSA

June 4, 1977

Can't Win Without Unity

Unity is the primary, the indispensable weapon of struggle for the working class. It must be strong enough to overcome the power big business gets from its control of the economy, the state, military, mass media, the police, courts, banks, the two-party system, the colleges.

Unity is a prerequisite, yet it has remained the soft spot, the "Achilles heel" for the trade union movement and for the working class of the United States.

The principal weapon of the ruling class against working-class unity is the policy of class collaboration. It is an insidious policy of boring from within. The argument of the class collaborators is: "Because there is no class struggle, there is no need for working-class unity." Class collaboration is for "unity" between the two classes, which is really selling out the interests of the working class.

Interwoven with the policies of class collaboration is racism. Racism is a most weighty weapon against working-class unity. Together, racism and class collaboration constitute the most potent ideological poison of disunity. In white workers the poison results in class blindness, in a distortion of their own class self-interests. Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican workers have difficulty in relating to white workers who are influenced by racism. Together, racism and class collaboration comprise not only a counter-force against class unity, but they act as a retardant to the development of class consciousness. A working class influenced by ideas of class collaboration and racism cannot fulfill the leading role history has assigned to it.

The lack of working-class unity daily adds a bonus to the corporate profits. With the development of state monopoly capitalism it has become increasingly difficult to win economic struggle without becoming involved in the political area. But here again lack of unity is the obstacle. Without class unity the workers will remain the tail or pawns within the two parties manipulated by big business. A prerequisite of class political independence is class unity.

So the question of working-class and trade union unity is not an abstract organizational question of per capita payments. The question is unity for what purpose?

Organizational unity in support of class collaboration, of no-strike policies, of support for George Meany's support for the cold war pro-imperialist policies of U.S. imperialism would not advance the interests of the working class or the entire people. Any steps toward unity must contain the potential of changing the policies of class collaboration.

Questions of trade union unity have again emerged for serious discussion. This has been rekindled by the decision of the United Automobile Workers union to seek re-affiliation with the AFL-CIO. Any discussion of trade union unity wakes the ghosts and the experiences of the days when the AFL and the CIO united. This is understandable. There are many lessons from that period that should not be swept under the rug of history. There were both positive and negative experiences. It is necessary to draw the lessons of history, but they must not become obstacles to new initiatives in new circumstances.

The discussion now is taking place within a new set of circumstances. This new situation does contain within it some new factors that give the question of unity a new meaning.

The crises of decay of capitalism present new problems for the working class. This gives rise to a new militancy, to a process of radicalization. As a result there is a crisis of the policies of class collaboration. By and large these rank-and-file movements reject policies of class collaboration and, in many cases, also racism.

The powerful rank-and-file challenge, involving tens of millions, to the class collaborators in the steel union leadership and the rejection of the labor-management contract by a significant number of local unions, and the strike by the iron ore and taconite workers in Minnesota and Michigan are but an indication of the mood and the breadth of the rank-and-file upsurge.

These developments are reflected in the shift taking place throughout the trade union movement. The right-wing class collaborators are losing their influence, while there is a coming together of the left and center forces on all levels. The growing left-center unity is on a program that clearly is the outlook of the great majority of the trade union members. It can become the dominant force in a united trade union movement.

When discussing questions of a new unity it is important to understand the new contribution Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican and other workers who are victims of racism and chauvinism make in the struggle against class collaboration.

Thus when all these new factors are put on the scales it is clear that they give a new content, they present new possibilities in the struggle for unity.

So it also follows that the struggle for trade union unity must be synchronized with the struggle against the policies of class collaboration, against racism, Meany-Lovestone cold war policies, for more democratic unions, and for working-class political independence.

Within this overall concept of unity the need and role of rank-and-file movements and the struggle for a unity of the left and center forces becomes decisive. Without this there can be no guarantee that the re-affiliation will result in a more militant trade union movement.

The Communist Party and, in a special way, Communists who are active trade unionists, have always made a unique contribution in the struggle for working-class unity. Therefore it follows that workers who want to make their maximum contribution to the struggles of their class can do so by joining the revolutionary party of their class, the Communist Party USA.

September 3, 1977

Crisis in Steel—Cause and Cure

A professor at Lehigh University recently observed: "Bethlehem Steel is like a dinosaur, so big that sometimes he thrashes his tail around without realizing he is knocking things down."

The only way the steel corporations can be compared to dinosaurs is that the economic system they are a part of is scheduled for extinction, because like the dinosaur it is unable to adapt to the changing realities that surround it.

The general crisis of capitalism which is leading it inevitably toward its extinction is a definite feature of the present crisis affecting the steel industry in most of the capitalist world. The fact that the crisis has developed at a moment when the overall economy is on the upswing side of the cycle is proof that the cause is deeper than just the momentary factors.

In dealing with the crisis it is necessary to separate the crisis factors from how the steel corporations are using the situation to put over their anti-working-class, maximum profits policies.

There is a crisis of overproduction of steel in the capitalist countries not because there is no need for steel in the world. There is an overproduction because of the inability of capitalism to pursue programs of economic expansion.

Many of the steel mills in the United States are not up to date technologically because during the past years instead of investing part of their profits in modernization programs the corporate executives have siphoned them off as dividends and huge salaries. The exorbitant profits and executive salaries not only divert funds from necessary modernization, but also push up the price of steel to a point where U.S. steel products are not as competitive.

U.S. steel products are also at a disadvantage because of the cold war policies and their accompanying emphasis on military production. The cold war dictates high military budgets, but modern military technology does not consume as much steel as in the past. It is an

established fact that in spite of unprecedented military production only about 3 percent of the steel products are consumed in this sector.

If it were not for the cold war the billions of dollars used in military production could be transferred to the construction of machinery, and for the badly needed construction of housing and other steel-consuming lines of production.

Because of the policies of imperialist aggression and the cold war policies the markets for U.S. steel and steel products are restricted, especially the markets in the socialist and developing countries. And it is precisely in the socialist and developing countries where explosive construction is taking place. A simple cancellation of the discriminatory Jackson-Vanik Amendment and the shortsighted Stevenson Amendment, aimed against the socialist countries on matters of credit, would add thousands of jobs for steelworkers in the United States.

The steel monopolies and Lloyd McBride, president of the United Steelworkers of America, speak with one voice. They want tax ripoffs for the corporations and embargoes on steel imported from foreign countries. And the tax ripoffs are just that—corporate ripoffs.

An embargo on foreign steel is no solution. When the United States cuts back on foreign steel shipments the countries affected will immediately cut back their orders of U.S. products made from steel. The end result will be a stand-off.

The steel magnates (or should we say “maggots”) are strongly opposed to any kind of affirmative action when it comes to taking concrete, remedial steps to eliminate the unequal status of those who are victims of corporate racism. But they are screaming their heads off demanding affirmative action in the form of quotas (tariffs) against European and Japanese steel producers.

A variation of the tax ripoff is the TIP (tax based income policy). This is a double ripoff. It proposes a tax cut for the corporations if they hold wage standards to a set pattern. It would stipulate that if the corporations go over the set wage standard they would be taxed. This plan also specifically excludes any price controls. So the corporations would get tax ripoffs and wage cuts, without any price controls.

These are all solutions based on a continuation of ever greater corporate profits and more wage cuts for the workers. They must be rejected for what they are—monstrous, unconscionable corporate ripoffs.

What then are the real solutions to the steel crisis?

First, all solutions must start with and rest on the basic premise that there is only one necessary and just concern. And that is a decent standard of living for the steelworkers and their families. When the corporations announce the shutdown of a plant it is an immediate crisis for the workers and their families. In such a crisis the takeover of the physical plant facilities by the workers is justified. It can be an effective weapon in forcing the government to act.

From this working-class viewpoint and concern the following program is one that would solve the steel crisis in the interest of the steelworkers, their families, the working class and all working people, by cutting the profits and power of the steel monopolies.

- Reduce the work week without any reduction in pay;
- a federal law prohibiting all layoffs;
- roll back and freeze steel prices to keep U.S.-made steel competitive;
- federally-financed, low-cost housing program to construct 3 million new units a year;
- federally-financed program to build mass transit systems in all large and medium-sized cities; to provide new schools, health facilities and recreation areas, starting with inner-cities and rural poverty areas;
- slash the military budget. Change the priorities of government spending from the military to non-military products. This would go a long way toward creating the basis for the use of steel;
- demand federal guarantees for jobs, or retraining for new jobs;
- reject and resist any demands from the steel corporations to give up wage increases or take wage cuts;
- a law against all plant shutdowns. If the steel corporations can't run them efficiently, let the government take over and keep them running, administered by democratically elected committees representing the steel workers and public;
- eliminate the discriminatory Jackson-Vanik and Stevenson Amendments restricting trade with socialist countries, and put an end to all cold war policies. This would immediately change the situation in the steel industry;
- united action of steel unions of all capitalist countries against the international steel cartel. (This program, with additions, is based on the program published in the *Daily World*, October 6, 1977.)

There is, of course, a basic lesson for all workers in the fact that this crisis in steel is limited to the capitalist world. And, as is the case in one capitalist crisis after another, the socialist world is completely unaffected. An even more basic fact is that even when socialist countries reach a level of sufficient steel production steelworkers will not be laid off.

Under socialism, when machinery, technology and science take over, working hours of the people are decreased accordingly. That is a basic difference between a system that is motivated by private corporate profits and a system that is motivated purely by the goal of serving the best interests of all the people.

That is why capitalism and its corporate monsters which cannot adapt to a changing world are like the dinosaur on the road to extinction, while socialism is the most progressively human system constantly adapting to the ever-changing environment on the road to communism and a New World.

November 5, 1977

A People's Solution to the Steel Crisis

For the 60,000 permanently laid off steelworkers and the one-quarter million members of their families, for the construction workers, service industries workers and for the small business people in these steel communities life has turned into a disaster, a nightmare. For those who are able to collect unemployment benefits, or still have some savings, the full impact of this disaster is like waiting for a flood to crest.

Years ago, I landed in Mahoning Valley in the middle of another disaster—the economic crisis of the 1930s. Life then was raw and brutal. Hungry families were evicted from their homes. There were

soup lines. Death from so-called "natural causes," of people weakened by hunger, increased dramatically.

There were no unemployment checks, relief checks or old-age pensions. And there were no welfare systems people could turn to for emergency relief.

But, in spite of the hunger and misery, there was hope because there was a fightback.

Because of the militant fightback the federal government was forced to take emergency measures and appropriate money for programs like WPA, PWA, etc.* Because of the fightback movements, with all their weaknesses, we now have unemployment benefits, Social Security and welfare systems.

When the economic crisis of the 30s was over, most steel workers were still unorganized and did not have the protection of trade unions.

In those days, if workers even whispered complaints about low wages and working conditions, or the need for unions, they were fired without recourse or appeal.

I was fired by both Youngstown Sheet and Tube and Republic for union activities.

Against all obstacles the steel unions slowly took root—first as a secret, underground force, later as the open, fighting United Steel Workers locals.

Tom Girdler, then president of Republic Steel, avowed publicly that he would rather quit as president and pick apples on his farm, than sign a union contract.

Six months later he was forced to sign that contract.

Now the steelworkers face a new crisis, a new disaster.

Today it is the Campbell Works and tomorrow, when U.S. Steel completes its new mill in the Ashtabula-Conneaut area, it will be the Ohio Works and McDonald. Without struggle the Mahoning Valley, and many other valleys, will become ghost valleys.

The question is: What and who is destroying this once busy, green valley? Why is there a crisis in the steel industry?

As usual, the captive mass media and the steel corporations, in a conspiracy to hoodwink the people, are deliberately pointing the

*The Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the Public Works Administration (PWA) were some of the numerous federal agencies set up by President F. D. Roosevelt's "New Deal" administration to cope with the Great Depression of the 1930s.

accusing finger in the wrong direction. They are lying through their teeth.

It is a calculated, dirty falsehood when they claim that the cause of the crisis is high wages, steel imports, high taxes and too-strict pollution controls.

The steel imports are, in reality, a very small factor, and therefore it is a cruel hoax to say that restrictions against imports are going to reopen the Campbell Works.

Six years ago, in 1967, 18 percent of all steel supplies in the United States came from foreign imports. In 1976, the total was 14.1 percent.

In other words, the percentage of imports declined in the six-year period. These imports are more than balanced off by the steel and steel products the U.S. ships overseas.

However, it is true that U.S.-made steel is not as competitive as it used to be. But the main reason for this is that the steel corporations in Japan and Western Europe are ready to accept a profit margin of 8.5 percent, while the U.S. corporations, in their boundless greed, skim off 12-18 percent in profits.

In the last 10 years the U.S. steel corporations have more than doubled their profits.

It is an unmitigated, bold-faced lie that the cause of the problem is that the steelworkers' wages are too high.

The hard facts are that 10 years ago, in 1967, steelworkers' wages accounted for \$16 of every \$100 worth of steel shipped. Last year, wages accounted for only \$12 of every \$100 worth of steel.

In other words, the corporations are getting a bigger share, and the steelworkers are getting a declining piece of the total steel pie. And, in the same period (1967-77), the steel corporations increased the prices of steel by 150 percent.

Ask any steelworkers how much they have managed to save—how rich are they after the 25 percent tax bite, escalating rents, the rising mortgage payments, interest rates, utility bills and the inflated cost of food and clothing.

Look who's complaining about the high wages of steelworkers!

The 18 directors and officers of Lykes and Youngstown Sheet and Tube admit to a take-home pay of \$1 million, 300 thousand dollars last year. They are among the most successful pirates in all of history.

A Mr. Cleary, a vice president of both corporations, has an annual

salary of \$130,000, plus \$90,000 a year in retirement benefits, plus the coupons he clips from 3,000 shares of stock.

Joseph Lykes gets \$185,000 a year in salary, \$100,000 in annual retirement benefits, and the coupons on 380,000 shares of stock.

Randolph Rieder and other vice presidents of Youngstown Sheet and Tube get \$155,000 per year, and \$45,000 in yearly retirement benefits.

After all this legal robbery, the parent company of Youngstown Sheet and Tube, admitted it made a profit of \$20 million last year.

The gall of these degenerate embezzlers—to complain about workers' wages. These same corporate pirates have now forced the coal miners in the mines they own to go on strike.

These corporate vultures have the audacity to complain about taxes. They are the biggest tax swindlers in all of history. Last year U.S. Steel's tax swindle was \$273.2 million—for closing the Campbell Works. The Lykes Corporation has filed a \$138 million dollar tax loss for a \$20 million dollar tax credit.

It is also a complete fraud and a falsehood that one of the reasons for the present steel crisis is because workers in Japan and Western Europe work harder and are more productive than U.S. steelworkers.

The hard fact is that there are no steelworkers in the world who are as exploited as are the U.S. steelworkers. In fact, that is one of the problems.

Fewer and fewer steelworkers are producing more and more steel. There are 100,000 fewer steelworkers, today, producing much more steel than 10 years ago. Last year U.S. steelworkers produced as much steel in 30½ hours as they did in 40 hours in 1967.

Now, the real question is: Are there solutions to this crisis?

The Carter administration has come up with so-called solutions. President Carter has been so long in the business of selling peanuts that everything from Washington now comes in the form of "packages." So now there's a Carter "steel crisis package."

The Carter package is based on the overall concept of giving the steel corporations anything they ask for. And if by chance some few nickels trickle down to steelworkers they will not object. There is nothing of substance in the Carter package for the steelworkers.

When you add up all of the rebates, investment inducements, gifts and credits given to the corporations, they amount to a \$1 billion Christmas present to the steel monopolies.

So it is \$1 billion for the steel corporations and peanuts for the steelworkers.

The steel corporations have doubled their profits in the last five years. But whatever plans for modernization of the mills they plan to undertake under the Carter package will be paid for by increased taxes on the people. The restrictions on foreign imports in the Carter package will do nothing for the steelworkers. But it will give a free hand to the steel corporations to raise the price of steel—further adding to the pressures of inflation.

So the Carter package is no solution. It is fakery, a hoax on the steelworkers and the people.

Now, what are some real solutions and remedies?

The real solution must start with an immediate right-to-live emergency appropriation by the U.S. Congress that will provide a decent standard of living for every laid off steelworker for the duration of the crisis.

There must be a demand that the Ohio Senators and Congressmen get off their fat behinds and, for once, fight for the interests of the people.

It is high-time for Senator John Glenn to get out of the corporate orbit and for once in his career blast-off in the interest of the steelworkers.

For the second solution the question is: *Is there a potential market for steel?*

Yes, and the potential is bigger than ever. A few examples will be proof enough:

The Federal Transportation Department reported just this week that out of some 750,000 steel bridges in the country, 110,000 are collapsing, and in need of replacement. One-half of the bridges in Pittsburgh are now limited to 3,000 pounds. They report that a steel bridge collapses every other day in the United States.

A program of rebuilding and replacing these bridges would keep the Campbell Works in operation full time.

In the big cities, water main breaks take place every other day. Most of the water mains are over 50 years old.

It is estimated that New York City alone needs \$2 billion worth of steel pipe to replace a 100-year-old system. This could keep the pipe mills running year-round.

The cities badly need transit systems. The building of such systems

would keep the Ohio works, and my old stamping-ground, Briar Hill Plant, going at full steam.

There is a housing crisis in the United States. There is a crying need to tear down and replace the slums with modern, liveable apartment complexes.

This would create a large market for structural steel, and steel that goes into the manufacturing of pipes, stoves, refrigerators, etc.

This could easily add an additional 60,000 jobs in steel. So, when you add to this the steel that goes into the manufacture of autos and badly needed railroad tracks, it is obvious there is a huge potential domestic market for steel.

What Is the Obstacle?

The obstacle is priorities. The top priority of the Carter administration is the \$130 billion totally wasteful military budget, and the doubling of corporate profits every five years. Therein lies the problem.

Dollar-for-dollar, the military budget—production of weapons, arms, missiles, etc.—results in the least number of jobs and uses very little steel. Something like 2-3 percent of the steel produced is used in the production of arms.

So, the simple transfer of, say, 50 percent of the Pentagon budget, and a cut in the enormous corporate profits would open up the domestic market for steel.

What about the foreign market?

Again, there is a great potential market for steel and steel products.

The facts are that while the older capitalist countries like Great Britain, France, West Germany and Spain suffer from a chronic crisis of stagnation, and therefore do not provide a potential market for steel, the socialist countries and most of the "Third World" countries, are in a long-term historic period of growth and construction. They are in a period of economic boom. They want to buy steel and steel products.

Again, what is the obstacle?

The hangup is U.S. foreign policy. A policy of aggression has become counterproductive for the United States. For example, the people of Angola are now entering a historic period of construction and industrialization.

How can Angola, (or other countries like Angola), think about

buying U.S. steel or steel products when the Carter administration, to this day refuses to give up its policies of aggression and will not establish diplomatic recognition of Angola?

The socialist countries are a huge potential market. But again, there is an obstacle.

The amendment to the trade bill by Senator Jackson and Congressman Vanik of Ohio, places a special, discriminatory tariff on imports from most of the socialist countries. And the amendment by Senator Stevenson of Illinois actually cuts off ordinary business credits to the socialist countries that are used by all countries who import and export.

The simple removal of these special, discriminatory amendments would open the markets in the socialist countries to U.S. steel and steel products.

There are also other solutions.

A six-hour day, without overtime or cuts in take-home pay in the steel industry, would create approximately 100,000 new jobs. That by itself would be more than enough to put every laid off steelworker back on the job.

But, as I said earlier, the steel corporations oppose all these solutions because they would necessarily affect their profits.

The military-industrial complex is against these measures because they would then not be able to play around with \$130 billion budgets.

In the past year, the steel corporations have condemned and banished 65,000 steelworkers and one-half million members of steelworkers' families to a life of pain, insecurity and suffering. By any yardstick of human rights, this is a crime.

These criminal actions should be proof enough that these corporations cannot be permitted to continue to dominate, and be in charge of such an important and vital aspect of life—one that in so many ways directly affects the lives of a majority of the people.

There is an effective remedy, and in a sense it would be punishment for the crimes of the steel corporations.

The time has come when in the United States we are forced to consider nationalization of a number of industries.

We are not going to be able to solve the serious problems of energy, steel, coal, housing, mass transit and the pharmaceutical industry without nationalization.

Nationalization means that these industries would be taken out of

the system of corporate profits and would be democratically operated and controlled as public properties by elected representatives of the workers and the public, and run for the benefit of all the people.

It is unrealistic and illusory to think this can be done by some committee collecting \$50 million to buy the Campbell Works.

The people who are pushing this idea are well-meaning, but not very realistic. The federal government has a special fund for small plant takeovers. It is called ESOP (Employee Stock Ownership Plan), better known as "Aesop's Fables," because there are a number of pitfalls.

First, the total fund is less than \$60 million. Secondly, such takeovers are a trap because the federal government insists that the corporations and the old management hold onto key positions.

Senator Long, the open corporate stooge, said of ESOP, "It is better than Geritol—it will increase productivity, it will save this (capitalist) economic system."

The argument that workers and people's representatives are not capable of running such facilities is sheer nonsense. After all, who runs the plants now if not the workers.

Most of the present stockholders of Youngstown Sheet and Tube don't know a rolling mill from a gin mill.

The solutions I have just presented are realistic, necessary and possible. However, these solutions will not materialize without mass pressure and mass struggles.

And this is no time for the union leaders, who sit in warm cushioned chairs, to play footsie with the corporations. This is a time when union leaders must raise hell all over the place.

The key to mass struggles is working-class unity. And the main ingredient of steelworkers' unity has always been the unity of Black and white workers.

This question has now emerged as an integral part of the present crisis in steel. Steelworkers cannot win without unity. And there can be no solid unity without a struggle against racism—racism that the steel corporations have fostered and practiced for over a hundred years.

The bottom line in the struggle against racism in the steel industry is the struggle for economic parity for Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano workers.

Therefore, there is a need for an affirmative action plan in the steel

industry, a plan that will eliminate the unequal status of Black steelworkers through adjustments in hiring, upgrading and layoffs.

There is a solid basis for unity, in the struggle to raise the economic status of the 40 percent of Black Americans the 16 percent of white Americans who are forced to live below the official government established poverty level.

Through struggle it is possible to win reforms. But the long-range truth is that no matter how many short-range victories and remedies are won and put into effect, the basic pattern, the source of the problem, will remain. As long as the private corporations have control over industries such as steel, there will be crises and disasters for the working people.

The only way to put an end to the crises and disasters is for the people to take over the industries, banks and the government. Only then is it possible to put an end to the insatiable greed for private profits and set up an economic system that will operate the mines, mills and banks solely for the benefit of the people.

One-third of the world's people are doing just that. Socialism has become the wave of the future.

The steelworkers in the socialist countries not only do not face disasters because of layoffs; their Bill of Rights guarantees each worker a job—a job at his or her highest skill.

In the socialist countries there are no high-paid executives, no coupon clippers. The steelworkers own and operate the steel mills. They are the stockholders.

It is obvious that when people themselves run the industries they are concerned about people. No one in the executive suites of the Lykes Corporation knows or cares about the laid off Campbell workers. All they care about is their profits.

For them, the closing of the Campbell Works is nothing more than a \$20 million dollar corporation tax write-off.

But there is a way to make them take notice. There is a way to force concessions from them. And it is the only way. That way is militant, mass actions.

December 20, 1977

The Myth About Wages and Inflation

One of the main myths propagated by the mouthpieces of the monopolies is that inflation is caused by excessive wage increases—by the so-called wage-price spiral. This myth is worth many billions of dollars to the monopolies. It helps them keep fattening their profits, while dumping the costs of controlling inflation on the working people.

There is absolutely no truth to this myth. Wage increases are not the cause of inflation, and restrictions on wages are not the key to controlling it.

To see this, let us begin by taking a quick look at U.S. history to find out when inflations have arisen. An interesting fact emerges: practically all the major inflations have arisen in times of war. Major inflations occurred at the time of the Civil War, World War I, World War II, the Korean War and the Vietnam War and its aftermath.

A closer look at the period from World War II to the present will further illustrate the connection between inflation, military expenditures and war.

For five years prior to World War II, prices were stable. Then the war set off a giant wave of inflation. By 1948, the Consumer Price Index was 72 percent higher than in 1940. With greatly reduced military expenditures, prices were stable between 1948 and 1950. Then the Korean War set off another inflationary surge, with an 8 percent leap in just the first year.

Between 1953 and 1965, the rise in prices was comparatively mild except when there were sharp increases in the military budget, as in 1957. After 1965, the escalation of the Vietnam War brought with it an escalation of the inflation.

Unlike what happened after World War II and the Korean War, the end of the fighting in Vietnam brought no relief. The inflation continues as strong as ever. Last year the rate of increase in the Consumer Price Index was over 9 percent. After both World War II

and the Korean War, military expenditures plummeted. But since the Vietnam War they have continued to be high.

These are the historical facts. They fit the basic explanation given for inflation by economic theory.

The key factor causing inflation is the pumping of too much money into the economy in relation to the supply of goods available. This is what military expenditures and wars do. The money to pay for them goes into the market, blowing up the money supply. But the military goods and services do not enter into the market to absorb there the money that was spent for them. Military goods and services are consumed on the military bases and battlefields.

One might argue, of course, that if the government were to pay for military expenditures with money withdrawn from circulation through taxes, or getting people to buy government bonds, inflation would not result. As a matter of hypothetical example, this is true. But hypothetical examples in economics are dangerous.

One has to see how things work, not hypothetically, but in fact. In fact, the United States has not—and as a practical matter could not have—fully financed its wars and arms buildups through withdrawal of money from circulation. It has financed them in good part by running budget deficits covered by what amounts, if one looks behind the technical banking fol-de-rol, to printed money. Consequently, wars and arms buildups have caused inflation.

How do wage increases fit into the picture? This can be answered in two parts. First, if one sticks to what happened in fact, not even a shadow of a case can be made that wage increases precipitated inflation. Second, wage increases are essential to keep workers from falling behind, to keep their incomes from being chewed away by the inflation.

The monopoly mouthpieces can't afford to tell honestly what happens in fact, so they construct artificial, hypothetical examples to show how wage increases are responsible for inflation: "Suppose wages increase by, say, 10 percent. Prices will also have to go up. This, in turn, will make wages go up. And there you have the wage-price spiral." This kind of out-of-context hypothetical reasoning is a con job—a trap which honest people should avoid falling into like the plague.

The abstract example may sound plausible. But it just can't explain what really happens. If wage increases are responsible for inflation,

how come the wage increases of the periods 1948–1950 and 1953–1965—when there were no wars— did not produce inflation? How come the inflations arose only during periods of heavy war expenditures?

Take the period from 1965 to 1970. Wage increases can't explain why a wave of inflation suddenly got underway. But the Vietnam War can. For several years prior to that war military expenditures were steady. Then they shot upward by 55 percent between 1965 and 1968. Lyndon Baines Johnson was afraid to ask for a tax increase to pay for the hated war. So the federal budget deficit began to soar. It was an enormous \$25 billion in 1968. The military expenditures, financed by printed money, are what caused the inflation to gather momentum.

The fact that workers, in such a situation, fight for wage increases does not make them responsible for inflation. They are simply defending themselves. Think where they would be if they didn't. However, even with struggle, wages have been falling behind prices. Workers may be getting higher money wages, but with prices going up even faster they are really getting less.

According to the government's own statistics, average real hourly earnings—that is, earnings adjusted to take into account the increase in prices—fell by almost 3 percent from 1973 to 1975. And they have not caught up since. Over the last five years, average real hourly earnings have been lower than what they were in 1972 and 1973. And in 1978, with the umpteenth flare-up of inflation, they were again falling.

That workers are not responsible for inflation becomes even more apparent if one looks at profits. While real hourly earnings have been declining, profits have been soaring. In 1978, corporate profits ran at a record level, and well ahead of the inflation. A militarized economy and swollen corporate profits go together, of course. One of the biggest sources of profits are the juicy military contracts.

Some highly-paid bourgeois economists talk about “breaking the wage-price spiral by holding back wage increases”—as though they were involved in some sort of intellectual game, rather than dealing with real people. For those who like to play such games, it can be admitted that if the working class were to give up eating for 18 months the inflation would probably be stopped, although even this depends on not getting militarily involved in the Middle East, Africa or elsewhere.

But the real world is not a game. We are dealing with people—

workers and others who depend on their wages and salaries to feed their families, to pay the soaring costs of food, clothing, housing, utilities, gasoline and medical care.

Albert Kahn, President Carter's so-called "chief inflation fighter," gets \$57,000 a year in salary, to say nothing about his income from investments, etc. Kahn has had the gall to state that in order to defend the Administration's 7 percent wage guideline, "we may have to be willing to take strikes." He was asked why workers should accept a limitation of 7 percent, when the increase in the price level in 1978 was more than 9 percent. To break the "spiral," he asserted, workers have to suffer a loss of real income: "There is no allowance for catching up for past years."

It is just not true that it is necessary to control wages, to cut down the real income of the working class, in order to eliminate the inflation. In fact, as the experience with wage-price controls under Nixon in 1971 and 1972 showed, this method won't do the job.

The way to eliminate the inflation is to slash the war budget; get rid of the tax loopholes which enable the rich and the corporations to get away with tens of billions in taxes; pass a law rolling back and freezing prices and rents and imposing a strict limitation on corporate profits.

The theory that workers and wage increases are responsible for inflation is not being put forth because it has a scientific basis. It is being put forth as a weapon of the monopolies and the monopoly-dominated government in their class struggle against the working people

The government is trying to control the inflation at the expense of the workers and people while preserving monopoly interests. That's what Carter's anti-inflation program really means. It means cutting real wages, cutting both federal and local government services to the people, and deliberately producing a recession and higher unemployment. At the same time, the military budget is not only to be maintained, it is to be increased.

With such a program, Carter is really asking for it. We, the working people, should give him the response he deserves.

January 13, 1979

Chrysler's Inhumanity

A few weeks ago the Chrysler Corporation announced that it intends to close its Dodge Main plant in Hamtramck, Michigan, at the completion of its 1980 run of cars. This is a criminal act.

The basic essence of capitalism—its inhumanity and cruelty, its total lack of social responsibility, its fundamental lack of democracy, its anarchy, and, in the present stage of its life, its decline—are all illustrated in this one case.

The closing would throw 6,000 people out of work. For these workers the closing is a tremendous tragedy. Loss of their jobs also means loss of seniority, insurance, medical care, cars, furniture, etc. How will they pay for food, clothing and rent? Many of these workers have put their life savings into a home. For those who will not be able to meet mortgage payments and cannot now sell their homes, it means losing their house and their hard-earned investment. And how will these workers be able to take care of their families and raise their children? What if a member of the family gets sick?

But none of this matters to the Chrysler Corporation. It literally doesn't matter—doesn't enter at all into their calculations. For business corporations, what matters—what is at the basis of all calculations and decisions—is profits. And the worker is of interest to the company only as a source of profits.

For the Chrysler Corporation, the Dodge Main plant continues to be a profitable operation. Then why are they closing it? Because as the corporations have become giant monopolies they are no longer satisfied with anything less than *maximum* profits. If the "pickings" are less than what they calculate "maximum" should be—and if they think they can find better "pickings" somewhere else—they move on.

For the corporations, labor power is a commodity to be bought and used like any other commodity. And the worker is not a person, a human being with human needs, desires and feelings, but something

that can be used or discarded at the convenience of the company—like scrap or a piece of machinery.

The effects of the Chrysler closing would not be limited to the Chrysler workers and their families. The whole city of Hamtramck—the whole Detroit area of which it is a part—would be affected. Hamtramck depends on the Chrysler plant for a good part of its tax revenues. Upon the news of the closing, the city government announced a freeze on municipal salaries and is talking about a cut in services. The Detroit area already has many decaying urban areas. The Chrysler closing would add another big one.

The Chrysler announcement shows the enormous power of the mammoth corporations that dominate our economy. A corporation like Chrysler has the power of economic life or death over tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of people.

It's a dictatorial power. They have not consulted anyone—not the workers, the union or city officials. Who elects the top officials of Chrysler? Not the workers. Not the people of Hamtramck. Not the people of the United States. The top officials of Chrysler, like those of other corporations, are picked by and are responsible to a few super-rich stockholders, not the people of the United States.

How's that for democracy? The defenders of capitalism work very hard, and spend billions each year, to steer our thinking away from the question of who controls our economic life. But for the great majority of people making a living is the first and most basic problem. And making a living in the capitalist United States is not under the democratic control of the people, but the dictatorial control of a small number of corporations. In the economic area the capitalist system is fundamentally undemocratic and anti-human.

This of course affects political democracy as well. In a capitalist society money is one of the central levers of politics, and it is the corporations that have the money. They can use this money to elect government officials, control the mass media, dominate the universities, etc. We live in a society dominated by the corporations, the monopolies. So even in the area where there is democracy, it is limited and flawed.

With each corporation a law unto itself, capitalism is of necessity anarchistic. This anarchy runs flatly counter to the overall planning and coordination that our economy objectively requires. We are living in a complex modern society in which each part is inter-connected

with and dependent on many other parts. Workers are dependent on the jobs controlled by the corporations. They can't earn a living with their bare hands, and the factories and machinery—the means of production—are in the clutches of the corporations. Merchants are dependent on whether workers have jobs. Cities are dependent on whether industries are running, whether workers have jobs and merchants are doing well. What happens in a city affects the surrounding area.

Our economy needs to be run according to a central plan, the main goal of which would be to promote the welfare of our people. But this can't be done under capitalism, where the economy is run by separate private corporations, each pursuing not the interests and welfare of the people, but its own private profits. It can only be done under socialism. And that is why the United States needs socialism..

The unchecked raw power of our greedy, irresponsible corporations to shut down plants, to move to other areas, is causing dozens of towns and cities to decay and whole regions of our country to deteriorate and decline. The steel industry closes down plants in Ohio's Mahoning River Valley and leaves ghost towns there. The garment industry of New York City greedily chasing lower wages moves to the South, to the other side of the Rio Grande, to Hong Kong or Taiwan. It doesn't give a second thought to the urban blight this causes in New York. Large parts of New England, the birthplace of U.S. industry, have declined because of the shutting down and moving out of factories. And this process has now spread to the whole Northeast and Midwest.

This process has to be stopped. The crisis of the cities will become still worse. Whole regions will become depressed areas.

There is only one way to handle this whole problem. And that is for the people to unite and fight—to fight everywhere, at all levels.

The workers at Dodge Main and the people of Hamtramck are fighting against the closing of the plant. This fight deserves the strongest, broadest, most widespread popular support.

There also has to be a fight to deal with the problem on a national basis. The power of the corporations to shut down or move plants has to be taken away—or at least to begin with severely limited and curbed. Many specific measures could be taken. The corporations could be required to give, say, five years severance pay to laid off workers and to retrain them for new jobs, and to make good several

years of the lost taxes to the affected municipal and state governments.

Other, more radical measures, could also be undertaken—like workers taking over the plants. But the important thing now is that the fight be strengthened—both at Hamtramck and across the country.

June 30, 1979

The Inflationary Recession

Last November I wrote a “Basics” in which I said that the Carter administration was “deliberately, cold-bloodedly triggering an early recession as a means of handling the problems of the falling dollar and inflation over which it had lost control.”

Not only are we now in that recession, but the administration is deliberately, cold-bloodedly working to make it severe. It is maintaining the high interest rates and other financial screws which, by squeezing credit for housing, autos, furniture, and other goods, triggered the recession in the first place. It is not lifting a finger to take action to try to soften the recession and cut it short. *They have calculated that for every one million workers unemployed for two years, the inflation will be reduced by one percentage point.*

This policy of strengthening the recession constitutes the real meaning behind the repeated assertion by Carter and other administration spokesmen that inflation is the Number 1 enemy. What is being said is that the recession, the layoffs, the big rise in unemployment that is on the way, are a medicine that we have to swallow to control the inflation.

The policy is also the meaning behind Carter’s appointment of Paul Volcker as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Volcker is a representative of the narrowest, most conservative banking interests. His appointment was hailed by bankers here and abroad, by the *Wall*

Street Journal, *The New York Times*, and many others as just the right one for the purpose of fighting inflation and protecting the shaky dollar. There was a lot of talk about Volcker's long experience in matters of money and banking, his skill, etc. But this talk is all eyewash. What the bankers are happy about is what Volcker stands for.

And what Volcker stands for is simple. He won't—to use a *Wall Street Journal* expression—"panic" as the reports of higher and higher unemployment appear. Come recession, come unemployment, come hell or high water, he'll keep the financial wringer tight the way the bankers want it kept. To put it plainly—the bankers, and now Carter, figure that the job the job of Federal Reserve chairman should be held by a real S.O.B., and Volcker is their S.O.B.

At the same time that Carter names Volcker to apply the financial wringer, he is proposing to hike the military budget by 3 to 5 percent—after increasing it to allow for inflation—in each of the next five years. Can there be a more lunatic economic policy? While Volcker is squeezing the economy with recession and unemployment, the military budget will be pumping more and more into it. So Volcker will have to squeeze all the harder.

The situation is very serious. The administration is fighting the inflation with recession and unemployment, and this is no mild inflation—it is raging away at an annual rate of 14 percent. The administration is trying to prop up the shaky dollar with recession and unemployment—and the dollar is very shaky. It could easily start plummeting again, which would create a crisis for the whole capitalist world. The administration is mortally afraid of such a crisis. The dose of recession they are preparing for us is strong.

The recession comes at a time when unemployment is already high to begin with—even according to the lying official figures. Now it will shoot up much higher. Even government economists are now predicting an unemployment rate of over 8 percent next year. Actually, we face the prospect of unemployment reaching new highs for the period since World War II.

On top of everything else, the fact is that the administration policy will not eliminate the inflation or solve the problem of the dollar. This kind of policy did not do this under Nixon or Ford, and will not do it under Carter. Nobody, including Carter and his cohorts, expects the inflation to be eliminated or the dollar to be really stabilized. Again we

can cite government economists—they are predicting inflation of 9 percent next year and at least 6 percent per year throughout the 1980s. Similar past predictions by these economists have turned out to be over-optimistic.

The economy is in a tremendous, worsening mess. The problem goes far beyond the recession that we are now in—serious though that is. The problem is the state of the economy for the whole decade of the 80s, or longer. Unless economic policies are drastically changed, unless truly radical measures are undertaken, the economic prospect for as far ahead as one can foresee is for a sickness-ridden, crisis-ridden economy—an economy suffering from low growth and high unemployment, high inflation and a weakening dollar.

Such an economy will not even be able to hold in check, much less solve, the many other problems from which it is suffering—energy, urban decay, a running down of the whole economic infrastructure, the disaster in health care, the potential financial breakdown of the social security system.

This picture is gloomy enough, but it is only the minimum. There could also be an economic explosion of one sort or another—a widespread financial collapse in the capitalist world, a major depression comparable to that of the 1930s, etc.

One way or another, a continuation of the enormous military budget and the economic policies that have accompanied it means catastrophe—either creeping catastrophe or catastrophe that hits us with an explosion, but either way, catastrophe.

There is only one solution to the problems—a radical break with the monopoly-oriented, imperialist-oriented, militarist-oriented policies of the past and their replacement with a working-class-oriented, people-oriented policy. The military budget has to be slashed. This is now an urgent objective economic necessity. Unless this is done, we cannot even begin to extricate ourselves from the mess—the mess will only get worse.

We must also get away from the capitalist trap of debating whether unemployment or inflation is the Number 1 enemy. This is bad economics and even worse politics—it divides us. Unemployment and inflation are both curses and we have a right to say, Down with both, we don't want either. Why not? In the Soviet Union they don't have either.

The main source of inflation in our economy is the military budget

and the runaway corporate profits, and the main thing the administration uses as a pretext for not mounting programs to put our unemployed to work is the inflation. If we slash the military budget we can get rid of both inflation and unemployment. And if we don't slash it, we will continue to be plagued by both.

With the outbreak of the recession we are now in, time has grown short. Every day that passes without the administration's policy being changed means that we sink further into the morass, means widening, increasing misery for our people.

August 23, 1979

Racism—1980s, Worse Than "More of the Same"

For the Afro-American, Puerto Rican, Chicano, Native American Indian and Asian-Pacific peoples—for the 50 million Americans who suffer because of racial and national oppression—the decade of the 80s is starting out worse than “more of the same.”

The late 50s and 60s were a period of hope and promise. The Black and other racially and nationally oppressed peoples made a number of important gains. They won the right to vote, to be elected to public office, to attend integrated schools. Transportation, restaurant and other public facilities were desegregated in many places.

But the 70s ushered in a decade of disappointment and frustration. Many of the rights won in struggle were weakened in practice and sometimes all but nullified. Tricky re-divisions of voting districts were used to reduce the impact of the nationally oppressed peoples' vote. The establishment of private schools and other devices were used to hold back school desegregation. In many parts of the North segregation actually increased. There was an increase in cross-burning and

other forms of intimidation in areas where Blacks moved into previously all-white neighborhoods.

The biggest failure, however, has been in the key area of economics. The failure to solve the problems of jobs, upgrading, housing, health care and the like stands as a formidable roadblock to all social progress.

Take the job situation. Last year, according to government figures, the rate of unemployment among whites averaged 5.1 percent, while for the category "Black and other," it averaged 11.3 percent. And these official figures lie because they do not include those workers who are not "actively seeking" work because they no longer have any hope of finding any. The true rate of unemployment among the oppressed peoples, and especially among the Black people, is closer to 20 percent and for Black teenagers in some areas the figure is a catastrophic 50 to 75 percent. For oppressed peoples unemployment has been at the depression level of the 30s for many years.

In the 70s the courts set up legal barriers to affirmative action as well as desegregation of schools.

Carter's 1980s corporate-profits-first economic policies have a sharp racist edge. They call for a reduction in the standard of living and quality of life for all of us. But these policies hit with special force the oppressed peoples whose standard of living is already at rock-bottom. So all the terrible economic burdens they are already reeling under will get worse. They are nothing but official policies of racism.

At this juncture—more than ever before—an effective attack on the super-exploitation and oppression of Afro-Americans and other oppressed peoples requires a clear understanding of the problem. It requires that there be clarity about the true causes of racism, about who benefits from it and who is hurt, about who the enemy is and who the allies of the oppressed peoples are, or can be. It requires a strategy that can bring about progress not only in civil rights and civil liberties, but in jobs, housing, health care and other economic areas.

What are the basic causes of racism? Historically, racism in this country originated with slavery. Only with a racist ideology, bigotry and prejudice, could the slaveholders attempt to justify and rationalize such a monstrous, inhuman institution. Today the basic cause of racism is monopoly capital—the giant corporations that dominate the economy, the government, the media and educational institutions of our country. It is the corporations who mainly benefit from racism—

who maintain it, stir it up, and use it for making huge super-profits and to divide-and-rule.

The corporations make billions each year by paying artificially low wages to racially oppressed workers. Job classification systems are deliberately manipulated to define certain jobs as worth less than others—not because they require less skills, but simply because they are mainly occupied by Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other oppressed groups. White workers must understand that keeping down the wages of racially and nationally oppressed workers also keeps down the wages of white workers.

Landlords, real estate interests and the banks make billions by deliberately fomenting racism in housing. They use racism to divide the housing market into compartments. People's freedom to choose where to live is severely limited and redlining is rampant. Not only are Blacks forced to pay outrageously high prices for miserable ghetto housing because they can't go anyplace else, but the rents of other Americans are kept high in this way.

In a plant, racism is used to pit one group of workers against another. It is an instrument of dividing the trade union and labor movements and to hold back the whole working-class movement. It is an instrument of class rule. Racism is the main weapon of big business to control the country, politically and economically.

It is absolutely crucial for the solution of the pressing problems of our country that white Americans recognize their self-interest in fighting racism—that they too are losers. Racism is an obstacle to a better life for all, to social progress generally.

The overwhelming majority of white people—those not tied to corporate interests—do not benefit from racism. This becomes especially clear in time of economic crisis like the present. The people of the United States are suffering from an inflation that is out of control. Unemployment is high and on the rise. The real spendable earnings of workers are less now than they were 15 years ago. Last year alone they fell by 7 percent. The government has been announcing regularly that the standard of living of all working people has to be reduced.

What racism does is divert attention from the real problems, from the true causes of these problems, and therefore from the necessary solutions. What racism does is to divide people so they are unable to mount an effective fightback.

All this does not mean that a white worker may not gain some

particular, immediate advantage from discrimination against a racially oppressed person. But in most cases this advantage is obtained at the cost of sacrificing bigger, more fundamental interests.

For example, some white construction workers may gain some immediate advantage in obtaining jobs as a result of discrimination against racially oppressed workers. But how much does this help, especially in a situation like the present, when the government is deliberately choking the construction industry and building trades unemployment is soaring? The true interests of white construction workers lie not in discriminatory practices, but in fighting for the economy to be run in such a way that there are enough jobs for everyone. Racism has greatly weakened the building trades unions and workers have been forced to take wage cuts.

The problem is basically one of class solidarity. Scabbing can bring a person immediate advantage. However, historically, scabbing is despised by most workers. Gaining an advantage from discrimination is like scabbing. It sacrifices the interests of the whole class for momentary, individual, selfish gain. What we need is to build up a tradition against benefiting from racial discrimination that is as strong as the tradition against scabbing.

Just as it is crucial for white people to recognize the racist poison for what it is and to fight against it, it is important for the racially and nationally oppressed to know who their potential allies are, who the enemy is, and what stands in the way of further progress at this point.

To begin with, there is the question of solidarity between Black and other oppressed peoples. The ruling class works tirelessly to sow division among Black and Chicanos and Puerto Ricans, etc. They shrewdly use, among other weapons, differences in historical background and customs. But regardless of such differences, oppressed peoples are all in the same boat in this country. They are all trying to make a living and all confront the same oppressor. Pride in one's background is natural, but it should not be allowed to serve as a means of disunity.

The Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American Indian, Asian-Pacific and all other nationally oppressed peoples in the United States total more than 50 million people—over one-fourth of the total population. Strongly and solidly united they can become a potent, major force in the United States.

But even solid unity among the oppressed peoples is not enough.

Unity with white people and above all with white workers is indispensable. This is especially true in the current situation.

Basic economic progress for oppressed peoples, progress in improving their economic situation in jobs, wages, housing, health care, requires turning the priorities of the whole country around. It requires slashing the military budget, reversing foreign policy and cutting into corporate profits. Without these changes there can be no economic progress.

But reversing these policies is a job that cannot be done except by a broad coalition of the great majority of the people. The basis for such a coalition already exists in embryonic form. What is needed is to broaden and strengthen it. The basis for this coalition exists in the developing of mutual self-interest. It is in the self-interests of the racially and nationally oppressed—and working people generally—to seek these overlapping self-interests. The ruling class promotes the contradictory features of these relationships. In order to wipe out the effects of racism it is necessary to take some special steps of affirmative action, especially in hiring and upgrading. Once this is done, the workers in a shop can unify and fight for cutting down speedup, reducing work hours, and for wage increases.

Among the working class of all races and nationalities there are overlapping self-interests; while there are only irreconcilable, basic antagonisms between all exploited sections and big business.

Taking on monopoly capital is a big job. But there's no way around it. Without an all out united fightback against the monopolies there's no way the problems can be solved. The job can be done and will be—precisely because there's no other way. The people of our country are not going to sit back and watch things get worse and worse. More and more they're going to unite and fight. And unity requires first and foremost mounting a determined fight against racism and discrimination wherever and whenever it rears its ugly head.

April 10, 1980

Carter Fights Inflation by Attacking Its Victims

We are now in the worst inflation in our history. There have been periods in the past when the price level was shooting up the way it is now. But these were periods of war—for example, World War II. Everyone knew that the war would end sooner or later and that then the inflation would be brought under control. Now there is no such prospect. The prospect is for the inflation to go on indefinitely.

For the working people, a galloping, endless inflation constitutes a crisis of critical proportions. It not only robs us regularly at the supermarket checkout counter, not only cuts down our real income and our standard of living, but will weaken and wreck our whole economy. For the people inflation is an economic disaster.

To give just one of the ways in which inflation will do this, the main capitalist way of trying to control inflation is to slow down economic growth, to produce recessions. The idea is that unemployment is the best way to fight inflation. Therefore, so long as we have inflation we will have a low-growth, stagnant economy, or worse—we will have both high inflation and high unemployment,

We have already begun to suffer from this effect of inflation. The growth rate of the U.S. economy during the 1970s was much lower than during the preceding period. The recession that followed the upsurge of inflation in 1974 was the worst since World War II. Last year the economy moved sideways, not up. And it now stands on the brink of recession.

Low growth will exacerbate all our economic problems—the problem of providing jobs to our growing population, the problem of

maintaining a sound, adequate social security system, the problems of our cities, etc. And this isn't all. The many distortions inflation creates could also end up producing a major depression. In sum, the inflation spells big troubles ahead.

For the purposes of his re-election campaign, Carter and his advisers are now panicky about the inflation. And well they might be. The people are already angry and are going to get still angrier. But what has the Carter administration been doing? The main thing it has done recently amounts to economic lunacy. It has instituted a program to hike the military budget—to jack it up by \$90 billion over the next four years. This guarantees that the problem of inflation will get not better, but even worse.

Then, just as the news of the increase in military expenditures was helping inflation soar to 20 percent, the Administration set up rush-rush meetings of its advisers, consultations with Congress, etc., to bring forth an anti-inflation program. This is now the umpteenth time since the inflation got up steam during the Vietnam War that the government has come forth with an anti-inflation program. Nixon had several. Ford had one. Carter is now on his fourth.

What is Carter's latest anti-inflation program? A good part of it is simply a continuation of his third program. There is the tight credit policy and astronomical interest rates, which are designed to produce a recession. There are also the wage-price guidelines which are designed to make workers accept wage increases that are five or more points less than last year's increase in the cost of living. In other words, a big cut in real wages, while the prices are soaring completely out of control. The so-called guidelines are only for wages.

And on top of this there now are more cuts in the government's social programs and an oil import fee. Programs for jobs, mass transit, day care and health care, education, welfare, programs that help the elderly, and for saving and rebuilding our cities, are to be slashed. And the oil import fee will add another 10 cents to the already soaring price of gasoline. These measures are a direct consequence of the recent decision to increase the military budget. They are designed to compensate for part of that increase.

The administration has said that it is necessary to reduce the people's standard of living. Its latest program is designed to speed up the process by which this is happening. It is an anti-working-class program. It is designed to free for the military the additional resources

they want to chew up and put the burden of this on the backs of the people through higher unemployment, cuts in real wages and salaries, slashes in social programs and an increase in the cost of gasoline.

This continues the policy of making the victims the target of the attack. Like all the other so-called anti-inflation programs, the Carter program has the sharpest knife against the people who suffer the most from inflation, the racially and nationally oppressed. It is a racist program.

This is not really an anti-inflation program. It will not control the inflation, much less eliminate it. It is an adjunct to the administration's foreign policy and military plans, a program designed to allow the carrying out of these plans, while trying to keep the inflation from getting completely out of hand. The administration is gambling with the economic future of our country.

Some people—like Ted Kennedy—have been suggesting wage and price controls as the way to control the inflation. Carter has been denying that he will institute such controls. But Nixon also issued such denials and then put controls into effect. Are Nixon-type controls the answer to the problem? No. Under capitalism, and with the kind of government we have, such controls turn out to be wage controls and not price or profit controls. Here, for example, is what the 1974 Annual Report of the Bank for International Settlements (a report of conservative bankers) had to say about the Nixon controls:

The price regulations were not very effective, even though the wage aspects of the policy were not subject to serious challenge. First year pay increases under the new contracts in 1973 averaged less than 6%, the lowest figure in several years. By contrast, consumer prices in 1973 were nearly 9% and food prices alone 20% higher than 12 months before.

In addition, such controls do not get at the cause of the inflation. They just try to hold the lid down for a while. As soon as the Nixon controls were lifted, double-digit inflation erupted.

If such controls were imposed in the present situation the results would be even worse since the inflation is much stronger and the rise in military expenditures much sharper. The controls would be simply a device to allow the government to keep wages down and to carry out the military budget increase while postponing the day of reckoning. But the pressure would be building and eventually—in the not too distant future—there would be an explosion. What is needed are some

emergency measures that would roll back and freeze prices, rents and profits.

There is often talk these days in one connection or another of the need "to bite the bullet." There is such a need, although the bullet has to be the right one. The bullet that needs to be bitten is that of the military budget. Without biting this bullet the problem of inflation cannot basically be solved.

April 26, 1980

Part **4**

*The Communist
Movement*

The Vision . . . 50 Years Ago

The appearance of the first issue of the *Daily Worker* 50 years ago was an important, historic, political landmark. More than anything else, the birth of the *Daily Worker* speaks about the nature of the moment and the nature of the men and women who undertook to publish and distribute a working-class, revolutionary Communist newspaper. It was a bold undertaking. They had to break with accepted and traditional patterns.

It has been said: "They were men and women with vision." That is true. But their visions were of a special texture. Their visions were grounded in a deep understanding of the historic moment. They were fired with the understanding and conviction that scientific socialism was an idea whose time had come. From this they concluded that the time had come for the launching of a newspaper that speaks for this idea.

What was so unique about these early revolutionary pioneers? It was that they had a unique insight into the historic moment. By studying the inner laws of capitalist development they concluded that the class struggle in the United States had reached a new level. Capitalism was on the road to spawning huge monopoly corporations. The United States was developing into a major imperialist nation. The signs of its decay and parasitism were beginning to appear everywhere.

These pioneers understood the unique feature of racist oppression and its relationship to class exploitation. They concluded that all this would lead to a sharpening of the class confrontation, which would inevitably lead to a rising working-class consciousness. This, they correctly predicted, would lead to the need for presenting the socialist alternative.

They linked the *Daily Worker* to this assessment of the moment. These pioneers correctly foresaw that this working-class, revolutionary current would be able to sustain a daily working-class newspaper.

Their vision was rooted in the science that gave them this unique insight into that historic moment. The science was scientific socialism—Marxism-Leninism.

The 50-year history of the Marxist daily press, the *Daily Worker*, the daily *People's World* and now the *Daily World* is proof that they were absolutely right. The *Daily World* continues the high standards set by its predecessor. It contributes to the best in working-class, revolutionary journalism.

In a capitalist society, newspapers and the mass media, generally, are in two categories: the mass media supported by the advertisements of the corporations and the media sustained by mass political currents. The 50-year history of the Communist daily press is the most dramatic example of a press being sustained by a mass revolutionary current. Fifty years is proof that its time had come!

The primary considerations that led to the decision to publish a Communist newspaper were related to the domestic scene. But there was also an explosive international event that "shook the world." With the birth of the Soviet Union the vision of a working-class power had become a reality. This was the beginning of new thought patterns which are still sweeping the world. It was not accidental that for years most of the news articles, books and pamphlets written about the Soviet Union carried the theme, "socialism works." This only proves how deep and widespread the propaganda campaign was that said socialism couldn't work.

Not only was socialism an "idea whose time had come," but the fact that it "works" added a new feeling of confidence and excitement to the working-class movement.

The Communist press in the United States has had its good days as well as some bad ones. Since this is its 50th birthday, we will speak mainly of the good days.

During its 50 years of life the Communist daily press in the United States has been an active force in the struggles around the everyday problems of the people. But there are special areas in which it has made unique contributions and left permanent footprints in the sands of time.

During most of the history of the fight for unemployment insurance, including the many years of economic crisis, government bodies, federal, state and city, would do nothing about social security. Unemployment was considered a "private" matter. When the Com-

munist Party and the Communist press launched a drive for unemployment insurance, it was not only unique, it was rejected by almost everyone. The leadership of the AFL, the Socialist Party, the Socialist Labor Party, most religious leaders, the newspapers and magazines all attacked the concept as some "Communist scheme." Most political leaders, including President Franklin D. Roosevelt, were against it. And, of course, big business attacked it ferociously. The campaign conducted by the Communist press left an important footprint "in the sands" of that time.

Our mass industrial trade unions are among the youngest in the world. Monopoly corporations in steel, auto and mining used extreme terror tactics, murder and corruption to prevent unionization. Until the victory in the drive for industrial organization in the mid-1930s, they employed armies of private gunmen and stoolpigeons.

Beginning with its first issue, the Communist press campaigned for the organization of the mass industrial unions. The Communist press was viewed as the most dangerous of all newspapers by big business. Hundreds of workers lost their jobs for the "crime" of being caught with the *Daily Worker* in their hands. When the drive to organize industrial unions was finally started, the Communist press was an effective weapon in this struggle and because of its efforts it had the best organized following. This was another historic footprint made by the Communist press.

With the notable exception of some of the Black press, the Communist press is the only mass media that can claim that it has taken and retained a principled position in the struggle against racism. It held this position from its very first edition. Many others in the spectrum of Left politics now take a stand against racism. But the Communist press has always conducted a continuous struggle against racism. Many specific cases stand out: Scottsboro, Willie McGee, and Angela Davis. The Communist press has always related the struggle against racism to struggle against class exploitation.

No other paper has such a sustained record in the struggle for democracy. The Communist press has been a clarion call for unity against such outfits as the Liberty League, America First, the ultra-Right and the Dixiecrats. It has always been, and continues to be, the clearest and loudest voice of anti-fascists. For the Communist press the struggle against the police-state structure that brought on Watergate is but the continuation of this struggle.

These are all unerasable footprints in the sands of our time. But in all of this the most unique contribution of the Communist press is that it is the voice of the revolutionary working class. It has always included in its contributions the viewpoint of the working class.

Fifty years ago the vision of the Communists who put out the first edition of the *Daily Worker* was a working-class vision. In their vision it was the new element, the rising working-class movement, the developing class and socialist consciousness that added up to the beginning of a new historic period. It was in this context they saw that the time for the idea of scientific socialism had come.

The 50-year history of the Communist press is the history of unprecedented contributions to this idea, to this new historic period. With each passing year this vision has become clearer. With each passing year the act of putting out the first edition of the *Daily Worker* is of additional significance. In the years to come the Communist press, in close harmony with the struggles of the working class and the people, will make even greater contributions.

January 12, 1974

At 55, Well and Fighting

Marxism is not a newcomer to these shores. And contrary to capitalist propaganda it is no more an "import" or a "foreign idea" than capitalism is. Both concepts, socialism and capitalism, came to our shores with the influx of immigrants from Europe. In fact, the concept of socialism had much more in common with the communal life of the Native Americans than did capitalism. In that sense, it has a greater claim to being a native product than does capitalism.

Socialist ideas and groups were popular long before the first truly Marxist organization appeared in 1868, 106 years ago.

The seeds of Marxist ideas arrived with the immigrants but were

nourished on a soil that was prepared by the development of capitalism. The growth of the working class in numbers, in the consciousness of itself as a class, the clear delineation of the classes, the sharpening of the class struggle, the accumulated and systematized experiences of struggle world-wide, all this as set forth in the theories of Marx and Engels, combined in giving birth to the first Marxist organization.

The birth of the Marxist organization was a qualitative step in this process and signaled things to come. It was a reflection of the fact that the working class was taking the first step in assuming its place as a revolutionary class, a role assigned to it by history.

But the course of history does not follow a straight line. The Marxist movement had to gather experience, and in this process, to mature. This process is always intimately related to the development of the working class as a class, with its own self-interests, ideas and world outlook.

The next explosive period that resulted in a qualitative leap took place around the turn of the century. The birth of the Communist Party, 55 years ago this September, was a product of that thrust. It was propelled by both national and world developments. In the United States big business had become the dominant sector of capitalism. With newly acquired economic and political power U.S. capital tightened the screws of oppression and exploitation. Its drive for profits had moved beyond the national boundaries. The United States had become an imperialist power. The class lines were drawn tight.

The world was shaken when the first socialist state burst meteorically on the world scene. With the appearance of the Soviet Union the new class had established a firm beachhead. These new experiences of struggle were formulated and synthesized in the brilliant theoretical works of V.I. Lenin. The science which had been known as Marxism now became the science of Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin's theoretical contributions had a profound effect on the Communist movement throughout the world.

On this new level of the movement and the development of revolutionary thought, Marxism-Leninism became the science with which the revolutionary working-class movement was able to overcome the hangups that had continued to retard its full development.

In most fields of study when science establishes a truth it does not have to keep re-establishing that truth. It becomes an accepted, integral part of the science. This is not the case in the field of social

science. In this field rejected concepts that are proven false keep reappearing. The jargon is changed, but the content remains the same. These concepts are always presented as something “new.” In most cases they are opportunistic maneuvers in an attempt to bypass, to outflank, the realities of the class struggle and to downgrade or to ignore the hardest fact about that reality, the working class. In most cases they are so-called “short cuts” that seem possible only in a fantasy world. A few examples just to prove the point. In 1900, the *International Socialist Review*, a Marxist magazine in the United States, stated: “The revolution would be produced by the familyless, homeless, voteless and godless.” This general idea has been rejected many times as having no base in reality. But it keeps reappearing. Some present this idea by glorifying the “lumpen” element. Others, like Marcuse, give it a more refined touch by assigning the “revolutionary role” to “those outside of the production cycle.” The words are different, but the ideas and the purpose are the same—to bypass the class struggle and to eliminate the working class as a revolutionary force.

U.S. radical history is full of attempts to build “counter societies.” They range from “utopian socialist communes” to “producers’ cooperatives.” Experience has proven that they are a form of escapism, an attempt to escape from the class struggle and participation in the working-class movement. But, as we have seen in these past years, they keep reappearing as “solutions.”

Among the most persistent ideas that hang on are the variations of reformism. They cover the field from “just” wage demands to open class collaboration and betrayal.

Before and after the Civil War, the working-class movement began to recognize the injustice and brutality of the racial oppression of Black Americans. But it was the Marxist movement that injected the correct understanding that Black Americans were the victims of a system of racist oppression, that the majority of Black Americans were part of the working class and exploited as workers, but they were also part of the racially oppressed people, the super-exploited. From this correct understanding there flows the absolute necessity to struggle against the ideology of white chauvinism and racism as an instrument of capitalist super-profits. These are established truths.

But ideas that opportunistically attempt to bypass or ignore these truths keep reappearing. Among them is the idea of postponing the

struggle against racism, of postponing the struggle for Black-white unity until we have socialism. These opportunistic evasions of the struggle against racist oppression, more than anything else, expose the fact that all these “new innovations” are in fact the result of enemy class influence within the radical and working-class movement. They are forms of capitulation to the ideological pressures of the enemy. They are themselves the product of white chauvinist influences.

In 1863, Ferdinand Lassalle projected the “iron law” that the average wages of workers could not be raised by economic action. He concluded that therefore trade unions, as forms for economic struggles, were useless and that only “electoral activities” were productive. Marxism has fought for a policy that combines the two fields of struggle, the electoral and economic, but the old “iron law” concept keeps reappearing.

With Marxism-Leninism as its guiding science, the Communist Party, USA has grown into the mature, effective revolutionary party of the working class.

- The Party has mastered the art of combining the two aspects of struggle—the independent activities and positions of the Party and the policy of simultaneously taking part and leading united front movements of people. It has mastered the ability of combining the electoral struggles with non-electoral movements. It has mastered the art of combining the struggle for reforms with the movement toward socialism. It has learned to combine economic struggles with political struggles. It has learned to see and base its work upon the interconnection between the struggle against racism and the class struggle.

- The Communist Party, USA is what it is because it not only has drawn on the experiences of the U.S. working class, but has drawn the lessons of the struggle on a world-wide basis.

- The Communist Party, USA is what it is because it struggles against all forms of opportunism, whether it appears with a Right or a Left coating.

- The Communist Party, USA is a vanguard party that pursues a mass line.

- The Communist Party, USA is what it is because it fights both against the brittle, empty rhetoric of dogmatism as well as the influences of capitulatory right opportunism.

- The Communist Party, USA has a glorious and proud past, a relevant present and an exciting, meaningful, revolutionary future.

No commentary on the anniversary of our Party would be complete without a word of tribute to the comrades who have left their mark on our Party's development and on the course of United States working-class history. So, on this occasion we salute them all by mentioning a few among the many—William Z. Foster, Benjamin J. Davis, Eugene Dennis, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Charles Ruthenberg, Charles Krumbain, James Ford, Pettis Perry, Betty Gannett, John Williamson, Claudia Jones, Robert Thompson, Alexander Trachtenberg, Anita Whitney, Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois, Theodore Dreiser, Ray Hansborough, Jesus Colon, "Mother" Ella Reeve Bloor, Israel Amter, Hank Forbes, Al Lannon, Robert Minor, Louis Engdahl, John Reed, Peter Cachione, Geraldine Lightfoot and Jack Stachel.

September 7, 1974

Fifty Years of Honor

It is a great privilege to be asked to speak together with such honored guests and beautiful people at this 50th anniversary celebration of the most consistent voice of truth, the most dogged fighter against injustice and oppression—to pay tribute to the finest, the greatest daily newspaper that has ever appeared in the 200-year history of the United States.

For most of its 50 years the *Daily Worker* and now the *Daily World* has had to buck the tides of great odds.

For most of the 50 years it has been the voice of a minority, in the United States and in the world. That was in the old world.

Now the *Daily World* speaks in the name and voice of the majority of the world's humanity.

Because the *Daily World* has never accepted things as they are it has molded and made history.

There are only two kinds of daily newspapers in the United States.

There is the *Daily World* and there is the corporate press. *The Daily World* speaks for and deals with the truth. The corporate press deals in coverups and falsehoods.

There are all kinds of awards. There are the Pulitzer Prizes, the Oscars, the Emmys and the Tonys. These are momentary reflections of passing scenes. The real, the lasting awards are those bestowed by history. Only history can view achievement objectively. There is no evading its correct judgment, and it is making judgments on the press.

From the votes coming in it is clear there is only one nomination for the "Right-On Award," and the winner is the *Daily World*.

The *Daily World* receives the award for being—

- Right-on in the struggles of the working class;
- Right-on in the struggle against racism;
- Right-on in the struggle for socialism;
- Right-on in the struggle for democratic rights, for social security;
- Right-on in the struggle against imperialism—and in the first place against U.S. imperialism.

But history is also passing out other awards. They are more in the form of indictments.

In the category of "Total Disregard for Truth" the indictment for unmitigated lying—there were many nominations. But the award goes to the Hearst Press.

In the category of "Overall Reactionaryness, Jingoism and Being Closest-to-Fascism," here again there are many nominations. But the award goes to the *Chicago Tribune*.

The "My Heart Belongs to My Corporate Daddy" award goes, of course, to the *Wall Street Journal*.

The award for "The Most Racist Paper of the Epoch" goes to the *New York Daily News*.

The "Anti-Communist, Pro-Imperialist and Support for all Fascist-Military-Racist Dictatorships Around the World" award has to be shared by many—the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, *Chicago Sun Times*, *Detroit Free Press*. In order for other papers to share in this award, the people in each city have the right to add the name of their paper.

And last but not least, in the category of "Print Only the News that Fits into a Fake Liberal Coverup for the Crimes of Monopoly Capital" the award goes to the aging, molting *New York Times*.

There are many good reasons why the *Daily World* has invariably

been right and the corporate press invariably wrong. The *Daily World* works with the history-making progressive tides, while the corporate press has its backside to progress.

The *Daily World* works with and stimulates the healthy elements that arise from a sick society. The corporate press reflects that which is sick, decaying and dying.

The *Daily World* speaks for the class that is leading human society to a new and beautiful plateau. The corporate press speaks for and defends the exploiting, self-centered racist class—an ugly, decaying obstacle on the path of human progress.

At every turning point in human affairs the *Daily World* and the corporate press have been on opposite sides of the fence.

While the corporate press was glorifying Hitler and Mussolini, the *Daily Worker*, the *World's* predecessor, was raising the warning flags about the dangers of fascism.

During World War II when the corporate press was saying that the fascist forces would cut through the Soviet Union “like a knife cuts through soft butter,” the Marxist daily was saying, “Don’t sell socialism and the people of the Soviet Union short.”

When the corporate press was an open advocate of racism, when they glorified lynching, the *DW* was stubbornly fighting against racism, including the Scottsboro Nine and many other cases.

When the corporate press called the rise of the CIO unions “a dangerous development,” the *DW* was the clearest and strongest advocate of industrial class struggle trade unionism.

While the corporate press consistently defends and advocates policies of imperialist aggression, the *Daily World* has been and is the most consistent anti-imperialist voice.

While the corporate press snipes at and raves against detente, the *Daily World* is the most consistent champion of world peace and detente.

The corporate press is tied to a fading, dying star, a star fast losing its lustre because its magnetic force is decaying capitalism.

The *Daily World* is tied to the rising star, a star that is now the key political and ideological magnetic force in the universe—socialism.

We are, once again, at a critical turning point in history, a turning point that again places the corporate press and the *Daily World* on opposite sides of the battlefield.

The *Daily World* states that we are in an economic crisis, a crisis of overproduction and inflation.

The *Daily World* says the crisis is caused by the policies of monopoly capitalism, that the very processes of capitalism breed crises.

Master Misleaders

As usual, the corporate press is out to cover up and mislead. The corporate press says the crisis is caused by the people. The people either eat too much or too little, depending on who is writing President Ford's speech. In the morning they say you are un-American because you use sugar and in the afternoon you are subversive because you don't use sugar.

Who is responsible is an important question, because the answer determines who should pay for getting the country out of the crisis.

The fact that we have inflation and a depression—rising prices and unemployment at the same time—is the most convincing proof that capitalism, with its irreconcilable contradictions, is antiquated, obsolete and ripe for the trash can.

The corporate mass media is working overtime covering up for capitalism. They like Nixon, they are as phony as Agnew and they cover up like Mitchell and Haldeman.

Even the bumblebee has become inflationary! Otherwise, how can you explain the fact that the price of honey has more than doubled in a few weeks? How can you explain this in corporate economic terms? The unbelievable answer must be that the queen bees are sending out messages—labor productivity of the working bees is down! They are demanding higher wages! They say the high prices are due to the higher cost of raw materials—because of shortages. And so the rose buds, dandelions and daffodils are not producing as much nectar. And the flowers are blaming it on a shortage of fertilizer.

This makes as much sense as most of the bourgeois economists who cover up for monopoly capitalism.

That is the essence of the inflationary bees' and coverup economists' sweet talk—pass the buck and cover it with B.S.

A feature of the coverup is the attempt to confuse the people with all kinds of fancy words and double-talk, when in fact the explanations are rather simple.

Let us look at two concrete examples, Ford and Rockefeller—two corporate thugs in fancy coat-tails.

Ford Motor Company, like all automobile corporations, has produced cars and trucks at an ever faster rate. The production line is now faster than at any time in history. Speedup is beyond human endurance. The number of cars and trucks has increased, but the wages of workers have not. Leaving the factory, the two factors of increased production and decreased wages meet in the marketplace. Ford has increased the price of cars. The gap between the number of cars produced and the ability of the workers to buy them has widened. The result is unsold cars and a depression. That is how capitalism works!

Last week we saw an example of how a corporation behaves when it has a monopoly on a line of production. The parking lots are full of unsold cars. During the same week Ford issued three orders:

1) Shutdown a million lathes, a million drill presses, one hundred assembly lines, 50,000 workers. Give the human beings pink slips, but be sure to clean, lubricate and preserve the machines.

2) Increase the price on the unsold cars by \$75.

3) The third order was to the other Ford: "Don't tax me. Let's have a tax that is equal. Let's put a 20 percent tax on gasoline."

At the end of the year this tax will cost the president of Ford Motor Company \$100, and it will cost the laid-off Ford worker \$100, who has to use his car to look for work. That's Ford's "Equality Tax." It's the old lumber-camp story of equal parts, 50-50 stew—one horse to one rabbit!

The critical question which the corporate mass media covers up is: Where did the extra corporate profits that result from increased prices on cars, from the speedup of workers, and from the reduction in the total work force, go? Needless to say the workers certainly didn't get any of these extra profits. They are the victims of this operation.

It has been, and is, a gigantic corporate rip-off.

Because all the Fords of monopoly capital have been ripping off the billions of dollars through speedup and inflation, the workers are not able to buy either what they need or what they produce. This is the basic cause of the economic crisis.

How are these corporate criminals able to keep raising prices while the shelves are full of sugar and the car lots are piled high with unsold cars? This is possible because there is a corporate monopoly conspiracy. They are able to conspire because two or three corporations like General Motors and Ford in auto have a monopoly on production.

The Rockefellers are doing the same thing, except they now want to

be in a position to give direct orders to the other Ford—the Ford in the White House.

During the past weeks, in the hearings on Rockefeller's nomination, we often heard the words, "no conflict of interest," and "there is nothing illegal, immoral, unethical or unusual about their (the Rockefellers') operations." And from the viewpoint of monopoly capital, in a sense that is true. Because for the Rockefellers to buy off every government official around is not in conflict with the Rockefeller interests. Of course, it is in total conflict with the interests of the people.

There are many ironic twists and angles in this sordid Rockefeller story. For instance, while Rockefeller was using millions of dollars to buy off public officials with loans and gifts, at that very time as governor he signed a bill into law making it a crime to give a tip, a bottle of wine or a free meal to anyone on the public payroll!

When Rockefeller became governor of New York the workers were already paying 65 percent of all the taxes collected in the state. By the time Rockefeller left office the workers' share had risen to 81 percent of all the taxes paid. The corporate share had declined from 31 percent to 19 percent. And to top it off, as we all know, for several years during this period, Rockefeller paid no taxes at all. But from their point of view this is not immoral or unethical.

Finding solutions to the serious economic problems has now become a critical question. The corporate thugs and the Ford administration are also talking about solutions. But their solutions move in one direction: how to place the burden of the crisis on the backs of the workers and the people. Therefore, finding the solutions must start by a sharp rejection of the idea that "the people must sacrifice." The lives of workers in general, the lives of the Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican peoples, the lives of the elderly and the youth consist of nothing but sacrifices. The Ford administration wants the elderly to sacrifice by limiting their intake to one can of Alpo instead of two. They want the food stamps to be taken away from the people who are now living in conditions of starvation. Instead of the over 50 percent unemployment among Black youth, they want to raise it to 75 percent.

The Democrats are passing resolutions at their mini-convention in Kansas City. There is nothing so terribly wrong with these resolutions. There have always been some acceptable planks in the election platforms of the Democrats and Republicans. But what has happened

after these planks have been adopted? They have always been and are now empty electoral rhetoric. The test of the mini-convention would be for the Democrats to march into the halls of Congress and say, “We are now the majority. We have adopted a program at our mini-convention and we want to start implementing it by rolling back prices, rents and, in the first place, excess corporate profits.” But based on past experience we know that this is not going to happen. The great majority of Democrats, like the Republicans, will go back into Congress looking for ways to force the people to make further sacrifices.

Finding solutions must start from the concept that we must “take from where it is at, and give it to those who need it.”

The actual solution must start by expropriating the corporate ripoff profits—the excess corporate fat. And they are without limits.

Imagine, just for a moment, what we can do by expropriating the following ripoff profits, the excess fat.

- \$100 billion from the federal tax privileges enjoyed by the corporations and the super-rich;
- \$100 billion from the war budget;
- \$80 billion from the special subsidies that the government gives to big business;
- \$40 billion the corporations make each year from inflation;
- \$40 billion the corporations get from what are called “military cost overruns.” It is a ripoff on top of the ripoff in military production;
- \$30 billion, just by placing a moratorium on the interest payments on the public and national debts.

And look what we can add to the incomes of the people just by eliminating taxes from families who earn less than \$20,000 per year. This would add \$85 billion to their incomes.

This excess fat, these ripoff profits, would amount to something like \$400 billion.

Just to show you what can be done with such figures—if we would take the total civilian labor force and provide them with an adequate standard of living it would amount to about one-half of the \$400 billion. In short, the ripoff profits could be the source of decent living standards for working people. It is these ripoff profits that are the cause of mass poverty.

So that’s where it’s at—and that’s where the solutions are. How should this be done? How can the ripoff profits be taken from the

corporations and passed on to the people? By any means that are necessary—by taxation of the corporations and super-rich, by nationalization, expropriation or by socialization. Some would ask: is this moral and ethical. And I say—to feed, clothe and house the people is the only real morality there is. In fact, to take it from where it is at and to give it to where it is needed is only returning that which has been taken from the people.

But, as we so well know, the solutions are simple, but the struggle to achieve them is not. Only a high level of unity can defeat the corporate thugs who not only control the economy, but the government and the two parties in their service.

We Communists want to take this opportunity to propose a new drive, a new effort, to unite the ranks of the people.

The people of our country face a deepening crisis. There is hunger and want in the land. This crisis supersedes whatever other differences there may be among us.

This is a time for united action on every level.

There is no reason for despair or hopelessness.

There is no necessity for people to be hungry or in want. Solutions are available.

And with the able assistance and support of a fighting paper like the *Daily World* we can defeat these corporate monsters and the social system that is immoral, unethical and totally corrupt.

The corporate press is busy, as usual, spreading the big lie that this crisis is worldwide, when in fact it is worldwide only for capitalism.

This economic crisis has brought into sharp focus the basic comparison between the two systems—socialism and capitalism. There is no economic crisis in the lands of socialism. There is no crisis and there is no inflation. There will be no crisis or inflation in the socialist countries. In place of crisis there is a steady, stable, continuing rise in the standard of living.

There is no crisis in the socialist countries because socialism has not only eliminated the excess corporate fat. When they established socialism they also took care of the corporations. They took care of the corporate fat and the corporate fatsos in the process.

December 8, 1974

A Unique Convention

In many ways a convention of the Communist Party is unique. It is certainly not a gathering of armchair strategists or idle phrasemongers. The delegates are the most serious and dedicated fighters for a better life. They are the most uncompromising foes of injustice. They are the most involved activists. They are not “summer soldiers” or “one-shot” participants.

The delegates at the convention represented their local Party organizations. But they are also involved and active in every movement and struggle of the people. Their concern with national and world problems and with local needs is characteristic of the convention delegates. That is their working-class character. The delegates to this 21st Convention are leaders of rank-and-file groups in the shops and trade union locals. They are union presidents and shop stewards. They are active in movements for jobs and against high taxes and prices. They came from housing movements. They are activists and leaders of Black liberation, Chicano, Puerto Rican movements. They are activists in the women’s liberation struggles, in parent-teacher organizations, as well as in farm and youth organizations. They are activists in the struggle for political independence.

It was a gathering of Communists as well as a gathering of people from every possible type of mass organization. Because of this, it is understandable why the convention was immersed in the problems and experiences of movements and struggles. Like a stream, the experiences and problems of the people’s struggles flowed through the convention deliberations.

There is a unique input-output relationship between a convention of the Communist Party and the mass movements. Through the pre-convention discussion and deliberations, delegates gather the experiences of the struggles, and the convention examines them with the help of the science of Marxism-Leninism, draws lessons and then passes them back to the mass movements. The delegates represent a cross section of the trade union movement. They work in mass

industrial unions as well as in craft unions. The majority of the trade union delegates are rank-and-file activists from the basic industries—steel, auto, mining, machine building, etc. The convention delegates represent the most uncompromising, persistent and able fighters against racism, and there is no question but that the Communist Party convention is the most youthful, both in composition and outlook, of any organization on the Left.

The policies, tactics, assessments and the theoretical premises are all clearly stated in the reports and resolutions of the convention. They are available to all Communists and to the public. If you want to know what the 21st National Convention of the Communist Party is all about, just send a letter or postcard to CPUSA, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010, and ask for the “Convention materials.” They are historic documents. They give a new assessment of the present moment. They give a clear lead to the struggles ahead.

But there was much more to the convention than the reports and resolutions. It is difficult to convey or to transmit that which is not explicitly manifest in these documents.

To say the convention adopted main reports and resolutions unanimously does not fully convey the spirit and the depth of the unity. The unity in the convention was a reflection of the unity in the Party. It is not a formal unity. It is a unity based on principles. Such unity is possible only when problems and thoughts are dealt with on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. Such unity on all basic questions is the fruit of approaching all problems from the viewpoint of the working class and the class struggle. The unity was not something imposed on the convention. Rather it flowed from the democratic process of probing and discussing.

It is difficult to transmit the spirit and enthusiasm that engulfed every minute of the convention and crested at the mass Bicentennial Rally of 6,000 people. The enthusiasm was very real. No one had to work at creating it. There was no need for cheering sections. It was a genuine expression of enthusiastic support for the policies of the Party.

It is difficult to transmit the sense of confidence that manifested itself in every speech and action of the convention. It was an expression of confidence in the Party, the working class and in the people's movements. It is a confidence that comes from the realization that we are a part of the victorious forces propelling the world revolutionary

process. A confidence reflecting the victory of world socialism, the forces of national liberation and the working class the world over.

It is difficult to transmit the seriousness, the dedication, the hard work that goes into the deliberations of a Communist Party convention.

Nor can the reports and resolutions transmit fully the sense of political and ideological growth of every single participant as a result of the convention proceedings. Each delegate left with a deeper understanding of the role of the working class. Because of the convention, there is now a greater understanding of how to fight against racism, a greater sensitivity to its influence in the Party.

The convention molds fighters and leaders for united mass movements. It clears away sectarian hangups and strengthens the struggle against opportunism on all fronts. The delegates left with a deeper understanding of theory and practice. Because of the convention we will all be better at formulating tactics that will get the maximum from all objective developments.

How can we put into words the blending of Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American, Asian-American and white that takes place at a Communist convention? Or the harmonious working together of older experienced cadre with the new and the younger? Or the high level understanding and expression of the equality of women cadre in the Party? The Communist Party convention is a blending of the working class and the professional intellectual.

It is also difficult to describe in words the human element, the beautiful comradeship, the warm friendship, the deep human concerns that are present every minute of the convention.

A convention of the Communist Party is a meaningful political experience, but it is also a deep cultural and emotional experience.

In spite of the refusal of the U.S. State Department to grant visas for some 200 foreign guests, including leading scientists, international leaders of trade unions, members of parliaments and leaders in every field of endeavor, the internationalism expressed at a special evening celebration was one of the high points of the convention. The delegates from our fraternal parties of Canada and Puerto Rico made a significant contribution to the 21st Convention of our Party.

Exactly how history-making the proceedings of the 21st Convention were will be determined by life struggles.

August 2, 1975

For a World Conference of Communist And Workers' Parties

I have received a number of letters relating to the next World Conference of Workers and Communist parties. They ask questions such as: "When is the next world conference?" "What are the problems in calling such a conference?" "Why do they take place so seldom?" "The last conference was held six years ago in 1969—why is the next one postponed until some time in 1976?"

First, as to our Party's position. We have for some time been of the opinion that there is a need for a world conference now. We believe such an exchange of opinions and assessments would benefit the struggles and movements in the United States. We think that most parties in the world have the same opinion. But there are some who are for a conference, but who want to postpone it.

We have favored a new world conference for a number of years. But now the sharpening crisis of world capitalism has added an element of urgency for calling it. But the way it looks now is that there will be some regional conferences, including a conference of European Communist parties, some time in 1975, and then the world conference will take place some time in 1976. These are not fixed dates, and may still be changed.

The U.S. mass media keep repeating the falsehood that the obstacle to holding a world meeting of Communist parties is that some parties want to "read the Communist Party of China out of the world Communist movement and some parties do not." That of course is poppycock. At a world conference the delegates of each party would express their attitudes towards Maoist policies, as they would on any other question. If some parties choose not to discuss these problems, that is their autonomous decision. It is their business. There is no "reading" of any party out because there is no organized world structure to read anyone out of.

Our Party has for years taken a critical position on Maoism. Some time before it was discussed in a world meeting we stated that it was a political and ideological concept based on narrow nationalism and opportunism. Since then it has become opportunism on the level of class betrayal. Scurrilous Maoist attacks on policies of detente, their villainous, hateful anti-Soviet hysteria, the actions of the Maoists in relation to Bangladesh, Chile, South Africa, their defense of NATO, are openly and clearly policies based on opportunist capitulation and accommodation to the pressures of imperialism. They serve imperialism in general, but in the first place U.S. imperialism. We said so at past world conferences and we will continue to express our thoughts on this matter, including at the coming world conference.

We speak about these matters not only to condemn betrayal. We speak about them because Maoism has the appearance of being radical, revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist and is therefore misleading and confusing. It destroys potentially revolutionary cadre. It is obvious why the Maoists do not want a world conference. That they do not want a discussion or an airing of these policies at a world conference only emphasizes why they should be discussed.

It has been our Party's position for some time, and it is our position now, that there should not be a continuous postponement of the world conference. It is our opinion that there is an urgent need for the world's Communist parties to take a collective look at the new world situation. There is a new stage in the general crisis of world capitalism. Since the last conference U.S. imperialism has had to withdraw its open, direct military forces from Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. The colonial empire of Portugal has come apart. Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Angola are not only on the way to independence, but they are qualitatively changing the relationship of forces against imperialism in Africa. The military fascist junta of Greece has been toppled. And there are the lessons of the counter-revolutionary coup in Chile that should be studied and assessed. How to fully harness the power inherent in the new objective situation which is created by the new stage of the general crisis of world capitalism is of the greatest importance for the forces of the world revolutionary process.

Since the last gathering detente has become a household word. The struggle for detente has itself become a force in further changing the balance of world forces. U.S. imperialism has had to retreat from its cold war bunkers, to accept and, in some cases, to maneuver with

detente. West German imperialism has been forced to deal with the realities and the borders of Poland, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic (GDR). The anti-imperialist forces in the Mid-east have made significant gains.

The whole world movement, it seems to us, would be strengthened by a collective examination of the nature and influences of opportunism as it emerges at the present level of the world struggle.

And even if there were not these other questions, we feel that the present economic crisis that is affecting every capitalist country is reason enough to convene a world conference of Communist parties. There is a need for a deeper study of this unique crisis of overproduction and inflation as it is related to the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism. There is a need to examine the new balance of forces between the developing countries that possess the raw materials and the industrial countries that import them.

Now it is true that each party views the calling of such a conference from its own political point of reference. And it is also true that the conference may not have the same meaning for all parties. Some parties are obviously for postponing the conference for understandable tactical reasons related to domestic developments. But from this distance it does seem that some parties are for postponing the conference because they are in fact for not having it at all. Bourgeois propaganda has always made a big point about the communist movement being "a world phenomenon" and because it is "a world phenomenon the conference is in contradiction to the national interests of the working class," and the "peoples of specific nations." They keep repeating the slander that the Communist parties are either a "world conspiracy" or a "foreign agency." They have always used this as the basis for an appeal to the nationalistic and patriotic sentiments of people. It is opportunism to accommodate to this slander or to capitulate to this attack of the enemy. The working class is a global phenomenon. The class struggle is a worldwide struggle. To capitulate to the enemy pressure is to open the doors to opportunism, to nationalism and to the destruction or the weakening of the concept of working-class internationalism.

A world Communist conference is not an ordinary meeting. The preparations and the meeting are a historic political and ideological process. The preparations are a process of a collective, scientific examination of the ever-changing relationship of world forces. It is an

exchange of experiences in the class struggle. It is an honest and open examination of the weaknesses of the revolutionary movement. It is a process of taking the new developments and experiences, of rechecking and thus further developing the science of Marxism-Leninism.

Marxism-Leninism grows as a result of the cumulative experience of the worldwide working-class movement. The preparations and the world conference strengthen the working-class revolutionary movement in its struggle against the influence of opportunism. There is that old saying: "No man is an island unto himself." In a world where the class struggle is national but also global no party, no revolutionary movement is "an island unto itself."

The persistent resistance to a world conference is itself a reflection of opportunistic influences.

History is not a list of events that can be repeated. But it is a source for ideas, for approaches, for comparisons. The world Communist movement has come a long way since the First Congress of the Communist International. Looking back, it is of some interest that under Lenin's leadership a Second Congress of the Communist International was called 13 months after the first, and the Third Congress followed after a short period.

They were called because there were significant, fast-moving developments. There is no organization like the Communist International now. There is no need for annual conferences. But there is a need for a world conference now. This is a movement of exceptionally significant fast-moving events. It is because of this and other considerations that our Party has been, and is now, for the calling of a world conference as soon as it is possible.

The opinions of all parties must be taken into consideration. But one or two parties should not use a veto influence when the great majority of parties are for such a conference.

There have been enormous changes in the world since the days of the Communist International. Based on experience there is no need for an organization like the Communist International at the present moment. It is necessary to conclude that while there is no need for such an organization, there is the need for global exchanges, for collective assessment, the drawing of theoretical conclusions, and there is a need for more coordination, unity and global initiatives.

And is it not also correct to conclude that at this stage of developments it is necessary and possible to hold world conferences of those

parties that are ready to send delegates? Is it not a correct conclusion to say that at this stage of developments it is not necessary to wait until all of the parties agree to a world gathering? It would, of course, be good and beneficial if all parties would agree to send delegations. But until that is possible it seems to me the positives greatly outweigh the negatives in holding world conferences representing the parties that think such conferences are important. Whether or not a particular party takes part in a world conference is, of course, that party's prerogative. But, in turn, it is the prerogative of the parties that are for a world conference to hold just that.

Our Party is for deepening the ties of proletarian internationalism, including through the medium of world conferences.

December 14, 1974

Not How Independent But How Communist

Recently I received a letter in which the writer requested that I respond to the following question:

“I am curious about the stories I’ve been reading in the press about some leaders of some Communist parties in Europe who make critical remarks about the socialist countries.

“I would like to know why I haven’t seen or heard of any such remarks made by you or other leaders of the CPUSA?”

The question is a fair one. But first, let’s be certain that we are considering the same question.

Criticisms of weaknesses or discussions of differences with the leaders of parties in the socialist countries or between parties in general is one thing. However, slander, distortions and falsehoods are a completely different matter.

What you read in *The New York Times* and the mass media about socialism is mostly slander and distortion.

When it comes to reporting about the socialist countries, *The New York Times* has become the most unobjective, untruthful and unscrupulous paper in the world. Its code of journalism is the use of the big lie. Its anti-Sovietism borders on insanity.

We will not join in or in any way contribute to their campaign of slander and distortion against the socialist countries for many reasons, the most basic of which is that we stick to truth and honesty. When one makes truthful and honest statements about socialism or the socialist countries, they will not be printed in *The New York Times*. You will not hear them on national television. We do not participate in the anti-Soviet campaign because its primary purpose is to slander and vilify socialism. Its aim is to convince our people of a basic falsehood that socialism is inherently anti-democratic, anti-human, bureaucratic, dictatorial, war-like and aggressive and that it is not a workable and realistic alternative to capitalism.

Therefore, what sense would it make for us to advocate and tell the truth about socialism while at the same time joining the forces of big business in spreading falsehoods and distortions about the socialist system and life in a socialist society? Truth is on the side of socialism.

Most people do not believe what the open spokesmen of capitalism write. That is why the mass media has set up a huge, widespread network to dredge up every possible remark by partisans of socialism they can use, quote out of context or distort.

Unfortunately there are some Communists in some parties who lend themselves to this slander campaign. The most obvious and clear examples of this are the statements of Santiago Carrillo of the Communist Party of Spain. For some years Comrade Carrillo has been a source of anti-Soviet slanders. *The New York Times* has featured them regularly. The Soviet Union, true to its principle of proletarian internationalism and its determination not to add to the difficulties of the Communists and other anti-fascists in Franco Spain, refrained from responding to his statements. Now, however, Carrillo has compiled all his false and slanderous theories and concepts in a recently published book. *New Times*, a Soviet magazine, took issue with the anti-Soviet slanders in this book. The book includes the basic slander that the Soviet Union is not building socialism. How could the Soviet Union remain silent about such slander?

As was to be expected, *The New York Times*, with Carrillo's help, used the statements in *New Times* to create a new falsehood: "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is in an open attack on the Communist Party of Spain," and "The CPSU is going to split the Communist Party of Spain," and "The CPSU is out to excommunicate Carrillo," etc., etc.

This is big lie journalism. And the story does not end there. The Soviet press stated that such statements are not true, that the *New Times* article was not an attack on the Communist Party of Spain. *The New York Times*, true to its big lie code, used this to build on its *Big Lie*. They said, "It is a tactical retreat." This then provided the opening for *The New York Times* editorial writers to extract simple sentences from statements by other Communist leaders and use them as "proof" that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was forced into a "tactical retreat," statements such as, "the existence of a leading center in the Communist movement is excluded," or "that each Communist Party develops its own policies based on the specific realities of their own countries."

They use these quotes to give the impression that there is a struggle over these concepts between the Communist parties. In reality, such questions were settled when the Communist International was dissolved. The concept that there is no world Communist center was introduced by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union some 30 years ago. There are no disagreements about Communists participating in electoral coalitions. There are no differences about seeking a peaceful path to socialism. Kissinger, in his continuing campaign of anti-communism, in a recent speech quoted world Communist leaders as saying the same thing for over 30 years.

The New York Times has carried pages and pages of anti-Soviet slander falsely using the *New Times* article, but it has not reprinted or even quoted from the article that took issue with Carrillo's slander. That is also in keeping with big lie journalism.

It is the capitalist ideologues and big lie journalists who are trying to cause division among Communist parties, and who are attempting to create fissures in the world Communist movement, on issues where there are no differences. We are not about to contribute in any way to such efforts.

Why do some, like Carrillo and the Maoist group in the leadership of the Communist Party of China, join with the propagandists of

imperialism to slander the very socio-economic system they advocate? The Trotskyite sects the world over have followed such a pattern of ideological schizophrenia for some 60 years. They say they are for "socialism" but they deny its existence and are against it wherever it is a reality.

This is a form of fakery. The sharp edge of anti-communism is against the countries where socialism is a reality. So they try to bypass the sharp edge by opportunistically going around it. It is accommodation. It is an attempt to gain popularity on a false premise. It is a form of fakery because most opportunists know they are using slander and falsehoods.

Some view this opportunistic path as a short cut, a detour, around difficult questions of the class struggle. But there is a compelling inner logic to opportunism.

The forces of capitalism use each concession to press for additional concessions.

At a recently held conference on "Eurocommunism" sponsored by the Hoover Institute and the CIA, Kissinger placed the basic position of imperialism: "For the key issue is not how 'independent' the European Communists would be, but how Communist." That is an admission that as far as imperialism is concerned the issue is not independence.

Every so often some differences between Communist parties do emerge on some assessments and tactics. There are two ways of approaching such problems: one is to discuss and debate them out. The aim of partisans of the working class and socialism is to correct weaknesses and to unify. Such discussions go on most of the time. The other is to "use" such differences to "prove" the "independence" of one's party. Such an approach is used by the enemies of the working class and socialism for the purposes of slander and distortion.

We are not going to bend or distort basic truths to prove anything. The partisans of socialism don't have to because all the objective processes are on the side of social progress—on the side of our class, on the side of socialism.

The defenders of capitalism have no choice. The only way they can defend a reactionary, decaying, anti-human system is with falsehoods, with the big lie. The big lie journalism, the hysteria of *The New York Times*, is but a reflection of the decay of the socio-economic system they defend.

You say you "are curious" why the great majority of Communist parties and leaders of the world do not join in slandering socialism. What is "curious" is that a few do.

July 30, 1977

The Papers That Get Under The Boss's Skin

The *Daily World*, *People's World*, and their weekly supplement, *World Magazine*, are newspapers your boss does not want you to read. He will not say you should not read them because "they always take the side of the working class." Instead he will say, "They are Commie sheets."

The real truth is that these newspapers get under the boss's skin because they expose what goes on behind the doors of the corporate front office.

The boss also tells you these papers are partisan. And, for once in his life, he is right. Yes, they are partisans of the working class. They take the worker's side from the smallest grievance in the mill to fighting for lower rents, taxes, lower prices for food, clothing and all the necessities of life. They are advocates of workers' politics.

The basic difference between these working-class newspapers and the other daily newspapers is that the *Daily World* and *People's World* are partisans of the working people and honestly say so. In fact, they are proud of it and boast about it. The other newspapers are partisans of the bosses, the corporations and the capitalist economic system. But they work overtime trying to cover up their partisanship.

It is true that all newspapers are partisan. There are no neutral ones. They all have a class viewpoint. All newspapers approach every aspect of life from either the working-class viewpoint or the capitalist class

viewpoint. Their thinking, and therefore their writing, is a reflection of the class they represent or are a part of.

The *Daily World* and the *People's World* approach and deal with all aspects of life, all questions, from a worker's viewpoint. While the other daily newspapers take the side of the corporations and the corporate bosses. The editorials as well as the articles in all newspapers are written from the self-interest viewpoint of the class they represent.

But, there is a fundamental difference in how each of these papers present their viewpoints. It is an undeniable fact that anyone who defends the policies, practices and actions of the big corporations, or the capitalist system in general, must of necessity lie and/ or distort the facts.

How then can a writer for the capitalist press truthfully report on or write about production speedup, about the constant pressures to cut wages, about the high taxes that workers have to pay and the declining taxes that the rich pay? How can these writers honestly report on corporate efforts to bypass safety regulations in the mines, mills and factories? Could one of these writers openly condemn and tell the truth about racism and the racist and discriminatory practices pursued by the corporations? How can these writers honestly write about all these issues knowing that the policies and practices of exploitation, racism and all the anti-labor activities engaged in by the corporations are the very source from which a few rich plutocrats become even richer?

Just as one could not honestly defend highway robbery, one cannot honestly defend capitalism, because in essence capitalism is robbery.

In the daily corporate press everything—articles, editorials, headlines, feature stories, columns, etc.—is slanted and distorted in favor of the boss. Through the practice of outright lying, omissions, subtle and not-so-subtle hints, the overall impression they present to the people is that the corporations and the rich have an inherent right to their huge private profits and the workers are born to be wage slaves.

For example, when have you ever read an article in the daily corporate press that said (or even implied) that “speedup in the factory is wrong, unfair, unhealthy,” or that “the corporations have no right to lay off workers who have labored in the same mills most of their lives,” or that “the wages of working people are too low, especially under the present conditions of constantly increasing prices, rent,

food, clothing, etc.” The answer, of course, is—never! What you read is just the opposite. Through the practices of slanting the news, distortion and outright lies they write their news stories, columns and editorials, working day-in and day-out to brainwash, confuse and divert the public into accepting the idea that what the corporations do is right; what they say about the capitalist system is correct and always the truth.

In relation to this, a social scientist at Harvard University recently conducted a detailed, scientific 30-year study on how *The New York Times* deals with the socialist countries. The results of this 30-year study were: 87 percent of all the articles written and published about the Soviet Union were total falsehoods, based on pure invention and that in the remaining 13 percent the facts were, to one extent or another, distorted—that is, pure fiction and brainwashing.

The New York Times defends and covers up for capitalism by lying about socialism.

Most of the daily newspapers do not come out into the open, but instead use a liberal cover for their defense of the corporations. This fraud is exposed when the workers go on strike. Then these newspapers become defenders of the “public interest.” They claim it is always the workers who should make the concessions and end the strike in the so-called “public interest.” In such papers you will never read an article that states: “Corporations should make concessions so that the strike can be ended.”

Truth is not required of a writer for the corporate-controlled press. In fact it is not permitted. Truth would expose the lies and the corporate thievery.

Under capitalism workers are at a disadvantage. Management holds the prerogative of laying workers off (whenever it is advantageous to them), determining the speed of production, setting and raising prices, freezing wages and the power to make a decision as to whether a plant, mill or mine will remain open or close down. The corporations control and therefore have the full support of the daily press, radio and TV. They dominate the two old political parties. Most of the elected public officials are in their vest pockets. The press and politicians are programmed to work for corporate interests.

But the situation in which the working class finds itself is not irreversible. Workers inherently have the power to turn the tables on corporate power. In order to be in a position to unleash this power,

however, the workers need strong, militant, rank-and-file-based trade unions. The *Daily World*, *World Magazine* and *People's World* support such unions.

Workers also need a political electoral arm, including an independent, anti-monopoly people's party based on labor. These working-class papers support the building of such a political party.

The working class needs a voice, their own voice, one that is in their corner at all times, on every issue. The *Daily World*, *World Magazine* and *People's World* are the voices of the people. They think and write in order to provide answers to questions and solutions to problems as partisans of the working class. They defend the rights of workers. They unmask, strip the coverup of the corporate press and their owners, the capitalist class, as the enemies of the working class. They expose the inner workings of the corporate profit system which exploits and lies to the working people.

These "voices of the people," the *Daily World*, *World Magazine* and *People's World*, are the watchmen for all workers; they guard the interests of the whole working class and all the people.

When reading these papers you do not have to read between the lines to attempt to discover the truth. Every line tells you exactly like it is from your viewpoint, the viewpoint of the working class.

Truth is on the side of the workers. Therefore, telling the truth, the real facts, is essential to the *Daily World*, *World Magazine*, and *People's World*. It is inherent in the very purpose for which they exist.

These working-class newspapers are based on some very basic and fundamental truths:

- Workers have never won a settlement of one grievance or won a labor contract without a strike or the threat of a strike.
- The corporations have no inherent or legal rights to exploit workers in order to enrich a few already enormously wealthy families.
- Working-class unity, Black-white unity, is an absolute necessity.
- Racism is a tool of monopoly capital. It is a weapon, an ideology, used by monopoly capital to divide the ranks of the working class in order to expand, extend and continue the system of private profits. Racism is an enemy, a deadly disease spread by the class enemy, in order to retard the unity of the working class.
- Socialism, the absolute opposite of capitalism, is a socio-economic system geared to the needs of the workers and all the people whose self-interests are always on the top of the list of priorities and values. It

is not only the solution to the growing problems of U.S. workers; it is the best of all solutions to the deepening crisis of everyday living of the working class in every capitalist country.

Therefore, these partisans of the working class and socialism, the *Daily World*, *People's World* and *World Magazine*—the people's press—are devoted to the interests of the working class not only to expose the system of capitalist exploitation, but to point the way out—socialism. Daily they provide the answers to questions, how to fight on all issues of vital interest to workers and they propose solutions which will solve the problems of all working people, today and for the future.

You cannot afford to read only newspapers that are in your boss' corner; that support only your boss' viewpoint.

Read and support the *Daily World*, *World Magazine* and *People's World*. They are in your working-class corner. They support and fight for your self-interests, your viewpoint.

And, there are several other very special reasons why you should read these papers, now.

We are beginning a new year—a presidential election year. New contracts will be coming up for negotiation for five million workers, including auto workers, rubber workers, truckers, etc.

This will also be a year of elections for leadership in a number of unions. In order to be knowledgeable and on the inside of these developments in the working-class movement, it is necessary and vital to your interests to read the only newspapers that will truthfully discuss these developments from the viewpoint of the working class.

January 10, 1976

NBC's Rockefeller-Bred Peacock

On record, I want to protest and issue a challenge to the National Broadcasting Corporation executives, the writers and reporters responsible for the January 15, 1978, program, "Kissinger on Record."

You, of NBC, are guilty of presenting as "news" 90 minutes of the most vulgar and blatant falsehoods in the history of TV. Your cold war extravaganza was a criminal act against the people of the United States and the world.

Your program violated the most elementary standards of decency and honesty. You gathered up the putrid slime and filth from the bottom of the ideological sewers—the decaying garbage left there by the reactionary scourges of society—the Goebbels', Hitlers and Mus-solinis.

It was 90 minutes of irresponsible diatribe, and a criminal violation of a public trust. Each and every word—every sentence—was a distortion and a falsehood. The very premise of the program was based on the Hitlerian big lie concept that if the falsehoods are big enough and repeated often enough some of the people will believe some of the lies.

For 90 minutes Kissinger, the venom-tongued, ideological marionette of monopoly capitalism, spewed forth one falsehood after another. And sandwiched between Kissinger's lies was the filth written for the NBC barroom newscaster.

In the main, it was a cold war, big lie harangue against the Communist Parties of Italy, France, Portugal and Spain. And it was a slander against the millions of voters in Europe who cast their votes for the candidates of the Communist Parties.

But it was also a nazi-like, lying attack against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of Europe.

Your program was based on the McCarthyite premise that anything, even the most vulgar falsehood, is permissible, as long as it is directed against Communists.

An example of the gutter-level of the program was the obvious forgery in the treatment of Alvaro Cunhal, the general secretary of the Communist Party of Portugal. While showing Cunhal's face, you presented a man's voice reading a forged statement—a statement which Cunhal had publicly repudiated over two years ago as a total falsehood.

And, of course, in stating that Cunhal lived in Czechoslovakia you deliberately left out the fact that he lived and worked most of the fascist years, including over 13 years in prison, in Portugal.

Kissinger's slander against the Communist Party of France was also based on a total falsehood. He worked hard to create the impression that the Communists of France are interested in alliances only when they can dominate them.

The basic big lie premise for Kissinger's slander was that the Communist Parties of Europe are some kind of unstated, foreign-instigated threat to the people of their countries. It was a pitiful attempt to resurrect the old foreign agent slander.

The program scraped the very bottom of the big lie barrel with Kissinger's slimy attempt to connect the acts of terror and the terrorists to "some Communist source." When slander is based on the big lie there is not even the attempt at presenting any proof for any of the slanders. Of course, Kissinger's performance is proof again that the big lie is the only defense one can give for capitalism.

What bugs the cold warriors is why one out of three voters in Italy, one out of five in France, and one out of six in Portugal vote for Communist candidates.

The NBC-Kissinger fraud was an attempt to get around the basic truth that tens of millions vote for Communist candidates because capitalism, and the political parties that support capitalism, are in a crisis and in bankruptcy, the undeniable truth that the Communist Parties are the best fighters for the interests of the people, and that socialism presents the best of all solutions to the crisis.

One of the reasons the Communist Parties are not acceptable to Kissinger is that "they have never supported positions of the United States, especially when the positions are in opposition to those taken by the Soviet Union." Of course the NBC imperialist pitchman did not mention specifics, or the reasons why the Communist Parties do not support U.S. positions. If he had he would have been forced to cite such examples as Chile and the U.S. support for the butcher, Pi-

nochet; Angola, and the U.S. support first for Portugal's fascist, racist colonial rule, and second, the U.S. support for the imperialist, South African-led intervention against the government of national liberation in Angola. He would have had to cite the U.S. support for the racist regimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa, and the U.S. position of openly denying human rights to the people of Palestine. It sticks in Kissinger's imperialist craw that people around the world support the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union.

Statements such as "For 30 years liberty around the world has depended on the USA," and that "socialist societies are failures," are self-serving whistles in the imperialist graveyard.

It was fitting for the NBC-Rockefeller bred-and-fed peacock to defend the concepts of nuclear attack and the use of the neutron bomb.

What to do about your criminal, irresponsible 90-minute cold war extravaganza is a serious question. To appeal to you for equal time in the name of truth and justice would be an exercise in futility. You obviously do not operate on such a premise.

It is also clear you do not operate on the basis of social responsibility. So it is useless to appeal to your social conscience.

There is one positive development that your irresponsible actions will contribute to. And that is the growing public sentiment that TV as a public mass medium is too important to be left in the hands and control of a handful of ideological hoodlums. Your actions add additional evidence to this truth.

Kissinger tried to slander socialism and the Communist Parties by asking: why do people of "civilized nations" vote for Communist candidates? A more proper question is: How can the people of the United States continue to permit such irresponsible war-and-hatemongering programs, based on the big lie, to be passed off as "NBC news"?

February 11, 1978

The Ideological War

We live in a world of fierce ideological struggle—a struggle being carried out on many different levels, in many different forms and on a worldwide scale.

The mass media, the universities, the book publishers, all try to hide the fact that they are engaged in an ideological struggle. To hear them tell it they are simple “seekers after truth.” The universities claim they are dedicated to “objective scholarship.” The publishers claim their books do not reflect an underlying ideology, that they simply express “the rich variety that exists in a pluralistic society.”

But this is all high-sounding bunk, put out because it serves the purposes of those who put it out. What’s the alternative for them? To admit they are defenders of monopoly capitalism. It is not possible to openly defend a system of exploitation and racism. How is it possible to honestly defend a socio-economic system that pays to destroy crops when there are millions living in poverty, a system that deliberately creates shortages so the banks and corporations can use such shortages to raise prices? How is it possible to defend a system that is inherently based on injustice, inequality and repression?

Because it is impossible to honestly defend such a system, monopoly capital uses falsehoods, slander and deception as weapons in the ideological war. Despite the big lie about “all the news that’s fit to print,” the mass media deliberately withholds news. They admit, for example, that in 1961 they had hard news that U.S.-trained and supported mercenaries were about to invade Cuba at the Bay of Pigs. The mass media didn’t publish this news because it was afraid that publication would jeopardize the success of the operation. So they acted like a U.S. military censor.

This is one of the more blatant examples of how the mass media withholds and distorts news daily. Millions of columns went out, but

could one learn before the Shah of Iran was toppled that he was a bloody dictator, whose CIA-trained secret police, the SAVAK, was guilty of murdering and torturing tens of thousands of people? This was common knowledge in Iran. But it never got into the mass media. It is a conspiracy. When the word goes out the thousands of news outlets all clam up.

Similar points hold for the universities and the book publishers. How many true Marxist-Leninists are allowed to teach at American universities? How many books giving the Communist view of things are published by establishment publishing houses?

The media, the universities and the publishers are no more impartial than the police or the courts. Ask strikers, ask the Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican people whether the police and the courts are impartial. The media, the schools and universities and the publishers are no different. They are part of the same system by which monopoly capitalism maintains its domination and control.

We live in a society of class struggle, and one of the crucial weapons in this struggle is ideas. We live at a time when a world revolutionary process is underway. The ideological struggle is taking place along all major lines of the contradiction that feeds this process. There is ideological struggle between capital and labor, between imperialism and the forces of national liberation, and between capitalism and socialism.

Anti-Working-Class Ideology

The ideological machinery of capitalism grinds out propaganda against labor in an endless stream, like a sausage machine turns out frankfurters.

We are suffering from inflation. The media don't apply their talents to showing what this inflation—the soaring prices of hamburger meat, heating oil, gasoline, rent and medical care—means to working people. No. What they do is spew out the false idea that labor, through wage increases, is responsible for the inflation and that in the interests of both itself and the country it must show “restraint.”

There is a coal strike. The media don't write about such things as deaths and accidents in the mines, how the miners live, what they are striking for. No. What they try to do is scare us with stories of how many people will be laid off as a result, and how the miners “put their own selfish interests ahead of the country as a whole.”

There is a subway strike in New York. Scare the people with the threat of fare increases and cuts in service.

The media are extremely skillful in the job they do on labor. They work with time-tested strategies, well-honed techniques. They work to divide the working class, to cause strikers to lose public support. They play on fears—fear of inflation, being laid off, increased fares, the effects of rotting garbage in the streets, shortages, etc.

It's the same story when it comes to the struggle between imperialism and the forces of national liberation. You can read the newspapers or listen to radio and TV news for years without being given the faintest inkling of how the U.S. multinational corporations are exploiting the underdeveloped countries. Everybody in Santo Domingo, for example, knows about the role there of the conglomerate, Gulf & Western. But the people of the United States are not told about it. Nor can you learn from the U.S. media how many U.S.-supported, often U.S.-created, fascist regimes there are in the world—in Indonesia, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Chile, etc.

The media technique is simple. When a revolution occurs and people show themselves to be anti-imperialist, don't tell this to the people of the U.S. Tell them that the people in revolutionary struggle are anti-American for some inexplicable reason, or out of sheer jealousy. Don't tell them that what the Iranian people wanted to get rid of was Exxon, the Pentagon and the CIA. Just show TV shots of U.S. families leaving Iran without telling the audience whom they worked for. Stress exactly those things the CIA is working on in the interests of U.S. imperialism.

Monopoly capitalism reserves its best talents and greatest efforts for the ideological war against socialism, above all against the Soviet Union. There are many sides to this war. One is to simply ignore the achievements of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union now out-produces the U.S. in many items—steel, oil, cement, mineral fertilizers, tractors, apartments and houses. Don't tell this to U.S. readers and listeners. Tell them about difficulties in transport.

The U.S. media are full-fledged collaborators with the State Department and the CIA in the carefully planned and executed so-called "human rights" slander campaign against the Soviet Union. The right to a job, to education, to health and medical care, to decent housing, to a secure old age—and these rights, which are absent in the United States and are guaranteed in the Soviet Union, are ignored. Instead,

U.S. reporters, almost without bothering to hide the fact that they are moonlighting for the CIA, work to help create "dissidents" by offering publicity and a platform in the West.

The racists in the Carter administration, many of whom belonged to or attended clubs in Georgia to which Blacks and Jews were not admitted, suddenly pretend to become concerned about the rights of Jews in the Soviet Union. And the U.S. media obediently help them carry out their hypocritical campaign.

The U.S. media help the Pentagon spread the myth that there is a military threat from the Soviet Union. The repeated statements and proposals by Soviet President Brezhnev demonstrating that it is Soviet policy not to seek military superiority over the U.S., only equality, goes carefully unmentioned in the media. Instead, they spread scare stories about a supposed Soviet arms buildup. The truth is that the arms race was started and is kept up by the United States, that all but one or two of the new weapons of mass destruction were first developed by the United States, forcing the Soviet Union to develop them also, so as to be able to defend itself.

Despite all the effort and skill they are putting into the ideological war the capitalists are steadily losing ground. This is inevitable. The capitalist propagandists are defending an irrational, unjust and out-moded system. And they can't do this except by lies. Part of the world revolutionary process consists in the exposure of these lies. U.S. workers are fighting back against the monopoly and government offensive disregarding the lie about the workers being responsible for inflation.

The anti-imperialist consciousness of broad sectors of the American people, which developed during the Vietnam War, is still growing. Americans are learning more and more about the support given by U.S. imperialism to racists in Zimbabwe and South Africa, to bloody dictatorships in many other countries.

And with each passing year, as the Soviet economy grows and Soviet society develops, it becomes more and more difficult for the ideological warriors of imperialism to palm off their lies about the Soviet Union. The truth is emerging. Next year, for example, the Olympics will be held in Moscow and hundreds of thousands of people will be seeing the building of socialism for themselves.

June 7, 1979

Portugal CP Is on Solid Ground

The mass media's political newscasters are at their usual game of shooting clay pigeons. For weeks, they have sent up stories about a "Communist take-over in Portugal." And now that the elections are over, the same news pundits proclaim: "The Communists have suffered serious defeats."

The Communist Party of Portugal was always much more realistic about its electoral support.

Political developments never take place in a vacuum. Therefore, there are a number of factors that must be taken into consideration in any serious assessment of the elections in Portugal.

The fact is that 60 percent of the voting population voted for parties who are advocating socialism. The CP of Portugal was and remains a leading force in a United Front committed to democracy and advance to socialism.

This was the first election in almost 50 years in which ideas and programs were presented and debated publicly.

The past 50 years have been 50 years of active anti-communism. Anti-communism and racism have been the main ideological ingredients force-fed to the people by the fascist forces of Portugal.

The Communist Party of Portugal has been and is the most open consistent and vocal advocate of the ending of Portugal's racist, colonial oppression of the people of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau.

Anti-communism has been the main "spiritual" position actively pushed for 50 years by the hierarchy of the Catholic Church of Portugal. The Catholic Church is the dominant and officially accepted church in the country. Its anti-communism has paralleled open support for the murderous, fascist rule at home and the racist oppression in Africa. The top hierarchy of the Catholic Church continued its anti-communism in these elections.

In assessing the election results one must keep in mind that, for the

first time in 50 years, the Communist Party of Portugal has been able to answer publicly and expose the fraudulent nature of anti-communism. The poisonous ideological results of 50 years of reaction cannot be destroyed in a matter of few months.

Under these circumstances the 12.5 percent who voted for the Communist candidates reflects a good beginning. As the ideological fog that has engulfed the people of Portugal for 50 years lifts, the voting patterns will accordingly continue to change.

The Communist Party of Portugal is on solid ground. In a few months it has emerged as a leading revolutionary force in the country.

Let the mass-media pundits send up clay pigeons and shoot them down. As in nature, the life span of clay pigeons is very short.

April 29, 1975

On Violent Overthrow

Q: Do Communists believe in violent overthrow of the U.S. government?

J.A.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

A: Anyone who advocates violence or believes in violence for the sake of violence, is not serious about winning reforms or revolutionary changes. Advocacy of "violent" is counter-productive. Therefore, we Communists will seek the most peaceful, least painful path of transition to socialism.

If the transition could be as smooth and uneventful as was the change-over from the Ford to the Carter administration it would be

great. That, however, would be wishful thinking. The change of administrations in Washington is nothing more than an exchange of big business controlled political teams. It's the "ins" and "outs" within a monopoly controlled government. It is not a challenge to the dictatorship of monopoly capital. Ford or Carter may be in the White House, but the Rockefellers, Morgans, DuPonts, Mellons, Gettys and Hearsts continue to rule the roost.

The transition to socialism is a totally different matter. In that event, the class of monopoly capital, the banks and big business corporations, lose their economic, political and military power. Their property becomes people's property. Monopoly capital loses its political power as a class, and the working class becomes the most influential political force. That is a revolutionary transition, from capitalist class rule to working-class rule.

Can such a basic transition be peaceful? More specifically: When the majority of our people have arrived at a point at which they can no longer find solutions to their problems within capitalism, and want socialism, will big business give up its privileged position peacefully? That is the real question. And there is no simple yes or no answer.

The words "violent," or "peaceful," when placed in the context of such a basic upheaval as the transition to socialism, are relative terms, of how peaceful or how violent.

Just as it takes "two to tango," there are two sides and two basic classes involved in transition to socialism.

We can state with absolute certainty only what the attitude of one side will be—the working class. Workers will come to see that the transition to socialism is a necessity. Therefore, we will advocate and fight for socialism. We will take affirmative action to help bring this transition about—as peacefully as possible.

We cannot say what the monopoly corporations or the government they control will do under such circumstances. We can only make estimates based on what the capitalist class has done in the past. The history of U.S. capitalism is a history of class and race violence. Vietnam, Hiroshima, San Juan, the Philippines, Ludlow, Attica, Alabama, Haymarket Square, the Little Steel Strike are bloody chapters in the history of U.S. capitalism. Therefore, any revolutionary working-class party that either closes its eyes and says nothing, or even worse, gives the impression that because of the new world balance of forces, which enhances the possibility of a peaceful transi

tion, the capitalist class is going to peacefully surrender to the inevitable, is dealing in dangerous illusions.

Speaking for our Party, we cannot say the revolution will be peaceful. But we will take advantage of every new possibility to make it so.

March 5, 1977

On Socialism and Personal Property

Q: I worked very hard to buy a home. If socialism comes to this country would I lose it? Would it become the property of the state?

S. Jacobson

Los Angeles, Cal.

A: What is good for the people is socialism. Socialism is the most people oriented society in all of history. What is good for the people is the basic guideline to all questions about socialism.

This year the handful of major stockholders and the banks who own General Motors are going to pocket the hog's share of about \$4 or \$5 billion dollars of what is referred to as profits. And the president of G.M. will take almost \$1 million in what is called a salary. Grand larceny is a more accurate description!

This is done by picking the pockets of GM workers. That is not good for the GM workers or the people. What happens in GM is what happens in all of the big industries throughout our country. That is the very essence of capitalism. That is why socialism will turn the GM complex into public property. That is why socialism will transfer all of the privately owned industrial properties, the railroads, bus lines, utilities, mines, TV and radio networks, the banks, telephone and the big agri-businesses into socially owned and operated complexes. Yes, Co-op City will really be owned and operated as a cooperative of the tenants. Socialism will not permit anyone to get rich by exploiting other people.

The propagandists of big business have always tried to frighten people with the falsehood that socialism will take away our homes, our cars and our babies. Socialism will do nothing of the kind. There will be some exceptions, however. For example there are a few mansions around Tarrytown, N.Y., one of which is the Rockefeller's. That will be taken over because it is not in the interests of the people to permit a few to waste all that potential housing space.

The land and the operation of the big agri-corporations will also be turned into state-owned and people-operated agri-complexes. The people who have small farms and lots will continue to operate them as long as they want to.

So, my friends, enjoy your homes and cars. Join in the movement for socialism and be assured you will not have to give these things up, because what is good for the people is socialism.

June 4, 1977

Milestone Toward Communism

[Following is an interview with Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party USA and candidate for president of the United States on the Communist Party ticket, upon his return from Moscow and the historic 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Henry Winston, national chairman, Helen Winter, international affairs secretary, and James Jackson, national education director, were the other members of the CPUSA delegation.

Hall was interviewed by the *World Magazine*.]

Q: *How would you characterize the way that the 25th Congress of the CPSU was treated by the U.S. media?*

A: When the Soviet Union reports big advances in the construction of socialism, the big-business political and ideological establish-

ment brings out the heavy artillery of the big lie. And, as usual, the leading voice of slander and falsehoods is *The New York Times*.

Steady economic growth and political stability in the Soviet Union are turned into a weakness, and the big lie journalists try to take the fact that socialism is a society without crisis and make it appear as proof that socialism is stagnating.

It is understandable why the reports in the U.S. press and television and radio about the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union break all past records in the catalog of lies and falsehoods. *The New York Times* correspondent Christopher Wren wrote: "... of the industrial countries, the Soviet Union has one of the lowest standards of living." The truth is just the opposite.

In my judgment, the 25th Congress marks a point in history when in the USSR the quality of life, including the overall standard of living, is now the highest of any country, including the United States.

In calculating the standard of living, it is necessary to include the fact that no one in the USSR lives below the poverty level—30 million people in the United States do.

In the Soviet Union, rents are about five percent of the wages. In the United States, rents are about 30 percent of the wages.

In the United States tuition fees for higher education keep going up, and colleges and universities are being closed and are reducing their freshman enrollments. In the Soviet Union, education—including college education—is being provided by society.

Take these specific features: The USSR is now going to start giving a one-year maternity leave with pay to mothers. In the USA, we know most mothers face a layoff without pay or even any guarantees about getting their jobs back after giving birth.

We currently have the deepest slump in the construction of housing in 30 years. Slums are expanding, and it is estimated by government sources that eight out of 10 families in the United States are now priced out of the housing market.

In the Soviet Union, the biggest housing construction boom in the history of the world continues at full speed ahead.

In assessing the overall quality of life, one must include the 40 million Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and Native American Indians who are victims of special systems of racist and national oppression. In the Soviet Union, racism is a thing of the past. They are a hundred nationalities, but one people. In such an overall comparison,

the Soviet Union comes out as the winner in the historic competition between the two systems.

Q: What does the 25th Congress represent in terms of the social development of the USSR?

A: The Soviets mark the date of the 25th Congress and use it as a base from which to launch the most meaningful and the largest five-year plan in the history of the Soviet Union. One gets the impression that the Soviets have reached an economic stage where it is not necessary to have the special kind of forced march mobilizations. Instead of that there is a high level of industrial and agricultural growth, of growth in science and culture, in every phase of life. Because of that, one gets a sense of continuous growth. In the next five-year plan, the aim is to take another leap in the standard of living and in the overall quality of life of the Soviet citizen. Thus, the big drive for quality production, increasing labor productivity without the vicious exploitation of workers characteristic of monopoly capital.

And *The New York Times* makes little of the fact that the Soviet Union has now reached first place in a number of key economic considerations. They are first in the production of steel, of pig iron, of oil, of cement, wool fabrics, chemical fertilizers, and just a whole series of things, and in the next five years they will surpass the United States and other countries in other areas.

Q: What importance do you place on the extraordinary news coverage the 25th Congress received all over the world?

A: In a sense, there were two events taking place in Moscow. There was the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but then there were present 103 delegations of foreign parties and many government delegations.

As a matter of fact, outside of the United Nations, it was the biggest gathering of top government officials in the world today. Many of them represented the parties in power. And one of the rather interesting and tremendously new things was the delegations of newly independent countries and their role in the Congress, especially the role of delegations from Africa.

The delegation from Angola was received very warmly. Delegations from countries like Laos, Vietnam, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and

Nigeria, among others—these delegations reflected the progress of the national liberation movements and of socialism, especially in Africa.

This is not to discount the many delegations from countries in Latin America and Asia. In a way, this is a tribute to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its policies, that so many countries and so many parties sent delegations to Moscow.

Some of the press in the U.S. has made remarks to the effect that I announced my candidacy for the presidency of the United States and then left for Moscow. Well, it wasn't quite that way. There's nothing wrong with that. I think it would be good for any president of the U.S. to take part in such a gathering of so many delegations from around the world, and the fact is that any president of the United States will have to deal with this great socialist country, the Soviet Union. Therefore, in a sense I'm on the ground floor in these developments.

Q: How would you describe Leonid Brezhnev's report to the Congress?

A: Leonid Brezhnev's report was divided into two parts, more or less. About a third of the report was on foreign policy developments and assessments of the moment in history and a projection of the foreign policy that the Soviet Union pursues and will pursue.

It is my viewpoint that this section of the report is a challenge to the leaders of all capitalist countries in the first place. And I would say above all it is a challenge to the government and the leaders of the U.S. because no matter how one looks at the world, the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States is a key factor in the preservation of peace.

Brezhnev projected a continuation of the policies of peace starting at the 24th Congress. There are a number of concrete and specific proposals that contained this challenge. Among them is the idea that there should be a world disarmament conference, a conference in which all the countries of the world would take part—a conference that would reverse the present trend toward the buildup of armaments and would start a decline in the manufacture and the use of armaments generally.

Then Brezhnev spoke of SALT II and indicated that the USSR is flexible in these negotiations.

It is clear why Ford, Kissinger and the administration have been

sidetracking these negotiations, blocking them and halting them with the appearance and the testing of the cruise missile by the Army and the Navy, and it is clear that the United States didn't want to proceed with the SALT talks until they had tested this new weapon. So now it is a fact of life and will become a part of the negotiations as far as SALT II is concerned.

Brezhnev presented the idea that the world should move in the general direction where peace would become the normal way of life instead of the tensions and the continued arms race which I think is a great idea that certainly the people of the United States can go for.

Q: What is the effect of the current anti-detente campaign in the United States?

A: Since coming back, I have noted an increase in the campaign against detente and the policies of detente. And one of the central arguments is that it is a one-way street and only the Soviet Union benefits from detente. Frankly I see it in the opposite direction. The United States has gained greater benefits than the Soviet Union, although detente is a mutually beneficial policy.

Take the issue of trade. There's no question that the United States has gotten more in trade than the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union buys and pays for great factories and products of all kinds and the United States buys much less. The balance of trade is greatly in favor of the United States.

Or with science. Once you list the scientific projects and the advances in science in many of the basic areas, the United States has benefited more than the Soviet Union.

Q: What about this question of the development of democratic rights in the capitalist countries as opposed to democracy in the socialist world?

A: As to the question of democracy in the development of the two systems, what is most important is the historic trend in the world. In the socialist countries the trend is for a deeper, broader form of democracy. Socialist democracy is still in the process of being developed. What's important is it's moving in the right direction.

In Congress discussions and in Brezhnev's report, he was critical and he invited everybody in the Soviet Union to use the method of criticism and self-criticism. I heard more criticism of Soviet govern-

ment officials in this Congress than I have heard any place in the world in regard to a country and its leaders.

And if you take the question of the operation of factories, of course that's the base of socialist democracy. In the Soviet factories, the workers have the fundamental say about everything.

In the United States and in capitalist countries, generally, the workers really have nothing to say about what goes on in the factories.

Generally, the direction of democracy is moving backward in the capitalist countries. Starting with the United States, all one has to mention is Senate Bill No. 1 which contains the worst features of all the repressive bills and the racist bills of history. It basically restricts the democratic rights of not only Communists but the entire people—trade unionists, and newspaper people, and the media generally. It's really a step toward an authoritarian type of situation. The same kind of thing is taking place in most of the major capitalist countries.

Q: What is your view of the differences between Communist parties that were discussed at the 25th Congress?

A: Around the Congress there was much talk about differences in the world Communist movement. But we have never tried to hide the fact that there are differences and that very often the differences are tactical. Sometimes these differences go further, and they are based on certain opportunistic considerations.

And as I said at the Congress, the example of where opportunism leads is what has happened to Maoism. At the bottom of the swamp of opportunism is counter-revolution. In the specific areas of Angola and Chile, and in the generally anti-socialist campaign of Maoism, they have reached the point of counter-revolution. The other differences between other parties are largely tactical. For instance the Italian Communist Party is very often used as an example of differences. And there are certain tactical differences. But in the Congress itself there was a special meeting between the Italian delegation, led by comrade Enrico Berlinguer, and comrades Brezhnev, Mikhail Suslov and Boris Ponomarev. It was reported widely.

And what is interesting is that after discussion they signed a joint communique and in the communique there was agreement on all questions that they discussed.

So there are differences, but one should not overstate these differences, because if you take the total 103 delegations that were

present at the 25th Congress I think the thing that stands out is the unity and the continued growth of the world revolutionary movement and the world Communist movement. That, I think, is the outstanding feature of the world situation and it's in that context that there are some differences. And they are being discussed.

There will be a European conference of Communist parties shortly, in my opinion. After that, I'm sure that there will be another world conference of Communist and Workers' parties so that differences and problems can be discussed. The general trend, the irreversible trend, is toward greater unity and broadening of the world revolutionary movement

March 20, 1976

The Tenth Birthday of the YWLL

Each moment has its incidents that are symbols of the times. This moment is no exception.

There was Brzezinski, standing on a rock, a beat-up old rifle in his hand, glowering across the Afghan border.

There was the aging, decrepit Washington lawyer, Clark Clifford, representing no one, declaring in New Delhi: "We will go to war over Pakistan."

There was Rosalynn, on a stump, announcing: "We will draft women," but of course not volunteering herself.

There is the fact that the FBI had to call off its payoff operations because of a fear that the majority of Congress would have to be indicted.

There are also some symbolic numbers of the moment. There is the number 5.2; in 1979 there was a 5.2 percent decline in real wages and standard of living.

Then there is the 1979, 5.2 profits of AT&T; that is, 5 billion, 200 million dollars. Such figures are inter-related.

There was the Carter-Vance call for an international meeting on February 20th to discuss a capitalist world campaign against the Soviet Union. But the foreign minister of France came to New York publicly declaring: "We will not go to any meeting that discusses creating tensions with the Soviet Union. We will only go to meetings that discuss the reduction of tensions in the world."

And, there is the prime minister of Canada, Joe Clark, agreeing to go to such a meeting, but by then he most likely will be the ex-prime minister because he will be voted out of office in the next election.

These incidents say a lot about the real world, the balance of world forces, inner-imperialist rivalries and the determination of the people of the world to prevent a nuclear holocaust and to block all efforts to move into a new cold war.

It is a great pleasure—and most appropriate—that I share this anniversary celebration with you since I was present when you were born exactly ten years ago.

I have celebrated your birthdays and I have watched the YWLL grow from infancy, to childhood, through the trials and tribulations of puberty and to the maturity of adulthood. Your was a natural birth, but it was by no means painless. Although you are still young, you have rapidly matured in the short decade of your life. You are now, so to speak, in the prime of life.

While pondering what I should say about today and tomorrow, I did some reminiscing about yesterday and took a look ten-years back to your founding convention. In retrospect, I would like to share with you my opening remarks on that eventful day when the YWLL came into the world on February 8, 1970, in Chicago.

You have established more than another radical youth organization. For the youth of the United States you have established a new point of reference. They now have a working-class, revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist point of reference.

Thousands will join your ranks, but millions will compute their political course by relating it to the Marxist-Leninist point of reference.

You will create a working-class youth field of gravity around you. You will lift the ceiling of revolutionary visibility.

And you will bring into the youth movement a revolutionary spirit. You must be the activator, the energizer within the youth movement.

In today's reality a Marxist-Leninist youth organization need not be narrow or small. Don't be selfish—don't keep this science of sciences to yourselves. Share it with the millions.

Well, I don't want to call it precisely prophetic, but you have breathed life into those words spoken ten years ago on the day of your birth.

You have grown. You have not strayed from the straight, but not narrow, course. You have been sharing our science of sciences with the millions. You have established a working-class, revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist point of reference for the U.S. youth movement. You have become a vital energizer, an activator. You have succeeded in creating a "working-class youth field of gravity." The YWLL has become an indispensable force on the youth scene today.

Today, your energetic revolutionary spirit, your Marxist-Leninist point of reference, is indispensable for activating our country's youth.

In many ways, each generation is different but today's young generation is strikingly unique.

You face problems and crises that past generations never dreamed could happen. You are young in the period of old capitalism's decline.

You are growing up when capitalism is on its way down—on its last legs, sick and dying.

And since you are living and struggling in the twilight of capitalism, for each new generation it offers less—less joy, less hope, less security—less of everything except problems and crises and the need to fight back.

You are the first generation of Americans who are living in a period when the official corporate-government policy is to enforce a declining standard of living on the people. For 1979, the decline was 5.2 percent. The code words used are "austerity and scarcity."

A whole generation is being asked—no, being told—it must bury its expectations, its needs and dreams. You are being told to "defer your dream." "What happens to a dream deferred" is exactly what big business is plotting for you—creating a crisis in which youth will have no alternative but to "dry up like a raisin in the sun," and passively accept this deferment of their dreams—forever.

You are being told civilization has passed its peak of growth and development; that it has used up its reserves, its energy resources. Therefore, they say, you must passively accept the inevitable decline in

your living standards—in your expectations. You were born too late. The good old days are gone forever.

That of course is hog-wash. It's a fraud, a cruel hoax. The best of days—of life on this galaxy—are ahead of us. To this point history has but created the scaffolding for the giant strides of human progress that will unfold.

There is nothing so wrong with the United States that a cut in military spending, a curb on monopolies and their profits, a 6-hour work day, a program to rebuild our cities and the elimination of racism won't reverse. This kind of program will put our great land back on the tracks that will lead to jobs, to economic and social security. The source of insecurity—joblessness, hunger and want—is our social-economic system. It is capitalism that is running out of steam.

For youth, getting a job is the life-dream that enables you to reach for all other necessities of life. Yet before your generation even reaches the factory gates, auto and steel plants are being shut down, or moving to another country.

Past generations had Youngstown Sheet and Tube, Dodge Main, the Pullman Plant and Ohio works, where employment offices were open for young workers. Today, those gates are shut forever.

For youth, an education is the dream that will prepare them for that ultimate "American-dream-job." Today, schools are being shut down, or the cost is so way up that millions of working-class youth can no longer even hope. And even when that dream comes true, especially for Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican youth, it turns into a nightmare because there are no jobs when you graduate.

And what awaits you today is the prospect of being drafted. There's been an official decision that educated working-class youth aren't needed anymore. Monopoly capital—in its never-ending search for maximum profits—plans to put you either in a uniform, or on the streets where you will join the reserve army of unemployed.

And if you're real lucky you'll land a job that won't come anywhere near the wages you need to match the inflation and to live a decent life.

All this—to feed the bloated bellies of big business!

In the past, corporate profits were in the tens of millions. Today, the monstrous monopolies squeeze tens of billions from the sweat and blood of working people.

To cover up this tremendous take, the mass media rails against OPEC oil prices, but is completely silent about Exxon's 1979 profits of over \$4 billion dollars or AT&T's 5.2 billion dollars, profits that pile into the bulging pockets of a few filthy-rich dynasties like the Rockefellers—who literally dictate government policies that empty your pockets.

Carter bemoans the necessity for Americans to sacrifice, to tighten their belts. But not one word about sacrifice by the fat cats whose profits keep skyrocketing.

You are the generation of crisis-level high unemployment during the boom-phase of the economic cycle. The best capitalism offers millions of young people is either unemployment or the draft. Instead of carrying the Olympic torch, Carter wants you to carry the torch for corporate profits. The old saying: "the rich get richer, while the poor get poorer," doesn't fit millions of young people—they can't get much poorer.

Peanuts for Youth

For nine months the Carter administration has been spending our tax money studying the youth unemployment crisis and finally came up with more peanuts.

Carter had the audacity to brag about the \$400 million he's going to spend for jobs and job training for youth—with an overall youth jobless rate of over 16 percent and the rate among Black and other nationally oppressed youth at a disastrous rate of 37 percent. He's selling a hoax that would provide \$1,700 per year for 180,000 youth. The Congressional Black Caucus this week charged "Our young people are being told that money can be found to send them to war, not to put them to work. They are held hostage to the military budget."

This so-called "major new domestic initiative" is nothing but a fraud to mislead the youth. It's a coverup of the real program contained in the State of the Union message: The Carter-monopoly message to youth is—mass unemployment, the draft, militarization and pauperization.

Youth have to reply to this message and send Carter their message that: "We won't register for death and destruction—our own or others. Instead, we'll register to vote and send Carter and his corrupt

cronies to the unemployment lines unless they about-face and begin to fight for youth's right to 'earn, learn and live.'"

For past generations, military budgets were in the millions of dollars. You face military spending in the hundreds of billions—hundreds of billions to train for the planned “rapid deployment force.” In the name of “vital U.S. interests” you will be sent to the Persian Gulf, but you will really be marching for the Exxons. It is not the so-called “vital national interests” you will be protecting, but the vital U.S. corporate interests. The problem for youth is not the Persian Gulf, but the political and economic gulf between corporate interests and the people's interests—the gaping gulf between Carter's promises and reality.

The planned “rapid deployment force” is nothing but a coverup phrase for armed support to reactionary puppet regimes so the Exxons can keep raking in their \$4 billion plus profits.

“The rapid deployment force” is not meant for or designed to fight the Soviet Union. It is to be a counter-insurgency force. It is planned as a military support to reactionary puppet regimes and against national liberation movements.

There are plans to use it in Iran to set up another Shah, in North Yemen, Oman, Saudi Arabia and Sadat wants it in Egypt to buttress his rule.

There is much talk about the need to make sacrifices. But the only sacrifice monopoly capital is willingly ready to make is the sacrifice of your whole young generation.

In fact, it is ready to sacrifice your young lives around the world so that U.S. imperialism can work to regain its dominance over the globe. It is ready to sacrifice other peoples and other lands to preserve its prerogatives to plunder and pillage peoples and lands. The one thing it is not about to sacrifice is a penny of its profits.

And as the events in Afghanistan and Iran demonstrate, it is even prepared to risk the sacrifice of the whole human race to preserve its profits and the capitalist system.

This is the vast dimension of sacrifices capitalism is willing to make on a worldwide scale.

And the dimensions aren't much less on the homefront. Capitalism is also quite ready and willing to sacrifice the standard of living and quality of life for *all* U.S. people. They want to repeat the 5.2 percent decline in real wages in 1980–81–82, and every year.

This policy of austerity and scarcity creates a crisis for the whole working class. But for the working-class youth it is an absolute catastrophe, a dead-end.

Because of this policy you are not to be allowed to enlist in the future of the United States, except as cannon fodder to kill and be killed for Exxon and Shell.

In years past, the slogan was "Uncle Sam Wants You!" Now, the slogan is: "Uncle Sam is Going to Take You."

You aren't going to be asked to accept sacrifices—to be patriotic all-Americans.

If Carter has his way, you will be drafted—forced to sacrifice your lives for the money-bags in the executive suites.

You are going to be forced to give up the right to stay home and fight for "your place in the sun" so that the fat-cats can sit beside their pools and bathe in the sun. They are plotting poverty and sacrifice for you and more riches and luxury for themselves.

Today, monopoly-capital is pushing the concept that it is literally unpatriotic for the young to object to war talk, to war-clouds, to the draft; that it is un-American for the young to expect a decent education, a job, a roof over their heads, enough food on the table, good clothes on their backs and pocket-money to go out on Saturday night.

There is nothing more criminal, more insane, unpatriotic and un-American than spending billions for the military, than the rich families who plunder and pillage our economy out of hundreds of billions of dollars while tens of millions of Americans live below the official poverty level.

Carter's sacrifice program—his so-called "moral equivalent of war"—is, in reality, a declaration of war against youth.

And their plans for the future are more of the same. If you do land a job and get laid off, unemployment insurance won't be enough to live on. If you're injured on the job your family won't be able to survive on the compensation because that's been cut too. If you get sick, you could not only lose everything saved, but go into debt for the rest of your life without a national health insurance plan.

And with all this, you have to look forward to living in cities where apartments and building, bridges, mass transit systems will continue to decay and crumble. and hospitals and schools continue closing down or falling down around you.

And before you can even reach the age of social security benefits and medicare, there are plans now to dismantle and gut them also.

In all this crisis and decay, if you should ever be driven to apply for public welfare, it's the same old story—gutting and stripping to the bone all human social services and programs for the people—all sacrificed on the altar of profits and war.

Capitalism is working to turn you into the guns not butter generation!

But—you are also the generation of great historic battles and victories. The American people are not for long going to accept the big business-Carter program of austerity and sacrifices.

You are also the generation of the world revolutionary process, the epoch of national liberation and the transition to socialism.

It is true—you have less options, much less than past generations. Therefore, the youth will also not passively accept the burdens, the sacrifices big business wants to lay on you.

Saying “Hell no, we won't go” isn't enough anymore. Because even if you don't go what kind of life is offered to you? And it is not enough just to repeat the old cliché. “The future belongs to the young.” The more important question is—what kind of future?

The time has come when youth must shout out to big business and to its two old parties: “You are out-of-date, out-of-touch and out-moded. Step aside, clear the path of human progress. You're going backward and we want to go forward. You're standing in our path.” The time has come when it is necessary to curb the corporate-military dogs.

It is becoming more obvious that in order to meet the challenge of the times *there is a growing urgent need for the youth to bind together into a broad youth front.*

But it is also clear that such a front will not make the scene as one all-inclusive unified front.

There is a front emerging against registration and the draft.

There is another youth front around some of the pressing economic issues.

At some point such separate fronts will work together as a coalition of forces in the different arenas.

To help create—to activate and energize—such fronts is also the challenge for the YWLL and the Party.

A society that fears and fights people's expectations and dreams—a

society that only offers sacrifices and a declining standard of living—needs to be replaced.

There is a greater-than-ever need to unite and fight for basic changes.

There's a need for youth to take up the challenge, don their real battle fatigues, put on their marching boots, pick up their political and ideological weapons and fight for basic change. For a new society that will create a future of security, education, jobs and training for all, socialism is the answer.

There's a need to unite all youth in a grand alliance with the whole working class and the racially and nationally oppressed. This is the unbeatable combination. This is the only foundation upon which our youth can build a happy, secure future.

In the next ten years you have to take up the challenge of this unique period in history.

You have more than fulfilled the hopes and the trust placed in you when you were born. Now you must continue to grow, to mature, to build upon the great traditions, the militant movements you have helped to initiate.

You must become today's "energizer and activator." You must become today's new "revolutionary spirit," the force that unites all youth. This is the monumental challenge we all must meet today. I am confident the YWLL will do just that.

The YWLL is an indispensable force in the struggle against the power of monopoly capital, in the struggle against racism, for economic and social security, for world peace and for socialism.

And with your help we will turn the 1980 presidential elections into a campaign the ruling class will never forget.

February 14, 1980

Address to the 25th Congress of The Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Comrade delegates and guests:

This 25th Congress of the Party of Lenin is another landmark, a guidepost on the revolutionary path of transition to socialism and to the fulfillment of human society's highest aspirations—a Communist society.

Like a piercing laser beam of light, the basic theme of Marxism-Leninism runs through the very sober, profound and deeply penetrating assessments and projections of Comrade Brezhnev's report.

Just as the building of socialism demonstrates, by the power of its example, the superiority of socialism, so the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, by the power of its example, by its unwavering adherence to, by its resourceful application of, and by the continuous development of the science of Marxism-Leninism, serves as the working pattern for the revolutionary movements throughout the world.

At a moment when the struggles of the historic revolutionary transitions have become increasingly more complex, and the ideological pressures build up, at a moment when new strains of the virus of opportunism are being hatched, this power of the Leninist example is of a special and great historic significance.

It serves as a working model because the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, throughout its 78 years, has always zealously guarded the working-class heart, the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism.

The concepts of proletarian internationalism and the class struggle

have always been its guiding points of reference. With great skill and persistence the CPSU fights for peace, for detente and for the application of the policies of peaceful coexistence, but with the same persistence it rejects any and all opportunistic accommodations to imperialism.

The new proposals for peace in Comrade Brezhnev's report are a challenge to world capitalist leaders. Because the Communist Party of the Soviet Union never permits consideration of momentary gains to erode the pillar of the class principles, it consistently finds the elements of unity between its national and international responsibilities.

It is a high tribute to the CPSU that your Congress has become the occasion for the assembly of one of the largest gathering of representatives of the world revolutionary movement.

While socialism continues along its steady course of growth and development, while its five-year plans are translated into economic, cultural and social wellbeing, while the overall quality of socialist life improves, in the capitalist world the general and the cyclical crises are translated into deeper poverty for greater numbers, into economic insecurity and a declining overall quality of life. Political repression and racism become United States capital's main line of defense.

While socialism reaches for new levels of achievement, monopoly-state capitalism develops new dimensions to its crises.

The new theme song of monopoly capital is "austerity." They are saying the people are living too high off the hog. There is a concentrated drive to cut down, to dismantle the social security programs which the working class and the people have won in earlier periods of capitalist development.

The drive for austerity goes hand in hand with the ever rising corporate profits. The cities in bankruptcy are but a reflection of this new dimension of the crises of state-monopoly capitalism.

The daily comparison studies and the great mass awareness of the divergent paths followed by the two world socio-economic systems has emerged as a decisive factor in the political and ideological areas of struggle.

Increasingly, socialism is viewed by the masses as the standard of achievement against which all social progress—or lack of it—is measured. It is this shift in the mass patterns of thought that explains

the new hysterical note, the new low of falsehoods in bourgeois anti-socialist propaganda.

It explains the fishing with the baited silver lure, and the dredging for any and all anti-communist, anti-Soviet or anti-socialist "droppings," especially if they have radical, left or Marxist coatings.

In our times, the main ideological pressures of imperialism are in relationship to the socialist world and against the Soviet Union in the first place.

Because capitalism increasingly comes out on the losing end in the comparisons of the two systems, they have to resort to more intangibles, to political vapor bubbles that appear and disappear, leaving but an odor.

Opportunism breaks through where the ideological pressures of the enemy are the greatest.

Our Party has a basic principled position on these matters. We are not going to fight imperialism by their rules. We are not going to use or repeat anti-socialist and anti-Soviet slander to win acceptance, to win respectability or to prove our autonomy. We will not pattern our policies by accommodation to the attacks against our class, our Party or socialism.

Maoism is the classic example of where the path of opportunism leads to, if it goes unchecked. At the murky bottom of the swamp of opportunism there is counter-revolution. Maoism has reached to that bottom.

The CIA-U.S. corporate and Maoist alliance in support of the fascist butchers in Chile is counter-revolution.

The Maoist-CIA and the racist South African conspiracy against the people and government of Angola is counter-revolution.

The Maoist vile slander campaign against world socialism is counter-revolutionary.

To be silent about these outrageous acts is to be neutral. To be neutral in such a basic struggle is itself an accommodation to opportunism.

There are problems and there are momentary setbacks, but by any yardstick the central fact, the hard core reality of this epoch, is the continuing victorious flow of the world revolutionary process and the growing power, and the unity of forces that propel it.

So, dear comrades and delegates, accept our heartiest congratula-

tions, our warm greetings and our best wishes for new and greater victories in your pioneering work in the building of Communist society.

May the staunch heroic working-class heart beat strong and in rhythm the world over.

March 4, 1976

Index

- Abel, I.W. 95, 116, 174, 208, 209
Abt, John 107
Adams, John 127
Afghanistan 55, 57, 58, 69-82, 85, 86, 317, 322
AFL 271
AFL-CIO 171, 233
Africa 7, 30, 36, 42, 43, 78, 84, 95, 249, 288, 307, 313, 314
Agnew, Spiro 89, 90, 91, 92, 123, 162, 279
Alabama 309
Allende, Salvador 29
America First 271
American Committee on U.S.-Soviet Relations 31
American Historical Review 163
American Medical Association (AMA) 181
American Telephone & Telegraph (AT&T) 318, 321
Amin, Hafizullah 74, 76
Amter, Israel 276
Anderson, Jack 230, 231
Angola 33, 40, 60, 84, 243, 288, 301, 302, 307, 313, 316, 328
Appalachia 184-186
Argentina 28
Asher, Frank 230
Asia 78, 95, 314
Aspin, Les 23
Attica 309
Bakke, Alan 148, 153, 155
Bangladesh 8, 288
Bank of America 27
Barker, Bernard 96
Batista, Fulgencio 29
Bay of Pigs 27, 72, 303
Begin, Menachem 48
Benson, Elmer 218
Bergland, Robert 220
Berlinguer, Enrico 316
Bernard, John T. 218
Bethlehem Steel Corp. 235
Bloor, 'Mother' Ella Reeve 276
Blumenthal, W. Michael 43
Boston 181
Boyle, Anthony 185
Brazil 222, 305
Brennan, Peter 95
Brezhnev, Leonid I. 25, 34, 52, 54, 56, 63, 80, 97, 98, 99, 221, 306, 314-16, 326, 327
Briar Hill 243
Brzezinski, Zbigniew 36, 60, 84, 199, 201, 317
Buffalo 210
Burke, Thomas 177
Burns, Arthur 187
Business Week 187, 195
Cacchione, Peter V. 276
Cambodia 13, 17, 77, 288
Campbell Works 239-245
Canada 15, 28, 71, 165, 286
Caribbean 84
Carrillo, Santiago 292, 293
Carter, James E. 22, 29, 30, 46, 47, 48, 53, 54, 68, 69, 71, 72, 75, 78, 80, 81, 84, 86, 149, 213, 218, 241, 250, 254, 255, 263, 264, 306, 308, 318, 321, 323, 324
Carter, Rosalynn 317
Castro, Fidel 27, 30, 36
CBS, Inc. 159-62
Central America 84
Chase Manhattan Bank 27
Chavis, Ben, Jr. 212
Chicago 202, 318
Chicago Sun Times, The 277

- Chicago Tribune, The* 277
 Chile 8, 29, 40, 72, 102, 103, 104, 106, 138, 288, 301, 305, 316, 328
 China, People's Republic of 40-4, 52, 72, 73, 85, 229
 Chrysler Corporation 162, 193, 251-4
 Church, Frank 132
 CIA 23, 24, 29, 40, 55, 57, 73, 94, 127, 130, 131-134, 138-140, 144-6, 151, 152, 294, 304-5, 328
 CIO 206, 278
 Clark, Joe 318
 Clark, Ramsey 110, 111
 Cleary, Thomas A., Jr. 240-241
 Cleveland 228
Cleveland Plain Dealer, The 277
 Clifford, Clark 317
 COINTELPRO 133
 Colon, Jesus 276
 Columbia Presbyterian Hospital 181
 Committee on the Present Danger 32
 Committee to Re-elect the President (CREEP) 92
 Communication Workers of America (CWA) 207
 Communist (Third) International 290, 293
 Communist Party of China 41, 287, 288, 293
 Communist Party of France 300-1
 Communist Party of Italy 300-1, 316
 Communist Party of Portugal 300-1, 307-8
 CPSU 53, 293, 311-317, 326-29
 Communist Party of Spain 292, 293, 300
 CPUSA 8, 26, 33, 48, 80, 81, 92, 101, 105, 107, 108, 109, 130-134, 151, 153, 159, 160, 161, 164, 166, 174, 182, 186, 187, 205, 221, 234, 270, 273, 275, 276, 283, 284-6, 287-9, 291, 324, 328
 Connecticut 181
 Constitution, U.S. 91, 100, 103, 151, 161
 COPE 172
 Corman, James 182
 Costa Rica 96
 Cox, Archibald 100
 Cruise missile 37, 38, 52, 53, 56, 71, 85
 Cuba 27-30, 73
 Cunhal, Alvaro 301
 CUNY 164
 Czechoslovakia 6, 73, 289, 301
Daily Worker, The 165, 227, 269-272, 276, 278
Daily World, The 208, 237, 270, 276, 277, 278, 279, 283, 295-9
 Davis, Angela Y. 90, 271
 Davis, Benjamin J., Jr. 107, 159, 276
 Dean, John 92
 Declaration of Principles of U.S.-U.S.S.R. Relations (1972) 25
 Democratic Party 25, 219, 281
 Deng Xiaoping 40, 41, 43
 Dennis, Eugene 108, 109, 159, 166, 276
 Detroit 213, 252
Detroit Free Press, The 277
 Dimitrov, Georgi 163
 Dodge Main 251-4, 320
 Dominican Republic 30, 72, 305
 Dreiser, Theodore 276
 Du Bois, W.E.B. 165, 276
 Dulles, John Foster 140
 Egypt 8, 20, 46, 72, 322
 Ehrlichman, John D. 89, 91, 92
 Eisenhower, Dwight D. 6, 94
 El Salvador 84
 Engdahl, Louis 276
 Engels, Frederick 273
 England 15, 16, 17, 56, 57, 74, 76, 165, 243
 Ervin, Sam 91, 92
Esquire 141-143
 Ethiopia 60, 111, 112
 Experimental Negotiating Agreement (ENA) 157, 205
 Exxon Corp. 10, 20, 69, 75, 305, 321, 322, 323
 Fairfield Decision 118
 Farmer-Labor Party (Minnesota) 218, 219, 220
 FBI 95, 127, 130-134, 138-140, 146, 151, 161, 164, 165, 174, 227
 Field, Fred J. 162
 Finletter, Thomas K. 102
 Flint 213
 Florida 26, 27, 222, 224
 Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley 159, 276
 Forbes, Hank 276
 Ford, Gerald R. 121, 123, 124, 127, 135, 139, 187-189, 191, 193, 202, 206, 213, 218, 255, 263, 279, 308, 314
 Ford, James W. 276
 Ford Motor Company 130, 193, 215, 280

- Fortune* 175-77
 Foster, William Z. 206, 276
 France 10, 15, 16, 17, 24, 56, 243, 301
 Galveston 228
 Gannett, Betty 159, 276
 General Electric 215, 216
 General Motors Corp. 180, 193, 213, 215, 280, 310
 German Democratic Republic 70, 289
 Gierak, Edward 221
 Girdler, Tom 206, 209, 239
 Glenn, John 242
 Goldwater, Barry 13, 129
 Gramercy 154
 Greece 102, 103, 104, 288
 Green, Gil 159
 Greenglass, David & Ruth 164, 165
 Griffiths, Martha 182
 Gromyko, Andrei 36
 Guantanamo 30, 52, 72
 Guatemala 30, 72
 Guinea-Bissau 288, 307, 313
 Gulf & Western 10, 20, 75, 305
 Gulf of Tonkin Resolution 81, 86

 Haldeman, H.R. 89, 91, 92, 123, 129, 279
 Hammett, Dashiell 162
 Hamtramck 251-4
 Hansborough, Ray 276
 Harsch, Joseph 73
 Harvard University 297
 Hazners, Vilis 150-153
 Helms, Richard 152
 Hill, Joe 163
 Hiroshima 309
 Hitler, Adolph 15-17, 42, 80, 91, 93, 102, 104, 112, 113, 140, 151, 164, 167, 204, 278, 300
 Hobbs Act 207
 Hoover, J. Edgar 95, 166
 Hoover Institute 294
 Hong Kong 11, 253
 Houston 151
 HUAC (House Un-American Activities Committee) 174
 Hughes, Howard 96
 Hungary 6
 Hunton, Dr. Alphaeus 162
 Husak, Gustav 221

 Indian Ocean 52, 72
 Indochina 6

 Indonesia 305
 Intelligence, House Select Committee on 144-6
 Intelligence Committee, U.S. Senate Select 24, 132-4
 International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT) 158
 International Olympic Committee 80
International Socialist Review 274
 Iran 42, 55, 58, 60, 69, 70, 72, 74, 75, 81, 303-4, 322
 Israel 8, 20, 46, 72, 147
 IT&T 93
 Italy 24, 56, 201, 301

 Jackson, Henry 13, 36, 60
 Jackson, James E. 311
 Jackson-Vanik Amendment 236, 242
 Japan 8, 38, 40, 46, 52, 56, 67, 71, 74, 76, 240, 241
 Johnson, Arnold 159
 Johnson, Lyndon Baines 6, 81, 86, 249
 Jones, Claudia 276
 J P Stevens 212

 Kadar, Janos 221
 Kahn, Albert 47, 250
 Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp 154, 155
 Kansas City 281
 Karmal, Babrak 72, 76
 Kennedy, Edward 182, 264
 Kennedy, John Fitzgerald 6
 Kennedy-Griffiths Bill 183
 King, Dr. Martin Luther, Jr. 133, 134, 213
 Kissinger, Henry 8, 13, 18, 19, 43, 84, 89, 127, 134, 164, 293, 294, 300-2, 314
 Krieger, Sam 163
 Krumbein, Charles 276
 Krushchev, Nikita 146
 Ku Klux Klan 212

 Landrum-Griffin Act 129, 174
 Lannon, Al 276
 Laos 288, 313
 Lassalle, Ferdinand 275
 Latin America 7, 95, 163, 314
 Latvia 150
 Le Duan 221
 Le Duc Tho 89
 Lehigh University 235
 Lenin, V.I. 273, 290, 326

- Levi, Edward I 127, 139, 140
 Lewis, John L. 185, 206
 Liberty League 271
 Lightfoot, Geraldine 276
 Lincoln, Abraham 223
 Lodal, Jan M. 37
 Lordstown 180, 215
 Louisiana 154
 Lovestone, Jay 95, 234
 Ludlow 123, 309
 Lykes, Joseph 241
 Lykes Corporation 240, 241, 246
- MacLeish, Archibald 110-114
 Mahoning Valley 238-246, 253
 Maoism 8, 40, 76, 287-8, 293, 316, 328
 Mareantonio, Vito 107
 Marcuse, Herbert 274
 Marshall, Thurgood 155
 Marx, Karl 40, 197, 273
 McBride, Lloyd 236
 McCarran, Pat 166
 McCarran Act 107, 129, 174
 McCarthy, Joseph 112, 151, 166
 McCarthyism 78, 79, 128-131, 112, 113, 132-4, 159-162, 163-167, 174, 226, 227, 300
 McClellan, John L. 174
 McGee, Willie 270
 McGovern, George 133
 Meany, George 95, 97, 171, 204, 233, 234
 Memphis 213
 Mexico 50, 71, 165, 253
 Meyers, George 159
 Miami Beach 181
 Michigan 213, 233
 Middle East 7, 20, 21, 36, 42, 43, 72, 77, 84, 85, 249, 289
 Minnesota 218-222, 225, 233
 Minor, Robert 276
 MIRV's (Multiple Independently-Targeted Re-entry Vehicle) 37, 83
 Mitchell, John 89, 90, 91, 92, 101, 123, 129, 279
 Mondale, Walter 133
 Mossadegh, Mohammed 55
 Moynihan, Daniel Patrick 18, 19
 Mozambique 288, 307, 313
 Munich Agreement 16
 Muskie, Edmund 135
 Mussolini, Benito 104, 112, 113, 278, 300
 MX (Mobile Missile System) 37, 71
- The Nation* 163
 NBC, Inc. 300-302
 National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC) 203
 National Security Council 37, 94
 National Union of Hospital and Health Care Employees, District 1199 181
 NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) 24, 40, 56, 62, 70, 71, 79, 85, 288
 Navasky, Victor 163
 Neimoller, D. Martin 160
 Newark 210
 Newport News 158
New Republic 163-167
 New York 281
 New York, City of 21, 210, 242, 253
New York Daily News, The 146, 277
New York Times, The 9, 31, 97, 98, 99, 103, 104, 105, 106, 138-40, 144-6, 175, 187, 188, 195-197, 219, 277, 292-4, 297, 312, 313
 Nigeria 313
 Nixon, Richard M. 5, 6, 25, 43, 89, 91, 94, 96, 97, 103, 123, 129, 138, 152, 164, 166, 180, 201, 250, 255, 263, 264, 279
 Norris-LaGuardia Act 156
 North Carolina 212, 213
 North Yemen 322
- Odorcich, Joseph 203-209
 Ohio 239-246
 Olson, Floyd B. 218
 Oman 72, 322
 OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) 78, 145, 321
- Pakistan 73, 74, 85
 Palestine 151, 302
 Palmer Raids 163
 Paraguay 305
Peace Decree, The 62
 Pentagon 23, 27, 78, 84, 127, 243, 305-6
People's World 208, 270, 295-9
 Perpich, Rudolph G. 218
 Perry, Pettis 276
 Pershing II Missile 52, 53, 56, 71, 85
 Persian Gulf 72, 78, 322
 Philadelphia 212
 Phillipines 103, 309
 Picasso, Pablo 111
 Pinochet, Augusto 40, 301
 Pittsburgh 206, 242

- Poland 221, 289
Ponomarev, Boris N. 316
Portugal 288, 301-2, 307-8
Potash, Irving 159
Pound, Ezra 110-114
Public Works Administration (PWA) 239
Puerto Rico 30, 72, 95, 286
- Radosh, Ronald 163-167
Rand Corporation 92
Reagan, Ronald 136
Reed, John 276
Republic Steel 239
Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) 217, 302, 306
Rieder, Randolph 241
Rockefeller, David 199, 201, 280, 302, 309, 321
Rockefeller, Nelson 122, 123, 202, 280, 281, 309, 310, 321
Rogge, O. John 164, 165
Roosevelt, Franklin D. 239n, 271
Rosenberg, Ethel & Julius 163-167
Rothbard, Murray 164
Ruthenberg, Charles 276
- S-1 129, 131, 140, 207, 316
Sacco & Vanzetti 163
Sadat, Anwar el- 48, 322
Saginaw 213
St. Paul 225
Salt 11 51, 52, 57, 59-64, 81, 314, 315
Saudi Arabia 145, 322
Savak 55, 304
Scales, Junius 164
Schlesinger, James 36, 127
Shell Oil Corp. 10, 20, 69, 75, 323
Smith Act 108, 129, 159-162
Socialist Labor Party 271
Socialist Party 271
Solzhenitsyn, Alexander I. 104
Somalia 72
South Africa 84, 103, 152, 217, 288, 302, 306, 328
South America 78
South Korea 11, 48
South Yemen 81
Soviet Union 7, 15, 16, 22, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 56-58, 62, 70, 75, 83, 84, 150, 152, 163, 228, 270, 278, 292, 301, 305-6, 311-16
Spain 103, 111, 112, 243, 292
Stachel, Jack 159, 276
- Stalin, Joseph V. 146, 204
Starobin, Joseph 164
Steelworkers Organizing Committee 206
Stern, Sol 163-167
Stevenson Amendment 236, 244
Stockholm Peace Appeal 34
Suslov, Mikhail 316
Sweden 104
- Taft-Hartley Act 129, 156, 174
Taiwan 253
Tartakow, Jerome E. 165, 166
Tarrytown 311
Taylor Law 157
Texas 151, 224, 228
Thieu, Nguyen Van 10
Thompson, Robert 159, 165, 276
Thurmond, Strom 96
Trachtenberg, Alexander 159, 276
Trilateral Commission 78, 199, 200
Truman, Harry 94, 208
Trade Unionists for Action & Democracy (TUAD) 174
Turkey 72
25th Congress, CPSU 311-317, 326-329
21st National Convention, CPUSA 284-6
- United Automobile Workers (UAW) 215
United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) 185
United Nations (UN) 8, 18, 26, 313
U.S. Steel Corp. 118, 239, 241
United Steelworkers of America (U.S.W.A.) 118, 154, 155, 157, 203, 205, 206, 208, 236
Uruguay 102, 103, 104, 305
- Vance, Cyrus 37, 318
Venezuela 145
Vesco, Robert 96
Vietnam 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 77, 127, 138, 159, 288, 309, 313
Vladivostok Accord 37
Volcker, Paul 254-5
- Wall Street Journal, The* 20, 97, 187, 200, 277
Wallace, George 96
Wallace, Mike 159-162
Warsaw Pact 62, 71
Watergate 79, 89-101, 109, 133, 138, 140, 176, 201, 271

- Weber, Brian 154, 155
Weinstein, Allen 163
Weinstein, James 164
Weinstone, William 160
West Germany 8, 27, 46, 56, 67, 74, 76,
201, 243, 289
Western Europe 84, 240, 241
Westinghouse Corp. 216
Whitney, Anita 276
Williamson, John 160, 276
Wilmington Ten 212
Wilson, Woodrow 163
Winston, Henry 159, 165, 311
Winter, Carl 160
Winter, Helen 311
Wojtyła, Karol (Pope John Paul II) 49-52
World Magazine 295-9
Wren, Christopher 312
WPA (Works Progress Administration)
239
Yonkers 210
Yorty, Sam 99
Youngstown 206
Youngstown Sheet & Tube 239-245, 320
Young Workers Liberation League
(YWLL) 317, 318, 319, 324, 325
Zionism 9



From the Reviews of Gus Hall's Other Books

THE ENERGY RIP-OFF: Cause and Cure

"His solution is a radical one, but it deserves thought and respect." Publishers Weekly

ECOLOGY: Can We Survive Under Capitalism?

"Charging government as well as the economic system with irresponsibility Hall points out how the workers suffer the most from environmental deterioration." The Booklist

IMPERIALISM TODAY: An Evaluation of Major Events and Issues of Our Times

"A valuable contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle."
The Canadian Tribune

(This book is also available in cloth at \$14.00)

For a complete catalog write
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 Park Avenue South, New York, NY 10016