

SEPTEMBER, 1971

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

NIXON'S ECONOMIC STATEMENT

Political Committee, CPUSA

NIXON'S VISIT TO PEKING: WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

Editorial Comment

**NEO-COLONIALISM AND ITS
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STRATEGY**

K. Brutents

**THE BATTLE OF LOGAN COUNTY, 1921
AND A POSTSCRIPT, FIFTY YEARS LATER**

Art Shields

PARTY WORK IN HARLEM

José Stevens

COUNTER-CULTURE OF THE '60S

Gaylord Leroy

60¢

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Political Committee, CPUSA</i>	
Nixon's Economic Statement	1
<i>Editorial Comment</i>	
Nixon's Peking Visit: What Does It Mean?	5
<i>K. Brutents</i>	
Neo-Colonialism and its Socio-Economic Strategy	12
<i>Art Shields</i>	
The Battle of Logan County, 1921 . . . And a Postscript, 50 Years Later	27
<i>José Stevens</i>	
Party Work in Harlem	37
<i>Gaylord Leroy</i>	
Counter-Culture of the '60s	45
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	
Racism and Counter-Revolution	54
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>An Old Reader</i>	
On Revolutionary Transition	61
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>Daniel Mason</i>	
Colodny on Spain	63

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

Nixon's Economic Statement*

U.S. imperialism, through Nixon, is striving to deliver a powerful, many-sided assault against the working class, against the Black people, the Chicanos and Puerto Ricans, to get out of its crisis at the people's expense. Nixon's proposals will not reduce inflation and unemployment. He freezes wages, but not profits. Indeed, the whole purpose is to increase profits at the expense of wages.

That is one meaning of Nixon's speech.

The system of international monetary arrangements sponsored by U.S. imperialism and based on the dollar as key currency, has been smashed. Nixon's economic measures register this defeat, dramatize the anarchy and chaos of capitalist world finance, the deepening crisis of the system, the decline in the relative position of U.S. imperialism.

That is the second meaning of Nixon's speech.

U.S. aggression in Indochina brought the crisis of the dollar to a head. No remedies are relevant which do not move to end the war. But instead, Nixon aims to use these economic measures as a form of mobilization for continued, escalated warfare.

That is the third meaning of Nixon's speech.

Nixon has announced the most far-reaching set of economic measures taken by American capitalism in nearly 40 years. They sharpen all the social contradictions within the country. The stock market soars. The millionaires await Nixon's promised profit orgy. This calls for a more determined fight-back by the working class and oppressed peoples.

The American people will have the last word. They have it in their power, through struggle, to defeat the Nixon-big business assault, to win relief from inflation and unemployment, to smash the attempted wage freeze, to compel the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Indochina in 1971.

Nixon's speech is full of brazen arrogance, demagoguery, and hypocrisy.

He claims as achievements measures revealing the defeat of all his former policies. He talks of prosperity for all, while acting to cut mass living standards, while decreeing racist measures weighing most heavily against Black and other oppressed peoples.

He blames high prices on high wages, while wages are too low

* The following statement was issued Monday, August 16th, following Nixon's announcement of his new economic measures.

and high prices are due to monopoly and government policies. He talks of the merits of competition, while striving to enrich and strengthen monopoly. He promises to create jobs for Americans while directly cutting jobs. He talks of reducing Government spending, while raising the military budget to \$80 billion.

He talks of his measures as adjustment to peace, while continuing the slaughter and refusing to set a date for total withdrawal from Southeast Asia. He blames unemployment, caused by the Vietnam War, on his fictional "winding down" of that war.

He blames devaluation on "international speculators" while it is the inevitable end result of prolonged imperialist aggression, of the multinational operations of American millionaires, his main backers, who profited by converting billions into other currencies before devaluing.

The wage-price freeze is a real wage freeze and a fake price freeze. It gives employers full government backing to refuse wage increases, even those contracted, and sets up no machinery to prevent price increases. Any wage freeze is anti-labor because it gives capital the full benefit of rising labor productivity. The workers need and the country needs markedly higher wages.

Nixon's 90-day freeze aims to open the gate to a permanent freeze. Nixon and big business wish to use the 90 days to set up machinery, to ram through repressive legislation, designed to slash real wages, and radically raise profit rates.

Nixon proposes huge tax giveaways to big business, sugar-coated with trivial suggested tax cuts for workers. Despite the tragic crisis of the cities, Nixon aims to cut off even the small funds Congress was considering distributing. He uses the full weight of the White House to block action by members of Congress trying to convert his phony "welfare reform" program into one providing some real relief to the 14 million sufferers under the present rotten system. That is brutal economic racism. And these measures match Nixon's school busing decree for vicious racism in intent and impact.

The American people cannot and must not accept these blows.

What is called for is enforcement of existing contractual wage increases, of all escalator clauses, organization of the unorganized and continued struggle for higher wages and better working conditions, for real equality for Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican workers. This wage freeze can be smashed. A roll-back of prices and profits is needed now.

In the 1930s the millions through their struggles, defeated the drive of monopoly capital to get out of that crisis at their expense, and won significant reforms.

Victory can be won again today.

The Meany clique of labor bureaucrats betrayed the workers by joining the cry for a wage-price freeze, trying to make it palatable with the pitiful, and obviously futile call for a simultaneous freeze on profits. Once again, class collaboration inevitably leads to defeat for the working class.

The Nixon measures and speech emphasize the need to build the rank and file movement in the trade unions, as the key to mobilizing tens of millions for struggle in defense of their vital interests.

The Democratic Party politicians, the liberal intellectuals, showed their true class position as prime propagandists for Nixon's wage freeze.

The upshot emphasizes the need to build new independent political forms, based on the working class, the Black people and their allies in an anti-monopoly coalition.

It calls for maximum support for Communist candidates in 1972, for those who will provide real answers to the problems agitating the people, who offer correct immediate and long-range programs of struggle.

U.S. imperialism tried every means to preserve the role of the dollar as key currency of world capitalism. This yielded untold billions to U.S. multinational bankers and industrialists. It gave American monopolies an advantage in competition with their rivals, a weapon for dictating to and extracting extra revenue from developing countries. It enabled them to mobilize contributions of many billions from other imperialist powers to help finance U.S. aggression in Indochina and elsewhere.

Now the monopolists of other countries who collaborated with U.S. policy are stuck with tens of billions of depreciated dollars. They are trying to stick the workers of their countries with these losses. But their rivalry with U.S. imperialism has reached a point of qualitative change. They refuse to sustain the special role of the dollar any longer. The mark and the yen are challenging the dollar for domination of international finance.

Nixon's 10% tariff surcharge is an extreme form of trade warfare against Japan, Western Europe and Canada. Conflicts between Japanese and American, West German and American, British and French and American monopolies—among others—will become sharper. *A period of chaos and acute struggle in capitalist world finance and trade is beginning. New alignments will appear, as the different capitalist groups strive for power, attempt to replace the old dollar-dominated order with a new order, to restore some semblance of stability to decaying capitalism.*

U.S. imperialism tried especially hard to hold the price of gold down to the artificially low price of \$35 per ounce. This wholly uneconomic level was promoted for one reason only—anti-Sovietism. U.S. imperialism wanted to hold down the purchasing power of the USSR and of world socialism, considering that the USSR is one of the world's largest gold producers. But this strategy has backfired. The price of gold, even before the U.S. devaluation, passed \$43 per ounce, and is likely to go much higher.

The contrast between socialist stability and capitalist crisis, rapid socialist growth in living standards and capitalist stagnation and decay is sharper than ever. The deep crisis of U.S. and world imperialism will make clear to millions the need for socialism, will hasten the victory of socialism over capitalism on a world scale.

While blaming unemployment on imports, Nixon refuses to encourage increased employment by radically ending all barriers to trade with socialist countries.

He promotes the dead end "Buy American" line, designed to set off workers of one country against those of other countries. This line will not lead to a single additional job, nor end the loss of jobs to international runaways.

But hundreds of thousands of jobs can be provided by trade with socialist countries: by ending discriminatory tariffs against socialist countries and the so-called "strategic" export controls, and by ending the embargo against Cuba, North Korea, and North Vietnam, and granting Export-Import bank credits to Chile, Guyana, and other countries striving to free themselves from domination of imperialist corporations.

Nixon's measures will not stabilize U.S. capitalism, nor stop its decline and decay.

What is called for is struggle against Nixon's program, for a people's program, in the shops, cities and communities, in Congress and the legislature, in elections—a massive people's coalition and movement.

What is called for immediately is a further broadening of the great people's movement to end the war in Vietnam, the absolute prerequisite for relief of the people from economic hardships, for a shifting of priorities to meeting the people's needs, for effective measures to curb monopoly profiteering.

Socialism, more than ever, is required to really solve the problems facing the American people, to open the way to great social, economic and cultural advances, in complete equality, for all working people, Black, white, Chicano, Puerto Rican and Indian.

Nixon's Peking Visit: What Does It Mean?

On July 15, President Nixon made the following announcement on television, stating that it was being made simultaneously in Peking:

Premier Chou En-lai and Dr. Henry Kissinger, President Nixon's Assistant for National Security Affairs, held talks in Peking from July 9 to 11, 1971. Knowing of President Nixon's expressed desire to visit the People's Republic of China, Premier Chou En-lai on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of China has extended an invitation to President Nixon to visit China at an appropriate date before May, 1972.

President Nixon has accepted the invitation with pleasure.

The meeting between the leaders of China and the United States is to seek the normalization of relations between the two countries and also to exchange views on questions of concern to the two sides.

To this Nixon added: "Our action in seeking a new relationship with the People's Republic of China will not be at the expense of old friends." Also, "It is not directed against any other nation."

As might be expected, the announcement has had the impact of a bombshell in many circles throughout the world and has raised many questions. For here, seemingly, was a dramatic reversal of a policy of two decades—a policy of aggressive hostility toward People's China and the cutting off of all relations with her.

At home its immediate consequences were greatly to boost Nixon's falling political stock. In political circles it won a wide measure of bipartisan support, with only the extreme Right in open opposition. It was generally conceded that he had stolen a march on his opponents and that the coming visit, timed as it is in relation to the 1972 elections, will considerably enhance his chances of reelection. Faced with a deep-going political crisis created by his failure to get out of Indochina, he has, at least for the present, succeeded in projecting the idea among many people that the visit will contribute to world peace and specifically to hastening the end of the Indochina war.

But the question arises: what is the real meaning of this seeming about-face? Will it in fact lead to normalization of U.S.-China relations and a lessening of world tensions, thereby enhancing the pros-

pects for world peace? Or will it produce the opposite effect?

Progressive forces in the United States, and especially the Communist Party, have fought since 1949 against the U.S. cold-war policies aimed at undermining the People's Republic of China. They have long demanded its diplomatic recognition, its admission to the UN, an end to the U.S. embargo on trade, the cessation of imperialist incursions on Chinese territory, and the return of Taiwan.

In this light, the overtures toward friendly relations are to be welcomed. At the same time, it must be recognized that they are little more than gestures—mere cracks in the wall.

Thus, the ending of the total embargo on trade with People's China is in itself a positive step. However, it opens the door only to very limited trade. (On a similar basis, exports to the Soviet Union in fiscal 1970 amounted to a mere \$118 million out of total U.S. exports of \$40 billion.) *New York Times* correspondent Tad Szulc states that the action was designed "primarily as a political rather than an economic gesture. Neither the Administration nor American business executives anticipate meaningful commerce with China in the 'foreseeable future.'" (June 17, 1971.)

Similarly, the announcement by Secretary of State William P. Rogers that the United States will support the seating of People's China in the UN must be seen as a positive step. However, it is virtually negated by insistence on a "two Chinas" policy, on the continued seating of the Taiwan government as also representing China—a conception which the government of People's China has flatly rejected from the outset on the grounds that Taiwan is part of China.

Imperialist's True Aims

But in taking a positive attitude toward these cracks in the wall built by U.S. imperialism, one must not be blind to the aims which motivate these actions. They represent a shift not in basic policy but in tactics, even though a very significant one. Nor are they merely isolated gimmicks. They are part of a process of maneuvering going back to early 1969, a process culminating in the table-tennis invitations and subsequent developments. Noteworthy among these was the admission to China of a number of U.S. press correspondents, who then published a flood of articles describing the situation within China in such friendly tones as have never been applied to the Soviet Union or other socialist countries.

It is important to note that the change in attitude began to develop only when the anti-Soviet direction of the Chinese leaders became clearly evident. The disunity they had created in the world Communist movement had already encouraged the Johnson Administration

to embark on its escalation of the Vietnam war. And the increasing virulence of their anti-Sovietism encouraged U.S. imperialism, in the words of Gus Hall, to seek "dividends" from the split. Specifically, he writes, these are the following:

1. Continuation of the split between People's China and the rest of the socialist world.

1. Division between the socialist countries and those which have recently won political independence. . . .

3. Continuation of the split in the ranks of the world trade union movement.

4. Firing-up the differences and the divisions in the world Communist movement.

5. Because the Soviet Union is the most formidable world military-economic bastion of anti-imperialism, anti-Sovietism has the highest priority in the arsenal of U.S. imperialism. . . . ("U.S. Imperialism—Looking for 'Dividends,'" *Political Affairs*, June 1971.)

The aim of the overtures is to utilize rapprochement with the Chinese leaders as a means of realizing these "dividends." The U.S. policy of anti-Sovietism remains unchanged.

To be sure, key factors in the change are the deepening crisis of foreign policy and the worsening of the position of U.S. imperialism on the world scene. It is dictated among other things by the growing economic might of its closest rival, Japan. But it would be wrong to conclude, as some apparently have, that the projected visit represents a major defeat for U.S. imperialism and a great victory for the Chinese people. Whether it constitutes a setback for U.S. imperialism or a source of "dividends" remains to be seen, and this depends on a number of factors.

First of all, any real normalization of relations must be based on U.S. withdrawal from Indochina, as the Soviet leaders have repeatedly stressed. But Nixon is using the Peking visit primarily to divert attention from his refusal to get out of Indochina. In the words of Clark Clifford, former Secretary of Defense:

If the trip to China is Mr. Nixon's answer to the Vietcong's seven-point peace proposal of July 1, it is a real tragedy, because that offer could be the basis of an honorable settlement. My fear is that Mr. Nixon is using his trip to China as an excuse for not trying to find a settlement in Paris. (*New York Times Magazine*, August 8, 1971.)

Whether or not he succeeds in getting away with this depends on the actions of the people in this country. It depends also on the

stand taken by the Chinese leaders.

Secondly, there can be no real normalization of relations with People's China which does not also lead toward normalization of relations with the Soviet Union. Any U.S.-China agreement which is directed against the Soviet Union can serve only as an instrument against the forces of socialism and national liberation and as a means of aggravating world tensions and increasing the danger of war. With regard to Nixon's ability to use relations with China to foster anti-Sovietism and disunity, the stand of the Chinese leaders is, of course, decisive.

The Position of China's Leaders

However, it is precisely their stand on these matters, past and present, which casts grave doubts on the prospects for any real normalization of relations.

The departure of Mao Tse-tung and his supporters from the path of Marxism-Leninism and their efforts to disunite the world Communist movement have led to the isolation of the Chinese Communist Party from that movement and of People's China from the fraternity of socialist states. They have led to a campaign of unbridled slander against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a crew of alleged revisionists and betrayers of socialism, and to singling out the Soviet Union as the main enemy of People's China, charging it with nothing less than plotting nuclear aggression against the Chinese people.

In Mao's eyes the Soviet leaders are "world storm troopers" seeking to impose on China a so-called Brezhnev doctrine which allegedly asserts the right to intervene militarily wherever they consider socialism endangered. Moreover, it is to free their hands for such an "invasion" of China that they are seeking to come to terms with Western Europe and the United States.

In the light of this characterization of Soviet policy, totally at odds with reality, the fulminations against U.S. imperialism, though no less shrill and violent than before, have become increasingly hollow. Indeed, the Maoist line could only lead in the direction of seeking opportunist alliances with imperialist powers. Where else would one look for help against a "Soviet menace"? Furthermore, the increasing self-imposed economic isolation of China from the socialist world leads inevitably to a growing search for economic ties with capitalist countries. Already three-fourths of China's meager foreign trade is with the capitalist world. More important, the technological and economic assistance vital to China's industrialization, formerly supplied unstintingly by the Soviet Union and subsequently cut off by the Chinese leaders, must now be sought elsewhere. And what more likely source

is there than U.S. monopoly capital, possessed of enormous resources and always ready to extend "aid"—at a price?

The Maoist leaders have cloaked their line in a spurious theory of the "two superpowers," falsely lumping the Soviet Union and the United States together as equally reactionary, aggressive forces on the world scene. They call for mobilization of the small and intermediate-sized countries of the world for self-defense against this supposed twin menace. Of this crusade the Peking spokesmen propose to be the leaders, assuring the world that China has no intention of ever being a superpower. In this projected world alignment of forces, it should be noted, all class concepts, all recognition that the basic world conflict today is that between the socialist and capitalist systems, have vanished. It is small states against "superpowers," capitalist or socialist. And its effect is to turn these states against the Soviet Union; which is the foremost opponent of U.S. imperialist aggression and the staunchest bulwark of all countries fighting for national liberation.

Among the ominous indications of the direction of Chinese foreign policy are its ties with the murderous rulers of Pakistan which, significantly, served as an intermediary in the U.S.-China talks and as a taking-off point for Kissinger on his secret mission. An especially disturbing indication is the failure of the Chinese leadership to speak out against the bloody terror unleashed by President Nimeiry in the Sudan; if anything, they have given indications of supporting it.

Today the Chinese government pursues an increasingly open policy of seeking closer ties with imperialist states, even invoking the principle of peaceful coexistence—the very principle it has hitherto bitterly condemned as a Soviet sellout of the world revolutionary movement. But peaceful coexistence has nothing in common with *collaboration* with imperialism. Peaceful coexistence is a policy of struggle against imperialism and against imperialism's drive toward full-scale war with the socialist nations.

Interview With Chou

Do these changes signal a basic turn in Chinese foreign policy? Not at all. The public statements which have appeared in recent months, and especially those made by Premier Chou En-lai in his interview with James Reston of the *New York Times*, make it abundantly clear that the basic orientation remains the same.

In the interview the issue of U.S. withdrawal from Indochina was subordinated to other questions. True, Chou placed it as "the most urgent question" and expressed support of the seven-point proposals. But it was never placed as a necessary condition for the proper

development of U.S.-China relations. Moreover, Chou stated that he visualized the coming talks as focusing on longer-range questions rather than immediate issues—such as, presumably, the burning question of ending the aggression in Indochina.

Standing out in Chou's presentation was its anti-Soviet orientation. He spoke of "massive troops concentrated on our borders in the north," of the fear of a preemptive nuclear attack by the Soviet Union on China, and of the building of networks of tunnels under Chinese cities in anticipation of this. What Chou omits from the picture is the innumerable Chinese incursions into Soviet and Mongolian territory and the claims to large areas of this territory on the grounds that in the remote past they were part of China. What he omits is the fact that Soviet troops had to be stationed on the border with China because of these provocative incursions, as well as the repeated but fruitless Soviet offers to negotiate all border questions. Instead, the totally false picture is presented that the main threat to the People's Republic of China emanates from the Soviet Union, not from U.S. imperialism.

Chou places much emphasis on Japanese imperialism as a threat to China. He contends that Japan now has the resources, created with U.S. help, for speedy attainment of large-scale nuclear capacity, and that at the same time Japanese militarism and expansionism are being rapidly revived. Thus, both U.S. ruling circles and the Chinese leadership regard Japan as a major threat, even though not for identical reasons. Chou expresses the fear that with U.S. withdrawal from Taiwan a movement for independence would develop there, supported by Japanese ruling circles, which have heavy investments in that area.

What emerges from all this is the conclusion that U.S. withdrawal from the Asian scene is for Chou and his colleagues not at all a key necessity. On the contrary such a withdrawal would, in their view, leave China a prey to "Soviet aggression" on the one hand and Japanese expansion on the other. Hence, while Chou professes to be for U.S. withdrawal, there is no forthright pressure for it. And Chou adds: "We are not demanding only the U.S. withdrawal and not the Soviet withdrawal, because that would be unfair."

On this question the *New York Times* of August 11, 1971 comments editorially:

After two decades of angry complaint about the American presence in Asia, Communist China now appears to be equally troubled by the prospects of American withdrawal.

For one thing, Mr. Chou does not appear to be setting any deadlines now for American withdrawal. This omission in the Reston

interviews was particularly striking for Indochina, since Hanoi insists on a date certain for American troop departure before it will begin negotiations in Paris. . . .

But even more important for Chinese-American relations is the absence of a time frame in the Premier's references to an American pullout from Taiwan.

Opportunism in Peking

What all this adds up to, therefore, is the prospect of an opportunist alliance with U.S. imperialism, directed against the Soviet Union and Japan as common foes. Undoubtedly the Chinese leaders believe they can outmaneuver U.S. imperialism. But the game they are playing is a deadly one. It serves to disunite the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism at a critical juncture when unity against U.S. imperialism is decisive. And it is fraught with disaster for the Chinese people.

Temporizing with U.S. aggression in Asia and reliance on U.S. imperialism to defend Chinese interests only opens People's China to U.S. domination. Correspondingly, reliance on U.S. economic and technical aid opens the door to economic and financial dependence on U.S. monopoly capital. And once such dependence is securely established, with the accumulation of a mountainous burden of debt to the U.S., it will hardly be used by the U.S. monopolies to advance the building of socialism in China.

In short, the present policies of the Chinese leadership can serve only to advance the interests of imperialism. Far from taking advantage of the crisis of U.S. imperialism, they play into the hands of the Nixon Administration in its desperate efforts to overcome its deepening crisis at the expense of the people here and abroad. In the interests of People's China, these policies must be changed. As Gus Hall puts it in the above-cited article:

. . . No socialist country, for any reason, under any circumstances, can join hands with imperialism if, in any way, that act undermines the unity and power of the camp of world socialism and anti-imperialism. This has nothing in common with policies of peaceful coexistence between countries having different social and economic systems. While we welcome the cracks in the U.S. policy of trying to isolate People's China, we cannot close our eyes to the overall framework in which they take place. At the same time we will continue to fight to force U.S. imperialism to retreat from its aggressive policies toward People's China.

Thus, we support steps toward opening up U.S.-China relations.
(continued on page 26)

Neo-Colonialism and its Socio-Economic Strategy *

A quarter of a century ago the term "neocolonialism" meant very little even to people who specialized in international affairs. Today, however, it has acquired "citizenship rights," so to speak, and has taken a firm place both in the political and scientific lexicons. This is understandable: neocolonialism has become an important social problem in the second half of the 20th century.

The disintegration of colonial empires has undermined the old system of subordination and exploitation of the economically backward Asian, African and Latin American countries by world capitalism. But colonialism has not disappeared from the historical arena along with colonial empires. To begin with, the newly free countries remain an object of intensive imperialist exploitation. Even though the tribute these countries are forced to pay annually is no longer as important as it once was for the smooth functioning of the world capitalist economy, for the developing countries themselves the billions of pounds, dollars and francs that flow into the coffers of European and American bankers are very vital indeed, for they represent hundreds of unbuilt factories, electric power stations, schools, hospitals, decent housing. They stand for the millions of men and women who remain poverty-stricken, sick and illiterate.

With the help of neocolonialism, imperialism seeks to perpetuate the unequal, dependent position of the newly free countries, to steer them onto the path of capitalist development in order to continue exploiting them by more subtle methods, adapted to the tremendous social changes which have occurred in the world as a whole and in the zone of the national liberation movement in particular. It is in the garb of neocolonialism that imperialism is confronting the young independent states today, acting as the main stumbling block in the way of their economic and social progress. L. I. Brezhnev pointed out in his speech at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969 that "today neocolonialism is no less dangerous than colonialism."

* The following article originally appeared in the Soviet Journal *Kommunist*, No. 4, 1970. It is reprinted in English translation from *Reprints from the Soviet Press*, October 16, 1970.

In analyzing the character and essence of imperialism, Lenin demonstrated the historical nature of the forms of colonial policy, stressing its essential differences at various stages of capitalism. His statement is truly a methodological guideline for analyzing neocolonialism and understanding its place and role in history.

Neocolonialism can be defined as imperialist colonialism in the period of confrontation between world socialism and capitalism, of breakup of the colonial system and the winning of political independence by enslaved countries, the period of the world social, scientific and technological revolution. Neocolonialism is turning into the dominating trend in colonial policy and becoming an organic part of the global imperialist strategy at the stage of capitalism's general crisis, traditional colonialism having collapsed. The specific features of neocolonialism are determined by the situation existing in the world and also in the countries which are objects of neocolonialist expansion.

The rise of the world socialist system and the new relationship of world forces are exerting a tremendous influence on the policy of imperialism in the Third World, which deeply affects the shaping of relations between the imperialist powers and the newly free countries. The experience of the past decade demonstrated that however much imperialism may be interested in the economic exploitation of the former colonies and semicolonies, these are of still greater importance to it socially, from the viewpoint of the destinies of world capitalist formation. Throughout the 1960s the line of imperialism in the national liberation zone underwent modifications; but its driving force was, and remains, the desire to win over young independent states to its side in the worldwide class battle, to steer their development along capitalist lines.

In view of this, the rooting of capitalist relations in the newly independent countries is becoming neocolonialism's central socio-economic task. Without considering this fundamental element it is impossible properly to assess the general course of the imperialist powers in the Third World, to understand why in their relations with the young national states they are guided not merely by considerations of direct economic benefit. It goes without saying that all this does not alter the fact that the former colonies and semicolonies remain for imperialism important sources of raw materials, markets, spheres for capital investment, and strategic bridgeheads. Similarly, this does not imply that such means as the "divide-and-rule" policy and other tried and tested methods of colonialism have been relegated to the archives.

The former colonial and semicolonial world itself has also changed radically. The imperialists now deal with national states which act,

or in any case can act, as independent units in international politics, and utilize institutions of state power for defending their national interests. While remaining within the world capitalist economy, these countries hold a specific place there. In their majority they do not belong to the political system of imperialism. Moreover, their independent development, both economic and political, inasmuch as it is directed against the imperialist-dictated inequalities in relations, objectively have deep intrinsic anti-imperialist tendencies. At the same time support of the socialist community, and to a certain extent also the development of cooperation among young national states themselves, offer them the opportunity to resist the dictates of the monopolies.

In the course of their struggle the people of the newly free countries have accumulated considerable experience. In fact, their common conclusion has been the demand for the earliest abolition of economic dependence on imperialism, the elimination of social and economic backwardness, and restriction of the activity of foreign monopolies.

As social contradictions in these countries grow, the class forces become differentiated and polarized on the question of their further development. Divergence between the aspirations of the bourgeoisie and other privileged groups and the interests of the masses, glossed over in the earlier phase of the liberation struggle, stands out more distinctly. This, in turn, seriously influences the position of various social forces in the young states in relation to imperialism. The exploited sections are all for energetic, determined anti-imperialist action. At the same time, certain circles of the national bourgeoisie increasingly show a desire to renounce revolutionary forms of struggle and even reach a compromise with imperialism.

The loss of colonial empires has deprived imperialism of direct control over the former enslaved countries, but it still possesses powerful political, military, economic, and ideological instruments for affecting development and social processes in the Third World. This is determined both by the positions imperialism has preserved in this zone and the nature of the international capitalist division of labor, the alignment and the relationship of forces in the capitalist economic system, and the unequal position of the newly free countries in it.

These countries, inhabited by more than two-thirds of the population of the nonsocialist world, contribute about one-tenth of the entire capitalist industrial production. The imperialist powers still account for more than 70 per cent of the foreign trade of the newly free countries and more than 90 per cent of the state loans and credits

received from foreign sources by these countries. If to this we add their general backwardness, the instability and warped nature of their economy (adapted, as a rule, to the needs of the imperialist powers) and the extreme sensitivity of that economy to fluctuations on the world capitalist market, it will become clear how vulnerable they are to pressure by the imperialist monopolies. Account should also be taken of the fact that in the present phase of the development of state-monopoly capitalism, the monopolies are able to employ powerful instruments of indirect control and frequently to act on a "collective" imperialist basis.

The result is a specific, and in many respects contradictory, situation. Owing to the new relationship of world forces, the earlier forms of colonial policy, designed for direct control, have proved ineffective. But imperialism still preserves sufficiently strong instruments to enable it to exercise *indirect* control, resisting the consolidation of the political independence of Asian, African and Latin American countries and their attainment of economic independence. Not only a striving for independent development, but also anti-capitalist tendencies have arisen and are gaining strength in the newly independent countries. At the same time, the wish to prevent the withdrawal of the former colonies and semicolonies from the capitalist system is becoming a major aim of imperialism's global strategy.

It is in this situation that neocolonialism has crystallized as a totality of relations and methods of indirect control by the imperialist powers over former colonies and semicolonies.

In the sphere of *economic relations*, neocolonialism's line consists above all in supporting a moderately reformist, capitalist transformation of the former enslaved countries, designed to perpetuate their economic dependence, the lag of the newly free countries behind the leading imperialist powers, and their subordinate position in relation to the international capitalist division of labor.

Socially, neocolonialism pursues the line of alliances with those sections of the national and bureaucratic bourgeoisie which, out of narrow class, selfish motives and fear of the masses, incline to collaborate with imperialism.

It goes without saying that the line of neocolonialism whether in the economic or the social sphere, is not always displayed in its "pure" form. Neocolonialism, arising within traditional colonialism and acting as a natural heir to all its attributes, and adapting them to its needs, cannot but bear the imprint of this legacy. Only gradually does it elaborate its own strategy, adapted to the changing realities of the newly free countries.

II

The economic sphere holds a special place in the strategy of neocolonialism. This, of course, is understandable. The economic dependence of the former enslaved countries on world capitalism was intended to serve as the primary basis of imperialism's political influence in those countries. It is not by chance that the "aid" given by the imperialist powers is the most effective weapon neocolonialism can use to ensure the effectiveness of its methods. Moreover, trade with the young national states is acquiring ever greater significance for the neocolonialists.

Nor can we ignore the fact that in the postwar years, during the period of the disintegration of colonial empires, practically all the imperialist powers set up a wide network of "specialized" governmental institutions for "economic cooperation" with the former colonies and semicolonies. Among them are, specifically: the Agency for International Development in the United States; the Ministry of Overseas Development and the Commonwealth Development Corporation in Britain; the Ministry of Economic Cooperation in the Federal Republic of Germany; the Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund in Japan; the State Secretariat for Cooperation in France. Collective imperialist organizations for "aid" to Third World countries were also set up in the 1960s: The International Finance Corporation, the International Development Association, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and various other consortiums and groupings.

Classical colonialism based itself on preserving the feudal and semi-feudal backwardness of the colonies and semicolonies. It offered every resistance to the development of local capitalism. The socioeconomic shifts that occurred in the colonies despite this resistance were subsidiary, primarily a spontaneous result of the activity of the colonialists. According to the well-known phrase used by Marx, they acted (for example Britain in India) the role of an unconscious instrument of history.

A somewhat different line is characteristic of neocolonialism. To begin with, the abolition of colonial regimes deprived the imperialists of their ability to hinder the economic progress of the newly independent countries by administrative methods. At the same time, elimination of the backwardness inherited from colonialism became one of the principal slogans in the struggle of the peoples for national liberation. This slogan is also supported by representatives of the ruling circles in the Third World regardless of their political orientation. Economic progress is a requisite for the political stability of the existing regimes and frequently also of the young independent states

in general. The national bourgeoisie, which stands for economic development, is aware of this and is motivated not only by selfish material interests but also by political calculations. These sentiments cannot be ignored by the neocolonialists who orient themselves toward cooperation with the national bourgeoisie.

In a certain sense the neocolonialists themselves are interested in the economic development of the former enslaved countries—naturally, within limited bounds. The keeping of these countries in the orbit of world capitalism, and the entrenchment of capitalist relations, is inconceivable today without economic progress. Moreover, the imperialist monopolies expect to make no small profit on the expansion of the domestic markets of young independent states, which would be a natural result of such progress.

Forced to consider such a prospect as an objective reality, the imperialists seek to localize, to restrict, and what is most important, to steer the economic development of the young national states into capitalist channels. Cautious encouragement of a gradual capital transformation of young national states so as to counteract the struggle of the patriotic forces for a revolutionary, radical remaking of the obsolete socioeconomic structure and for genuine social progress—such is the chief strategy of neocolonialism. The implanting of bourgeois structures in these states has been one of the main aims of imperialism's large-scale measures, especially since the end of the 1950s and early 1960s.

Stimulation of the capitalist development of the newly free countries—naturally, along with exploiting these countries and securing political control over them—is becoming an ever more important task of imperialist "aid." This is demonstrated in particular by the increase in the share of this "aid" which, according to official statistics, is intended for economic purposes.

It goes without saying that the makers of neocolonialist policy envisage an economic development of the newly free countries that must cause no radical changes, must maintain them in their subordinate position in the system of a world capitalist economy. They assign the newly free countries a role of "backward" capitalist areas dependent on the imperialist powers.

It should be remembered that backwardness is a historically concrete concept and always contains an element of relativity. This also applies in full measure to the problem of the backwardness of Asian, African and Latin American countries, to the gap in economic development between them and the industrial capitalist powers. The nature of this backwardness and the size of the gap will hardly remain unchanged in the foreseeable future.

Dynamics of Distribution of United States Aid
(in million dollars)*

	All economic and military aid	Total	Economic aid alone Develop- ment loans	Percentages of all aid
1955	4,259	1,821	—	19.5
1960	3,873	1,866	522	48.2
1961	3,714	2,012	630	54.2
1962	4,204	2,509	1,087	59.7
1963	4,294	2,297	1,249	53.5
1964	3,759	2,136	1,253	59.7
1965	3,537	2,026	1,078	57.3
1966	3,869	2,545	1,154	65.8
1967	3,372	2,249	1,008	66.8

Today, in the last third of the 20th century, both have become somewhat different as compared, say, with the 1940s. It may be assumed that as time goes on neocolonialism will increasingly utilize not only the absolute backwardness, but especially the relative backwardness of the former colonies and semicolonies, their technical weakness, and the fact that advanced industry is concentrated in the imperialist states.

The imperialists promote the capitalist development of the newly independent countries both by exporting elements of developed capitalism into their economy and by stimulating internal private-property tendencies. Moreover, the neocolonialists are banking on both local and foreign capital. But it is the latter that gains most of all from such a trend. The reason is that this trend, because of the exceedingly limited resources of local private-property accumulation, presupposes the direct and extensive participation of foreign monopolies, with all the political and economic consequences following therefrom.

To stimulate private investment in the newly free countries, the United States and some of the other imperialist powers have set up special economic development funds which grant loans to private business on easy terms. President Nixon pointed out in his message to Congress on foreign aid in May, 1969, that the Agency for International Development intends to use for these purposes an ever greater part of its capital, technical, and consultative assistance. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and its branch, the International Finance Corporation, are also engaged in financing the private sector in developing countries. The total sum of the loans

* According to *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1968, p. 797.

it granted went up by almost 50 per cent in 1966-67.

In his message on foreign aid, President Nixon stressed the need for mobilizing the energy of private enterprise for activities abroad. He proposed to set up a corporation for private foreign investments which, as he put it, would be a new center for concentrating the efforts of the United States in rendering aid to newly free countries.

The power of state instruments is utilized for extending the channels of penetration by private capital into newly independent countries, for ensuring foreign companies control over their general trend and the essential aspects of economic development. The press bulletin of the US Agency for International Development, published in December, 1967, reported that the total sum of the guarantees it gave to US companies and enterprises operating in the Third World reached \$4 billion. Various forms of cooperation between "government-aid" agencies and private firms are widely employed in the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain and other imperialist states.

Net Export of Capital to Newly Free Countries from State and Private Sources of Developed Capitalist Countries on a Bilateral Basis and Through International Organizations
(in million dollars)*

	1963	1954	1965	1966	1967	1968
Total	8,016	9,143	10,493	10,471	11,306	12,900
State resources	6,072	5,856	6,200	6,498	6,977	6,927
Private resources	2,544	3,287	4,293	3,973	4,329	5,973
Share of state resources in the total sum of capital exports (percentages)	70.5	64.1	59.1	62.0	61.7	53.7
Share of private resources in total capital exports (percentages)	29.5	35.9	40.9	38.0	38.3	46.3

Although the stream of private investments by monopolies in the former colonies and semicolonies continues to be smaller than the export of state capital along "aid" lines—such a situation will apparently continue at least in the near future—a tendency to increase the role of these investments is clearly traceable. Naturally, for a proper

* Calculations according to *Development Assistance Efforts and Policies*, 1969 Review, P. 26, *The OECD Observer*, No. 41, August, 1969, pp. 3-4.

evaluation of the true significance of such a tendency it is necessary to remember that the lion's share of private capital flows into a very narrow group of newly free countries, and also that a considerable part of it consists of reinvestments (investments from the profits obtained locally) and export credits.

Private capital, not to mention the material benefits extracted by the monopolies, holds out special advantages for the neocolonialists. It is capable of penetrating most deeply into the economic and political life of the young national states, of establishing direct ties with social strata important for the monopolies, and exerting strong political and ideological influence.

The tendency to set up mixed companies in the developing countries with the participation of both foreign and local, chiefly private, capital, a tendency which has grown of late, is worthy of attention in this context. For example, in Malaysia most of the 70-odd American companies founded in 1966 were mixed. In India between January, 1957, and December, 1965, foreign companies concluded 2,358 agreements on the organization of enterprises together with Indian partners.

This is being done for the obvious purpose of depriving the local businessmen of freedom of action, to establish or preserve guardianship over them, firmly to link the interests of at least part of the local bourgeoisie with the interests of foreign capital. The imperialist monopolies would like, using the screen of partnership, to facilitate and disguise their expansion in former colonies and semicolonies.

This policy is being pursued with the encouragement and the energetic assistance of the imperialist states. The USA, for instance, has a special office for private investments, which is designated to promote the association of private American and local capital in politically unstable areas. The same function is served by the German Development Society set up in the Federal Republic, and by the Commonwealth Development Corporation financed by the British Government.

In imperialist circles, "association" of foreign capital with the local (and ultimately the establishment of control over the latter) is considered the most reliable and promising way for the entrenchment of capitalism in Asian, African and Latin American countries, for the preservation and extension of the position of monopolies there.

There has been one other striking new feature in the export of private imperialist capital to newly free countries in recent years. This is the rather substantial increase in investments in heavy industry and engineering. Suffice it to say that direct private US investments in the engineering and heavy industry of Latin America, Asia and Africa more than doubled between 1962 and 1968, while investments

in the mining and metallurgical industry amounted to only about 30 per cent during that same period.

This is explained above all by the desire to capture the lucrative expanding markets in the newly free countries before rivals do. At the same time, definite changes in the tactics of the imperialist monopolies are evident. Adapting themselves to the changing situation, they increasingly try to capture *new* key positions in the economy of the former colonies and the semicolonies, especially in leading branches of the manufacturing industry, which is organically a part of neocolonialism's long-term plans.

It should be noted that statements about the "inevitability" of the development of a state sector in the newly free countries have recently been frequently made by influential Western politicians. Financial support by the imperialists of state initiative in the economic life of these countries is on the increase. In December, 1968, Robert MacNamara, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and former US Defense Secretary, speaking in the UN Economic and Social Council, said that the Bank was prepared to finance state development banks in the newly independent countries. This statement has special significance: apparently inter-imperialist financial organizations will have to play an increasing part in the "aid" system. This is indicated by the tendency of some capitalist states to reduce "aid" and the striving of the imperialists to conceal their neocolonialist ends behind a screen of "internationalism." The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development intends to double its credit appropriations for 1968-74—from \$800-million to more than \$1.6-billion.

This, however, does not indicate any fundamental change in the intentions of the imperialist powers. According to the schemes of the imperialist strategists, the state must assume the role of a kind of midwife of capitalist relations in the Third World countries where there is no serious private-property alternative or where investments have to be made in spheres important for the economy but which are of low profitability and therefore unattractive to private capital. In other words, it is a matter of promoting the *temporary* development, until private capital has a chance to gain strength. Moreover, we must not forget that in this case, too, a major task of neocolonialism—stimulation of capitalist relations—is achieved, at the beginning in the form of state capitalism. Moreover, *such a type* of intervention by the state in the economic life of the former colonies and semicolonies, and its economic initiative, greatly facilitate the creation of an economic basis for exploring a bourgeois reformist solution to the social problems of these countries.

Thus, the economic strategy of neocolonialism presupposes certain concessions to the newly free countries which, however, do not run counter to its main economic aims, which are to exploit the former colonies and semicolonies and resist their striving for economic independence and social progress.

III.

The social strategy of neocolonialism, too, has its essential distinction. In the past, colonial regimes relied on the feudal and tribal nobility and also on comprador circles. But with the winning of independence the alignment of class forces changed. The influence of feudal and comprador forces now is receding, while the position of the bourgeoisie in most newly free countries is growing stronger.

In 1948, for example, India's own private companies and entrepreneurs accounted for 44 per cent of gross capital investments in the economy. But by the mid-1960s local enterprise was already contributing 83 per cent of the investments. In the Philippines, the participation of the local bourgeoisie in long-term gross capital investments more than doubled in the postwar period, from 25 or 30 to 65 or 70 per cent. The figures for Thailand are no less significant. Of the gross capital investments in the country's economy from April, 1959, to May, 1967, Thai capital accounted for 70 per cent. Lastly, on the Ivory Coast, in 1965 there were about 10,000 African planters who made up 9 per cent of the rural owners; but they held about 30 per cent of all the arable land.

Neocolonialism takes into consideration the rapid advance of the national bourgeoisie in a number of developing countries and is adopting its social strategy to the changing relationship of class forces in the Third World. Hence the turn of imperialism toward cooperation, and even alliance, with certain circles of the local bourgeoisie and pro-bourgeois groups which are assigned the role of chief social mainstay of neocolonialist policy. It is this that above all comprises the main content of neocolonialism's social strategy.

The imperialists act on the principle that for influential circles of the bourgeoisie in the newly-free countries the neocolonialist line of capitalist development is attractive to one degree or another. In a certain sense neocolonialism banks on the class solidarity of the bourgeoisie.

In recent years, neocolonialists have been paying particular attention to the so-called bureaucratic or administrative bourgeoisie and also the local intelligentsia. The bureaucratic or administrative bourgeoisie has been growing, and in most of them is now the chief, if

not the only, social representative of the forces of the bourgeois or pro-bourgeois order. The French newspaper *Le Monde* wrote that in Africa the term "bourgeoisie" is almost a synonym for "bureaucracy." In view of its specific position and methods of enrichment, the bureaucratic bourgeoisie is noted for utmost venality and servility and it is capable of assuming the most antinational positions.

As for the intelligentsia, the imperialists consider its social role exceptionally important in countries where this stratum is exceedingly small and an education offers tremendous social and political advantages. While seeking to influence possibly broader circles of the intelligentsia, the imperialists pay special attention to groups with an intrinsic pro-bourgeois tendency and a predilection for the Western way of life. They take into account the stratification of the intelligentsia, as a result of which one part takes a more radical anti-imperialist position, while another part is ready to compromise with, and even serve, the neocolonialists. They exploit the susceptibility of this social group to sharp political fluctuations.

The imperialists put forward the economic aims of neocolonialism, which open up possibilities for a certain amount of growth and enrichment, as the basis for agreement with the national bourgeoisie. In effect, what the imperialist monopolies are proposing is for the local bourgeoisie to share with them the markets of the newly free countries and to participate in exploiting their resources in the role of junior partner. These economic concessions, while forced on the imperialists, serve as bait which, according to neocolonialist plans, should lure to their side the social strata they need. Actually, if we bear in mind the political aspect of the matter, this is the specific kind of bribery which has always been used in colonial policy with regard to feudal elements and the tribal nobility.

It would seem that to make offers of unequal cooperation to the national bourgeoisie when it is operating in an independent state, and in most cases can serve as a mainstay, is sheer utopianism. But the imperialists hope to utilize for their own ends the process of social differentiation in the developing countries and the dual nature of the national bourgeoisie. Speculation on the sharpening of class contradictions in the developing countries is perhaps the most salient feature of the neocolonialist social-political course.

Faced with deepening social antagonisms, with the growing dissatisfaction of the people and the greater activity of progressive forces and organizations, a part of the national bourgeoisie increasingly displays reactionary tendencies.

It is for this reason that neocolonialists put forward anticommunism as the *ideological and political* basis for agreement with the national

bourgeoisie. Anticommunism is the preferred instrument of imperialist influence upon it. The imperialists see in the selfish, narrow class tendencies of a national bourgeoisie an important prerequisite for agreement with its influential circles.

Nor can we ignore the distinctive characteristics of the national bourgeoisie which flow from the colonial conditions under which it crystalized, and which exert a large influence on its stand in relation to imperialism. These are: its weakness and political faint-heartedness; "trepidation" in the face of the might of an imperialism which has not been completely rooted out; the existence of old ties with foreign monopolies; and, finally, its desire to continue to gain certain benefits from these ties.

It may be said that in the Afro-Asian countries the neocolonialists would like, to one degree or another, to duplicate their experience in a number of Latin American countries, where they succeeded from the very beginning in binding certain circles of the local bourgeoisie so strongly to the interests of the North American monopolies as to make them, in effect, lose their national face.

IV.

The economic and social strategy of neocolonialism cannot be reproached either for a lack of cunning or a lack of willingness to adapt itself to changing conditions, nor yet for an inability to exploit for its own ends the economic needs of the developing countries and the class selfishness of their propertied classes. But deep internal contradictions are inherent in neocolonialism's strategy. To begin with, by setting itself the aim of consolidating the "backward," "weak" and "dependent" capitalism of the newly independent countries, the neocolonial strategists are thereby making it vulnerable to attacks by the anticapitalist forces. Objectively, this boomerangs against the most important schemes of the imperialists and narrows down the possibilities for the development of capitalist relations in the newly free countries.

On the other hand, even the policy of limited industrial development in Asian, African and Latin American countries casts doubts on the principal aims of neocolonialism. In this sense neocolonialism, even to a greater extent than colonialism, contains an element of self-negation. By stimulating even a moderate development of the productive forces in the young national states, neocolonialism willy-nilly helps to strengthen the social forces opposing it. In the case of the young proletariat, it promotes the development of its own grave-diggers.

A deep contradiction also exists between the interests of the native

bourgeoisie and the aspirations of the imperialist monopolies. As the positions of this bourgeoisie are strengthened, the status of junior partner, assigned to it by neocolonialism, suits it less and less. It persistently strives for equality in cooperation and restrictions of the rapacious activity of foreign capital. Significant in this respect are the energetic measures (including nationalization) adopted by a number of governments in Asia, Africa and Latin America to curb foreign companies.

The task of financially supporting the capitalist development of former enslaved countries is by no means simple for the imperialist powers, especially in conditions of the crisis of the capitalist monetary system and the instability of balances of payments. The continued siphoning off by foreign monopolies of profits from the newly free countries—running into the billions—and the steady mounting sums which these countries are forced to ante up as repayment of "aid" loans, increasingly sap their already inadequate resources for the accumulation of local capital.

The implementation of neocolonialist plans is hampered by the wrangles of the imperialists themselves for the redivision of spheres of influence in the former colonial and semicolonial world. The collapse of colonial empires, of barriers which once protected the privileges of metropolitan countries, exacerbates their rivalry. Moreover, the interests of imperialism as a whole are by far not identical with the selfish interests of separate monopolies, which creates an additional source of contradictions.

Neocolonialism, which is trying to turn back the clock of history, to stem the process of national liberation and regeneration of the formerly enslaved peoples, undoubtedly will suffer the same fate as its predecessors. It must not be assumed, however, that it will collapse of itself under the weight of internal contradictions and flaws. The defeat of neocolonialism, inevitable from the aspect of world history, requires the determined struggles of the peoples.

Neocolonialism is opposed by powerful forces. These are, first of all, the masses in the newly free countries, the Communist all-revolutionary and progressive parties and organizations in the zone of the national liberation movement, and national states adhering to anti-imperialist positions. In the battle against neocolonialism the national liberation forces are able to rely on the historical gains of the earlier phase of the liberation struggle, to utilize the instruments of national statehood, the democratic advance of the people, the awakened social energy of the masses. It goes without saying that the effectiveness of all these instruments depends on the social systems existing in the newly independent countries, on the character

of the state and the class nature of the forces at the helm, and on the policy they pursue.

Consolidation of the political independence of the newly free countries, the laying of the foundations of a national economy by them, restriction of the activities of the imperialist monopolies, the establishment of close political and economic cooperation between the young states themselves, all serve as a powerful barrier in the way of the neocolonialists. Naturally, the countries which have embarked on the non-capitalist path have the advantage for most effectively rebuffing neocolonialism. Deep-going socioeconomic changes and an orientation toward socialism are a reliable means against neocolonialists intrigues.

A major trend in the struggle against neocolonialism is the development of broad and all-around ties and close cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist states which act as a powerful international bulwark of the liberation struggle waged by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The new upsurge of the anti-imperialist movement in the Arab world, serious progressive shifts on the African continent, the ever more energetic action of patriotic forces against local reaction in some Asian countries which are ready to compromise with imperialism, the bold steps of a number of Latin American governments which have challenged the powerful US monopolies—all this strikingly reveals both the growing awareness of neocolonialist danger on the part of the peoples of the newly-free countries and their firm resolve to resist that danger.

(continued from page 11)

But Nixon must not be permitted to use them as a device for diverting attention from his refusal to get U.S. troops out of Indochina. On the contrary, the fight for complete withdrawal by the end of this year must be stepped up. Nor can the matter of relations with People's China be allowed to rest with the few gestures which have been made so far. The fight is still to be waged for diplomatic recognition, for fully opening the door to trade, for seating People's China in the UN with the exclusion of Taiwan. So, too, is the fight for U.S. withdrawal from Taiwan and from all of Asia.

Not least, the struggle against anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism—the foundations of the Nixon policies—must be greatly sharpened. There is no greater illusion than the idea that one can effectively fight imperialism and simultaneously attack the Soviet Union. This lesson must be brought home to the people of this country, and especially in relation to the Nixon maneuvers to use People's China in its machinations against the Soviet Union.

The Battle of Logan County 1921*

"These are our hills and we love 'em. We had to fight for them long ago, against the bears and the panthers and the wolves and the rattlesnakes and now I reckon Don Chafin's thugs ain't a-goin' to scare us out."

A sturdy old mountaineer of more than three score and ten voiced these sentiments as we stood together on one of the loftiest peaks of Blair Mountain and filled our eyes with the surrounding magnificence of giant shaded valleys and mighty ridges, tossed in forested glory against the sky. It was a garden of towering wonder that blinded my eyes for the moment to the shallow trench at my feet, where thousands of empty shells were ugly reminders that Don Chafin's machine gunners and automatic rifle men had been nesting there a few days before.

We were tramping over the southern end of the fifteen miles of wilderness where twenty thousand men had been contesting the right of the thug system to exist in the mining fields of West Virginia. The battle had lasted through an entire week, during the closing days in August and the first ones of September, and it ended with the gunmen giving way along more than half their line after sustaining losses second only to those of the Paint and Cabin Creek campaigns. Two thousand federal troops came none too soon to prevent the miners from sweeping on through the mountain barriers, through the terror-haunted scab lands of Logan county, and on to the protection of their fellow union men under the heel of a bloody state martial law in the Mingo fields beyond.

Ten thousand labor volunteers with high-powered rifles leaving work and wives and rushing to the defense of their fellow union men nearly seventy miles away from the scene of mobilization! For an injury to one is an injury to all among the union miners of West Virginia. By their organized solidarity they have pulled themselves out of an industrial tophet that passes description. Mother Jones told me of miners working fourteen hours in the olden days in the state, and my veteran mountaineer friend smiled at this conservative statement, saying it was nearer eighteen. But step by step conditions have been lifted half way out of the mire. Desperate fighting has marked the unionization of each succeeding field of the high-grade industrial

* The following article originally appeared in the October 1921 issue of *The Liberator*, the successor of the magazine *Masses*.

coal which makes the state so desirable in the eyes of the great steel interests. But slowly and surely the organization has gained ground till today the operators are keeping Logan, McDowell, Mercer and Wyoming counties non-union only by the aid of several thousand deputized thugs, most of them drawn from the Baldwin-Feltz agency. In these counties murders are so common that the formalities of the coroner are seldom attended to. A year ago the United Mine Workers organized the men of Mingo County, which produces some of the best coking coal in this country. The operators locked the union men out and dispossessed their families from company houses. A strike was the counter-attack of the union and in the rough-and-tumble fighting which took place hereabouts between the two sides the thugs fared badly, especially in the battle of Matewan which was graphically described for the *Liberator* readers by Robert Minor a year ago. So the operators called in the state constabulary and state militia and since then, the Mingo miners, still standing by their strike that has crippled production nearly two-thirds, have been living under a murder regime that is excelled only in number of casualties by Logan County itself.

Miners have been shot down and tent colonies have been raided again and again. The United Mine Workers have kept the locked-out miners alive with weekly payments taken from dues and special assessments, but the rank-and-file of the West Virginia miners have been demanding more vigorous action than that given by their purses. "Nothing will do but that we go down there and set that place to rights ourselves," they said among each other.

But ten thousand armed miners—the number needed to overcome resistance on the way, are not easily pulled away from work and wife for a military campaign. It takes something tremendously dramatic and horror-raising to get such a force moving. The attacks on the Lick Creek Tent Colony and the steadily increasing murders did not have quite the necessary dynamic effect. Had the union officially called for volunteers, or had it sanctioned such a move, the miners might have gone flying; but something terrific that would shock all their working-class love and dignity had to happen before they would start on their own initiative.

It happened on July 31. I will let Mrs. Sid Hatfield* tell the story as she told it to me in Matewan, in the little apartment over the jewelry store, where she has been living since Sid was murdered.

"Sid never knew what killed him," she began. "Those Baldwin thugs were all hiding up there in wait for him on the top of the

* Sid Hatfield, village constable and ex-miner, was the hero of the battle of Matewan.

court house steps. I had begged Sid to take his guns along, but he said he wouldn't need them, and it didn't look nice to carry guns into the court house.

"They indicted Sid, you know, for shooting at Mohawk in McDowell County. Sid never knew anything about it. He hadn't been away from Mingo County or even from Matewan since we were married fifteen months ago, except that time he went to Washington to testify before the Senate Committee. It was just a trick to get him away from his friends and kill him.

"I guessed they were fixing to kill him, but the high sheriff of McDowell County, that's Bill Hatfield, a distant kin of Sid's, said he'd give him protection if he came on to the other county to answer the indictment. I was still nervous about it, but Sid went, anyhow.

"Ed Chambers and his wife Sallie came along with us. We went down on the night train, but the thugs knew all about it, for that fellow Lively got on twenty-five miles this side of Welch, the county seat of McDowell County, where we were going. That is the fellow, you know, that testified against Sid at the other trial. And next morning at breakfast there he was again, sitting next to us in the Busy Bee restaurant in Welch.

"Mr. Van Fleet, our lawyer, told Sid to be careful about going to the court house, for he didn't like the idea of this fellow following us, but Sid just laughed. He wouldn't take his guns but left them in the suitcase.

"That Welch court house is up two flights of steps. Everything looked all right as we started. Ed Chambers and Sallie in front. Sid had one foot on the second flight and was waving a hello to one of the other defendants in his case, who was standing nearby, when a bunch of men stepped out of the doorway, and began firing. Sid wheeled around and tumbled, and so did Ed. I ran up the steps, passed eight men shooting from the hip—like this. I don't know how they missed me. I ran inside calling for the sheriff, but he wasn't there. Then they told me that Sid wasn't killed. When I got out Sid had been taken away."

Mrs. Hatfield was devoted to Sid, but she is a mountain girl and knows the uselessness of bewailing the sudden death of her man, so she told the story quietly and without tears. Another witness took up the narrative where she left off and told how Lively had pumped his revolver into the body of Chambers, while most of the others concentrated on Hatfield. The first two shots hit Sid in the arm and a second later a gunman put his revolver to Hatfield's back and shot three times.

So died these lion-hearted, laughing young men, the salt of the

earth. And they died, not fighting as they would have chosen, but murdered in cold blood by sneering deputies, right on the threshold of the mocking temple of the law, and the murderers were allowed to go at large under bail. "Well, I'm glad that's over now," a high official of McDowell County is reported to have said that same day. Two practical opponents of the thug system were gone and Tom Feltz stood avenged of the deaths of his brothers Albert and Lee, who fell in the Matewan battle of May, 1920. Shortly after, this same gentleman complacently registered as a candidate for Congress on the Republican ticket in Galax in Old Virginia.

Success seemed to be smiling on the dual vested interests of coal operators and gunmen, and the prospects of wiping out all semblance of unionism in the rich coking fields of Mingo County, appeared better than ever. And—if in Mingo, why not all over West Virginia?

The funeral of Sid Hatfield, held a few days later from Matewan to the old Hatfield cemetery across the Tug River in Kentucky, might have given them pause. They might have noted the delegations that came from far and near while mining camps shut down for the day. They might have seen six hundred railroad shopmen coming from Huntington with an immense bower of flowers sent by their two thousand railroad workers there, who had closed down the shops for the day in memory of the passing of their brave fighter.

"It will blow over," was the comforting sentiment of the operators when their stools brought them word of the indignation flying like a fiery cross through the central and northern counties of the state. "It will blow over as these things have been blowing over for years," they reassured themselves.

But the workers were shaking with a fury that was boiling and not blowing over. The murder of Hatfield and Chambers in that premeditated fashion on the court house steps was the dramatic event that focused their eyes on the crisis before the whole labor movement of West Virginia. It was now or never for the cleaning up of Mingo County.

Up and down a hundred mountains where men delve deep for coal and even in the black diamond fields of Kentucky and Virginia, men began reaching for their high-power rifles for the big hunt again, as in Cabin Creek days. Organization for the purpose was hastily improvised outside of the United Mine Workers, which did not allow its district machinery to be used, and shortly after the middle of the month thousands of men began to move for the gathering place of Marmet. They came by train or car to this little town and its surrounding fields, there on the border of Boone and Kanawha counties, just sixty-five miles, as the bird flies, or more than

a hundred by road, to the Mingo coal fields. The route led straight across the union ground of Boone County and the thug-ridden lands of Logan.

Thousands of miners, black and white, came at the call; railroad men were there, atoning for the stain cast by the men who were transporting machine guns and thugs into Sheriff Don Chafin's Logan County lands; building-trades men came who knew that the powerful miners' union held up all organized labor in West Virginia, and machinists and farmers' boys gathered with the rest. Among the lot were more than two thousand who had taken post-graduate lessons in shooting "over there."

They moved on from Marmet on the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth of August, some six thousand strong; with thousands more coming on behind. Auto trucks loaded with provisions went on ahead and came behind. They were a formidable force when they arrived in the little Coal River Valley town of Madison in Boone County near Logan on the twenty-sixth. But here like a wet blanket on their enthusiasm fell the discipline of the United Mine Workers. President Frank Keeney of District Seventeen, with a record of consistent hard fighting, economic and otherwise, nevertheless ordered them to go back. What President Harding's ultimatum could not accomplish the hand of their union did.

They slowly started back, but they had not scattered far when the murderous Chafin's forces galvanized them into a return charge that no more orders or persuasions could have halted, had they been attempted. Four hundred Baldwin-Feltz thugs had dashed into the little mining town of Sharples, seventeen miles up the valley from Madison, Saturday night, and killed two miners, wounded two others, generally shot up the town and gotten away with four prisoners before the miners, taken by surprise, could come together from the neighboring hamlets.

The miners tumbled back into the Coal River Valley, thousands of reinforcements coming to avenge this latest insult, and the battle of Logan County began. Fighters rushed up to the front on each side, miners taking special trains on the little Coal River Railroad line and Chafin rushing in hundreds of state troopers, a thousand "killers" from McDowell County with Sheriff Bill Hatfield, recruits from Mercer and Wyoming, a few Legionnaires and other volunteers from elsewhere, and two or three thousand Logan people, volunteering through fear of submitting to a conscription that was enforced with threats of death, threats backed up by at least one jail murder.

It was a battle on the miners' part to break through the hills that cut off Boone County and the little unionized strip from Logan, from

the domain of the Baldwin-Feltz that was to furnish highway on their march to Mingo.

Machine gun nests guarded the fifteen miles of serrated mountain, and outposts of riflemen and automatic riflemen flanked out to protect the artillerymen. During the delay in the miners' march the other side had had time to dig themselves in and set their guns to command the mountain passes.

Cleaning out these machine gun nests and dislodging snipers was the imperative job of the miners' forces from the start. Out of the ten thousand men the best shots were picked for long distance elimination work while telescopes searched out the machine gun centers.

Sometimes one of the rapid fire mechanisms was placed so carefully that snipers had no chance to get results, and the gun had to be taken by storm, or not at all. If you will climb the mountains some miles from Sharples you will come across a small field of corn that had been mowed, as by a scythe, by machine gun fire. A squad of volunteers from the labor army dashing up the hill found that the gunner was unable to depress his weapon below a certain angle, and by bending double the shot went over their heads harmless to everything except the mountaineer's corn patch. This machine gun and four others near by were captured and two more elsewhere. Others were dragged back to second bases as the fire became too hot in the last days of the battle. All along the line from Hewitt Creek at the lower end of the valley, up through the mountains till within a few miles of the extreme end line, the workers' forces crowded their enemy back. Whenever the holding of the line depended on the conscript forces that line was not held, as in the mid-section of the line where fifty conscripts with a few Baldwin men mixed in hurriedly deserted an abandoned house in which they were camping for the night, at the rumor that the miners were coming. When the miners came they found a medley of trousers and socks and shirts left behind by some who fled too hastily to dress.

But it must not be supposed that most of the regular gunmen and the state troopers were of such weak kidney. "Give the devil his due" said one of the worker fighters in telling me of their desperate resistance. "Our boys got within twenty yards of a trench near George's Creek there, and those thugs stood their ground. Some of them couldn't shoot well, or our men wouldn't be alive, but they were game all right."

Some of them could shoot, too. I saw a tall tree whence a sniper had done execution till a rifle bullet tumbled him ninety feet to the ground.

Sheriff Chafin lost one of his chief aides in the fighting near Blair,

a veteran gunman named John Gore, who earned several paragraphs of eulogy from the newspapers when his death was announced. Gore fell with a bullet in his head while he was leading an outpost near George's Creek behind Blair Mountain, just after he had sent a ball through a chestnut tree killing a Negro.

In the same section of the fighting zone another bullet nearly clipped that very C.E. Lively who murdered Ed Chambers on the courthouse steps, if the eyes of a miner who knew him well did not deceive him. This miner was in charge of a body of men that had just fallen back to shelter after an attack on a trench, when he suddenly shouted, "There's that scoundrel" and drove a chunk of lead through the back of a tree behind which a man was operating with an automatic gun.

The Chafin forces were about as numerous as the miners, but composed of assorted gunmen, volunteers and conscripts; they were not nearly as effective as the miners, in spite of superior equipment. Consequently they lost many times more men. The miners have a record of eight known dead and several missing on their side, whereas the reports of refugees from Logan who counted stacks of dead brought back in truck loads from the front, made it evident that one to three hundred lives were lost on the other side.*

Apparently it was the disaster that was overtaking his forces that caused Chafin to loose his two borrowed planes as bomb droppers. For the first few days they had been doing scout duty only, but Thursday, September 1, hastily constructed bombs, made of powder and iron nuts stuffed into thirty inches of six-inch gas piping were supplied to the aviators. Bottles with chlorine gas were carried in addition and the mechanical hawks shot over the hills to the mining villages. The first bomb, dropped near Jeffrey, fell between two women washing their clothes, Mrs. Sallie Polly and Mrs. Lizzie Oxley, her married daughter. Like most of the others it was made so clumsily that it struck wrong and failed to explode. For three days bombs dropped on all the little mining towns in the valley, from Jeffrey, south to Blair. Mrs. Dula Chambers, the wife of the village blacksmith of Jeffrey, was gassed by a bursting bottle as she was rushing on a Red Cross automobile to the emergency hospital in a school house six miles up Hewitt Creek from Jeffrey, and she was sick for two days. But for the most part the bombs represented only the most futile bungling as well as brutality of intention.

* The figure was probably closer to 100. The gunmen were regarded as expendable by the coal operators and their casualties were underestimated.—A.S.

The arrival of 2,000 federal troops whom they summoned, saved these latter-day West Virginia beasts from the hands of the men they had wronged. Don Chafin still rules and lives by murder in his stronghold in Logan and the coal operators of the southwest counties are getting out their non-union coal at half wages and without the usual safety appliances. Nevertheless all is not well with them. The effect of the battle of Logan County has been to inspire the miners of the union counties with greater spirit and determination and it is tending to bring the whole labor movement of the state into closer co-operation.

... And a Postscript, 50 Years Later

This is the fiftieth anniversary of the biggest armed struggle in U.S. labor history. I covered the battle of Logan County for the *Federated Press*, a progressive Labor news agency, and *The Liberator*, and the memory of those brave, united men inspires me still.

The battle, however, did not win what I expected. The United Mine Workers union was broken in West Virginia and terror continued. Hundreds of men were arrested by gunmen deputies while President Harding's 2,000 troops kept the miners from resisting. Long trials followed, and a veteran of the armed march was still in Moundsville Penitentiary when I visited him in 1926 with a message from the International Labor Defense. In 1926 also, I slipped into Logan by the back way after an eleven-mile hike in the mountains and found that Sheriff Don Chafin's gunmen were still killing men in this traditional non-union stronghold. And in travels through West Virginia that year I did not find a single pit working under union contract. The miners were tied up tightly by anti-union "yellow dog" contracts and federal injunctions. The deputies had learned one lesson in the big battle, however. They were slower in pulling guns in the former union counties than they were in Don Chafin's domain.

But the love of freedom survived in the long non-union night. Many West Virginia miners preferred to starve in mountain cabins instead of living under gunmen in company camps where they were paid in scrip good only at the company store. Some families remained in the tent colonies that the union set up for strikers five years before. I still have a picture that I took of two miners' wives—one Black and one white—as they stood together in comradeship in front of one of the 1921 tents.

Freedom finally dawned in 1933 when the political climate was better. The Norris-LaGuardia Law, banning anti-union injunctions,

had been won by workers in 1932. In 1933 the famous "7-A" clause of the National Industrial Recovery Act—a law that was bad in other respects—promised workers the right to belong to labor organizations. The miners took advantage of these favorable circumstances and joined the United Mine Workers in overwhelming numbers. The coal operators were taken by surprise. The gunmen did not dare to begin shooting. And I met many splendid union men from Logan County when West Virginia miners were occupying the State Capitol building in Charleston during the Black Lung strike in 1969.

The question arises whether the armed march was a mistake. Mother Mary Jones, a beloved figure in the coal fields, said it was. She met the marchers and did her best to stop them. They had boundless affection for their Mother. They had followed her against the gunmen in the Paint and Cabin Creek strike of 1912 and elsewhere. But they would not need her now, and the aged fighter, then 93, was hurt and disappointed. She told me at lunch in Charleston after the battle that she felt certain from the beginning that Harding's troops would intervene. The troops, she said, were the bosses' reserves, who step in when local thugs are defeated.

I reminded Mother tactfully that she had taken a very active part in the fierce Paint and Cabin Creek strike of 1912 when guns were used on both sides for months. And Mother's eyes sparkled as she lived over that battle again and told how dozens of gun thugs bit the dust before the coal operators gave in. But conditions were very different in 1921, she insisted. Absentee owners had taken over West Virginia. They dominated Washington and anyone should have known that the troops would come and many miners would suffer, she said.

I cannot dispute Mother Jones's point that federal military intervention might have been foreseen and that federal troops would prevent the miners from reaching their goal. On the other hand I would like to correct some misunderstandings about this dramatic chapter in American working-class history. The armed march was not an insurrection, although the miners fought state police as well as company gunmen. It was not an attempt to take over the mining industry and to change the social system although there were many former Socialists and a number of Communists among the marchers. It was an armed mass movement in defense of union brothers, who were being butchered and enslaved by the minions of murderous financiers. And it followed extreme provocation.

The armed march had nothing in common with acts of anarchist violence by lone individuals or handfuls of individuals. It was a grass-roots movement, to use an old phrase. It was a movement of thousands

of men united by strong class feelings. They came from more than a hundred different communities with their own supply organizations. The march demonstrated some of the creative qualities of a militant working class that will in time take power. And it left behind a feeling of pride that persists after fifty years.

Nor is it fair to say, as some do, that the strikes were beaten and the union was crushed as a result of the armed march. The main causes were very different. The United Mine Workers Union was defeated in Appalachia because of the incorrect tactics used by its national leadership in the 1920's. President John L. Lewis was an active member of the Republican Party—the Party of President Harding and the coal operators. And he followed a policy of retreat from the time he took office in 1919 until his turnabout in 1933. He signed union contracts with coal operators in the Northern fields while the same companies were flooding the market with non-union coal from their mines in West Virginia, Kentucky, western Maryland and Alabama.

This dual policy started the UMW on its drift downhill. The drift was accelerated when Lewis left the steel companies' captive mines in southwest Pennsylvania out in the cold without a contract, after they joined the national coal strike and saved the union in 1922. By 1927 the UMW was almost destroyed throughout the country. And there was little hope for West Virginia's isolated miners until the entire union—including Lewis—took the offensive in 1933.

That offensive was so overpowering that no miner felt the need to take his high-powered rifle down from the wall.

A CORRECTION

In the August issue of *Political Affairs* three words were dropped from the conclusion of Henry Winston's article, "The Crisis of the Black Panther Party." Although the article ends there this typographical error makes it appear as if material was omitted. Page 25 of Winston's article should have ended with the following:

. . . against the people.

We are sorry for the confusion this caused. *The Editors.*

Party Work in Harlem

Within the Black Community there is a growing search for Marxism-Leninism. The possibilities for building our party have grown tremendously. Today the Communist Party is seen in a more positive light.

This change in mood comes as a result of the proven bankruptcy of one anti-Marxist ideological trend after another. In appraising the growth of interest in Marxism-Leninism we cannot overlook the pioneering role played by the Black Panther Party. In this past decade the Black Panther Party through its press and educational has popularized a number of Marxist classics as exemplified by the wide distribution and discussion of Dimitrov's *United Front Against Fascism*. The rising interest in Marxist-Leninist science is also due to the consistent and comprehensive political line of our Party. While many so-called revolutionary trends have come into being and passed away, our Party, although not seemingly as strong as others, continued its fight for a scientific direction in the struggle against capitalism, racism and oppression.

The recent Communist campaign in Harlem was a tremendous instrument in the fight for Marxism-Leninism and in the fight for a consistent direction to the struggle of the Black and Puerto Rican masses against the special forms of monopoly oppression inflicted on the Harlem community. Indeed our Harlem campaign helped to rekindle the flame of interest and identification with our Party. The Communist candidate in Harlem was a welcomed event to many who remembered the days of the late Benjamin Davis who represented Harlem in the New York city council.

The fight for the freedom of our imprisoned comrade Angela Davis has captured the imagination of a People enraged by this sinister attempt to murder one of today's most profound young Black intellectuals and militant freedom fighters. The fight for Angela's freedom and the role of our Party in this fight has led to the regeneration of the understanding that our Party is the one Party that is consistently partisan to the struggle for Black freedom. This understanding will continue to grow as we advance this struggle.

There is a shift in the ideological balance in the Black Community generally and in Harlem specifically. This is not to imply that the battle is won but to indicate there is a shift in favor of Marxism-Leninism. A few years ago many wouldn't even listen to a Commu-

nist. Our Party was viewed as a white people's party. Today, Communists are sought after; Communists are being listened to more carefully; Communists are being applauded more energetically.

Diversionsary Trends

We are now in a period of searching, of probing for new direction in the struggle. The class enemy is not "outside" of this probing. We are witnessing an intensified ideological drive by the enemy. The same old discredited ideologies are being presented in new clothing.

Pan Africanism has become the new dressing for bourgeois nationalism. This ideology is geared to diverting the Black masses to some utopian scheme of establishing a Black nation. There are two main trends of this "new" Pan Africanism. One calls for a Black nation in Africa. They call for "colonizing and expanding." This trend sounds very akin to Zionist ideology which is nothing but a tool in the hands of imperialism's attempt to roll back history and re-establish imperialist dominion in those countries that have successfully freed themselves from the yoke of colonial plunder. The second Pan-Africanist trend calls for the establishment of a nation in continental U.S.A. without altering the present social system. We must expose these theories for what they are. They are nothing but a new cloak for the aspirations of the Black bourgeoisie and petit bourgeoisie to establish their right to reap more of the benefits from the exploitation of the black masses. These theories are geared towards diverting Black workers from the struggle to change their immediate condition and from fighting in unity with their white class brothers. Any careful examination will show that these ideas are being supported and financed by monopoly.

There is growth of cultural-nationalist mysticism, the notion that the path to freedom lies in "knowing oneself," which has the effect of turning people away from struggle and towards self-examination. The Muslims remain one of the main cultural-nationalist trends. Many who espouse cultural-nationalist positions point to the Muslims as an example of the achievements of this ideology. In this period the Muslims are making an intensified ideological drive with Minister Farakhan, a most able and articulate speaker, as the main spokesman. They are capitalizing on the weaknesses of the Black Panther Party as their chief attack on the trend towards Marxism-Leninism.

Today many young militants are confused on the question of the relationship between reform and revolution. They fail to understand the organic interconnection between the struggle for reform and for revolution. This arises out of a failure to understand that a capitalist class could never exist without an exploited working class and vice

versa, and that what characterizes this system is the struggle of the working class for a greater share of the value created by it in the process of production. The logical conclusion of this continuous struggle by the oppressed for reform is the struggle for revolution. Failing to understand this, many develop "counter-community" approaches to struggle, which in essence mean abandonment of struggle. So, for example, the Black Panther Party developed a so-called Free Breakfast program for hungry school children. This program was not oriented towards organizing masses to fight to force the government, to which we pay billions in taxes, to provide this necessary service.

Similarly, today, some are developing sickle-celled anemia clinics. Of course, nothing is wrong with these programs in themselves because they attempt to provide vital services for the community. However the orientation which gives rise to them serves only to derail some of the most militant sections of the movement and transform them into "revolutionary" social workers.

There are also those who say we are Marxist-Leninists, but we want a Black Communist party. To speak of a Black Communist party in the U.S.A. betrays a failure to understand the essence of Marxism-Leninism—unity of the class as against class division; internationalism as against nationalism. Those who talk of a Black Marxist-Leninist party in fact are still under the influence of bourgeois nationalism.

The above are only a few of the ideological waves and currents within the Black Liberation movement. It would be extremely naive for us to think that these currents are only spontaneous in character. To be sure there is a spontaneous element in them. But at the same time there is an organized ideological offensive by the class enemy in a desperate effort to derail the struggles, to transform the people's organizations into dogmatic, isolated sects.

The Struggle in Harlem

Just as we see the Black Liberation struggle as the central question in the struggle of the working class, the enemy also understands this and is making a concentrated effort to divert that struggle. *Harlem is also a concentration for the enemy's ideological offensive.*

It is with this in mind—the growing importance of the struggle on the ideological front and the importance of the Harlem community in general—that the New York State Committee of the Communist party discussed and agreed to mobilize every resource to establish in Harlem an educational complex; a combined Marxist school and bookstore, by the fall of this year. Such a complex will be a tremendous instrument in the fight against diversionsary ideologies.

Harlem is the biggest Black metropolis in the world, facing all the major crises of the nation and the special forms of Black oppression, in an intensified manner. This community therefore, is not devoid of struggle. There is struggle on all fronts. There are struggles for better housing and for jobs. There is almost unanimous rejection of the U.S. war policies in Southeast Asia. There are struggles against repression and drug addiction. There is not an issue around which there is no organization in Harlem.

Nevertheless, there is no struggle of a genuine, mass character in Harlem. This is due, partly, to the dominant reformist character of the policies projected by the leadership of some of the major people's organizations. For example, on the housing front, the struggle is confined to the fight around services, rent and reactions to the consistent drive by City Hall and Albany to increase rents under the pressure of the landlord interests, well represented at all levels of government. In a decaying, overcrowded community like Harlem such struggles are meaningless unless linked to the fight for massive construction of low income housing units.

Another example is the unemployment fight where the main stress is on the fight against job discrimination. This is a necessary fight, especially as it relates to the building trades, but in the face of mass unemployment which cripples the community and contributes to the high rate of drug addiction, this fight also becomes meaningless if not related to the fight for public job creation.

As a result of these policies many become frustrated and disenchanted because the struggle seems to be nothing but an endless repetition of the same cycle which brings about no meaningful change. Countless numbers of tenants have fought militantly to have their apartments patched up but as a result of the decaying condition of unkept buildings those repairs made are rapidly negated. Countless numbers have given up voting because replacing one representative after another in the same old monopoly party improves nothing.

What is necessary in Harlem, in order to give a massive character to the struggle, is a fighting people's coalition. Such a coalition must be one that employs mass action as well as independent political action. This coalition, if it is to be meaningful, must be based firmly on a minimum program of unity on the major problems confronting the community. It cannot be based on the abstract concept of "Blackness." It cannot be based on ideological unity.

In order to guarantee that this objective is met requires a working-class force that can neutralize the instability of the bourgeoisie and petit bourgeoisie in the community and force them into consistent struggle against monopoly and in the interest of the Black masses.

Working-Class Leadership

The fight for working-class leadership is on the agenda, for certainly the leadership of the Rangels and Suttons will not suffice if the struggle is to surge forward. In the country as a whole Black representatives, the majority of whom represent the interest of the Black bourgeoisie and petit bourgeoisie, play a generally progressive role. They fight against the war. They fight for more progressive social legislation. But it can be said that in the Black communities they generally tend to be a brake on the development of the people's movement. Their reformist approach tend to lead to abstention from mass actions and struggles outside of the electoral arena. They fail to utilize their position to give leadership in the fight to change the deteriorating conditions in the community. Many of the present representatives of the Black community have established their niche in the parties of monopoly capitalism. Therefore they will not budge and continue to operate in the framework of keeping Blacks tied to the Democratic party.

The building of a people's coalition that can unite masses and win meaningful victories for the super-exploited people of Harlem is a necessary condition in the fight against some of the ideologies mentioned before. All of these "new" ideologies, from "Nation Time" to "knowing oneself," have something in common with the widespread problems of drug addiction and alcoholism in that they are basically escapist ideologies. They try to circumvent the mass struggle necessary to bring about change.

How do we fight for working-class leadership? First of all, our Party is the Party of the working class. To talk about working-class leadership without building our Party is idle chatter. To talk about building our Party without building intermediary organizations on the action front is like trying to hit a home-run without a baseball bat. For the last few months we have been working on the establishment of a Harlem Angela Davis Committee, a housing organization and an unemployed committee, based mainly among unemployed youth and organized through the Y.W.L.L.

In this period of heightened enemy ideological offensive any compromise or acceptance of alien ideologies is a demobilizing factor, undermining the development of our work.

Let me say affirmatively that we are influenced by alien ideologies which act as a brake on our work. Some of our comrades consider themselves as mass workers first and Communists second. They in fact become representatives of the mass movements in the Communist party, not class conscious Communists in the mass movement. As a

result they think of their particular field in isolation from other struggles. That is why when we undertake to mobilize people to participate in an important peace action, many comrades cannot produce any of the "masses" with whom they work. I get the feeling that many even think of the peace question or other issues that arise, as distractions from their main work. Needless to say, these comrades cannot produce any new faces at open Party educational meetings. They do not recruit.

There is a resistance to building intermediary forms and a failure to fight for the Communist party in the mass movement. Failure to build the Party is sheer reformism. It is opportunism of the first degree!

Then there are some comrades who are not involved in the mass movement. These comrades resist involvement in any activity, including open Communist activity. This reflects an accommodation to things as they are. This too is reformism, for Communists are not theologians. They combine theory with practice. This tendency to accommodate to things as they are is based on a lack of confidence in the working class. Consequently, some develop theories like, "leave it to the youth." "The youth will make change." To be sure the younger generation, being most sharply affected by the crises, will respond more sharply and with a tremendous revolutionary zeal, but the youth, disunited from the working class as a whole, disunited from the mass movement generally, cannot make revolution. In order to advance our struggle every Communist must be involved.

Bourgeois Nationalism

There is also a tendency among some to use phrases coined by alien ideologies and by bourgeois-nationalist trends. I detect a certain cynicism in our ranks towards the fight for the unity of Black and white. But the fight for proletarian unity is a basic cornerstone of Marxism-Leninism. In the United States the struggle for the unity of the working class is the fight for the unity of Black and white in the first place. Indeed no fundamental victories for the Black mass, no fundamental victories for the white masses, are possible without such unity.

In our work we have helped establish a number of all-Black organizations. For example: the Black Women's Committee to Free Angela Davis; the Harlem branch of the Young Workers' Liberation League; and some of our comrades in the League helped establish an all-Black Committee to Free Angela Davis on Columbia University campus. But to some, all-Black forms have become a panacea for building among Black masses. Let us understand however, that our ability to advance the democratic struggle among Blacks, to build our Party

PARTY WORK IN HARLEM

and consolidate the unity of Black and white is fundamentally related to our ability to wage an effective struggle against racism among whites.

The trend towards all-Black forms among Afro-Americans, as an oppressed peoples, has a progressive content which we Marxists support. Therefore it is correct for us to initiate and participate in all-Black organizations. But these cannot become homes for accommodation to enemy ideology. The fight for the unity of Black and white is a basic principle of the Communist party. Therefore, for Communists working within all-Black organizations to lay low on this question is nothing but two-faced opportunism. On this question Lenin said the following:

The class conscious workers combat all national oppression and all national privileges, but they do not confine themselves to that; they combat all, even the most refined nationalism and advocate not only the unity but also the amalgamation of the workers of all nationalities in the struggle against reaction and against bourgeois nationalism in all its forms. Our task is not to segregate nations but to unite the workers of all nations. (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, pp. 548-549.)

Under the pressure of the tendency towards all-Black organizations some comrades begin to lean in the direction of all-Black clubs of the Communist party. But the Communist party is not a federation of nationalities, but a Party of the working class, Black and white. In the formation of the revolutionary Marxist party in Russia, Lenin clashed with bourgeois-nationalist trends which attempted to divide the Party on the basis of nationality. In the fight against this tendency Lenin pointed out that:

Federation is harmful because it sanctions segregation and alienation, elevates them to a principle, to a law. Complete alienation does indeed prevail among us and we ought not sanction it or cover it with a fig leaf, but combat it and resolutely acknowledge and proclaim the necessity of firmly and unswervingly advancing towards the closest unity. (*Collected Works*, Vol. VI, p. 486.)

Further he added:

One who has adopted the standpoint of nationalism naturally arrives at the desire to erect a Chinese wall around his nationality, his national working class movement; he is unembarrassed by the fact that it would mean building separate walls in each city, in each little town and village; he is unembarrassed even by the fact that by his tactics of division and dismemberment he is reducing to

nil the great call for the rallying and unity of the proletarians of all nations, all races and all languages, (*Ibid*, pp. 520-1.)

This is even more true for us today in the United States. To advocate parallelism as the law of development for our Party is in fact capitulation to a condition and ideology imposed upon the people by the bourgeoisie. The class origin of "separate but equal" lies with the bourgeoisie. The utilization of such notions by whites is nothing but racism. For Blacks it is bourgeois nationalism.

SPECIAL NEW SUBSCRIBER OFFER!

Subscribe now during our circulation drive at the special rate of \$4.50 for one year

Or: Subscribe now at special book premium rates and receive one of the following books with your new subscription:

Book	Premium rate
1) Benjamin J. Davis, <i>Communist Councilman from Harlem</i>	\$6.00
2) John Williamson, <i>Dangerous Scot</i>	\$6.00
3) William L. Patterson, ed, <i>We Charge Genocide</i>	\$6.00
4) William L. Patterson, <i>The Man Who Cried Genocide</i>	\$6.30
5) William Z. Foster, <i>History of the World Trade Union Movement</i> (cloth)	\$6.50
6) V. I. Lenin, <i>National Liberation, Socialism and Imperialism</i>	\$6.00
7) V. I. Lenin, <i>The Emancipation of Women</i>	\$5.50

check appropriate box(es)

—Enclosed please find \$4.50 for a one year sub at special new subscribers' rate

—Enclosed please find \$—— for a one year new subscription and send me number —— as my book premium.

clip and mail to: Political Affairs Publishers, Inc.

23 West 26th Street

New York, N.Y. 10010

Counter-Culture of the '60s

As we seek to develop a genuine revolutionary culture in the United States, it is to be expected that many of the germs will be found in the culture that grew out of the activism of the 60s. Yet in that culture, as it comes to us interpreted through books by Theodore Roszak, Charles Reich, Irwin Silber and others,¹ one is impressed by how much is not revolutionary at all; it turns out to be a co-optable (to a great extent co-opted) culture, to have advocated nothing more world-shaking than a revolution in consciousness or life style. While the germs of a genuine revolutionary culture are no doubt there, they are overlaid with layers of ersatz. How are we to make the necessary discriminations between the real thing and the fraudulent substitute? There can be no other way except to consider the fundamental political position of those who created this counter-culture. If we are to solve the problems at the level of culture, we must first consider the connection between this level and more basic questions concerning the program of the new radicalism. What are some of the leading things to be said, then, about the political character of the intellectual revolt of the 60s?

The "Third Way"

Comparing the 60s with the 50s, the spectacular change was a shift to ostensibly revolutionary positions. The 50s had been non-political, fearful, searching for private solutions. The 60s was political and reckless; the search may have still been for private solutions, but they were private solutions for public problems. This is something everybody knows. Another feature of the intellectual revolt of the 60s is not so commonly recognized, but hardly less important. The new radicals of the 60s tended almost unanimously to seek a politics of the "third way." Hence the importance for that decade of Herbert Marcuse; and this is the place to express my debt at many points of this article to Robert Steigerwald's study of Marcuse as the philosopher of the third way.²

How account for the fact that so many new political activists in the 60s, most of them not especially conscious of questions of class, should have adopted unquestioningly the politics of the third way? We have a clue to the answer in the passage of the *Eighteenth Brumaire*³ in which Marx observes that the literary spokesmen of a class do not need to be driven directly by the material interests

of the class, they do not even need to belong to the class in a material sense; the important thing is that for reasons that we cannot necessarily easily determine, the spokesmen for a class are driven to the same theoretical tasks and solutions to which material interests drive members of the class itself. Something like this clearly happened in the 60s. The leaders of the intellectual revolt adopted for a variety of reasons the same kind of thinking that we see in characteristic representatives of the petty bourgeoisie. If we think about the situation of the small shopkeeper driven to the wall by the monopolies (using this as a model for the situation of the petty bourgeoisie), we see that on the one hand he is impelled to revolt against the existing order which threatens his extinction, but at the same time he fears and distrusts the organized working class, and also those states in which the organized working class has taken power, for he sees here another threat to his small property and independence. So in his revolt against the existing order he is impelled to shun the working-class alternative; he searches for a third way. The spokesmen for the intellectual revolt of the 60s followed the same track. Using the *Eighteenth Brumaire* as a guide, we can conjecture that this may not always have been a question of material interests, the spokesmen for the new movement need not have been conscious of class considerations at all, the reasons prompting individuals to follow this path may have been quite varied, but nevertheless their thinking had a profound class character.

Once one has seen that the search for a third way in the 60s has a class character, a question arises as to whether other features of the intellectual revolt in that decade may not be understood in the same way. For example, the revolt was predominantly an emotional one, at least in the earlier years. It was powered by moral outrage more than by an understanding of the nature of capitalist society. Again, revolution was often conceived of as a putsch, revolutionary activity as involving primarily acts of violence—a kind of thinking that culminated in the Weathermen's dynamite. Again, the intellectual revolt of the 60s often embodied a knee-jerk kind of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism. Leftists of the 60s tended to categorize the Soviet Union and the socialist countries of East Europe in much the same way as do the stooges for corporate monopoly.

All this may be regarded as further evidence for the class character of the revolt of the 60s. Material interests lead the petty bourgeoisie to a predominantly emotional revolt against the existing order; a systematic intellectual revolt is out of the question for them, since it is the property of the organized working class. They think of revolution as primarily an act of violence, for patient organization

of mass action again is the property of a working-class revolutionary program. And they are impelled toward anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism by the fear of the working class already alluded to. So we are confronted with further instances of the petty-bourgeois class character of the intellectual revolt of the 60s. How is the phenomenon to be explained? Steigerwald throws some light on this question when he observes that if a disciplined and theoretically guided revolutionary program is lacking, bourgeois mentality will automatically reproduce itself. In that atmosphere there may be revolt against the bourgeoisie, but it will be a revolt incorporating bourgeois assumptions. In the 60s in America the organized and militant working class had been largely dismembered; the leadership was in large part class collaborationist. The revolutionary party was greatly reduced in size and effectiveness, with the consequence that a scientific and theoretically guided program had fewer public spokesmen than in the 30s and 40s.

The situation is to be attributed partly to the political repression of the McCarthy period and partly to the setbacks to world socialism associated with the 1956 revelations concerning the personality cult. The situation in America had a connection, accordingly, with the movement of Right deviation in international Communism. All this helps to explain why those who turned for the first time toward radical politics in the 60s almost automatically adopted assumptions of the existing order. But it is not enough to say that the organized Left had been badly weakened, for the reasons given, and that in the absence of this particular force bourgeois mentality automatically reproduces itself; one must consider also the propaganda of the ruling class, which now has at its disposal instruments of manipulation more effective than ever before because of the unprecedented technological advance of our epoch. No wonder, then, that so many who believed they were serving the cause of revolution were in fact merely threatening the establishment with empty gestures.

The class character of the intellectual revolt of the 60s, incidentally, makes it difficult to evaluate what was achieved both at the level of politics and at the level of culture. On the positive side, hundreds of thousands of people were shaken loose from an unthinking acceptance of the status quo. This also constituted an important advance in the essential historic process of our time, the transition on a world scale from capitalism to socialism. A temper was prepared that made possible further steps toward the Left. On the other hand, the bourgeois character of the intellectual revolt deprived the movement, to a great extent, of revolutionary significance. In a certain sense, the movement was not revolutionary at all. It was marked

by a high degree of self-deception. One notes characteristically a disparity between what the radicals thought about themselves, and what the better informed representatives of the Establishment appear to have thought about them. Some campus radicals believed they were about to make the walls of the Establishment totter, but the men entrusted with the protection of those battlements perceived no threat, for they saw that the campaign for changing society that was projected could never succeed. A movement having this character necessarily impeded the development of many who might otherwise have gone on toward a more advanced position. To determine the relative weight of the positive and negative kinds of significance is difficult, since the picture changes from individual to individual and from one moment to the next; what had a progressive significance at a certain time took on a reactionary meaning a little later (a familiar phenomenon of dialectics).

The generalizations advanced so far in regard to the cultural developments of the 60s do not apply to the culture of the Black liberation movement. This may be regarded as the most important cultural development of the decade because of its actual and potential revolutionary character and because a new consciousness of the role of the culture in the revolutionary movement developed there. The petty-bourgeois class orientation of counter-culture (largely an affair of white intellectuals) is not in evidence in Black culture. The distinctions that need to be made with regard to Black culture are different from those required for counter-culture. In Black culture, the task is to discover how trends that may be regarded as expressions of Black nationalism are to be related to other trends associated with a class-oriented revolutionary program. In counter-culture, as we have seen, the task is to separate the germs of a genuine revolutionary culture from manifestations of a temper attuned to petty bourgeois radicalism.

Guidelines for a Revolutionary Culture

We are in search of guidelines that will help us identify the germs of a genuine revolutionary culture in the counter-culture of the 60s. As a start we have been considering ideological features of the intellectual revolt that generated the counter-culture. What we see is its predominant petty-bourgeois character, and this tells us a great deal about the counter-culture of that decade. Now in order to make a further advance toward locating the germs of a second culture, let us continue with the examination of basic ideological questions and ask what change would be needed to convert the intellectual revolt of the 60s into a genuine revolutionary movement.

The great need is for a Marxism-Leninism that restores essentials that were soft-pedaled in the denatured version concocted in order to supply the luxury of living in both worlds—or living in both and in *neither*, while seeking a “third way.” This Marxism-Leninism would bring clarity concerning the driving forces of history as having their source in class divisions and class struggle growing out of the mode of production, and it would show how these driving forces are manifested in the class antagonisms of capitalist society. It would put stress on the role of the proletariat as the central agent of revolutionary change and on the indispensability of a political party representing the interests of the proletariat and equipped with an ideological program constantly re-examined in the light of Marxism. It would give stress to what Steigerwald calls the key instruments of proletarian struggle, namely, the working-class party and, once a shift in class rule has taken place, state power exercised by the working class. This Marxism would be concerned with a revolutionary movement which drives straight forward (but not simplistically) to the transfer of state power, but it would not look on transfer of state power as the conclusion of the tasks of the revolution; on the contrary, it would foresee decades of work devoted to the building of the new social and economic base and the new socialist superstructure.

This restored Marxism would have an unequivocal class character and would bring clarification with regard to questions of class. Clarification is important because of the role of class criteria in distinguishing the genuine from the ersatz in basic ideological matters and in the sphere of culture; also because the concept of class is beset by difficulties that cannot be dispelled except through theoretical study. One of these is the discrepancy we often see between consciousness and behavior on the one side, and actual class position on the other. The class outlook of the individual may be different from that of the aggregate to which he belongs (the revolutionary millionaire).

Some difficulty results also from the fact that correspondence between subjective class attitudes and the objective class situation is not always a matter of spontaneity. Revolutionary class consciousness, for example, does not come entirely of itself; it is also developed through the educational leadership of a political organization. Above all, incessant ruling-class propaganda asserts that considerations of class are irrelevant, that if they apply elsewhere they do not apply in the United States, or if they applied in the past they do not apply now. Of course confirmation of the Marxist view of class will come of itself in the long run. Over long periods (also in times of

crisis) large aggregates of people who form an economic class are seen to behave and think in a certain way, but one cannot wait for the confirmation to be brought about by history; it is important therefore to bring clarity through theory.

A restored Marxism-Leninism must necessarily bring about a change in attitudes toward the Communist parties in the advanced industrial societies, since a new understanding would be developed of the indispensability of these parties as part of the revolutionary process. New attitudes would be developed in regard to the Soviet Union also, since whatever reservations one might have about this or that development in the USSR, this restored Marxism would make it clear that the work of the epoch of transition is going forward there.

Bourgeois Freedom and Socialist Freedom

The restored Marxism-Leninism would inevitably bring about a change in attitudes toward the concept of freedom. Freedom, invariably undefined, is a chief propaganda tool of the ruling class; freedom in a different sense is what the socialist revolution is all about. Unless we get the two concepts disentangled, we are in for endless trouble.

What is needed is a distinction between the concept of freedom that developed as part of bourgeois revolution and the concept that belongs to the period of the socialist revolution. Bourgeois freedom is likely to mean, among other things, the right to do what one wishes regardless of its implications within the context of an examined theory of man and society. It is commonly anarchistic. The governing idea of socialist freedom, on the other hand, is its interconnection with necessity, necessity being thought of as the process of cause and effect as it operates in the individual, society, and the natural world. This socialist version of freedom is more meaningful than its bourgeois counterpart, it has in it more of the authentic meaning of the term. Socialist freedom, too, is closely related to ancient wisdom about this subject, the kind of wisdom that for the church was expressed in the notion of a God "whose *service* is perfect freedom."

If we are to understand how socialist differs from bourgeois freedom, we can do no better than to examine attitudes toward the function of the writer in countries where socialism is under construction. Those with the bourgeois concept of freedom come generally with an unrealistic image of what socialist society is (all harmony and spontaneity, nudes dancing in the streets) and with an unrealistic conception of the epoch of transition, where it is implied that all you have to do is bring about a transfer of power,

then remove all restraints, and everything will be fine. They make little attempt at the historical understanding of the formidable problems of building socialism; they do not examine the relationship between the writer's freedom and the necessities involved in the construction of a new kind of society. Instead they convert freedom into an absolute and take the position that no one must interfere with what the writer wishes to express for any reason whatsoever. If the socialist regime impinges upon this freedom, they wash their hands of it. Of course those who approach the socialist countries this way are generally seeking confirmation of an a priori view that in these countries the revolution has been betrayed.

Those who have been able to master the socialist conception of freedom, on the other hand, will recall that Marx described the period of the socialist revolution as the time of man's "entering into the realm of freedom"; they see that construction of the new society charts the way toward a freedom unprecedented in history. Already the advance in this direction has been epochmaking. In the period of consolidating the power of the new ruling class, this freedom is accompanied by curbs on options for a counter-revolutionary minority. (For the capitalist press, of course, these are the people who count; because curbs are imposed on them, the socialist countries are described in the capitalist press as personal or party dictatorships, something different from the Leninist concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat.)

The meaning of socialist freedom becomes more clear if we consider what attitudes on the part of the writer should be encouraged with regard to the existing shortcomings in the socialist societies. To what extent should adverse criticism be welcomed, to what extent does it have the potential of doing harm to the cause of socialism? This question has become an integral part of the theory of socialist realism, where it is applied to attitudes toward the existing state of affairs in the new literature and art. The answer generally given is that in a certain sense the right to criticism is unlimited, but in another sense there is a kind of limitation in that criticism should be put in a certain context, a context that involves recognition of what is at stake in the transition of the modern world, recognition of the absolutely pioneering role of the socialist countries and of the fact that it is socialism that is being built and not something else, that socialism has not been betrayed (which is different from saying that there have been no mistakes), that despite setbacks, the construction of a new world is going forward. The mature view of freedom, in a word, does not mean accepting everything uncritically, on the contrary, a great deal of criticism is acceptable and

even desirable. But along with the criticism the writer should convey a sense of the significance of the great transformation taking place in the epoch of socialist construction.

When socialist freedom is projected in this way, we are likely to be told that once you insist on the principle that criticism should be put in a certain context, you open the door to totalitarian repression. The most important response to those beset by fears of this kind is to make it clear that socialist construction takes place in a situation where a leading political organization has the responsibility not merely to chart the path forward but also to erect safeguards against abuse of the principle of democratic centralism, and that this organization is made up of men and women well grounded in the world view of Marxism, identified with the class that is more than any other responsible for revolutionary change, and dedicated to making a success of what they regard as the greatest transformation in history. This is the best insurance one could have against abuse of the principle of socialist freedom.

A good analogy for the two kinds of freedom comes from the process of growing up, in which one moves from a state analogous to that of bourgeois or anarchist freedom to a different kind of freedom, one which entails limitations, restrictions, and to some degree sacrifices, but which at the same time multiplies the options many times over. Those who have achieved the adult kind of freedom invariably discover that the immature person who maintains the child's anarchistic freedom is in fact in bondage. A. H. Maslow advanced some interesting clinical confirmation for this in studies made many years ago.⁴

If we can dispel confusions concerning freedom in some such way as this, we will get a fresh view of how intolerable it is that so many who claim to be for socialism permit their thinking on this central question to be determined by the outlook of the *previous* revolution—a revolution now two or three centuries out of date.

The Cultural Revolution

We have been considering what is involved in the shift from the petty-bourgeois revolt of the 60s to a more genuine revolutionary program. Many are ready to make this transition. Some will succeed in doing so, some not. The transition is not easy. For those who are able to adopt a restored Marxism-Leninism, one result will be a decrease in the sense of revolutionary alienation, for they will understand that the new society is going to be built by the vast majority rather than coming into existence as a result of a catastrophic act in which an isolated cabal engineers a coup the majority does

not want.

Our concern has been to develop guidelines to help in discovering the germs of a genuine revolutionary culture as they emerged within the counter-culture of the 60s. To see the significance of the development of a revolutionary culture, we should recall what Lenin said about the cultural revolution of his time. Its function, in his view, was to change mental habits, to develop the kind of world view without which the tasks of the revolution cannot be performed, to establish new ethical norms. It was to make clear that the baseness of existing capitalist society has its roots in the class character of that society and is not to be attributed to the nature of man as such. It was to develop a vision that would enable the revolutionary class to devote its full energy to the task of building a new society, to make them aware of what was involved in this great creative enterprise, to generate conviction, the capacity for self-sacrifice, persistence. The cultural revolution was to bring about a change in the conception of the nature of equality, democracy and freedom. If we think in this way of what the cultural revolution meant for Lenin in 1917, it is not hard to see what the corresponding tasks are for this country at the present time.

We can now sum up by saying that the germs of a Leninist "second culture" will be found in cultural manifestations that can become compatible with a working-class oriented revolutionary program, one that stresses the leading role of the proletariat and of the working-class party, that looks forward to the transfer of state power and then to decades of work in the building of the new socialist base and superstructure. In this program great stress will be put on the leading instruments for proletarian struggle, the party of the working class and state power exercised by this class. The program will incorporate the socialist conception of freedom. All this constitutes only a beginning. But there can be no beginning without clarity with regard to the class content of major trends in culture. My hope is that the present article has made some contribution to this kind of clarity.

References

¹ Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter-Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and its Youthful Opposition*, Doubleday, New York, 1969; Charles A. Reich, *The Greening of America*, Random House, New York, 1970; Irwin Silber, *The Cultural Revolution: A Marxist Analysis*, Times Change Press, New York, 1970.

² Robert Steigerwald, *Herbert Marcuse's "Dritter Weg,"* Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1969.

³ Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, International Publishers, New York, n.d. See Chapter III.

⁴ A. H. Maslow, "Love in Healthy People," in Ashley Montagu, ed., *The Meaning of Love*, New York, 1953.

Racism and Counter-Revolution

On a global scale, the imperialist policy of subverting socialist societies and defeating national liberation movements has been basic to Washington's conduct for half a century. A central rationalization for this policy of counter-revolution has been racism; the latter was more easily and more effectively employed since it had been at the heart of the rationalizations for the genocidal policy pursued toward the American Indian peoples, for the African slave trade and for the enslavement of African-derived peoples in the United States—as well as for pre-imperialist, “Manifest Destiny” exhibitions, such as the war against Mexico.

A prime illustration of rampant racism in the service of counter-revolution is afforded by the history of the post-Civil War decade in the United States, generally known as the Reconstruction era. The main weapon created and employed by reaction in this instance was the Ku Klux Klan. Up to this moment there has been no adequate history of the KKK. Allen W. Trelease's *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (Harper and Row, New York, 1971, 605 pp., \$15) is not yet that adequate history, but it is the best book on the subject to date and it helps very much in preparing the way for the master-work that yet awaits the writing.

In the 1960's as part of the breakaway from the Neo-Conservatism of the McCarthyite era, younger historians began to publish significant studies of the KKK; especially important were those by Otto H. Olsen and W. McKee Evans on North Carolina, Herbert Shapiro on South Carolina, Ralph L. Peek on Florida and—especially important for the Trelease book—John A. Carpenter's “Atrocities in the Reconstruction Period,” which appeared in *The Journal of Negro History* in October, 1962. These works are properly credited by Trelease in the 110 pages he devotes to references and bibliography; absolutely extraordinary, however, is his failure to mention or to cite at any point the work of W. E. B. Du Bois. That this could happen in 1971 and pass the readers and editors at Harper and Row is one of those events that could happen “only in America.”

The weakest section of Trelease's book is its forty-page introduction and especially his pages on the institution of slavery and the response thereto of the slaves. Here his acceptance of the alleged docility of the slaves is not only false but helps vitiate the main body of his

volume for there he reiterates the idea that the Black masses were rather easily subdued during Reconstruction and that they did not actively resist the forces of reaction, including the KKK. Although, as I shall show, the data he himself brings forth show significant resistance, the chauvinist assumptions with which he began his work inhibit it throughout; actually what especially remains to be done now that Trelease has chronicled rather fully the barbarous atrocities committed by the KKK is *to search out and to present fully the record of resistance to the Bourbon and the KKK offered by some whites and enormous numbers of Blacks in the South*. Although the latter was not the main focus, of course, of Du Bois' 1935 classic, knowledge of its presence permeates that work, as it does the 1937 book on Reconstruction by the Marxist, James S. Allen (also not mentioned by Trelease).

One should add that the positive features of Reconstruction, which Trelease summarizes, appear in the paper Du Bois gave to the American Historical Association back in 1909 and that Du Bois published a characteristically penetrating essay directly on the KKK in the *North American Review* in 1926 that Mr. Trelease has ignored at his (and his readers') cost.

Albion W. Tourgée, the white Radical Reconstructionist, writing of Trelease's “white terror,” said in his *A Fool's Errand* (1879): “Of the slain there were enough to furnish forth a battlefield and all from these three classes, the Negro, the scalawag and the carpetbagger. . . . The wounded in this silent warfare were more thousands than those who groaned upon the slopes of Gettysburg.” Du Bois, in his *Black Reconstruction*, correctly indicated the dimensions of the violence when he spoke of it as constituting “a civil war of secret assassination and open intimidation and murder.”

The fact is that commencing in 1865 and continuing for about twelve or thirteen years, there was a systematic and organized counter-revolutionary war led by the Southern oligarchy whose purpose was to thwart the fulfilling of the bourgeois-democratic revolution commenced with the abolition of slavery as a result of the Civil War. That oligarchy sought to hold the social order as near its ante-bellum status as it could. For this purpose it sought to undo the extension of the suffrage, the establishment of a viable educational system, the undercutting of institutionalized racism and the effort to eliminate the plantation system. Its ideology was elitist and—above all—racist; its method ranged from bribery to demagoguery to deceit; its trump card was the basic sympathy uniting the major propertied interests of the North and of the South; and its main weapon was the atrocious terrorism of the KKK.

Trelease's book details the terrorism; it does so month by month and area by area, concluding somewhat prematurely with the beginning of 1873. Grant's Attorney-General, Amos T. Akerman (who had lived in Georgia since 1840, had supported the Confederacy, became a Republican in Georgia after the War and entered the Cabinet in June, 1870 and seems to have been the only member of the Cabinet who took the KKK seriously) wrote in November 1871, after having toured much of the South: "I doubt whether from the beginning of the world until now a community, nominally civilized, has been so fully under the domination of systematic and organized depravity."

Trelease is surely correct when he notes that, "Until recently, most historians of Reconstruction . . . made it palatable by ignoring, evading, or denying the greater substance of Klan activity" (p. 18). Though the KKK in its own printed announcements affirmed that it sought only to assist Confederate widows and orphans and to support Christian ideals and establish "law and order," in fact, as Trelease writes, it "pandered to men's lowest instincts; it bullied or brutalized the poor, the weak, and the defenseless; it was often the embodiment of lawlessness and outrage; it did almost nothing to succor Confederate widows and orphans; and it set at defiance the Constitution and laws of the United States" (p. 17).

The KKK tortured cripples, mass-raped children, lynched thousands, whipped women, burned churches, schools and homes, mutilated men. There is nothing the Nazis did in Poland or in the Ukraine which the KKK did not do in Alabama and Mississippi and Louisiana; and the casualties within the United States numbered in the tens of thousands. All this must be known—not in general but in detail—before one can understand the full horror of the indictment Trelease offers against American "scholarship" when he correctly writes that this is what most historians have made palatable to generation after generation of Americans. The seeds of Mylai have indeed been planted deeply.

* * *

In the South as a whole the Blacks were outnumbered by about two to one; they were about 90 per cent illiterate; they were almost all without land or other means of support except their own labor power; they were not widely armed and those who were armed did not have these arms, generally speaking, for long periods; they lacked horses and so suffered in comparison with groups like the KKK in terms of mobility; and they never got the real and sustained and vigorous support of the federal government. In the face of all this and the fanatical hostility of the planters and propertied classes—and the promises of the federal government and the Republican

Party which for some time deceived many of the Blacks—the resistance put up by the Afro-American people to the forces of reaction and Bourbonism is really remarkable.

Trelease thinks the record is not one of resistance; he writes a dozen times of the Black population as having been "cowed." Yet the narrative, the facts, the story which he tells is—despite him—filled with resistance. Specific instances commence on page 31 where we are told that in Tennessee in 1868 Blacks stood and fought back against a KKK attack, killed one and wounded four and forced the rest to flee, and they terminate on page 468 where another example of armed resistance by Blacks (again in Tennessee) to KKK assaults is given. To indicate the dimensions of this I think it is necessary to cite the pages in Trelease's book where instances of actual physical resistance by Blacks to the KKK are noted: 34, 38, 70, 95, 106, 117, 123, 125, 153, 177-78, 190, 192, 194, 207, 208, 229, 243, 250, 269, 280, 282, 289, 290, 304, 312, 337, 351, 355, 364, 367 (the text ends on page 422).

I repeat that this is in a book whose author labors under Elkins-like illusions of "docility" and seeks not to describe resistance but rather to describe KKK terrorism. Resistance during slavery makes up a great chapter in the panorama of human struggle; in Afro-American history there is a crying need for intense study of all available sources—and especially those coming from Black people—on the story of resistance after the Civil War.

* * *

Mr. Trelease is somewhat ambivalent in his attitude as to what course might have been pursued to combat KKK terrorism. He writes:

To arm the Negroes against a large proportion of the white population would surely have embittered race relations far more than was already the case, and precipitated a race conflict of incalculable consequences. Governor [William H.] Smith [of Alabama] naturally, and probably wisely, refused to risk such a conflagration. Like other deep South governors in these circumstances in the months and years to come, he refused to organize a militia, and the Klan in Alabama continued to grow almost unchecked (p. 88).

From Mr. Trelease's own description of conditions it is not easy to understand how anything at all—let alone arming the Black population—could have further "embittered race relations"; on the basis of racism, hundreds were being murdered and thousands wounded in Alabama and peonage was being instituted and schools and churches were being burned and Black and white leaders of democratic

government were being exterminated. Moreover, Trelease himself shows that where and when—as in Tennessee and Arkansas in the late 1860's—the anti-Bourbon and anti-KKK forces (Black and white) were armed and were given state support in their efforts to resist reaction, they were successful and something approaching peaceful and civilized conditions did prevail. Thus, for example, we read:

It seems very clear now as it did then that the militia campaign [made up of Black and white men] was directly responsible for disrupting the Klan and restoring peace throughout most of Arkansas. Governor [Powell] Clayton's calculated risk had paid off. As a result he accomplished more than any other Southern governor in suppressing the Ku Klux conspiracy (p. 174).

Indeed, Trelease's ambivalence is shown by such statements as these: "The Radical governments made no effort to outlaw the Conservative opposition or create a dictatorship. On the contrary, they were too lenient in enforcing law and order against those who used force to overthrow them." Again: "The greatest short-run deficiency of the Republican regimes—it would prove fatal—was their physical weakness." And yet again: "Radical regard for the civil liberties of ex-Confederates enabled the latter to sabotage the Reconstruction program almost from the start" (pp. xxix, xxxiv, xxxix). Well then, if there were examples of effective suppression of the KKK, and it is true that in general, however, Radical governments were "too lenient" and if this was "the greatest short-run deficiency" which was to "prove fatal," why did those who adopted the "too lenient" course which "proved fatal" to the defense of democratic and anti-racist government in the South, "probably act wisely"?

On the contrary, part of the counter-revolutionary reality was not only the KKK in the dead of the night but also the governors and sheriffs and senators in the face of the day who evoked excuses for failing to act and in fact, by so failing, made possible the triumph of reaction and the continuance of the slaughter of the innocents. The lessons here for all revolutionary efforts and counter-revolutionary thrusts are clear; historically one of the central failures of forces of progress has been to underestimate the cruelty, cunning and perversity of reaction.

Here, too, reading Du Bois would have helped Trelease. In his 1935 volume, Du Bois pointed out: "If the Reconstruction of the Southern states, from slavery to free labor, and from aristocracy to industrial democracy, had been conceived as a major national program of America, *whose accomplishment at any price was well worth the effort*, we should be living today in a different world." No,

one had to worry about the "civil liberties of ex-Confederates"—like the slave-trading General Nathan Bedford Forrest (the Fort Pillow murderer), so that he could become Grand Wizard of the KKK, and owner of railroads. In slavery, slave-owners are free to own slaves; if one ends slavery he must terminate that freedom. In reconstructing society, the "civil liberties" of racist planters and KKK Bourbons mean in fact the killing of the hopes and dreams of the poor and the coming into being of systems which breed governors like Wallace and army officers like Calley. Certainly, the experiences of Mankind have shown that these choices are not simple and that their implementation carries great dangers; but the choices must be made and are made and one must learn from the dangers but one must not become paralyzed by them. If one does, if one does not act at all, if one does not decisively protect the power needed to really remake society, the effort will fail and the fearful suffering will not only continue and intensify but will all be in vain. This is another of the basic lessons from Reconstruction and another reason for the fantastic distortion to which that period has been subjected.

* * *

One of the positive features of the Trelease volume is that it buries the mythology which ascribed the murderous career of the KKK to poorer whites who "get out of control" and insisted that the wealthy had in mind only the most chivalrous purposes. He shows that the leadership came from the planters and bankers and merchants; that the guiding spirits were "composed of the wealthiest and most respectable elements" (p. 98). Professor Ralph L. Peek, in his already mentioned studies of the KKK in Florida, had affirmed ten years ago that "the younger men of the upper class made the night rides, waged a campaign of intimidation by beatings, floggings and murders" (*Florida Historical Quarterly*, October 1961, p. 184).

There are, indeed, some data in the Trelease volume showing that the Republican Party inside the South during Reconstruction consisted of the mass of the Black population and very significant segments of the white population, especially those with little or no property and particularly, of course, in the Piedmont and mountain areas. In this sense, his narrative again contradicts the generalization in his own preface where he remarks that the era of Reconstruction "exemplifies" the assertion by Professor U. B. Phillips some forty years ago to the effect that the effort to maintain the South as a "white man's country" was "the central theme of Southern history." This was the effort of the historical mythology—a main creator of which was Phillips; but the actual history is of the effort by the slaveowners and the Bourbons to maintain their power as opposed to separate—and

sometimes joint—efforts by the exploited and oppressed, Black and white, to undo that power. The fact is that no era shows this more clearly than that of Reconstruction; this is, indeed, another reason why that period has been so systematically falsified.

Important in Trelease's book is its material on whites in the South— notably those born and raised there—who broke away from the dominant racist pattern and with great heroism—and often the loss of their lives—tried to make their home a region of equality and fraternity. These people include the 18-year old Emerson Bentley of Louisiana, George W. Smith of Texas, Alonzo B. Corliss of North Carolina and Robert W. Flournoy of Mississippi. As Trelease correctly states, "Radicalism [in the Reconstruction South] was also aimed less spectacularly at raising the status of poorer whites. Within limits the Republican Party was a poor man's party [in that South] which sought to obliterate racial lines as much as popular prejudices made it politically safe to do" (p. xxviii). It was a Charleston, South Carolina newspaper, the *Daily Republican* (July 2, 1870), which attacked the idea of white supremacy and continued:

Such talk is as wickedly idle as for colored men to say that their race shall have complete control. It is not to be a matter of race at all. It is to be a matter of citizenship, in which colored and white are to have their rights and their due share of power; not because they are white, not because they are colored, but because they are American citizens. By-and-by we shall stop talking of the color of a man in relation to citizenship and power, and shall look at his wealth of mind and soul.

That this could appear in a Charleston, South Carolina daily newspaper is another reason for the intense distortions to which Reconstruction has been subjected. *The story of Southern white opposition and resistance to chauvinist, oligarchic domination has hardly begun to appear; this would be a most worthy endeavor by a group of younger scholars seeking to forge fruitful lives.*

Trelease begins his book by stating that the KKK "became a counter-revolutionary device to combat the Republican party and Congressional Reconstruction policy in the South. For more than four years it whipped, shot, robbed, raped, and otherwise outraged Negroes and [white] Republicans across the South in the name of preserving white civilization" (p. xi). *White Terror* is the most detailed and least equivocal record of that barbarism to appear in print; having produced this, Mr. Trelease has accomplished a great deal.

August 4, 1971

COMMUNICATIONS

AN OLD READER

On Revolutionary Transition

The July issue of *Political Affairs* carried an article, "The British Road to Socialism," by John Williamson. There are two concepts in this article that I have questions about. While there is no suggestion in the article itself that the British road to socialism is necessarily the road to socialism in the United States, it seems necessary to point out the rather important differences between the way the question of the fight for working-class power is placed in the Program of the Communist Party U.S.A. from the way it is placed in "The British Road to Socialism"—at least a difference with the section that Comrade Williamson quoted in his article. It is necessary to point out this difference because John Williamson's name is associated with our Party's past.

I do not quarrel with the way the Communist Party of Great Britain places the question. It is their program. But it is not the way our Party places it. It is necessary to point out this difference because the quotation in the article gives a wrong emphasis and a wrong lead.

On page 56 there is the following sentence:

"It also *emphasizes* that the 'mass struggle for political power should

be carried through by peaceful means without civil war,' . . ." (*emphasis mine.*)

Maybe in England the phrase "should be carried through by peaceful means" has a different meaning. To me it seems to say: that is how it should be done. It does not give the impression that this is a desirable and even a possible path. It does not leave open the option that it may not be possible, that maybe, socialism will come through a civil war.

When the phrase "this will not be simple to achieve" is added in the next sentence it only adds to the one-sided impression that these quotations give.

"Should be carried through" has a different connotation from "a desirable path" or "it is a path we will seek." Without qualifying sentences stating that there is nothing in history or life that in any way guarantees a peaceful path, it is one-sided. It gives a wrong direction and fosters unnecessary illusions.

The Program of the Communist Party U.S.A. deals with these questions in the following manner:

"The question remains, however, whether the democratic will of the people can be brought to expression by relatively peaceful means, that is, without armed insurrection, with-

out civil war. Of course, we advocate social change by peaceful means, through political institutions and people's organizations within the American Constitutional framework. But the people's democratic will, our advocacy, and the democratic institutions of our country are not the sole historical factors that will determine the path of social change in the United States.

"... No ruling class relinquishes power passively and voluntarily. Hence the historical question still to be answered is: will the financial oligarchy be able to inflict a bloody ordeal on the country?"

"It is of course impossible to give the answer to this question today. Such a question can be answered only when the socialist revolution is the immediate order of business, and in terms of the precise situation prevailing at that time. The exact tactics of revolution can be determined only when a revolutionary situation matures—when the ruling class can no longer rule in the old way and the majority of the people are no longer willing to accept the existing order. Clearly, such a situation does not now exist in the United States.

"Of course, the people must be prepared to meet any eventuality. While we seek a peaceful path, as preferable to a violent one, this choice may prove to be blocked by monopolist reaction. Socialism must be sought, therefore, by whatever means circumstances may impose." (pp. 92, 93)

This is a correct and a more balanced presentation of the problem.

Masses will support revolutionary forces who they feel will seek the most peaceful path possible. This is a natural, human desire. But it is the responsibility of a

revolutionary party not to use this natural desire to create illusions about such possibilities. Illusions prevent the masses from being ready for all eventualities.

How the question of working-class power and the transition is placed is not solely a question of the transition itself. How the question is placed fundamentally has a bearing on what kind of leadership a revolutionary party gives to struggles before the transition. A revolutionary party must seek peaceful means but whenever forced to, it must be ready and willing to give leadership on higher, more militant levels, forms masses are willing to support. The key words are "mass participation." It is impossible to determine in advance what the exact nature of tactics will be. This includes the tactics during a transition. No revolutionary party can realistically, in advance, determine such tactics. It can indicate the possible options that are open.

The other question in the article that is somewhat confusing is dealt with on pages 54 and 55 where Williamson writes:

"Reformism had a specially strong hold on British labor, not because of 'magical' powers of 'wicked' Right-wing leaders or the backwardness of the working class, but because of material factors in the historical development of British imperialism. These are the superprofits from which some crumbs went to sections of the workers, fostering ideological corruption expressed in an opportunist outlook, i.e. 'sacrificing fundamental interests to gain temporary or partial advantage.' (Lenin)"

In the context of the article I think the quotation from Comrade Lenin is misused. It would give the impression that Lenin was against all struggles for reforms. I do not think Lenin was referring to the working class as such when he wrote the words that are quoted. I think the quotation more specifically refers to Lenin's condemnation of opportunistic, reformist leaders, who sell out the

interests of workers. That should have been made clear in the article.

I am not against *Political Affairs* publishing articles with which our Party may not fully agree. But I think it is the duty and the responsibility of the editorial board and the editors of *Political Affairs* to either make comments or solicit comments when such materials are published.

BOOK REVIEWS

DANIEL MASON

Colodny on Spain

* Robert Colodny, *Spain: The Glory and the Tragedy*, Humanities Press, New York, 1970, \$5.00.

In his new book on the Spanish Conflict that began in 1936, Robert Colodny, professor of history at the University of Pittsburgh and a veteran of that conflict, revivifies "the glory and the tragedy" of that war.* He writes the history of that terrible rehearsal for the horrors of World War II as a partisan—a partisan for humanity.

But his partisanship takes on distortions that end up only by giving the reader a view of that conflict that ignores the role of imperialism, that belittles the bravery and self-sacrifice of the Spanish Communists, that dismisses the magnificent, leading role of the world Communist movement in mobilizing the peo-

ple everywhere in support of Loyalist Spain, and besmirches the Soviet Union, whose aid and support, in every way, made the defense of Spain possible altogether.

Colodny writes:

The historian need be convinced of only one truth to make his craft meaningful in the context of today's disasters: the memory of mankind is sufficiently complete, sufficiently charged with the symbols of past political crimes, so as not to allow self-appointed guardians of human destiny to execute with impunity the same blind policies which led to boundless suffering for nameless millions during this century. The Spanish Conflict is such a symbol.

Time has not dimmed the relevance of this tragedy for today's groping generation, nor has the displacement in space of the main battlefield reduced the significance

or the *universality* of the Spanish experience. . . .

And he adds:

"To recall the days and years of the war in Spain against the contemporary background of the drift toward a Third World War is an endeavor to permit the million fallen to bear witness. Each generation, of course, must make its own judgment. No generation, particularly the young of this one, can be indifferent to the bell which tolled for the people of Spain.

He, however, does not adhere to these criteria in his book.

Colodny's book is short. The text itself comprises only 61 pages. But this is supplemented by 35 pages of notes and bibliography.

Within the small compass of his book, however, Colodny has given his readers only a portion of the facts, and has distorted some of these to fit in with his own bias as is evinced in the following points.

He characterizes such events as the Spanish Conflict as "blunders" by "statesmen frozen into diplomatic immobility by outmoded views of the external world" and rails at the U.S. State Department for having failed to learn the lessons of these blunders.

In the first place, from its viewpoint, the ruling capitalist class learned very well the lesson of Spain. It got what it wanted there. As Colodny himself writes, "a generation ago the Spanish Republic was destroyed in the name of a holy crusade against Communism." As far as Washington was concerned, it got what was wanted in Spain and this was worthy of emulation in the future.

But secondly and more importantly, it seems to this reader that Colodny is wrong when he writes that "the villages of Andalusia and those of Southeast Asia have this in common, they were both turned into cemeteries of the innocent in the mindless pursuit of a fugitive security against popular revolution." In this reader's opinion, Colodny falls into the trap of the liberals, who claim the invasion of Vietnam was a temporary "blunder" of U.S. foreign policy, from which we must now extricate ourselves.

There was no "mindless pursuit" in the imperialists' actions in Spain or now in Vietnam. Genocide and destruction are a conscious, deliberate policy of the ruling class, forced upon it by the exigencies and urgency of its situation under changed conditions.

In referring to the call of the Spanish delegates at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International for "the broadest coalition of working class parties and *all other* political groups, threatened by the rising tide of fascism," Colodny writes:

"That this policy in Spain and France coincided with the military-political necessities of the USSR is mere incident."

In other places in the book, he also differentiates the motives of the Spanish Communists and those of the Soviet Union in the prosecution of the defense of democracy in the Spanish Conflict. In this reader's view, this is a wrong estimate of the Soviet Union's motivation. After all, the Soviet

Union, as the responsible bulwark of socialism and leading protagonist for world communism, has always been in the forefront of the struggle against imperialism. It discharged its responsibility in the Spanish Conflict with great honor and courage.

Colodny also belittles the role of the Communist International in the establishment of the tactics of the united front in the mid-1930s. He makes it appear that these tactics were forced on an unwilling Moscow-dominated Comintern by the Spanish Communists.

In the past, some Left circles have accused the various Communist parties and the Comintern of having followed blindly the dictates of Moscow. Lately, a new tendency has developed, which claims that whatever good policies emerged from the Comintern were forced on it by individual Communist parties. Is it not possible that these policies were developed through mutual discussion among the various Communist parties, acting through the Comintern? And, who, if it was not the Communists, led the world struggle to aid the brave Spanish Loyalists?

NEW PAMPHLETS AND BOOKS

OUT OF INDO-CHINA! FREEDOM FOR ANGELA DAVIS! —OUR GOALS FOR 1971 AND HOW TO WIN THEM

by Gus Hall

The Sharpening Crisis of U.S. Imperialism and the Tasks of the Communist Party. Report to National Party Conference, July 9, 1971. Bankruptcy of U.S. imperialist policy, possibilities of important victories, need for full mobilization of the Communist Party.

64 pages—85¢

THE MEANING OF SAN RAFAEL

by Henry Winston

A polemic against "Left" anti-Communism and theories of "picking up the gun" and exemplary acts of revolutionary adventurism—shows how such "super-revolutionary" policies play into the hands of reaction and government provocations.

24 pages—20¢

THE "JEWISH DEFENSE LEAGUE":

A New Face for Reaction

by Hyman Lumer

The history of the JDL, its failure to fight anti-Semitism, its racist, anti-Soviet and pro-imperialist actions; the need to struggle against racism, anti-Sovietism and Zionism in order to combat the JDL.

24 pages—35¢

REBELLION IN THE UNIONS

A Handbook for Rank and File Action

by George Morris

This book examines the growing rebellion of rank and file workers, challenges bureaucracy and conservatism in labor, develops new goals for the labor movement. Deals with class collaborationism vs. class struggle, new technology, workers' living standards, Black liberation and the fight against racism, the ALA, political action, peace, the "New Left," the Communist position.

160 pages, paper—\$2.75

At bookstores or order from

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

32 Union Square East • Room 801 • New York, N. Y. 10003

Orders must be prepaid (no stamps). Add 20¢ postage on orders under \$2.00. New York purchasers include sales tax.

WRITE FOR COMPLETE LIST