

MAY, 1972

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE TIME IS NOW!

Political Committee, CPUSA

THE CPUSA IN THE 1972 ELECTIONS

Daniel Rubin

THE FIGHT AGAINST RACISM AND THE
ANGELA DAVIS CAMPAIGN

Elaine Mann

THE 15th CONGRESS OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF IRELAND

Michael O'Riordan

MAOISM IN THE PHILIPPINES

William J. Pomeroy

AGGRESSION, REPRESSION AND
ANTI-COMMUNISM

Herbert Aptheker

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Political Committee, CPUSA</i>	
The Time Is NOW!	1
<i>Daniel Rubin</i>	
The CPUSA in the 1972 Elections	2
<i>Elaine Mann</i>	
The Fight Against Racism and the Angela Davis Campaign	13
<i>Michael O'Riordan</i>	
The 15th Congress of the Communist Party of Ireland	28
<i>William J. Pomeroy</i>	
Maoism in the Philippines	38
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	
Aggression, Repression and Anti-Communism	47
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>John Williamson</i>	
Reply to "An Old Reader"	57
<i>Joseph Graham</i>	
On the Term "Mexican-American"	58
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>William Weinstone</i>	
The New Radicalism	59

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.

POLITICAL COMMITTEE, CPUSA

The Time Is Now!*

Men from hell are clouding the heavens over the cities and villages of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. With the flick of a bombardier's finger, a switch is thrown and 30 tons of screaming death plunges earthward from the belly of each winged monster. . . .

The renewal on a massively increased scale of the air war of destruction against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is the wilful decision of Richard Nixon. . . .

The death and dread which Nixon's bombers rain over Vietnam is the wanton destruction of the vengeance of a loser. The Washington aggressors' design for snaring a win from the ashes of defeat—the Nixon scheme of "Vietnamization," of "we supply the guns, they supply the bodies" lies in tatters.

The puppet forces of the shameless Saigon regime of Thieu fall back before the advancing liberation forces of the Vietnam patriots. Everywhere the tyrants and occupiers are experiencing the wrath of a people rising for freedom.

The consciences of the peoples of the world have judged the vengeful burnings and killings of the retreating Hitler-like armies as crimes against humanity. The world's peoples will not forgive nor will history absolve our nation from the historic condemnation and shame that befell Germany unless our people impose their will upon the Government to stop the aerial slaughter NOW and withdraw all U.S. armed forces from Vietnam and all of the Indochina.

The concerted action of millions is called for to straight-jacket the war-expansion maniacs and bring an end to the criminal war of destruction against Vietnam.

Now is the time for all who have voiced a wish for peace to undertake activity to stop the war.

Now is the time for working men and women, for trade union members and leaders to take action against the new dangerous escalation of the war.

Now is the time for Black Americans to forward the demand that this freedom-destroying war end now.

Now is the time for youth and students to come forth to claim a future for themselves by an end to the war.

(Continued on page 27)

*The following is an abridged text of an appeal issued on April 17, 1972.

The CPUSA in the 1972 Elections

This is an election year full of surprises for bourgeois election commentators. Indeed, even Marxist-Leninists have to be careful not merely to project the past into these elections and treat them as simply more of the same.

There have already been many big new developments and turns of events, and we can expect many more. While it appeared that Nixon planned to come before the electorate in November as the man who is steadily getting us out of Vietnam and who went to Peking and Moscow to lessen international tensions, he is now outdoing Johnson and even Hitler in the bestiality of his bombing and shelling of the people of South Vietnam and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and is provoking world confrontation with the USSR. No matter what Nixon tries now, he cannot appear as winding down the war. This brutal aggression and its meaning for the masses of people of our country will dominate the elections unless Nixon is compelled to accept the 7-point peace plan of the Provisional Revolutionary Government prior to election day.

The bourgeois theory on how to win elections in the U.S. had been to appeal to the middle of the political spectrum, and therefore not to take strong positions in any direction. But now all candidates claim to be "populists," champions of the interests of the little people, of the workers and the middle class against the wealthy, the monopolies and the powerful. Senator Edmund Muskie, who apparently had the Democratic nomination sewed up on the basis of the old type of campaign, avoiding strong positions, and depending on the party machinery is rapidly fading. Senator George McGovern, who was thought to appeal only to middle strata—youth in particular—on the peace issue, won the largest vote among white workers in Wisconsin and elsewhere by linking the war with taxes and inflation.

Wallace has attracted sizeable votes from workers and middle strata in the North by hiding his anti-labor, pro-big business and pro-war record while demagogically attacking the millionaires on the tax question, by claiming to have opposed the war all along as a mistake, and by toning down his racism.

Having believed their own years-long propaganda that the Communist Party is dead, the mass media have expressed great surprise and concern about the response to the Communist Party's effort to place its candidates on the ballot in 25-30 states. Especially surprising

to them was the collection of 41,000 signatures in 21 days in Pennsylvania, 6,400 signatures in Alabama in 5 days, and similar achievements.

A New Period

While no one has a crystal ball to foresee fully the outcome of these and other rapidly unfolding and qualitatively new developments, the 20th Convention of the Communist Party, USA and the report of Comrade Gus Hall, its general secretary and presidential candidate, give the key to understanding them. There is a new situation in the world, new shifts in the balance of world forces. The old position of U.S. imperialism in the world is coming apart at the seams and a new basis for stabilizing the situation is being sought. The economic position of U.S. state monopoly capitalism is much weakened. This is reflected in the long-term stagnation in the U.S. economy in the middle of the Vietnam war in which upturns do not take hold and massive unemployment continues.

Another major domestic feature is the tremendous changes in the thinking of the mass of people in the last couple of years. No important section of the population is any longer a reliable supporter of the policies of monopoly. Every section tends to oppose these policies in at least one major area. What began among students, white and Black, in 1960, and spread to the whole of the Black population, and then to wide sections of middle strata in relation the Vietnam war, has also spread to the Chicano, Puerto Rican, Indian, Asian peoples, to women, small farmers and now in a new big way to the white workers. Since August 15, 1971, when Nixon launched his "New Economic Program" and the wage freeze, there has been a pronounced build-up of sentiment among workers that Nixon favors the monopolies and is lowering their standard of living. So strong did this sentiment become that Meany and the other labor leaders were forced off the Pay Board.

With such understanding of the period in which we live, a period in which the progressive forces of the world—the socialist countries, the national liberation movement and the working-class and progressive movement of the developed capitalist countries—have already become dominant in the world, the events enumerated are by no means surprising. Comrade Henry Winston, national chairman of the Communist Party, said at the November 1971 National Committee meeting that all progressive struggles and movements would be reflected in the 1972 elections and that if these movements wanted to have real impact they would have to seek expression in this arena of struggle. The rapidity with which this has occurred follows from

GOOD POINT

VIETNAM & ELECTIONS

GOOD TO SEE THE CONNECTION

such an assesment of the period in which we live.

As never before strong, clear voices are required to speak to the people's real needs and, as never before, masses of workers, the specially oppressed peoples and other groups are ready to respond. The Muskie type of campaign cannot defeat Nixon. This gives special emphasis to the Communist Party candidacy of Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner for president and vice president and to local Communist candidacies, and shows why these must be pressed to the limit. The stronger the Communist campaign and vote and the more real issues are brought forward, the greater will be the shift of the electoral debate to the Left and the more will unity be built against the reactionary drive.

There are several conclusions that emerge from our assessment of the present period. One is that U.S. imperialism can be compelled to retreat, both because of its own relatively weaker position and because the people's forces are much more willing and able to struggle for their real needs. Another is that acts of desperation by U.S. imperialism, trying to escape its growing crisis and restore a stability to its liking, become a serious danger.

In Vietnam, we see acts of desperation to stave off defeat. Most of the fleet and air force from around the world has been speeded to Vietnam, many of their units carrying nuclear weapons. Over 60,000 additional naval and airforce personnel have been sent there. B-52's are bombing Hanoi and Haiphong, the latter a port constantly filled with ships from the Soviet Union and many other countries. In his desperation to prevent a people's victory in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, Nixon is most seriously threatening the peace of the whole world.

The New Escalation in Vietnam

The attempt of Nixon to continue the U.S. rule of Vietnam through the Thieu puppet clique on the basis of withdrawal of U.S. ground troops and the racist "Vietnamization" of the war, with Vietnamese killing Vietnamese for U.S. imperialism, was bound to run into a crisis. The anti-popular puppet troops were bound to prove unreliable and no match for the popular National Liberation Front forces. Nixon knew the PRG would not hold back indefinitely in the hope that he was serious about getting out of Vietnam. Nixon first rejected the 7-point plan and put forward a phony plan anyone could see was intended to guarantee that Thieu stayed in power, a plan that was bound to be rejected. He then broke off the Paris negotiations. When the Vietnamese replied to this open rejection of a serious approach to ending the aggression with a people's liberation offensive, Nixon

responded with criminal acts of desperation. But he got more than he bargained for in South Vietnam, and the puppet forces proved even more unreliable than expected.

There are two possible explanations for Nixon's moves. One is that he wanted to face the military and political offensive of the PRG now rather than on the eve of the elections, in the belief that U.S. firepower could contain the offensive and assure that the period just before November 8 would be relatively quiet and would again appear as a steady winding down of the war. But given Nixon's history and the factors giving rise to desperate acts to solve crises, there is also the danger of his seeking to win the elections by major escalation planned to continue past election day with a jingoistic appeal not to change presidents in the middle of a major war crisis.

Regardless of Nixon's motives, however, the Left and the peace activists have to overcome those factors holding them back from mobilizing the kind of rebuff to Nixon's actions which the moment demands and which is possible. These factors include:

1. Becoming inured to the fighting in Vietnam and failing to see this is a very special moment—a major U.S. crisis of the war in the middle of a national election, and one which threatens world peace.
2. Pessimism as to whether masses of workers, Black people and others can be mobilized to act against the war.
3. Sectarianism of various kinds, including the provision of only narrow forms of expression for the masses.

In supporting the bombing and escalation, George Wallace, Senator Henry Jackson and Hubert Humphrey reveal that their recently discovered opposition to the war is completely phony and that they pursue the same policy on the war as does Nixon. The peace forces must dog their campaign trails with their protests. The trip of Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam during the height of the bombardment gives an added ability to reach millions of people and mobilize them in the election campaign to compel a total end of the aggression.

Ending the aggression is objectively the most important issue in the elections. It is the key to the direction in which the country will move on all questions. Continuation of the war guarantees that the reactionary drive will continue on all fronts—the drive against labor and the standard of living of the working people, toward increased racism and repression, and so on. No matter how Nixon tries to maneuver, the latest developments assure that ending the war will in fact be the major issue in the elections and Nixon will no longer be able to come before the electorate pretending to be a man of peace steadily winding the war down. There will be no way to return to

the period of relatively slack military action of early March, unless there is a serious approach to getting out.

Divisive Tactics: The Use of Racism

A third conclusion from the new period is that imperialism will increasingly attempt to divide the world's progressive forces while still using other weapons of struggle. This reflects its relative weakness, its decreased ability to use more direct weapons successfully. Its aim above all is to split as many forces as possible away from close unity or alliance with the Soviet Union, the strongest world force for social progress and against U.S. imperialism. Every kind of lie and provocation from any direction—Right or "Left," especially the utilization of the reactionary side of nationalism, is suitable to achieve this purpose. The use of the Zionist movement of the world to propagate lies about conditions of Soviet Jews and to build support of the Israeli Mid-East aggression constitutes a major tool.

Another is the Mao nationalist, classless thesis that the world struggle is between the "one or two superpowers" and the rest of the world (including apparently such countries as imperialist Japan, West Germany and Britain) led by China. In practice, the "one superpower" they oppose is the USSR, despite ever new efforts by the Soviets to improve relations on all levels.

Domestically we see the same strategy: the only way to win is to divide the potentially united and progressive sectors of the population. This is to be done by open government promotion of racism. Nixon introduces legislation to prevent the carrying out of court decisions on school busing, pursues his attack on welfare recipients with thinly veiled racism and pushes the "law and order" issue in the same vein.

Nixon aims to win most of the South and to divide workers and the middle strata elsewhere with his policy. There is more or less open collaboration with George Wallace, evident especially in the Wisconsin primary, in which there was no Nixon campaign but rather encouragement to cross over in the primaries to support Wallace.

Humphrey in his campaign tries to appeal in both directions at the same time on racism. When talking to white audiences he competes with Wallace and Nixon as a racist, saying that their positions on busing are just repeats of his own. Yet at the same time his campaign is based on the assumption that his past ties with civil rights forces will deliver the Black vote. In Florida and Wisconsin the Black community did vote for him but he is extremely vulnerable because of his two-faced racism.

But Muskie, after his racist expression of opposition to a Black running mate, has pretty much written off attempting to gain support in the Black community, and so far McGovern has taken a similar position of staying away from the Black community. Thus, this remains the weakest issue in the campaign, placing in the hands of Nixon the free use of racism as his main weapon for victory. Without a serious and genuine appeal to the Black community, it is doubtful that Nixon can be beaten, since the Black community cannot be expected to bring out a big vote for the Democrats as such.

Shirley Chisholm's campaign, of course, has created meaningful pressure in relation to racism and the question of full equality for women. But it did not win widespread endorsement by Black leadership or by significant white forces. At present it tends to be a campaign aimed to get delegates in a small number of selected spots—in large Black communities—in order to come to the Democratic Convention with some bargaining power. Mrs. Chisholm no longer seems to be seeking state-wide popular votes in primaries, but rather seems to cooperate with white liberals like McGovern in state-wide primary campaigns.

As a result of this picture, the biggest task in the elections is to combat the racism of Nixon and Wallace, expose the racism of Humphrey and press candidates like McGovern to campaign forthrightly on this question. The campaign of Hall and Tyner is of special significance in pressing for better positions, especially since this ticket represents white and Black united in struggle against racism. The Black Liberation Program of the Communist Party, already distributed in 130,000 copies, is forcefully projecting these issues.

Closely related to the issue of racism is the general question of democratic rights as opposed to political repression. There are several aspects of great importance. The trials of Angela Davis and of Father Philip Berrigan and the other Harrisburg peace defendants are test cases for the Nixon administration in pursuit of its reactionary drive. Defeat in these struggles will greatly encourage this drive against the Black liberation movement and the peace movement, against the Black militants, against the Left in general and the Communist Party in particular. On the other hand, a victory will be a great blow to the reactionary drive and a blow to Nixon's re-election hopes. The question of amnesty for Vietnam war objectors is a big issue, especially among students. The constitutional confrontation between a very reactionary executive branch and the legislative and judicial branches of government continually re-emerges in sharper form.

Nixon's election strategy also calls for taking the issue of the economy out of the elections by claiming that inflation is being

ANTI-
CHINA

brought under control while production is significantly picking up. But you can not fool people who have to buy food in the store every week into believing that inflation is under control, or convince the millions now unemployed or fearing that they will be next that everything is fine. Wide strata also feel the impact of ever higher taxes.

As indicated, most of the candidates have picked up the tax issue strongly. McGovern is taking on the unemployment issue. But Humphrey, Muskie, McGovern and Chisholm make only secondary criticisms against the so-called price-wage control program. However in a situation where mass worker rebellion against the wage freeze compelled labor to quit the Pay Board, criticism of its inequities while accepting the need for a wage freeze is not good enough. This year workers want to know who will really speak for them and their interests. All of the Democrats mentioned are claiming to speak for the worker or at least the "unrepresented." But again, who better than Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner can speak for their fellow workers and press the issues, including total opposition to any wage controls?

Our Goals

In the face of Nixon's strategic approach to the elections, and taking into account the kind of period in which we live and the concrete developments in the elections, the 20th Convention of the Communist Party approved the following goals of the 1972 elections, contained in Comrade Hall's report:

First—they are to halt the present dangerous and reactionary course of developments in the nation.

Second—to turn the country toward an anti-monopoly course of peace, economic security and a wider based democracy; to bring about the crystallization of a broad people's coalition, of the anti-monopoly, anti-war, anti-racist anti-fascist, pro-labor forces in the United States.

Third—to force an end to the U.S. aggression in Indochina before the elections—or if not, then to force the setting of a final date.

Fourth—to bring about the defeat of the most reactionary anti-labor, racist, pro-war candidates, and the election of independent candidates—the election of workers, Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, women, youth, poor farmers; of progressive, Left and Communist candidates in their place.

Fifth—to give the people an opportunity to hear, read and see where the Communist Party stands on the issues.

And sixth—to get the largest possible vote for the Communist candidates as the strongest, the longest lasting, most meaningful protest against the reactionary policies of monopoly capitalism. (*Capitalism on the Skids to Oblivion*, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1972, p. 47.)

"In general terms," said Comrade Hall, our aim is to expose and defeat the reactionary candidates—to sharply criticize the liberal candidates and to give support to the progressive independent candidates. We will expose to defeat, we will criticize to strengthen and we will support to elect." (*Ibid.*)

Growth of Political Independence

Expression of political independence from the establishment in the Republican and Democratic parties and of independence from adherence to these two parties of monopoly is already massive and growing rapidly and takes many forms. Those groups which express themselves as already definitely outside these parties are very limited, centering mainly around the New People's Party and Dr. Benjamin Spock's candidacy. But with so many rapid turns in events, with the grave new danger to world peace from Nixon's adventurist course in Indochina, and with the demand of masses for strong alternatives, there could be a rapid turn even on this question, depending on what candidates are nominated by the Democratic Party and how they move.

Among the many forms that are not yet completely outside the monopoly parties are the Black Congressional Caucus and the Black Political Convention. These are pressing on issues and are active especially in relation to local candidates and the fight to increase, substantially, Black representation in Congress. There are similar caucus developments and much independence around local candidates in the Chicano community including in this case the La Raza Unida Party, which is outside the monopoly parties and in places is seriously contending for election. The Women's Political Caucus is playing a big role. Large numbers of youth are expressing their independence at the polls, in the tens of thousands, mainly students, who have become McGovern campaign workers, and in the more independent voting of young workers as compared to their parents. There is also independent development among Puerto Ricans. In the ranks of labor, there are the committees for McGovern which challenge the top labor officialdom, who strongly oppose McGovern and support Humphrey, Jackson or to a lesser extent Muskie. Those, too, are a form of independent expression. This is true even though McGovern is supported by some of the more realistic monopoly circles as well as by anti-monopoly middle strata.

There are many candidacies in local and congressional races challenging reactionary and machine candidates. The possibility exists of increasing significantly the liberal bloc in Congress and even adding

3RD
PART 4

to the few more radical voices in Congress. These are signs of growing independence.

The Communist Party Campaign

The Communist Party in launching its own campaign has had to combat a number of wrong views influencing circles around it and its own membership. Some felt that the response to the Party would be so small and insignificant that the campaign was not worth the effort, being a very unimportant way of influencing the total electoral process. A Communist campaign, it was said, would not create much pressure on issues nor push the political spectrum to the Left. Given the Party's limited forces, they should not be expended in this way. Rather they should be used to build up the campaigns of more advanced national and local liberal and progressive candidates, including pressing them from within to speak more forthrightly. Others tended to feel that electoral activity should be a minor part of Communist activity, that it is much less important than developing local struggles on bread-and-butter issues, especially since bourgeois candidates will "say anything to win." There were also those who argued that Communist candidates would weaken more liberal candidates and draw votes from them, and thus help to elect reactionaries.

These views still have influence but there has been a big shift in attitude. The experiences of collecting signatures in Pennsylvania and Alabama did much to achieve the change.

Many more signatures than the number necessary for ballot status have already been collected in Alabama, Arizona, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Utah. Signatures are being collected in another 20-25 states. In several of these, like California, Texas, and Florida, the signature requirements are so high that the objective will be to collect enough for a challenge of the law, and to build up to an even bigger signature effort next time.

The rapid growth of independent tendencies, the demand for real alternatives and not just some more election-time rhetoric, have all been experienced in the Communist Party signature collections. One in four or five people approached says he or she is registered to vote and is willing to sign. This is as true in Arizona and Utah as in Philadelphia, Detroit or Cleveland. In Birmingham, in the Black community, the average is much better, while in the white community it is not quite as good. This indicates that if there were enough signature collectors, about one-fifth of the adult population of the United States would sign such petitions.

Most sign because they believe it is in the interests of democracy to give people an opportunity to vote for Communists. Quite a few who

do not sign say they are for the right of the Party to be on the ballot but they are fearful of signing because they hold government jobs, though many government workers do sign. A very large number say they do not agree with the Communists on many things, but they think Communists in the campaign will give the usual politicians some real competition and may compel them to stop talking and do something for working people. Another smaller but significant group says, "Where have you been? We've missed you in the last number of years." Or they say that they are looking for a radical alternative and are seriously interested in the Communist Party and its program.

When those approached are told the candidates are both workers and are shown their pictures, showing they are white and Black, older and younger, the response is warm. Many respond warmly when told the petition is for the Party of Angela Davis.

In South Philadelphia among the big Italian population, nearly all of whom voted for the racist Right-winger and former police chief, Rizzo, who is now mayor, many of the same people signed the Communist petition. The ratio of signers to those approached was not significantly different than elsewhere.

In those places where large numbers of signatures were sought in a limited area during a short period of time, requiring a real campaign atmosphere, two major developments occurred. Overnight the relationship of the Communist Party to the masses of people, to all movements of social struggle and to the Left changed qualitatively. Where before the local existence of the Communist Party was known only to a handful, virtually everyone has personally met and judged a Communist seeking a signature for ballot status. In Philadelphia, 30,000 of 120-150,000 people approached signed. Hardly a family did not have at least one member who was talked to by a petitioner. This makes the Communist Party a mass political force on all issues, a force the politicians of monopoly and everyone else cannot ignore.

The second result, largely related to the first, is that the Communist Party organization in such an area becomes internally a different kind of organization. Its membership is politically renewed, seeing concretely the validity of what theory has taught about Communists moving masses and masses being willing to respond. Thousands of contacts are made for every kind of purpose, from membership in the Communist Party or Young Workers Liberation League and readership of the *Daily World* to activity on mass issues.

Such experience demonstrates in life that for the time and personnel employed there are no other activities that are more productive in terms of results on all levels of the objectives for progressives in the 1972 elections. It contributes greatly to achieving a coalition of

ah?

!!

(FOR GOAL & THEN DO)

forces to defeat the reactionary drive and open up the path of democratic advance. It contributes greatly in developing pressure on the issues and pushing the mass debate to the Left. It helps create independence from the parties of monopoly and it builds the influence of the Left and of the Communist Party and its membership.

The experience of the candidates in speaking to millions through the mass media is the same. Masses are willing to listen and it creates real pressure on other levels of the campaign. Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner are necessary voices for peace, against racism, for the economic needs of the workers, for democratic rights and against reaction and monopoly in general. Without this kind of pressure the liberals will tend to retreat under pressure from the Right. In a number of areas, Communists are running for office locally. So far, these include a full slate in Illinois, William Taylor for Los Angeles School Board, Edward Texeira for State Assembly in Boston, and Anthony Monteiro who is a serious candidate, not just a minority-protest candidate, for Congress in the third district of Philadelphia. Additional candidates are expected in New York, Michigan, Minnesota and elsewhere.

There are many methods the ruling class and their politicians have devised to deny ballot status even when the usually undemocratic signature requirements are met. Mass and legal struggles are now going on against some 29 anti-Communist laws denying ballot status, and there is real possibility of victory. In some states filing fees are prohibitive and in others there are all kinds of technical requirements around the petitions or around establishing a new political party. Some states permit only notaries to collect signatures. And so on. Then there is the last resort of scoundrels, such as declaring signatures or addresses illegible. Thus, completion of the signature goal in 25-30 states will not assure ballot status in all these states. But the total campaign, including the securing of several hundred thousand signatures while talking to one to two million people creates great mass pressure against the use of such methods to deny the democratic right to the ballot.

With such a change in the Communist Party's participation in the 1972 elections it is not surprising that bourgeois commentators find one of the notable developments of these elections the emergence of the Communist Party as a significant contender for political office across the country. It also marks a turn toward the re-establishment of a Communist Party with a mass membership and an even greater mass following.

The Fight Against Racism and the Angela Davis Campaign*

As this article is being written, the trial of Comrade Angela Davis is just getting under way. As of now there are only two predictables: (1) The prosecution will do all in its power to push through its frameup of Angela. (2) Only a massive defense movement can free her.

The movement to free Comrade Angela Davis has already proved to be one of the most remarkable in the history of this country—in many respects, in fact, already the most outstanding. And now the Communist Party is accelerating its all-out effort in the fight to defeat this Nixon-Reagan frameup—to build a movement so powerful that Angela can quickly take her place in the vanguard of the fight against reaction instead of being made its victim.

One of the most basic factors in building a movement to free Angela and all political prisoners—and to prevent the escalation of new frameups—is *consistency* in mass struggle. And achieving this requires first of all the consistency of Communists.

We, as Communists, must take full advantage of every aspect of the spontaneity that occurs in the struggle. But we cannot allow ourselves to be slowed down during those periods when spontaneity is at a low point. Our own work should not ebb and flow according to the momentary moods of the movement—which is greatly influenced by media attention, trial developments and other factors. The consistent work of Communists is the basis for encouraging others to do the maximum—in other words, for making the most of periods of mass spontaneity and for continuing to build the movement even when spontaneity temporarily declines.

However, in some areas of the struggle to free Angela and all political prisoners, this has not been the case. In some instances, activities and committees have been like a thermometer reflecting the ups and downs of the mass movement.

This degree of fluctuation cannot be accounted for simply by the ebb and flow of the mass movement. In too many instances, comrades have directly reflected these ups and downs in their own

* The writer is a white comrade active in the defense movement.

work. Such comrades are influenced by others in the wrong way: that is, they allow themselves to be affected by incorrect ideas in the mass movement, while all too often ignoring the good ones.

Personal—Or Political?

In one area, a neighborhood Committee to Free Angela Davis carried out a number of successful activities during a period of mass spontaneity. When spontaneity temporarily declined, not only did activities decrease (which is understandable to an extent) but some of the Party members involved—all of whom are white—either sharply curtailed their work or left the Committee altogether.

Each of these comrades had a *personal* reason for this cutback or cessation of activities. But since all of these comrades were *simultaneously* affected by personal reasons, it's clear that what was involved was not purely personal but *political*. What are the underlying political reasons that account for the inconsistency in the work of such comrades in the defense movement?

When the initial high point of activity after the arrest of Comrade Angela was followed a number of months later by a lag, some comrades (particularly those involved for the first time in a prolonged defense struggle) felt that, despite all the good work done, the movement had declined rather than progressed. They were, of course, wrong in this estimate; no mass movement proceeds along an unbroken path of visible forward motion. (At this writing, activities to free Comrade Angela are, in fact, already headed in the direction of a new peak.)

However, during periods when it is more difficult to organize mass activities, some comrades reveal a certain reluctance to do so. And frequently the same comrades who reveal this conservatism in action, a Rightist tendency, are influenced in thought by the Leftist tendencies that have been present in the movement, and which Comrade Henry Winston analyzed in *The Meaning of San Rafael* (New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1971.)

Finally, and of utmost importance, is the effect of white chauvinism on the struggle to free Comrade Angela.

Two Forms Of Chauvinism

White chauvinism in the movement takes its most extreme form among those who resist participation in the fight to free Angela. But some white comrades involved in the defense of Angela Davis draw a strange conclusion from this. According to their view, a comrade involved in this struggle is thereby free of chauvinism, or

else its effects are so negligible as to be hardly worth mentioning. If this subject *is* mentioned, some of these comrades make strenuous efforts to reroute the discussion to those who are *not* involved in the campaign.

By all means, let us discuss why some comrades are not making the contribution they could or should to free Angela. But for comrades in this work to feel that their participation—or even their presence—is sufficient is a severe form of arrogance. They are saying, in effect, that Black people will recognize them as revolutionary allies simply because they are there.

Comrades affected by such attitudes do not fully see that the struggle to free Comrade Angela is at the center of the fight in this country against the threat of fascism and for democracy, that it is a life-and-death struggle for Angela *and* for the masses of people—Black, Brown, Yellow, Red and white.

These comrades are not really aware that they can begin to fulfill their revolutionary role only when they fight the influences of white chauvinism in themselves and in the movement, and when their own work is primarily aimed at bringing white masses into the struggle to free Angela.

"Her Fight Is My Fight" is not just a slogan. And comrades who realize the proportions of this battle will want to go into it fully prepared, that is, ready to fight white chauvinism rather than allowing themselves to be burdened down by it.

Black and White in the Committees

The scope of activities to free Comrade Angela by many types of organizations in the Black community has been tremendous. At the same time, the Committees to Free Angela Davis—which play a leading role in and out of Black communities—are bringing together Black, Brown and white forces, Party and non-Party. And in many many instances, people who join a Committee to Free Angela Davis go on to join the Party.

In some cases, however, results have not been so positive. In the neighborhood Committee to Free Angela Davis mentioned earlier, for example, a substantial number of Black non-Party activists were drawn into the work. Then, one by one they dropped away, until at one point only one Black person participated on a consistent basis.

As noted earlier all of the Party members in this Committee are white, and when a Party discussion of the problems in the work was held, some of them refused to acknowledge any connection between white chauvinism and the departure of the Black activists. In fact,

these comrades maintained that this could not be the reason since non-Party whites had also left the Committee!

But white chauvinism leads to the loss of white as well as Black activists. When Black people, repelled by chauvinism, leave a committee, much of the leadership qualities, the ideas and the militance, goes with them. In such an atmosphere, whites also leave. Those white comrades who remain tend to feel isolated, demoralized, and thus to become less active.

"Raise Their Resistance and Immunity"

In *Racism: The Nation's Most Dangerous Pollutant*, Gus Hall states:

. . . We have made some significant beginnings in the recruitment of Black youth into the Party. . . . They are coming into the Party partly because of our higher standards in the struggle against racism. They are coming in because of our theoretical, political and tactical concepts.

But Communist standards of years back are not high enough for today. These young people are coming in expecting Communist standards that meet the level of the movements and the struggles of the '70s. (New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1971, p. 12.)

But simply because higher standards are required today it does not follow that they will appear spontaneously. (There is little spontaneity in the fight *against* white chauvinism.) This is why Comrade Hall goes on to say:

We also have many new white youth coming into the Party. They, too, are the best activists, but they also need the Party's ideological concepts. It is necessary quickly to raise their understanding of racism. It is necessary to raise their resistance and immunity to this enemy ideology. (*Ibid.*)

In many instances, the approach Comrade Hall outlines has already brought impressive returns. Through the efforts of the Party collective, the understanding of many young comrades is being quickly raised. As a result, these comrades are seriously beginning to struggle against white chauvinism in themselves and in the movement, while simultaneously working to draw whites beyond the movement into the struggle against racism.

At the same time, it is possible to underestimate the difficulties in this phase of the struggle against white chauvinism. For instance, today there is in general a far greater awareness of the Black liberation struggle, and this holds especially true in the movement. There-

fore, some comrades may have drawn the conclusion that white youth now enter the Party less deeply affected by chauvinism than in the past.

But this is a many-faceted question. While the influence of the Black liberation movement is now much broader and deeper, the propagation of racism in all forms has been greatly intensified by the ruling class. And radical youth are not immune to this.

In addition, many white youth have joined the Party as a result of the student struggles. They have rejected the "solutions" offered by the New Left in favor of the Marxist-Leninist course advanced by the Communist Party. Nevertheless, some traces of New Left "super-revolutionism" are difficult to overcome.

In the New Left there was no serious struggle against white chauvinism. In fact, self-criticism, which is at the core of this struggle, was totally lacking in the student movement.

Further, sections of the New Left did not view mass struggle as the way to social change. Quite the contrary: many New Left radicals considered the masses the *obstacle to progress*. Since the masses were the barrier to and not the makers of the revolution (which would be taken care of by an "elite"), it logically followed that white radicals need accept no special responsibility for winning the white masses to the struggle against racism. Instead, white radicals could best fulfill their role by denouncing the "hopeless" white masses, and in particular the "hopeless" white workers, in a "super-militant" manner.

But rhetoric cannot substitute for struggle, and "super-revolutionary" rhetoric is an obstacle to it. By rejecting even the possibility of winning whites to the struggle against racism, New Left "theoreticians" abandoned the fight for Black-white unity, and mass struggle itself.

In the Party, young comrades discover an atmosphere entirely different from that which they had experienced in the New Left. Racism is analyzed, not denounced in the abstract. Specific struggles against it, requiring activity, are planned and carried out.

In addition, new comrades must soon face up to the fact that the influences of white chauvinism affect not only others but themselves. It is difficult to accept this, but for a Communist, it is a basic starting point in the struggle against racism.

The Seeds Of Something Positive

Very often comrades react to an allegation of chauvinism with resistance, shock, or even complete rejection of the possibility that they themselves might show traces of this poison. It isn't easy to recognize

—let alone acknowledge—traces of “the nation’s most dangerous pol-
lutant” in one’s own self.

While this initial reaction may appear totally negative, it usually contains the seeds of something positive: by the very strength of their emotion—resistance, shock—comrades unconsciously reveal that, on a very deep level, they recognize the seriousness of what is involved, that racism is indeed the greatest deterrent to the revolution-
ary process.

The seriousness a comrade attaches to a charge of chauvinism is actually converted into something positive when the comrade openly recognizes the chauvinism in his or her own actions. This is what should happen when the allegation of chauvinism is an accurate one, and if it is clearly and carefully discussed with the comrade. This is all part of the process by which white comrades learn to take the lead in the struggle against white chauvinism.

However, it should be kept in mind that comrades are not always able to recognize the chauvinism in their actions after it is initially called to their attention. No comrade is deliberately chauvinist, and patient explanation may be required before the comrade understands the racist influences reflected in his or her behavior.

There are some comrades who seem to be more interested in pre-
serving their “image” than in overcoming chauvinism. These few comrades do not seem particularly upset by the harm their chauvinist actions have caused; in fact, they do not become upset so long as they can convince others that what they have done is not serious, or that they couldn’t be expected to know any better. Sometimes such comrades can become very upset indeed, but it is not at the *fact* of chauvinism on their part; it is only when they feel that this behavior may have harmed their “image.”

The Party collective must make every effort to penetrate this deep-
seated resistance and raise the level of their understanding. But these comrades should not be permitted to hold back the struggle against white chauvinism by the intensity of their own resistance, which may reveal itself in a variety of forms.

A Pattern Of Racist Stereotypes

In certain defense committees, the white members may include both Party and non-Party people, while none of the Black people are in the Party. This situation, which creates many special problems, can be corrected, of course, where there is a struggle against white chauvinism and Black activists are recruited into the Party.

Black and white unity will be achieved in mass work only to the

extent that white comrades take the lead in fighting against chauvinism. If this fight is not made, white Communists will be indistinguishable from white non-Communists. Only if Black and Brown people see individual whites struggling against chauvinism can they make a distinction, instead of being forced to the conclusion that “all the whites are alike.”

When white Communists do not struggle against chauvinism in mass work, it may not necessarily be because they are hesitant to do so, but rather because they themselves are not really aware of it—
or are partially responsible for it.

In the local Committee to Free Angela Davis referred to earlier, a number of acts of chauvinism revolved around a young white woman who had just joined the Party. In one instance this woman said, jokingly: “I’m going to start a commune.” She first turned to a young white man and said, “You’ll do the cooking.” She next turned to a young Black woman and stated: “And you’ll do the cleaning.” The Black woman had played an active role in the Committee, but this was the last meeting she ever attended.

On another occasion plans were made to run a fund-raising party. A pub had been offered for the occasion, and a white man said he would go to look it over. Then a Black committee member—noting that he had had considerable experience in evaluating halls for movement fund-raising events—volunteered to go with the white member. No comment was made when the white man said he would go, but when the Black man volunteered, the white woman said: “Oh, that Bob, he knows the inside and outside of bars!” In this one sentence, she converted the Black man from the dedicated activist he is in reality into an age-old stereotype created by racist media.

In a third incident, a Black woman volunteered to serve on the publicity committee (which was responsible for leaflets and letters as well as press releases). The white woman told her there were enough people on the committee already—herself and another white woman. The Black woman was firm: she had a job and a small child and it was difficult for her to get out, but publicity was something she could work on at home. The white woman remained adamant: there were enough people on the publicity committee, the Black woman should serve elsewhere. At this point, other whites present (including a few comrades) began to pressure the Black woman to serve on the entertainment committee and line up the singers and musicians. In short, another old stereotype had been introduced: whites should do the thinking while Blacks provide the singing and the dancing. The Black member refused.

This Black woman also stopped working with the Committee. However, this incident and the others related here must be seen only as very obvious reflections of deep patterns of chauvinism in the Committee—as the tip of the iceberg.)

Other blatant acts of chauvinism on the part of this white woman included an Amos and Andy-type imitation, and shocking disrespect of an older Black woman comrade who was not present (and does not function in this local Committee).

A Pattern Of Resistance

In a subsequent Party meeting of this all-white group, one comrade gave a report on some of these acts of chauvinism, and stressed that a struggle against white chauvinism was central to rebuilding the Committee, whose activities were at a low point. This comrade made it clear that discussion of these particular acts was only a starting point, since chauvinism in the Committee had certainly not been limited to one person.

Some of the comrades present reacted to the report in a most positive manner, and entered into the struggle in a serious, meaningful way. *Others, however, initiated a pattern of resistance to the struggle against white chauvinism that eventually overshadowed in importance even the original acts of chauvinism themselves.*

This resistance began when a few comrades denounced “the way” the question of chauvinism had been raised—complaining that it was “too sharp,” etc. They then expressed their deep sympathy for the comrade who had been guilty of blatant acts of chauvinism. Throughout the course of prolonged discussions, none of these few comrades ever mentioned how the Black people who were grossly insulted might have felt. This was, of course, nothing less than a reflection of another old racist stereotype, that is: “*They don’t have the same kind of feelings we have.*”

These comrades’ resistance to recognizing their own chauvinism took a number of forms. While it seems quite obvious that the influences of racism in this society are pervasive—and that when there is no struggle, chauvinism is going unchallenged—these comrades offered by implication an opposite point of view.

One of them said, for example, that a Black woman (one of those no longer attending Committee meetings) “is very outspoken. If someone says something chauvinist, she answers it.” According to this train of thought, it is the *Black* person who must take the initiative in this struggle—and if the Black person does not, that is proof positive that no chauvinism exists! (“When Black people say nothing,”

said a Black comrade, commenting on this attitude, “it’s because they feel it’s no use.”)

It was mandatory that these comrades frankly discuss their chauvinism with the Black activists who had been insulted. But they showed no desire to do this. If anything, their only interest in discussing this with the Black people was in the illusion that they could elicit assurance that they had *not* been chauvinist. (One comrade, for example, demanded to know if the acts under discussion were chauvinist “in context”—that is, if the Black person doesn’t feel that a “joke” based on a racial stereotype is chauvinist, then is it really chauvinist?)

Before these Party meetings were held, if one of these comrades was asked why a particular Black person no longer attended meetings, it was her custom to answer: “He has problems.” Only she never saw chauvinism as the problem!

During the series of Party discussions, these comrades continued to express this same point of view, giving reason after reason why various Black members had stopped coming to meetings. One person’s grandmother had died, another went away weekends (although committee meetings were held in mid-week), and so on—every reason except white chauvinism!

One comrade even went so far as to assert that one of the Black women members no longer participated because of “ideological differences.” But one does not leave a united front committee because of ideological differences. A united front is *based on* differences.

Further, this comrade implied that the Black member left the Committee because of ideological differences with *Party* positions. This is something he could not assess—because his own positions were not those of the Party. More to the point, since this Party member considered his own differences with Party positions permissible, how could he deny this same privilege to someone who did *not* belong to the Party?

This small group of comrades, who resisted not only the struggle against white chauvinism but Party positions on many basic questions, did not see that it was their *own* ideological differences with the Party that created problems in the united front, and led to loss of non-Party activists (white as well as Black).

“Necessary Quickly To Raise Their Understanding”

It is necessary quickly to raise their [young white comrades] understanding of racism. It is necessary to raise their resistance and immunity to enemy ideology. (Gus Hall, *Racism*. . . , p. 12.)

Surely no comrade disagrees with the above statement by Gus Hall

—at least not in the abstract. However, in a real life situation, such as the one discussed in this article, there are a few comrades who in practice *do* disagree. Such comrades urge that criticism be withheld or diluted to the point of meaninglessness because it involves “a new comrade.”

Every effort must be made to present criticism in a way that is understandable to the comrade most directly concerned. It should be offered within an ideological framework and related to the struggle in which the comrade is involved (this can also help counteract tendencies to view the criticism as something “personal”). Individual discussion with a comrade prior to a formal meeting can also be very helpful (but should not be regarded as a substitute for a formal meeting).

However, the criticism itself cannot be “scaled down” to meet the level of a person new to the Party. Instead, the aim should be to present it in such a way that the comrade rises to meet the level required in the struggle. This is indeed how comrades grow! (It’s also helpful to keep in mind that when Black people come to meetings and see whites behave in a chauvinist manner, they are not likely to excuse it on the grounds that, “Well, they haven’t been around long.”)

Further, doesn’t the act of joining the Party in itself entail certain standards of conduct? Is it permissible for the Party to allow either a new or an old member to crassly lower Party standards—without challenge? Should those in our ranks most influenced by chauvinism be permitted to determine the pace and level of the fight against it?

The hesitation to carry on serious discussions with young comrades is often based on the fear that we will “lose them.” But as Comrade Hall stresses in his report on racism: “Without such an ideological struggle, we cannot hold these youth in the Party. . . .” (P. 12.)

“The Way It Was Raised”

Vehement objection to “the way it was raised” was the slogan under which a few comrades carried on their resistance to the struggle against white chauvinism in the situation discussed here. Once these comrades had gone on record—in and out of meetings—in opposition to “the way” the question of chauvinism had been raised, virtually all their efforts were focused on justifying this response. In fact, these comrades developed a pattern of factional activity against the comrade who raised the question of chauvinism in an attempt to isolate her. It is possible that this factionalism was not carried out on a conscious level. *However, to my knowledge, this is the first time that factional tendencies have merged with resistance to the struggle*

against white chauvinism.

What shocked those comrades who so vehemently protested the report on chauvinism was not the specific acts of chauvinism described; each of these comrades had personally witnessed some or all of these acts—but apparently without realizing any chauvinism was involved. What they objected to was not the acts themselves, but that they had been identified as acts of chauvinism.

Despite the fact that they had apparently not recognized the chauvinism in these acts, at an early stage of the ideological struggle these comrades glibly stated, “Oh, yes, it was chauvinism”—and then went on to attack “the way it was raised.”

One of these comrades claimed there had been “unity” among the comrades involved in this defense work before the report on chauvinism and now there was “disunity.” How, he was challenged, can there be unity around chauvinism? What kind of “unity” exists when Black people leave a committee because of white chauvinism?

The obvious implications of this comrade’s remarks are that struggle against white chauvinism disunites and, that whatever happens, the way to unity is to say nothing and let white chauvinism continue to seep in. But as Comrade Hall states in his report, “Enemy ideology responds only to struggle. With each day without struggle the penetration increases.” (P. 12.)

The offensive against the alleged “way” the matter had been raised was simply a subterfuge to conceal resistance to the substance of what was raised. *Those who claimed the matter had not been raised “correctly” clearly demonstrated by their prolonged resistance that they didn’t want it raised at all.*

In a meeting with these comrades, a Black Communist leader made a penetrating contribution on the meaning of the struggle against racism. He then assured the comrades that if the Party group had included Black as well as white members, the original report on chauvinism would have been “*three times as sharp.*”

Problems In Coalition Work

When there is no fight on chauvinism in a defense committee, not only the feelings of Black and Brown activists are being ignored; it’s a safe bet that their views are receiving the same treatment. And when such methods are carried over into coalition activities, the results are apt to be even more blatant than when the situation is “hidden” within one committee. For instance, because the Party bore the main brunt of McCarthyism, it faces a much greater “missing generation” problem than mass organizations which have recently

emerged. This means that young comrades are sometimes predominantly in the leadership of local defense committees, while the community leaders they approach for coalition activities are generally in the "missing generation," in the 35- to 50-year age range. And many of these community leaders are Black, Puerto Rican or Chicano.

If white comrades are not sensitive to the views of Black and Brown members of a defense committee, they are not apt to show a greater sensitivity to the opinions of Black and Brown community figures.

The Committee to Free Angela Davis discussed in this article did valuable work in helping to form a coalition based on freeing political prisoners. The coalition included Black and Brown men and women, community figures with mass ties. They made outstanding contributions to the coalition, both in terms of leadership and in carrying out day-to-day tasks.

Yet the same few comrades who were indifferent to the views and feelings of Black people in the defense committee were equally indifferent in their relations with these community figures. These inexperienced comrades were under the illusion that because they were members of the Communist Party, they knew more than the older, experienced people in the mass movement. Of course, this arrogant attitude toward others—chauvinist in relation to Black and Brown people—has nothing to do with being a Communist; it is the antithesis of Marxism-Leninism.

When the coalition was confronted by a crisis situation, the reaction of these comrades was pre-determined by their relations with Black people in the defense committee: the acts of chauvinism in which they had been involved had programmed them arrogantly to bypass Black and Brown leadership within the coalition.

When this crisis occurred, these few comrades violated basic united front principles by going ahead to impose their own personal desires on the coalition; in fact, they scheduled a mass event without consulting coalition leaders.

And not only did they violate united front principles; they also violated democratic centralism. A Brown leader of the Party met with a committee of these comrades and reached agreement with them on a decision to help repair damage done by their violation of the united front. However, shortly after the meeting some of these comrades proceeded to ignore the collective Party decision.

This chauvinist way of operating continued up to the point where a community leader challenged what they had done. These comrades had gone so far as to send out an announcement of the date of an

action in the name of the coalition—although the coalition had not even met to discuss the action itself! Later these comrades went to a coalition meeting to try to get a confirming vote for the action they had already announced. They were stopped at that meeting only as the result of the opposition of the community leader.

Ideological Views And The United Front

In defense work, the united front can also be violated in other ways; for instance by the introduction of materials advancing ideological positions.

And when such ideological materials are based on "super-revolutionary" ideas, as they have been in the recent period, their promotion by whites is in itself chauvinist. As Comrade Henry Winston states in *The Meaning of San Rafael*:

. . . Harsh as it may sound, white radicals who engage in "super-revolutionary" interpretations of San Rafael are in reality expressing ideological views influenced by some of the same chauvinist manifestations that have plagued the New Left since its inception. (P. 18.)

The role of white radicals, Comrade Winston points out:

. . . is *not* to provide a cheering section for genocide in the form of "revolutionary" suicide. Their role is to join in building the united front to end racism. They cannot meet this responsibility without rejecting all forms of "super-revolutionism" which results in accommodation to rather than struggle against racism. (P. 8.)

But it is not only incorrect to introduce ideological materials containing such ideas into a defense committee; it is inappropriate to bring in ideological materials of *any type*—including those with which we may agree.

A principle in defense work is that *no* particular ideological position should be promoted by a defense committee, which is a united front of people of varying ideologies who join together for one purpose: to free political prisoners. Differences in a committee should not be expressed over ideology as such; they are properly expressed in different ideas as to the best tactics to use in the struggle. (This can be a big enough problem!) A defense committee does not defend a political prisoners ideology as such, but her or his *right to have these views*—without being persecuted and prosecuted because of them. A defense committee, in other words, is not a forum for debating tactics of the revolution!

Communists working in a defense committee would not, for instance,

ask the committee to sell Party literature. However, they are definitely acting in a proper and constructive manner when they bring such pamphlets as *The Meaning of San Rafael* to the attention of individual committee members on a personal basis. But within the formal structure of a defense committee, Communists best express their ideology by the way they advocate certain proposals, or oppose others.

Other Problems In Defense Work

For a prolonged period, there has been strong resistance by some forces in the peace movement to linking such vital issues as Black liberation, unemployment and poverty with the fight to end the war. And Communists have played a leading role in the struggle to relate these issues to the fight for peace in mass demonstrations, etc.

Now, however, there is some evidence of a need for a corollary struggle. A few comrades in defense work have been reluctant to take advantage of the opportunities now available for bringing the issue of freeing Angela Davis and all political prisoners into the peace movement; they have, for instance, resisted organizing special contingents around political prisoners in peace marches. In this resistance, they express the strong influence of conservatism, as well as "super-Leftist," anarchist contempt for mass action. The recent demonstration at Harrisburg dramatized the vital relationship between the fight for peace and the defense of political prisoners; now such an approach must be expanded upon in both the peace and defense movements.

Finally, a problem of long standing recurs from time to time in the work of some committees: that is, a predominantly white group will sometimes decide to focus its major efforts on the Black community—thus abandoning the day-to-day struggle to draw white masses into the fight against racism, the most basic responsibility of white radicals.

A Misinterpretation of Past Problems

Some older white comrades have allowed themselves to become temporarily dulled in the struggle against white chauvinism by a combination of factors. First, when a consistent struggle against chauvinism isn't carried on, one's reactions become less sensitive; one becomes downright rusty.

In addition, some older white comrades are not taking the initiative expected of them today because of a misinterpretation of problems in the Party's struggle against white chauvinism in the early 50's. They remember this struggle as "too sharp," and do not want to repeat old

errors. Some *young* white comrades have also been inhibited from moving assertively against chauvinism by what they have heard of the 50's.

But what was wrong in the 50's was not a question of "sharpness." How can one convey the seriousness of chauvinist behavior or penetrate resistance without sharpness? But that sharpness should not be allowed to take a subjective, inward direction. It must be an ideological sharpness, linked to mass struggle.

In the 50's the struggle against white chauvinism took place within a context of developing McCarthyism on the outside and Rightist revisionism within the Party. There were also tendencies in the Party toward a one-sided sectarian reaction against revisionism. As a result of these factors, the struggle against chauvinism tended to become separated from mass struggle, turned inward.

Older white comrades can make a very special contribution to today's struggle. They can help introduce a positive feature of the fight in the 50's: an alertness and sensitivity to chauvinist manifestations. At the same time, by helping to keep the stress on ideology and relationship to mass struggle, they can help guard against the errors in the 50's, when the emphasis often tended to be on administrative steps rather than ideology and struggle.

In this way, we can draw upon the Party's great experience and contributions in the struggle against racism—and in so doing add to them.

In the course of struggling to win freedom for Comrade Angela, we can lay the basis for building a mass defense movement to free all political prisoners and prevent new frameups—and make a great contribution to building the Communist Party.

(Continued from page 1)

Now is the time for citizens in uniform—for soldiers, sailors, and airmen to stand firm in defense of their humanity and morality and the honor of our country against the uncivilized commands to continue the killing and destruction.

Now is the time by telephone, by telegram, by letter and petition; by delegations to Washington, to your Senator, to your Congressman; to your local newspaper editor; your union leader, your clergyman—in your shop, your club in neighborhood meetings, in mass meetings.

Mobilize the millions to SPEAK OUT AND ACT NOW to stop the bombings, fix an immediate date to withdraw all U.S. armed forces from Vietnam and all Indochina, resume the Paris talks to end the war now.

The 15th Congress of the Communist Party of Ireland*

The 15th Congress of the Communist Party of Ireland was held in Belfast on October 16-17, against a background of exploding bombs, gunfire on the streets by British troops and the trundling arrival of more military reinforcements from Britain — including, ominously enough, the 22nd Special Service Regiment, experts in counter-insurgency operations and the psychological torturing of prisoners.

The Congress however met in a calm atmosphere. It was marked by the predominance of young delegates. It was also a great international occasion in the life of our Party because of the presence of fraternal delegations from the Communist parties of the Soviet Union, Britain, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, France, Italy and the USA.

I

The Congresses of our Party seem to have the knack of coinciding with historic commemorative dates. Nineteen months ago, there was held the Special Unity Congress for the reconstitution of the Communist Party of Ireland. Formed in 1933, the party during the period of World War II divided into two parties, the Communist Party of Northern Ireland and the Irish Workers' Party in the Republic of Ireland. There were a number of reasons for that development: the conditions generated by the partition of the island into two states; the involvement of one state, as part of the United Kingdom, in the war, and the existence of neutrality in the other state.

The reconstitution of one united Communist Party of all of Ireland was an important political and organizational achievement, coming significantly a few weeks before the centenary of the birth of that great revolutionary figure, V. I. Lenin.

The 15th Congress was so named because despite the difficulties of the existence of two parties, nevertheless over the years, the Irish

Communist movement retained at all times its political unity and continued the numbering of its Congresses since the foundation one of 1933.

The 15th Congress again coincided with another historic anniversary, the signing on December 6, 1921 of the Anglo-Irish Treaty in which, arising out of a preceding five-year period of revolt, mass resistance, rural and urban guerrilla warfare, the British were forced to give a degree of political independence to the major portion of Ireland. However, in order to obstruct the achievement of full liberation, London set out to implement a divisive plan now well known as "The Partition of Ireland."

Thus there came into being two states:

—*The Republic of Ireland* (population of 2.9 million) which since 1921, by unilateral legislative acts, has increased its degree of political freedom, but this has been, and is becoming more so, inhibited by strong British monopoly capitalist domination of the economy. The "Irish" banks are part and parcel of the British banking system, and likewise most of the manufacturing industries, commercial concerns and insurance corporations are owned by the British.

—*Northern Ireland*, with its population of 1.5 million, in the North-East part of the island, was retained by Britain as part of its United Kingdom. It was given a local parliament called "Stormont" from the name of the place where it is located. This parliament has only limited local powers and is completely subject to the British Parliament and Government.

Supposedly acting on the principle of giving a national minority who professed the Protestant religion the protective rights of British citizenship, the London Government, by the diabolical use of the device of partition not only split the island in two, but by incorporating in the Northern Ireland state a third of the population who were Catholics and who desired to be citizens in one united Irish state, they cunningly cultivated division also in the North.

Thus the members of the national majority became a minority in the artificial state which was created in Northern Ireland. There their position was used to divide Protestant and Catholic members of the working people from each other. Sectarian fears and passions were inflamed. The Catholic minority in the North were discriminated against in employment, and electoral constituencies were gerrymandered in order to give governmental power, on both a state and local level, to the Unionist Party, an appendage of the British Tory Party, and representative of the big landowning and industrial elements.

*This article is reprinted from the February, 1972 issue of the *World Marxist Review*. Michael O'Riordan is Secretary of the National Executive Committee, Communist Party of Ireland.

This state of affairs has been resented by the majority of the people of the whole of the island, and resisted by the minority within Northern Ireland by many forms of struggle, abstention from elections—and when elected—by boycott or obstruction within the Stormont Parliament, by struggles of civil disobedience and non-cooperation, and even by outbursts of armed force by some sections.

Having, over the centuries, instigated division between Protestant and Catholic and having created the state structure to aggravate it, the British have maintained with typical imperialist hypocrisy that bitterness and tension was a feature peculiar to the Irish people, which of course the British decried(!). As was stated in the introduction to the Main Political Resolution at the CPI Congress, that while the tactic of “divide and conquer” may have been invented by Caesar, it had not disappeared with the passing of ancient Rome. On the contrary, it has been perfected and brought to a fine art by the modern imperialists. Division was not a problem caused by Irish temperaments, it is the outcome of a technique of modern capitalism and imperialism which finds application in countries like Cyprus with its age-old history, in Canada with its comparatively recent history, and in the sophisticated society of the largest of the capitalist powers, the USA. Turk against Greek, English against French speaking, white against Black, and in our own country Protestant against Catholic—and vice-versa, of course, in all cases.

Meeting 50 years after the physical division of Ireland into two states, the Irish Communists characterized the outcome of the purpose of this British action, which was to enable it to continue its rule in the North, and to strengthen its neo-colonial domination in the South. “Both states,” said the Political Resolution, “have been continually plagued with high unemployment, emigration, inadequate housing, low living standards and retarded economic development. After 50 years’ existence, both states are monuments of failure to, on the one hand, the policy of Northern dependence on Britain, and on the other, to indirect 26-County (i.e. Republic of Ireland) dependence.”

This is so because the North is but in fact an underdeveloped part of the British economic scene in which unemployment is always higher than in any part of the United Kingdom. (At present 8.8 per cent of the insured working population are without jobs, with the percentage of males being 10.5 and women 6.0; the degree of the discrimination against the minority can be seen in the percentage for Catholic areas, viz., Strabane 26.9 per cent, Dungannon 19.4 per cent and Derry which has 18.0 per cent unemployed.)

In the Republic of Ireland, the unemployment rate is 7 per cent, which is almost a constant figure there. Here it is relieved by a somewhat higher degree of emigration in search of work to Britain and the USA. The failure to build a better job-giving economy has arisen from the unwillingness of the bourgeois government to challenge the British monopoly domination, and by not doing what many later independent states did by taking over control of the banking system, heavy industry and other vital sectors of the economy by means of state companies.

II

The 50th anniversary of the Anglo-Irish Treaty which factually divided Ireland is not being celebrated in our country; the half a century of the British “settlement” of the Irish question is being marked instead by an escalating situation of violence in which many lives are being lost, in which British soldiers have even shot down women in the streets, thousands have been forced to leave burning homes, people subjected in the streets and in their homes to batonings and to C.S. gassing by the British troops, and the detention of 500 without trial, under the most brutal conditions.

Why this sharpening deterioration in the situation, now, in the 50th year of Anglo-Irish “peace”? Throughout the entire period, of course, the situation has never been normal. In the chronic conditions of unemployment and bad housing the Unionist Party Government in its deliberate attempt to split the working people granted *some* privileges to the Protestant section of the working people. Whenever the danger arose, for them, of Protestant-Catholic unity being established, the government callously encouraged and organized pogroms against the Catholic working people.

This was the situation up to four years ago when the Civil Rights Association was set up to organize both the Catholic and Protestant sections of the people for a democratic change. A unity was established which terrified the Unionist Government whose own monolithic structure was split for the first time, between those who wanted to immediately crush the new united movement, and others whose similar alarm was tempered by the knowledge that over the 50 years changes had taken place in the balance of forces in the world.

British imperialism itself was in a crisis. Most of its once mighty empire was gone, it was contemplating joining the Common Market, and yet at the same time ensuring that Ireland remained a safe and secure place for British investment and market for its goods. (The Republic of Ireland, alone, ranks as the third biggest buyer of

British products after the USA and West Germany.) In the preparatory streamlining of her economy, prior to joining the EEC, Britain set out to combine the economy of the two states in Ireland, and to encourage, not a unification of the people, but of the capitalists, on both sides of the border. The two Prime Ministers were encouraged to meet for the first time in the history of the two states, to make a businessman's agreement in the interests of the businessmen of the two areas, and of the British businessmen most of all, who anyway owned most of the businesses they but managed. Britain, while still trying to maintain its firm grip on the whole of Ireland, by *partition*, at the same time wanted to bring the island as *one unit* into the Common Market. Herein lay a contradictory problem for them.

Side by side with the schemes of the British, there was the agitation of the Civil Rights Movement, which, as mentioned, split the forces of the Unionist government. The Civil Rights Movement was met by repression in the streets, and it replied with resistance in the streets. In the fierceness of the campaign the political consciousness of the people developed, moving from the demand for elementary civil and democratic rights to the challenging of the whole political and economic role of British imperialism in Ireland. As the Political Resolution of the 15th Congress of Irish Communists said: "In the new political situation caused by the tremendous resistance of the anti-Unionist forces to increased repression, the issues of democracy, national independence and socialist ideas have been elevated to a higher level. The anti-Unionist forces have the energy and strength and, given correct political leadership and ideas, can replace the present Unionist administration by an alternative."

In this manner was projected the strategy of the Communists. We recognize that the present political situation contains great dangers, even the possibility of civil war, but Communists in Ireland do not advocate civil war, rather is it our aim to promote civil unity, and to establish neither a Protestant nor a Catholic supremacy, but to establish the leading role and supremacy of the Irish working class. Dangers there are in the present situation, but at the same time there open up greater possibilities than ever before for the people of Ireland. These possibilities could be realized through the building of a people's alliance simultaneously in the two states and in Ireland as a whole. Such an alliance would lay the basis, first for an united opposition, and later for alternative governments to the Unionist one at Stormont and the bourgeois one of the Republic of Ireland. Thus, the perspective is the fight for the election of two progressive governments,

in which there would be, for the first time in Ireland, two governments with similar democratic and anti-monopoly programs, which would bring about an entirely new situation in which the structural problems of forming one progressive government for the whole of Ireland would be tackled in a fraternal and peaceful manner.

What would be the platform of such a People's Alliance?

The first, and major, point would be the fight against entry into the Common Market of either of the two states. In the Republic of Ireland it will be necessary to hold a referendum on this question, as articles in the Rome Treaty conflict with the Constitution of that state. Northern Ireland's citizens will have no say in the matter as their fate will be decided, as part of the United Kingdom, by the British Government. The conditions therefore demand the maximum unity in the fight against the EEC by the peoples of the two states along with the British people.

The integration of Ireland into the Common Market would be a national disaster adding the exploitation of the huge European monopolies as extra burdens to be borne by the Irish people. It would commit the whole country to an imperialist war alliance; it would force the abandonment of the Republic's policy of neutrality; accelerate the already high unemployment in the North, force the closing down of many industries in the South, an estimated 20 per cent increase in food prices, and the virtual elimination of the small farmer. In the main sector of our economy, i.e., agriculture, there would be not only depopulation of the countryside, but an actual exodus from the island itself because there is no alternative employment to which a surplus rural population could move to.

It is not without significance that on many of the bullet-marked walls of the Catholic ghettos can be read the slogans which proclaim—"EEC—NO!" Equally significant is the fact that more and more of the Protestant workers, small farmers, fisherman and small businessmen are coming out against the Common Market. Thus in the midst of all the division there is the common denominator which creates the basis for united action, for a unity that would be basically anti-imperialist.

Other common demands would be the development of our natural resources by the state and the setting up of new state industries; the division of large estates and cattle ranches amongst the landless and small farmers, with government incentives including provision of machinery, seed fertilizer and stock on favorable terms for cooperative farming; public ownership of inland fisheries and the equipping of our sea fisheries with the most modern boats and plants for processing,

together with training schemes for crews, process workers and marketing staff; intensive development of rural industries using local raw materials, where possible, including food processing, a pharmaceutical and chemical industry, with extra investments in Irish-speaking areas of the country to help maintain traditional communities; the protection of the small and self-employed businessman and the prohibition of foreign-owned supermarkets.

III

Meeting in Congress the Irish Communists examined the present situation not only in the context of Ireland itself, but in the light of the causes of the declining position of British imperialism in the world system of monopoly capitalism over the last 50 years. The Main Political Resolution pointed out that this world system was itself in a state of crisis, which had been caused by the intensification of contradictions between the capitalist powers themselves; by the sweep of the national liberation struggles; the upsurge by the workers in the capitalist countries, "and by the increasingly proven superiority of the socialist countries—of which the first and most powerful is the Soviet Union."

The system of imperialism—the source of all Ireland's troubles—is weakening. In all capitalist lands unemployment is increasing, inflation is spreading, and even the USA, the mightiest of all the imperialist states, is experiencing a crisis of the once almighty dollar. It was recognized that as the system of imperialism was being defeated in the field, it was resorting increasingly to an ideological offensive against socialism, mainly in the form of anti-Sovietism, and to attempts to divide the working people by encouraging racial, political and religious sectarianism.

"The ever existing class struggle between Capital and Labor," and Resolution stated, "is being fought out in every capitalist country. On a global scale it is taking place between the forces of world socialism and world capitalism. The former has already altered the whole balance of world forces by its ascendancy and provides an example and a material base for the anti-imperialist forces. This is accelerating the inevitable decline of imperialism and creates favorable conditions for the Irish people to advance to full freedom."

That small countries like Ireland are no longer alone or helpless at the mercy of imperialism is illustrated by the examples of countries like Vietnam, which, supported by the socialist countries and an international solidarity campaign, is able to successfully withstand the aggression of the powerful USA. Likewise there is the

example of the other small islands like Cuba, and the ability of places like Cyprus, Malta and Iceland to take determined stands for their rights. All thanks to the change in the world balance of forces which will also enable the Irish people to win through to victory.

IV

The Congress was deeply concerned about a serious weakness in the Irish struggle for national liberation, the existence of a gap between the national revolutionary forces and the labor movement. There is a tendency in the former to ignore the great revolutionary potential of the organized working class movement. In the latter there is a strong economist attitude which obscures the recognition of the role of imperialism in Ireland, and is inclined to fall into the trap that Ireland's problems are internal.

The 15th Congress of the Communist Party of Ireland made a rousing call to the Irish labor movement to recognize the emergence, once again, of the national question, this time in conditions where British monopoly capitalism, though weakening in the overall context of the international capitalist scene, is tightening its grip over all spheres of the Irish economy by means of the merger of financial corporations, by industrial takeovers, large scale property purchases, and by towing behind it the two parts of Ireland into that European monopoly capitalist institution—the Common Market.

There is the vital need for the realization by the labor movement of the leading role of the organized working class movement in the struggle for national liberation. The present situation gives the Irish labor movement, particularly in the Republic of Ireland, a great opportunity to advance the organized working class to its proper leading position.

Though dominated economically, the Republic has the opportunity to challenge the British domination of Ireland. It never had but bourgeois governments who were not prepared to act in a sufficiently resolute manner to Britain, and the present Government, led by Prime Minister Jack Lynch, is in the weakest position of all because of its joint commitment with Britain to join the Common Market. Therefore, there exists the opportunity for the Labor Party, in the present situation, to seize the political initiative by demanding the withdrawal of the Republic's application for membership of the Common Market; the cancellation of the present Anglo-Irish Free Trade Agreement, not only as an act of political and economic pressure against Britain, but also in order to protect the jobs of thousands of workers whose livelihoods are being affected by its provisions, and by indicting the

British Government internationally, at the United Nations, for its military and political conduct in the North of Ireland. Furthermore, since religious and quasi-religious issues are being exploited to divide the people North and South, there should be the drafting of a secular Irish Constitution in which the entire people of the island should be involved in discussion.

The Communist Party occupies a unique position in Irish politics. It is the only working class political organization which exists on an all-Ireland basis, as well as being the only political party which has in its ranks people drawn from both the Protestant and Catholic sections of the working people. It is also part of both the, as yet, separated Irish labor movement and the national revolutionary liberation forces.

The Party's roots in the organized working class movement were shown by the presence of many delegates who are well known trade union figures, at the level of rank and file committees, shop steward organizations, trade councils, right up to the level of national trade union center leadership.

An eloquent testimonial to the respect for the Party's fight for national liberation was given by the presentation of two especially hand-painted handkerchiefs bearing greetings to the Congress which had been smuggled out of Long Kesh Internment Camp and from Crumlin Road Prison. The greetings from the prisoners were two completely independent and spontaneous messages.

The Congress met in an atmosphere of patriotic Irish anti-imperialism. It was not however just an event of national character; the presence of 13 fraternal delegations gave it also a deep internationalist dimension. At the close of the Congress deep brotherly appreciation was expressed at their attendance. It was pointed out that the fighting traditions of our people had a powerful internationalist content, such as the activity of the Irish Section of the International Workingmen's Association; the militant struggle of the Irish Marxist patriot, James Connolly, who fought against the imperialist war of 1914-18; of James Larkin who championed the cause of the Soviet Republic in its grim days of infancy, and of Frank Ryan, outstanding fighter in the international defense of the Spanish Republic. It was unanimously agreed "that if ever the day should come when we would be less internationalist, that would be the sad day that we would become less Irish."

V

The fight continues in Ireland. What has been described as "the

oldest struggle for national liberation," goes on. It takes many forms, such as the fight against going into the Common Market; the strengthening of the powerful mass civil disobedience movement whose "no-rent" campaign has tied the Stormont Government in a knot; and the active opposition against growing unemployment and redundancies.

The Communist Party in both parts of the country has considerable experience in the latter struggle. It was foremost in the 1930s in Belfast in combining the Catholic and Protestant workless into one powerful movement that confronted the batons, bullets and armored cars of the Unionist Government. In the Republic in the 50s, Communists played the leading part in the agitation which resulted in the unique election of a member of Parliament drawn from and representing the unemployed.

Whole new vistas of struggle have opened up after the 15th Congress. It is not a simple situation, however. In modern history, British imperialism stands not only as one of the oldest imperialist powers, it stands also as one of the craftiest and most cunning, which has created for the whole of the Irish people, in the 1970s, the most complicated of problems. More and more, however, it is being realized that the Britain of 1972 is not the great imperial power of 50 years ago. It is no longer quite as capable as it was a half-century ago of promoting civil war in the South, in order to frustrate the mass movement for independence and to ensure the continuance of its domination in Ireland with the cynical proscription of "an economy in English lives."

The previous Congress of Irish Communists, as mentioned, was the Congress of "Party Unity." The 15th Congress has laid the basis for "People's Unity," the weapon which will end the long domination of imperialism in our country.

Maoism in the Philippines*

Maoist Tactics

The splittism and extremism of the Maoists have done great damage to the developing mass movement in the Philippines precisely when it was gathering momentum. In January-March 1970 an outburst of popular opposition to the police brutality, corruption, neo-colonial subservience, and failure to solve worsening national problems on the part of the Marcos administration resulted in huge demonstrations of 150,000 or more people in Manila and other cities, where "parliaments of the streets" were organized. At the beginning these demonstrations were featured by a unity of Left, progressive and even conservative groups, and a unity body, the Movement for a Democratic Philippines, took shape. The MDP had originally been set up earlier with the aid of the MPKP as part of popular protest against the fraud-ridden election of 1969, when Marcos had been re-elected. The KM and the SDK, however, conspired to dominate the MDP and to exclude the larger Left mass organizations. This was done by giving each chapter of the KM and SDK a separate name as if they were different organizations, with each claiming to be entitled to a representative on the MDP council. In this maneuver the Maoists were aided by Catholic student bodies associated with the Raul Manglapus Christian Social Movement. By this means the Maoists and their strange bedfellows attained an artificial "majority" on the MDP and voted to isolate from it the MPKP, the MASAKA, the BRPF and other groups. The upshot of this Maoist "victory" was the withering of the series of mass rallies to relatively insignificant gatherings, and the failure to move forward to a large, nationwide mass movement.

Instead of building and solidifying a broad movement around practical and realizable demands, the Sison group stultified its growth with impossible, vague, way-out slogans like "Make Revolution in Neo-Colonial Schools!" "Create Urban Liberated Areas!" "Organize Rebel Committees!" (This without ever defining what a "rebel committee" might be.) Furthermore, in the demonstrations taking place the KM, with the obvious assistance of planted provocateurs and of lumpen hooligans, invariably pulled a minority of demonstrators away

*This is the second half of a two-part article. The first part appeared in the April issue.

to go on rampages of indiscriminate car-burning and overturning of taxis, smashing of store windows, looting of vendor stands, beating up of innocent park attendants, and other exhibitions of "revolutionary violence" which, besides providing the excuse for police suppression, tended to alienate middle-class and small business elements that had had initial sympathy with the movement.

The "New People's Army"

A far more dangerous situation was brought about by the Sison group's creation of a "New People's Army" and by the "CPP-Mao Thought" proclamation of "armed revolution." Having advocated surrounding the city from the countryside but having only city-based students to start with, the Maoists sought desperately for a "peasant base" in order to put its doctrine into effect. Embarking on the armed struggle they so eagerly desired, they announced, "What little but well-consolidated strength we may now have will grow bigger in a series of waves in the long run, so long as we launch a protracted armed struggle in the countryside." However, the Maoist students and university instructors had been spurned in 1967 by the organized peasants whom they had approached (the mass base of the PKP-led Huk movement). Consequently, they fell back upon the opportunist step of establishing links with a band of rural outlaws.

This was its background: in Pampanga province, in the aftermath of the Huk struggle, a former Huk officer, Faustino del Mundo, who went by the name of Commander Sumulong, degenerated into gangsterism. In Angeles and surrounding towns, he set up a protection racket (including "negotiating" contracts between peasant tenants and landlords), and entered into deals with both the ruling political parties and the American military authorities on the big adjoining U.S. Clark Field Airbase. Sumulong delivered votes via the gun to the political parties, selling his services to the highest bidder, and had a "security" arrangement with the American military authorities who allowed him to dominate the night club-brothel-gambling network in Angeles frequented by American troops.

In the Philippine press and in imperialist news services, the Sumulong gang was played up as the continuation of the Huk movement, and Sumulong and his lieutenant, Pedro Taruc (a cousin of the renegade, Luis Taruc), went along with the hoax by holding occasional press conferences in which they talked of revolution and agrarian reform. This treatment was part of reactionary propaganda to discredit the genuine revolutionary forces. Actually, in his "territory" Sumulong did strike-breaking and murdered PKP and MASAKA supporters.

An underling of Sumulong, a young peasant named Bernabe Buscayno, who calls himself Commander Dante, quarreled with his chief over the division of "territory" and loot and broke away with his own men to operate in the adjoining province of Tarlac. This province is the bailiwick of the big landlord-politician, Benigno Aquino, the same man with CIA links who had negotiated the surrender of Luis Taruc. Aquino subsequently had become governor of Tarlac and then senator and is presently secretary-general of the Liberal Party. Dante entered into an alliance with Aquino typical of the corrupt landlord-dominated Philippine rural politics, under which he delivered votes in the *barrios* and fended off encroachments by Sumulong (who formed a similar alliance with Aquino's political enemies in the Marcos Nacionalista Party administration), in exchange for which Aquino gave paternal protection to Dante and his men.

(In 1970 Sumulong surrendered to the Marcos government, a step taken mainly to save himself from the murderous political crossfire in which all ruling political groups hired armed gangs as well as from people's justice being meted out by PKP-led partisans. After surrender, Sumulong betrayed Pedro Taruc to his death, to prevent his hidden loot from being confiscated by his lieutenant. The unreliability of imperialist press reports from the Philippines is shown by the fact that this was published abroad as the death of the general secretary of the PKP!)

In his endeavors to acquire a "peasant base," Sison-"Amado Guerrero" first made contact with Sumulong, but that gangster wanted to share his territory with no one. Finally it was the band of Commander Dante with which Sison made a link. The contact was arranged through none other than the CIA-connected Senator Benigno Aquino. As a result of the deal, the towns and *barrios* under the feudalistic political control of Aquino became overnight the "revolutionary rural bases" of the "New People's Army." In exchange for accepting an ideological partnership with the "CPP-Mao Thought" and agreeing to be its "Red soldiers," Dante and his group obtained finances, received arms from Aquino and other wealthy contacts of Sison, and received an enormous propaganda build-up by the KM, through all the easy channels of publicity afforded to the Maoists. Commander Dante suddenly became a great guerrilla leader, a Filipino Che Guevara, his name and picture carried on KM and SDK demonstration placards and trumpeted in the press and on radio and television. In the pact between Sison and Dante, Dante and eight of his men were arbitrarily elevated to membership in the 23-man "central committee" of the "CPP-Mao Thought," as representing the peasantry, all the rest being students and city intellectuals.

Debacle of the "New People's Army"

The "New People's Army" or NPA and its "revolutionary rural bases" lasted for a little over a year under the wing of landlord-politicians in Tarlac. While there, under Sison's direction, the "Red soldiers" of Dante murdered a number of PKP members and terrorized *barrios* along the Tarlac-Pampanga border where the PKP had had roots for decades, compelling PKP partisan units in the surrounding areas to take first defensive and then punitive measures. At the same time, in Manila and in the provinces, armed Maoists sought to terrorize and to carry out assassination attempts against PKP cadres and members.

From 1969 onward Sison-"Amado Guerrero" has claimed for the NPA credit for the armed activities of partisan units of the PKP, in Central and Southern Luzon and in Manila. The reports that frequently appear in the *Hsinhua News* on NPA actions (and that are picked up in the radical press abroad) are filled with incidents that have nothing to do with the NPA.

In its general attitude toward the ordinary armed peasants in the group of Dante, the PKP, however, has displayed patience and has sought unity. The PKP has never condemned peasants for taking up arms and resisting landlord or government abuses, recognizing the underlying honest spirit of rebellion against worsening agrarian conditions and seeking only to channel it into disciplined, prudent and responsible actions interrelated with the activity of the organized masses. In contacting those in the NPA, PKP cadres and partisans have praised their courage and determination and have warned them against being misled into rash and dangerous situations and into acts that bring harm upon the people. On several occasions when government troops or police had cordoned Dante's men or placed them in difficulties, the PKP partisans made attacks or diversions that enabled the Dante forces to escape destruction.

Relations between Sison's Maoist students and the armed peasants were, in fact, not as close and comradely as the "CPP-Mao Thought" tried to make it seem. The right-hand man of Sison, Arturo Garcia, who had also had the benefit of a visit to China, was assigned as the "political commissar" of the NPA. His dogmatic imposition of "Mao Thought" and his display of intellectual arrogance toward the relatively unlettered young peasants, whom he taunted as "no read, no write," aroused their anger. Consequently, early in 1970 he was shot and killed by his own bodyguards. Friction between the Sison group and the peasant "Red soldiers" of the NPA cropped up repeatedly. In the latter half of 1971 the Maoists suddenly ceased to play up

Commander Dante, and one of their own student members, Victor Corpus (who had been a cadet at the Philippine Military Academy in Baguio despite his KM connections), began to be projected as the "guerrilla warfare expert" of the NPA.

Although Sison and his "CPP-Mao Thought-NPA" have denounced the PKP as advocating merely parliamentary struggle and have projected armed struggle as the only path to follow, their actions have not matched their words. Thus, in the election of 1969, the Maoists and NPA in Tarlac made a deal, through Aquino, to support the presidential candidacy of the Liberal Party's Sergio Osmena Jr., a monumentally corrupt politician who took a blatantly pro-imperialist line in his campaign. For this they were paid 10,000 pesos. In the local elections of 1971 the Maoists again supported and campaigned for Liberal Party candidates. However, in both 1969 and 1971 the PKP called for and carried out an absolute boycott of the elections, stating that "we shall exert all-out efforts to persuade the masses to stay away from the polls, to express their rejection of the bourgeois electoral process as a means to achieve basic reforms."

It did not take long for the peasant masses to see through the amateur revolutionism of the Sison group, to grasp the gap between their words and actions, and to view them as upstart juveniles. Those in Tarlac who had listened to their proclamations soon learned to regret having done so.

The "rural bases" of the Sison group in Tarlac ended abruptly in the latter part of 1970 when President Marcos, striking at his political rival, Aquino, launched a two-pronged operation in the area: a ruthless military campaign by government troops, and a political deal in which the mayors and other politicians in the Tarlac towns were bought off, transforming the support system of the NPA into suppressive Barrio Self-Defense Units (BSDUs) patterned after the CIA-created guard system in the "strategic hamlets" of South Vietnam. Even before this, however, the Maoists were finding the area untenable because of punitive action against their abuses taken by PKP partisans.

Demoralized, the "CPP-Mao Thought" cadres (those who did not run to the safe homes of well-to-do relatives in Manila) and the "New People's Army" fled from Tarlac and Central Luzon to the northern province of Isabela, where they have attempted to set up a new "revolutionary rural base."

The flight of the "New People's Army" from Central Luzon is most significant. Central Luzon is the strongest area of organized peasantry in the Philippines, with a long history of revolutionary activity and traditions. The PKP-led movement has remained rooted and active

there despite decades of bloody suppression and of far more ruthless and more saturating military campaigns than that which was conducted in Tarlac in 1970. The Maoist failure there was due to their rejection by the peasant masses.

In its propaganda, echoed in *Hsinhua News*, the "CPP-Mao Thought" has tried to cover up its debacle, arising from opportunism, extremism and antagonizing of the peasants, by claiming to have "expanded" into Isabela. Their moving from place to place, however, has nothing in common with revolutionary establishment and expansion of mass bases but reflects the adventurist and bankrupt "guerrilla foco" theory of Debray, which is contrary to Marxist-Leninist concepts.

The Position of the PKP

From 1967 to the beginning of 1971 the PKP refrained for the most part from engaging in public polemics with the Maoist group, seeking to encourage unity of all sectors of the Left, including unity on various issues with the Maoists. However, as Maoist activity degenerated toward CIA-supported provocations, as the murder of PKP cadres was both carried out and threatened, and as Philippine ruling circles increasingly utilized the Maoist "revolutionary threat" as the excuse for undertaking to suppress the mass movement as a whole, the PKP, early in 1971, felt compelled to take the propaganda offensive against these adventurist extremists who were endangering or deliberately sabotaging the national-democratic struggle.

Contrary to the Maoist lies, the PKP does not oppose armed struggle nor does it evade employing it. In May 1967, two years before Sison manufactured his "New People's Army," the PKP issued its *Theses on the National Situation*, approved by the plenum which Sison shrank from attending. The *Theses* subjected the period of the Huk struggle to review, severely criticized the Leftist-adventurist mistakes and other errors of the Party leadership of that period that had resulted in the defeat of the armed struggle, and put forward a strategic and tactical line which called for the utilization of *all* forms of struggle made appropriate by conditions to mobilize the masses. Included was the creation of partisan units built on the surviving skeleton of the Huk organizations that had never actually been dissolved.

Sison—"Amado Guerrero," the PKP states:

... declares the armed struggle as the only means of liberation and condemns as "revisionist" the use of other forms of struggle. He has turned the gun into a fetish and degraded Marxism-Leninism to the level of a cowboy ideology. Guerrero and his running

dogs bark at the wrong tree when they assail our Party as denying the necessity of armed struggle. Never did our Party fall into the Bernsteinian heresy. Our Party has waged an armed struggle, it wages an armed struggle, and it will wage an armed struggle on a larger scale when objective conditions shall ripen. We do not regard parliamentary struggle as a substitute of armed struggle but we consider it to be a means of hastening the development of objective conditions . . .

It is not armed struggle *versus* parliamentary struggle [that is the issue], but whether 'armed struggle is the only way' or a revolutionary Party should learn to combine both forms of struggle. On this issue, as in others, we stand firmly on the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. We uphold the principle of *combining* parliamentary and armed struggle; the exact combination depends, of course, on the prevailing political situation.

Partisan units had been set up by the PKP wherever possible. "Guided by our Party, these partisan units have gained the respect and confidence of people in many *barrios*; they are the chief instruments of the people to obtain revolutionary justice and to protect them from bandit gangs and puppet troops. Unlike the NPA, however, they prefer to strike with the least fanfare and fight with the minimum publicity, except in those instances when the prominence of their targets attracts unsolicited attention in the bourgeois press."

Pointing out that forms of legal and parliamentary struggle had enabled the PKP to recover from its military setback and to help rebuild the mass movement, including the original Kabataang Makabayan, the PKP asserts:

Parliamentary struggle does not mean putting up candidates for elective positions in order to transform the nature of neo-colonial government. It simply means laying stress on utilizing and broadening whatever democratic rights are available. Strikes, demonstrations, leafleteering, factory gate agitation, etc., form part of the parliamentary struggle.

[In our circumstances] parliamentary struggle is not a method of capturing state power and smashing the old state machine. It is merely a technique of breaking the Party's isolation and conducting revolutionary work under extreme conditions of illegality. . . . Our Party has always maintained that, in the Philippine context, armed struggle is an indispensable aspect of revolutionary strategy. . . .

We do not entertain the illusion that the neo-colonial ruling classes in the Philippines will ever give up their power and privileges peacefully. The seizure of power can only be accomplished through an armed uprising. But we reject the undialectical thesis that 'armed struggle is the only way.' Armed struggle is doomed to certain

failure without popular support, and in building popular support we must utilize other forms of struggle allowed by real circumstances.

In our assessment of the existing balance of forces, the time for a strategic offensive has yet to come. We are still at the stage of preparation and the main form of struggle is legal or parliamentary struggle. The principal tasks are the politicalization and organization of the masses, including the most backward sectors who up to now constitute the vast majority. The armed struggle must be waged even today but it occupies a secondary and subordinate role in relation to the parliamentary struggle. As the revolutionary process develops, however, the armed struggle will steadily gain importance until objective conditions shall dictate that it be adopted as the main form. ("Marxism-Leninism and Revolutionary Quixotism," *Ang Komunista*, February 1971.)

Maoism and Imperialist Tactics

The most illuminating and most menacing aspect of the whole Maoist phenomenon in the Philippines is the manner in which it has been exploited by American imperialism and its neo-colonial allies. Aside from the splittist weapon that they handed to the class enemy, the Maoists and their activities provide the most convenient excuse for suppressing the Filipino mass movement as a whole.

In August 1971 the Marcos administration accused the Maoists of a bombing outrage against a Liberal Party election rally in Manila (which had all the earmarks of having been engineered by ruling elements themselves) and used this excuse to suspend the writ of habeas corpus and to begin arresting people on the Left. Producing evidence of Maoist links with Aquino and other wealthy politicians and groups on the Right, Marcos proclaimed a "Maoist threat of armed rebellion to overthrow the government" in order to move against both the Right and Left opposition and to attempt assuming dictatorial powers, including the imposition of martial law.

A few Maoist members of the KM and SDK were arrested in Manila. Detained but unharmed, they were made the center of maximum publicity and of solicitous aid from anti-Marcos politicians. Several produced statements desired by Marcos, admitting NPA and "CPP-Mao Thought" connections with Liberal Party and anti-Marcos Nacionalista politicians, which strengthened steps toward martial law. In the Central Luzon area, however, innumerable cadres and members of the genuine Left were seized, tortured and killed without any official announcement or publicity.

On September 7, 1971 the national president of the MASAKA, Pablo Santos, wrote a letter to the Manila press "on behalf of the

peasantry of Central Luzon who are now bearing the brunt of the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by President Marcos." Wrote Santos:

. . . It is not surprising that the first ones in Central Luzon who were summarily rounded up after the presidential proclamation were militant members of MASAKA, SPKP (Samahang Progresibo ng Kababaihang Filipino, or Progressive League of Filipino Women), and MPKP. . . . Despite Marcos' claim that no one is being picked up in the provinces, that so far only fourteen have been arrested, that the Maoists are his only target, concrete realities perpetrated by his fascist agents make him a poor liar. So far, more than ten known militant peasant leaders have been confirmed arrested in Central Luzon branded "communists" and "members of the People's Liberation Army" allegedly headed by Commander Diwa [partisans guided by the PKP], mauled and tortured by state goons out to extract "information." Add to these the countless others who are just reported "missing" by their families. What is worse is that there is a complete news blackout in the provinces and these abuses never see print. The indications are clear. The suspension of the writ of habeas corpus is merely one step towards the imposition of martial law, toward a total clampdown on all forms of peaceful struggle for meaningful change.

It has become increasingly clear that these moves are part of an imperialist policy of shifting from a facade of democratic processes in the Philippines to the clamping down of dictatorial rule, in order to cope with mounting unrest and the spread of popular organization and protest. It is part, indeed, of the general pattern of "Asianization" proclaimed by the Nixon administration, which has at its core the employment of native fascist groups to replace the overt presence of American armies and bases. A bitter struggle for power within the ruling groups, aided and encouraged by the CIA and other imperialist agencies backing favored elements, is occurring within this development. The PKP stands apart from it, organizing masses outside the corrupt and unrepresentative neo-colonial politics; the Maoists, despite their ultra-Left propaganda, have entangled themselves in the bourgeois power struggle.

Whether or not Sison and his group have realized that they are serving the interests of the CIA and its allies, their personal thirst for power, for publicity, and for romantic adventurist actions have made them perfect dupes of the ruthless forces that manipulate the ambitious and the unscrupulous. To say that the Peking Maoists do not comprehend the pattern of events in the Philippines and the conse-

(Continued on page 56.)

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

Aggression, Repression and Anti-Communism

On St. Patrick's Day in 1948, President Truman said: "The United States has become the principal protector of the free world. To carry out that responsibility we must maintain our strength—military, economic and moral. . . . We must not be confused about the issue which confronts the world today. . . . It is tyranny and freedom. . . . And even worse, communism denies the very existence of God. . . . This threat to our liberty and our faith must be faced by each one of us."

In those phrases was the rationale adopted by Washington for its cold war policy aiming at the containment and—if possible—the "roll-back" of socialism, replacing Britain and France and the Netherlands as the dominant imperialist power in the Mid-East, in Asia and in Africa, achieving domination over the economies of Western Europe and Japan and confirming the mastery with a Pax Americana to last, hopefully, long enough to merit the title of the "American Century," in the phrase of Henry Luce.

Truman's demagogy was accepted as reality by the academic and intellectual apologists for the cold war as reflected in the writings, for example, of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Sidney Hook, David Riesman, Allan Nevins, Peter Viereck, James Burnham, Louis Hacker, and Reinhold Niebuhr. Those who exposed the Cold War for what it was, *at the time*, suffered every form of persecution, vilification, slander and hardship; and the professorial lackeys of the racist monopolists filled most of the newspapers and magazines and lecture halls and book-stalls and radio programs with highly-paid "explanations" of The Vital Center and of Heresy Yes and Conspiracy No and of how yesterday's robber barons had really been, all the time, Industrial Statesmen, and of the manifest delights of People's Capitalism.

Washington's policy—to establish world hegemony by U.S. imperialism—was bound to fail because it appeared in the era of the increasing senility of that system and its replacement by socialism; the question was how to hasten the failure and how to minimize its costs—especially, in the latter regard, how to avoid the catastrophe of World

War III. The system erected to bulwark the policy—from Truman Doctrine to Marshall Plan, to massive retaliation to brinkmanship to the Bay of Pigs to the Johnson-Mann doctrine to Cambodia's liberation and the "great regard" for Yahya Khan—from NATO to CENTO to SEATO to Mylai; that system lies in ruins, condemned by world opinion and an embarrassment even to its creators.

The result is a new generation of historians and a new kind of history-writing. It is post-cold war and anti-cold war. Five years ago Schlesinger the Little already pleaded that enough was enough, but its power is so great that even he has announced he was premature in suggesting that the revisers cease and desist. In the pages of this magazine we have from time to time called attention to this New History; and we do so again for now the post-McCarthy generation of historians are turning their attention with great effectiveness to the roots of the atrocious foreign policy which has characterized Washington since the end of the Second World War.

In this essay attention will be focussed on two examples of anti-cold war history-writing. One is the book by Anthan Theoharis, of Marquette University, *Seeds of Repression: Truman and the Origins of McCarthyism* (Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1971, 238 pp., \$6.95). The second is that by Richard M. Freeland, of the University of Massachusetts, *The Truman Doctrine and the Origins of McCarthyism* (Knopf, New York, 1972, 419 pp., \$10).

* * *

Having in mind Joseph McCarthy, Professor Theoharis writes: "The Senator and the Administration differed not so much over ends as over means and emphasis." The body of his book shows that given substantially the same ends, however, Truman's means moved inexorably in the direction soon to be taken by McCarthy. New in this book is the text of a memo to Truman from Secretary of Defense James Forrestal, dated May 26, 1945, asserting that in his view World War III was highly probable (meaning then, against the USSR as a main adversary) and that the one chance of preventing it was to maintain an overwhelming might and to see to it that this "adequate force [was] applied in sufficient time"—a forerunner of the idea of preventive war that was to gain a considerable number of highly-placed advocates by 1950 (vii, 38).

With the end of 1947, "rhetorical anti-communism was central to the Truman Administration's political posture . . . the standard for judging every policy proposal put forth became the degree of its anti-communist thrust" (114). The result was defense of fascism in Spain and Portugal, forcibly instituting fascism in Greece and trying

to shore up colonialism from Indochina to Mozambique. Finally one had from top officials in the Truman entourage this kind of nazi garbage—the speaker is Attorney General McGrath, April 19, 1950:

There are today many Communists in America. They are everywhere—in factories, offices, butcher shops, on street corners, in private business—and each carries in himself the germs of death for society. . . . This Godless tyranny of Communism will always be a menace to the internal security of the United States so long as Communist dictatorships menace the peace and security of the world. . . . They are busy at work—undermining your Government, plotting to destroy the liberties of every citizen, and feverishly trying, in whatever way they can, to aid the Soviet Union (136).

As for the latter, the Soviet Union, Truman had reached the stage, May, 1947, where he would declare that Soviet leaders "understand one language, force, and that is the language they are going to get from this point" (41). It was this postulate and the practice of diplomacy—open and covert—based upon it which marked the fundamental nature of the Truman shift from the stance of Roosevelt. The latter was symbolized by Yalta, whose rationale, as Professor Theoharis points out, held "that a negotiated settlement with the Soviet Union was possible and that the development of mutual trust was the best means to a just and lasting peace" (70). This does not mean, of course, that in the basic historic and strategic sense the differences between FDR and Truman were significant; they were not, for both were heads of an imperialist government. But it does mean that the tactics preferred and largely pursued by FDR were quite different from those favored and employed by Truman; that is a difference which no discoveries of this or that particular secret cable or letter can alter.*

A weakness in the Theoharis volume is its verbal acceptance of the idea that anti-Communism as enunciated by the Administration reflected majority public opinion. At times, his own writing contradicts this; thus: "More striking, until the Korean War public opinion polls showed popular anti-communism to be ambivalent and far less militant than it appeared to be" (10). What the author means to say

* The N.Y. Times, March 27, 1972, gave great space to "a revelation" provided by Professor F. L. Lowenheim of Rice University consisting of a secret cable from FDR to Churchill agreeing with the latter's suggestion of a "tough" stance towards the USSR; the cable was sent a week before Roosevelt died. It is "a revelation" only for those people who ever doubted the class position and allegiance of FDR; it does not alter the fact that the tactical posture of FDR was symbolized by Yalta and that the wrecking of Yalta was a deliberate act of the Truman administration. As Elliott Roosevelt said in 1946: ". . . it was the United States and Great Britain who first shook the mailed fist, who first abrogated the collective decisions."

here is that it *was made* to appear to be, for the commercial media did not merely report in this instance, of course, but deliberately exaggerated and calculatedly concocted. As a matter of fact, the results of opinion polls that form an appendix of the Theoharis volume show that in February, 1951, 61 per cent of Americans who expressed an opinion were in favor of U.S. withdrawal from all Korea, and 52 per cent as contrasted with 28 per cent of those who stated their opinions were opposed to the idea of a U.S. military intervention in Italy to prevent the prospect of a Communist victory in elections. Indeed, these polls showed that back in 1947 when Truman commenced U.S. intervention in Greece, of the 90 per cent expressing any opinion, 53 per cent opposed such intervention. Three years later of the 85 per cent expressing a viewpoint as to whether or not the USSR wanted war with the U.S., 50 per cent thought she did not. Finally, in 1951, of the 89 per cent expressing an opinion, 50 per cent held that involvement by the United States in the affairs of Korea in any way was a mistake.

These data run so counter to the very widely repeated idea of the "popularity" of anti-Communism that they seem not to have been assimilated even by Professor Theoharis, though they appear, as I've stated, in his own volume. Those data are of great significance in understanding the compulsion felt by the Truman Administration (and later administrations) to pursue the path of legal and extra-legal repression and persecution which finally eventuated in what is called McCarthyism. Since the connection between the aggressive foreign policy and the resort to repression at home is a fundamental theme of Theoharis' volume, the failure to understand the basically unpopular character of that foreign policy and its rationalization detracts from the logical structure of the book itself.

The Theoharis book suffers, too, in its failure to mention—let alone evaluate—the significance of racism in U.S. government policy, both abroad and at home. It omits also any sense of the very considerable resistance that existed against the Truman policies; this tends to give the account of the "repression" which forms the very title of the volume a certain abstract quality. Withal, the book is part of the developing anti-Cold War historiography and as such contributes towards the vital effort to change the direction of postwar U.S. foreign policy.*

* An earlier book by Theoharis also contributes to this end: *The Yalta Myths: An Issue in U.S. Politics, 1945-1955* (University of Missouri Press, Columbia, 1970); a fuller examination, more concerned with the diplomacy, is Diane S. Clemens, *Yalta* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1970), another of the anti-Cold War books.

* * *

The Freeland book is almost twice as long as that by Theoharis but deals with only half as long a period. It confines itself to the three years, 1946-1948, and within that period, as its subtitle indicates, concerns itself with "Foreign Policy, Domestic Politics and Internal Security." It is a careful, exhaustive and significant work. We summarize the book, in the first place, and largely in the words of the author himself. It argues that "the emotional and political forces and the patterns of belief—what in aggregate might be called the 'Cold War Consensus' [only very partially achieved, as I have pointed out earlier—H.A.]—were aroused and these patterns of belief developed . . . as the result of a deliberate and highly organized effort by the Truman Administration in 1947-48 to mobilize support for the program of economic assistance to Europe called the European Recovery Program, or Marshall Plan" (5). The discerning reader will catch the charged words in the above quotation—*aroused, developed, deliberate and highly organized*—affirming a consciously directed effort which, as Freeland demonstrates, included the concoction of scares, the dissemination of distortions and falsifications and the leaking of untruths, all showing that the only thing unique about the current "Pentagon Papers" is that Mr. Ellsberg patriotically decided to release them while they were still relatively current.

The Truman Administration, bent upon establishing the hegemony of U.S. capitalism over the world and therefore necessarily moving towards cold war and the danger of a hot one, "represented to the American people" that the consequent "collapse of the brave hopes for the postwar world" was due to "Soviet betrayal and aggression." Specifically, Washington attributed "the economic problems of western Europe" right after the war "to Soviet obstructionism and communist subversion," which, of course, "distorted these problems and obscured the positive reasons for the Administration's advocacy of aid programs" (9).

What were those "positive reasons"? Central among them, as Will Clayton, the millionaire who served Truman as his Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, said in his blunt way: "Let us admit right off that our objective has as its background the needs and interests of the people of the United States. We need markets—big markets—in which to buy and sell." Or, in the words of Clayton's boss, Cordell Hull, the policy of the U.S. government sought to assure it "a supreme position in world finance, commerce and industry" (17, 18). Deception being a basic method, world domination and exploitation the aim and cold war the result, of course to "put this over" there was re-

quired an enormous propaganda effort, a major dose of jingoism, and the so-called "loyalty-security" program, which, as Freeland writes, meant "legal and economic restraints on enormous numbers of people." (10)

U.S. policy sought to assure that eastern Europe "would continue to be the underdeveloped supplier of the powerful west European economies" (21) and those economies, in turn, would be subjected to U.S. domination; it meant persistent open and secret efforts to move west Europe to the Right politically, to encourage anti-Communism especially in the trade unions and to build up a new anti-Soviet bloc of nations in Europe; therefore, Washington always used "economic assistance to promote the political interests of pro-American elements" in Europe (54, 56). Hence, economic aid "became openly a tool for consolidating America's geopolitical position at the onset of what was to become the cold war" (57).

All this required not only the propaganda and the jingoism and the "loyalty-security" program already mentioned; it required also as a persistent thread an insistence upon the imminent peril facing the nation from external "Red" aggression and from internal "Red" subversion. To get this program adopted, in other words, and to keep it operative inside the United States, as Will Clayton wrote in a memo of March 5, 1947, required that "the people of the United States are shocked into" approving it; Senator Vandenberg, the chief architect of the Republican Party's participation in the Administration's policy, told Truman that he would have "to scare the hell out of the country" (89).

It is within this context that Freeland shows the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan were fitted. Both were advertised as philanthropic acts having only democratic and freedom-loving intent; both were in fact, as the author shows, coldly-calculated devices seeking to hurt the USSR, to prevent socialism elsewhere in Europe, to promote U.S. economic and political domination in western Europe, and to provide the monopolists and financiers inside the United States with raw materials at attractive prices, with large and manipulated markets for finished products and with enormous opportunities for the investment of billions of dollars at fabulous profits within a prostrated Europe. Basic, too, especially in the Truman Doctrine and its original concentration upon Greece and Turkey, was the undermining of British and French power the Mid-East and the assuring of U.S. control in that fantastically rich oil area.

As for scaring "the hell out of the country," the climax of that undertaking came early in 1948 in a deliberately concocted war scare which from the President and his Cabinet members down to the

Also brothers and Reston of the *New York Times* tried to make the American people believe that a Soviet attack and an internal Communist uprising were imminent. All this despite the fact, as Freeland documents, that those fanning the war scare knew that there were no plans for a Soviet attack or a Communist uprising; that these were lies made up out of whole cloth for the purpose of making politically possible the implementing of a policy seeking a Pax Americana and a "coordinated" United States. It is within this context, as the author points out, that arrests and deportation proceedings were begun against Communist and trade-union leaders, such as Irving Potash, Claudia Jones, Charles Doyle, Ferdinand C. Smith, John Williamson, Beatrice Johnson, Betty Gannett and Harry Bridges—with Truman and his Republican cohorts, notably the young and fiercely ambitious Representative Richard Nixon, coming forth as saviors of the nation. In fact, as Freeland writes, "the arrests played a major role in preparing the country psychologically for the war scare of 1948" and served as an "explicit and public combination with the President's campaign for nomination and election" (297, 298).

Of course, with the likes of Joseph McCarthy and Richard Nixon around, the Democratic Administration was risking its political dominance by uncorking the force of chauvinism, jingoism, and war hysteria; and the likes of McCarthy and Nixon at once moved in with the propaganda of "twenty years of treason" and the "Yalta sell-out." "It seems impossible to avoid the conclusion," Freeland writes (286), "that the war scare of 1948 was yet another exercise in crisis politics by the Truman Administration. This time, however, the impact seems to have been greater than was bargained for, for there were reports that both Truman and Marshall were distressed by the extent of public hysteria that was generated."

The result is concisely put by our other author, Theoharis: "Although this [McCarthyite] critique was simplistic, conspiratorial at its base, and rather sleazily moralistic, it nonetheless neatly used Administration rhetoric to condemn Administration policy. Through its own rhetoric, the Truman Administration had closed the vicious circle on itself. All the McCarthyites had to do was chase around it" (67). From then on out, it was a straight line—so far as ruling circles have been concerned—to the Smith and McCarran Acts and persecutions, to the burning of the Rosenbergs, the blinding of Henry Winston, the crucifixion of Korea, the frameup of Angela Davis, the continuing atrocity of Vietnam and the making real of Dr. Strangelove.

• • •

Freeland is correct when he remarks that the arrests of Communists

in 1948 and 1949 were part of the war scare tactics and of the politicking of Truman; but they were more than that. *They were also an effort to silence the Communist leadership and membership because that Party was first and foremost and most consequential in exposing the actual character of the Truman policy and this principled announcement of the truth had a profound effect upon millions of Americans and upon tens of millions abroad, including Communist parties in the rest of the world.* The post-cold war historians may be, in large part, academicians but their findings are far from "academic"; they are important not only because the truth itself is important but also because in exposing the imperialist reality of past U.S. foreign policy and laying bare the demagoguery and deceit which accompanied that policy they are adding fuel to the intense discontent with and distrust of present U.S. foreign policy. The logic of their exposures is to induce a *radical* critique of the social order and to suggest what is of course true, that, for example, the monstrous Vietnam policy of Washington Administrations represents not a mistake or an aberration but a reflection of the nature of the U.S. social order whose rulers want and actively pursue such unspeakably foul policies.

All of this is further underlined by a fact that neither Theoharis nor Freeland—nor any other of the non-Communist post-cold war historians—have yet pointed out; namely, that the critique of U.S. foreign policy which they are now publishing represents in essence the content of what Communists were saying *at the time*, commencing in 1945—and for the saying of which, very largely, they were persecuted, deported and imprisoned.

Let us give a few examples of what we mean. Here is an article published in *Political Affairs* in February, 1946, by William Z. Foster. Its theme is the demagoguery of Truman's policy of "benevolence" in foreign policy; Comrade Foster continued: ". . . the United States, with its present economic and political set-up, is an imperialist country . . . with the United States now definitely making a bid for world imperialist hegemony there are hardly any voices outside of the ranks of the Communist Party that signalize this gross manifestation of imperialism for what it is" (99-100). Or, here is the statement of the National Secretariat of the Communist Party issued March 5, 1946—sparked by the "Iron Curtain" speeches of Winston Churchill and Secretary of State Byrnes:

The scheme for world domination comes right out of the circles of the big trusts, the huge monopolies in the United States who see a chance to use their enormous power. . . . It is a plan to bolster the rotten British imperial system. . . . It is above all a scheme to save the capitalist system as it heads into deeper crises, contradic-

tions and antagonisms . . . *their whole outlook is to impose their will on the world, including the Soviet Union, by overwhelming military power based on the atom bomb.*" (*Political Affairs*, April 1946; italics in original.)

Here is Eugene Dennis, then General Secretary of the Party, denouncing "the expansionist and interventionist role of American imperialism" and spelling it out, as for example: "In Germany, American policy remains directed toward revising the Three-Power Potsdam Agreement, toward preventing de-nazification and the destruction of Germany's war potential . . . to restrict the scope and grants of UNRRA . . . for imposing America's will on other States, for maintaining unilateral control and monopoly by the United States of the manufacture and use of the atomic bomb. . . ." (*Political Affairs*, September 1946.)

One could go on for many, many pages—in fact, one should go on and produce a book of readings in the Party's analyses of U.S. foreign policy—but within the limits of a magazine article, we call attention only to one more example; this is the statement made by the Communist Party in hearings on the Marshall Plan held by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, February 17, 1948:

This legislation is not intended to bring about an economic recovery in Europe. On the contrary, it is an extension of the notorious Truman Doctrine, a vital part of our Government's reactionary "Cold War" against the Soviet Union. . . . It is designed to prop up the tottering capitalist system in Europe, to halt the march of the peoples of Western Europe toward Socialism, and underwrite the dividends of American and West-European monopolists . . . it will accelerate the drive toward the establishment of a full-fledged police state in the United States.

The Marshall Plan, the Party continued, in February, 1948, intensifies the cold war against Eastern Europe; it seeks to undermine the influence of the Communist Parties in Western Europe; it "deliberately bypassed the machinery that was set up by the United Nations for collective efforts to achieve economic recovery"; it seeks to restore the German cartels; it gives priority to restoration of German might in Europe; it undermines the sovereignty of those nations that are to participate in it; it seeks to keep such nations economically backward; "the obvious intent of the bill is to exclude the Soviet Union" from it for it is framed in such a way that to participate would mean for it to surrender Socialism. (*Political Affairs*, April 1948.)

The above paragraphs are an outline of the best of the revisionist books on U.S. foreign policy that have been appearing in the past years—except that the Party's class analysis tends to be sharper and its concern with colonialism and racism greater. I certainly do not say this in order to embarrass anyone or in order to say "we told you so." I say this because it is true and elementary scholarship requires some attention to such sources and data and I say it also because the pioneering character of the profound analysis that issued from the Party and its leadership reflects the Marxist-Leninist outlook which is at the heart of that Party. That analysis has been ignored—or at least not publicly acknowledged—by most scholarship in the United States, even the best of it and it is past time that such shoddiness and opportunism be overcome. Ignoring the Marxist-Leninist outlook has cost this country very dear indeed—the books under review inadvertently show that—and ignoring that outlook or caricaturing it has vitiated much of what has passed as scholarship in the United States in the past thirty years. There are accumulating signs that a change in this practice is coming; let it come—let it be brought about and then books such as these by Theoharis and Freeland will be even better than they now are. The country will then have not only better books—but hopefully this may help induce a better foreign policy!

April 2, 1972

(Continued from page 46.)

quences of their backing of Sison would be inconceivable. They demonstrate that they are prepared to bring about the destruction of the Filipino mass movement and of the PKP vanguard, with a denouement not unlike the bloody Indonesian events of 1965, in the effort to gain control over that movement.

The PKP is determined to resist and to overcome the disastrous course of Filipino Maoism, to preserve the people's organizations in the face of provocation and suppression, and to continue the anti-imperialist, national-democratic fight with the use of all appropriate forms of struggle as the developing situation matures.

COMMUNICATIONS

JOHN WILLIAMSON

Reply to "An Old Reader"

The September 1971 issue of *Political Affairs* only arrived in Britain in the middle of November so this is the earliest possibility to reply to "An Old Reader."

As stated in my article, "The British Road to Socialism," in the July 1971 *Political Affairs*, its sole purpose, in the circumstances following the Labor Party electoral debacle and the sharpening class struggle, was to present "a contrast between the ideas governing the Communist *British Road to Socialism* and the Right-wing Labor *Building a Socialist Britain*, with the hope that this would "be helpful to Americans following the British scene."

"An Old Reader" correctly recognizes that "there is no suggestion that the British road to socialism is necessarily the road to socialism in the United States." Each party's program is based on its own history, relationship of class forces and analyses of the situation, and I agree with both—which is not at all contradictory.

For the benefit of "An Old Reader" (and remember my article dealt primarily with contrasting the Communist Party and Right-wing Labor Party programs on immediate struggle on

the background of these programs, and only summarized briefly at the end in what ways the *BRS* "goes beyond what has been dealt with"), let me make clear that for Britain, and only Britain, the *British Road* not only says "it is in the best interests of the working people . . . that the mass struggle for political power should be carried through by peaceful means, without civil war" and that this "will not be simple to achieve."

But it goes on to state: "The ruling class will not easily surrender wealth and power. On the contrary, it will strive by every means, direct and indirect, constitutional and unconstitutional, to restrain and . . . break [the] strength" of the mass movement. It continues that "the working class and popular movement will need to be ready to use its organized strength to prevent or defeat attempts at violence against it . . . or other illegal actions by reactionary forces at home or by agents of their foreign allies. There will be particular dangers of such resort to force at critical stages of the struggle. . . ."

The strength of "the popular movement, above all its working-class core" and its "vigilance and mass action" will "determine

whether the verdict is accepted, or whether in defense of their interests, the capitalists resist by force."

The fears of "An Old Reader" that I misused the quotation from Lenin are groundless. I refer him to Lenin's *Selected Works* (International Publishers, New York), Volume VIII, page 281, where it is stated: "Opportunism means sacrificing fundamental interests in order to gain temporary and partial advantages. That is the

essence of the matter from the standpoint of a theoretical definition of opportunism." Lenin was *not* dealing with "opportunist reformist leaders," although his remarks would be clearly applicable.

How anything in my article could give "the impression that Lenin was against all struggles for reforms" is mystifying. It is contrary to everything connected with my entire life and work as a Communist.

JOSEPH GRAHAM

On the Term "Mexican-American"

I would like to call to the attention of your readers the unfortunate typographical omission in the article, "Chicano Workers—Their Status and Struggles," that appeared in the January, 1972 issue of *Political Affairs*.

The last section of the article headed "Jobs and Income" includes the term "Mexican-American" a number of times. These words should have been in quotes as the term, in this context, was taken from a U.S. government study of the Chicano worker.

The reason I call this to your attention is not to split hairs but to deepen our understanding of the nature of U.S. imperialism and national chauvinism. U.S. imperialism has built up over the years the acceptance of the term "American" as synonymous with the United States of America. So we find it common practice to use this term interchangeably even within the Left. But I call your attention to the following excerpt

from a resolution presented to the recent 20th Convention of the CPUSA from the Northern California District and referred to the incoming Central Committee:

Equating the terms "United States" and "America" is not simply a problem of semantics. It is a political problem . . . to equate the terms is an expression of gross arrogance and national chauvinism. It assumes that the U.S. has hegemony over the entire American continent. The use of the word "America" when referring to the U.S. has deep and continuing roots in U.S. imperialism and the concept of manifest destiny. . . .

The term "Mexican-American," although used by a section of the Chicano community, was formulated by Anglos and is based upon national chauvinism. The people of Mexico have as much right to consider themselves "Mexican-Americans" as do the Chicano people in the U.S. Although we do not pretend to determine for the Chicano community what they should call themselves, we propose that our Party adopt the term "Chicano" instead of "Mexican-American."

BOOK REVIEWS

WILLIAM WEINSTONE

The New Radicalism

Gil Green, in his book *The New Radicalism: Anarchist or Marxist?**, has made a valuable contribution in the fight against anarchist and ultra-Left trends in the New Left movement. His style is not only lively, which makes for good reading, but he argues in a reasoned way and his tone and approach to the youth are sympathetic but critical.

In a recent article B. Ponomarev, secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, while pointing out the harmful influences of the Trotskyites, Maoists and other ultra-Left tendencies, also cited the New Left movement as an example of the Leftward shift in the capitalist countries. He added that "their general anti-imperialist direction is evident. Failure to win over this section of the mass movement would amount to a weakening of the anti-imperialist struggle and a hampering of the establishment of a single front against monopoly." ("Theoretical Problems of the World Revolutionary Process," *Kommunist*, No. 15, 1971.)

Green states that the "massive youth revolt that has been with us for more than a decade is one of the most remarkable phenomena

of our times without historic parallel. It is the young radicals who deserve the credit for having broken through the stifling, complacent and conformist mood of a decade ago. They have confronted the Establishment on a thousand different fronts with a freshness, vigor, imagination and audacity beautiful to behold."

At the same time, he notes that the new radicalism has lacked a consistent world outlook and perspective, which has become the movement's greatest weakness. "Without a correct ideology," he warns, "the immense vitality and potentiality will become diffuse and dissipate." In recent years, anti-imperialist and revolutionary consciousness has grown immensely in the movement but it has also "spun false theories which have become a major obstacle to the further advance of the movement."

There are not only anarchist but also Trotskyite and Maoist dangers in the New Left, as well as anti-Communist, anti-Party and anti-Soviet trends. In my opinion there is need for a precise definition of "New Left" since, due to the qualitative deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and the utter decay and irrationality of the system, a new anti-imperialist radicalism is spreading among the trade unions, among the Black and other oppressed peoples,

*Gil Green, *The New Radicalism: Anarchist or Marxist?*, International Publishers, New York, 1971, cloth \$6.95, paper \$2.45.

among the women, the veterans and other groups. While some of these have common ideological features with the student youth and intellectuals, their outlook is varied regarding Communism, the Party and the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union.

The Nature of Anarchism

Green centers his discussion on anarchism as the main shortcoming of the movement. He carefully analyzes the social and ideological roots of the movement from both international and U.S. experience. Anarchism, he writes, is not new. Its roots go back to the far past and it is a recurring phenomenon, arising "in periods of sharp social tension and crisis and particularly at times of rapid technological change which radically alters people's lives." It is also a reaction to intensified repression.

It affects especially the middle strata and the declassed sections of the population. Green quotes Lenin to the effect that "capitalism increases the number of office and professional workers with particular rapidity and makes a growing demand for intellectuals." This was written at the turn of the century about a process which is particularly pronounced today. The intellectuals, wrote Lenin, occupy a transitory, unstable and contradictory position, attaching themselves partly to the bourgeoisie by their connections, outlook, etc., and partly to the wage earners as "capitalism increasingly deprives the intellectual of his independent position and converts him into a hired worker and

threatens to lower his living standard."

Moreover, Lenin noted the tendency to become despairing and "furious over the horrors of capitalism," and this mood, says Green, is "far more prevalent today because the crisis of the system is more severe." Also, anarchist trends are a reaction to the collapse of liberalism and to the opportunism of the labor movement. Green quotes Lenin as saying that "anarchism is a sort of punishment for the opportunist sins of the working class."

The main feature of anarchism is individualism. Individualism is the ideology of the bourgeoisie, but anarchism is not its opposite pole; it is only its radical variant.

The anarchists believe that the salvation of mankind lies in each human being taking his stand against all forms of social authority. It preaches that each person must be an activist, must "do his own thing," for this is far more important than acting in accord with social theories, strategies or concrete programs for social change.

The "do your own thing" slogan is not so revolutionary, writes Green. It is nothing more than pseudo-Leftist rhetoric for typically classical bourgeois ideology. While Green sees the "back to nature" movement, the cult of "dropping out" and other such ideas as a reaction to the decay of capitalism, he says these will not liberate the individual or society.

The anarchist individualist philosophy stresses the subjectivist approach to social change. Anar-

chists tend to separate man as subject and man as object. This is wrong because "man is both subject to himself and object to others. As men act consciously together they become a subjective force capable of shaping objective developments." The anarchists have the notion, writes Green, "that human will alone will decide all, irrespective of objective conditions. This is known as voluntarism, the belief that one need merely have the will to 'make' the revolution and pronto it can be done."

But this is not the case. Green quotes the famous passage of Marx in the *Eighteenth Brumaire* that man makes his own history, but that he does not make it out of the whole cloth but of that which is available to him at a given time. Contrary to the bourgeois ideologists, Marxism emphatically recognizes the role of the subjective factors in revolutionary change—the revolutionary initiative, energy and will of people, especially on the part of the working class and its vanguard which educates the masses on the need of revolution and plays the leading role in the preparation and carrying through of revolution. But Marxism relates the subjective to the objective conditions and acts on the basis of objective realities, which in the last analysis are decisive in social development. It is because Marxists have been able to see the interrelationship of the subjective and objective that they have led successful socialist revolutions.

The State

The book discusses the central

difference between anarchism and Marxism—the question of the state. The anarchists oppose the state, including the socialist state even as a transitional stage to the eventual "withering away" of the state under communism. Green gives an account of the harm done by the anarchists in past revolutions, including the counter-revolutionary attempt by the anarcho-Trotskyite POUM against the Spanish people's government in 1937.

He stresses the need for a strong working-class government—a dictatorship of the proletariat—to introduce socialism and he cites the fact that "only where the Communists hold state power is the bourgeoisie being expropriated and a new socialist system being built." He notes the weaknesses of socialist states but rejects the criticism by the anarchists of a strong socialist state as seeking to weaken and destroy the socialist states, not to strengthen them. And he writes that the weaknesses, including bureaucratic excesses, injustices, cultism and mistakes, must be viewed in historical perspective, taking into account the incredible difficulties due to economic backwardness, civil war and world war and the stresses and strain of a world-wide struggle against imperialism.

Criticism of negative aspects of socialist states is, of course, permissible and necessary, but this must be done within the context of the total situation. Failure to take this into consideration leads to an overstress of the negative. This, unfortunately, is a

shortcoming in the book, particularly since it does not indicate the tremendous historic achievements of socialism, the decisive gains in the material and spiritual well-being of the people, the incomparable superiority of socialist democracy, the abolition of all national and racial oppression and other achievements and the immense aid to the national liberation struggles, particularly Indochina.

In his chapter entitled "Violence, Terrorism and Guerrilla Warfare," Green makes a superb contribution. (This was issued prior to the publication of the book as a pamphlet entitled *Terrorism—Is It Revolutionary?*) Here he examines many false and one-sided concepts in justification of terrorism. His cogent and well-rounded argumentation deserves careful reading.

Role of the Working Class

The book effectively polemizes against the anarchist theories of Eldridge Cleaver, who regards Marx and Engels as racists, notwithstanding their historic struggles against national and racial oppression, particularly in the United States. Cleaver also accepts the theory of the Russian anarchist Bakunin that the lumpenproletariat is the leading force for revolutionary change. Green defines the lumpenproletarian condition as not only a state of material deprivation and oppression but also a state of mind which is affected by divorce from gainful labor and by a feeling of hopelessness over this condition, which makes it impossible for the lum-

pen elements to make or lead the revolution. Only the working class—white, Black, Brown, Yellow, Red—can be the main social agency for revolution, thanks to its organization, discipline, class-struggle experience, and openness to socialist ideology.

The book points out that the great majority of Black people are workers. They are organizing caucuses in behalf of their rights and represent a militant section of the general working-class movement. Green explodes the myth propagated by Marcuse—by no means a Leftist view but a bourgeois-liberal concept—that capitalism has been able to overcome economic crises. He also attacks Marcuse's view, and that of Eldridge Cleaver, that the working class has been integrated by capitalism, that it has been bribed and cannot be counted on to perform a revolutionary role.

The working class has always fought capitalist exploitation on the level of its organized strength and consciousness. In the special period following World War II, he points out, because of the relatively long-term prosperity, the scientific-technological revolution, the rise of militarism and war, and the granting of concessions to large numbers (though by no means all), the bourgeoisie and the reactionary labor officialdom were able to spread illusions about the stability and advancement of the conditions of the working class.

But the system is in deep crisis and militant struggle of the working class is mounting not only for economic but also political de-

mands, although it still lags perilously in the fight against racism. There is a new radicalism arising in labor ranks and Green proposes a class-struggle program beginning with the fight for peace and including a fight against the wage freeze and other aspects of the new anti-labor offensive, which he foresaw. Key in the program is the fight against racism.

"Old Left" and "New Left"

A very interesting chapter is the author's constructive dialogue with Staughton Lynd on questions of strategy. There is also an important discussion on the indispensable need for leadership, and for both centralized and local organization. Lynd, in a self-critical article some time ago, expressed the view that the "New Left" can learn from the "Old Left" the lesson of organization but that the latter can learn the need for a Movement, by which he meant an organization based on socialist ideology. He thought that the "Old Left" was "economist"—that is, opportunistic. "We of the 1960's have tended to be adventurist and utopian," he wrote.

Green takes issue with this criticism of the "Old Left," stating that there was plenty of socialist ideology spread in the thirties and forties. But while agreeing that there were "economist" influences, particularly in the latter part of the Browder period, he points out that the unions were not organized on a reformist basis. They were not "creatures" of the Communist Party but were formed for the defense of their

conditions, which under the circumstances inevitably emphasized economic demands. For the Communist Party to have done other than what it did would have been to follow the sectarian policies of the Socialist Labor Party in trying to form "pure," socialist unions.

He correctly emphasizes that the motive force of history is the class struggle and that the danger of opportunism in fighting for reform always exists, due to the pressures of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois environment. These pressures must constantly be fought. It is impossible to fight imperialism without fighting its agents in the ranks of labor. But to curb opportunism and its influences it is necessary to fight for reforms in a revolutionary way—that is, to struggle militantly and constantly to maintain and extend gains, to raise the struggle from the economic to the political level, and to link immediate demands and the goal of socialism in an "integral and dynamic way."

On the Anti-Monopoly Coalition

Green calls for electoral struggles and argues effectively against Leftist opponents of participation in such struggles. Surprisingly, however, he does not state the need for a mass, independent workers' and people's party (which he favors). He does state that the existing movements must be brought together "into one vast unified independent political movement." The objective should be "to coordinate and bring together all the areas of discontent and

protest into a mighty torrent of struggle, [which] may not be a movement for socialism at the outset, but objectively . . . must move in that direction." He states, citing Lenin, that "the summit of revolution cannot be scaled in one swift assault. Stopping-off places, intermediary plateaus (stages) are inevitable."

This view of the road to socialism, recognizing transitional stages, is correct. It seems to me, however, that it suffers in being too general, or rather in stopping short of giving the movement an immediate strategic aim—that of an anti-monopoly coalition. Evidently this is because of his view, stated in his concluding pages, that the intermediate stages to socialism "cannot be seen in advance. They are not visible from afar."

But the building of a people's coalition against the monopolies is not a matter of the distant future. It is a question for today. Green sees the struggle to end the war in Indochina as central. This is correct. But every mass struggle today, starting with the all-important fight for peace, is a component part of the fight against the chief class enemy which dominates the country—monopoly capital and its governmental power, which is responsible for the Indochina war and other aggressions, for the threat of world war, for militarism, police state oppression, the intensification of racism, mass unemployment and the economic offensive against the workers. To unify these diverse struggles, to develop mass consciousness of the

nature of the common class enemy, to generate a movement leading toward the formation of a mass people's anti-monopoly party—such are the strategic aims which grow out of present-day struggles and which are central in the *New Program of the CPUSA*. The absence of this concept in the book leads to a lack of necessary concreteness in spelling out the path of struggle.

The Party

The book deals with the Communist Party and in several places it refers to the leading role played by the Party in outstanding struggles of the past. But the discussion of the Party as such is disappointingly brief. It consists of two paragraphs and it omits mention of the Young Workers Liberation League entirely. Green states the need of a revolutionary vanguard and writes that "as a long-time leader of the Communist Party, it is the author's opinion that it provides the nucleus of such a revolutionary vanguard. He adds that "obviously this is not the view around which unity of the entire Left is yet possible."

But to put it in this way is to fail to bring forward the true role of the Communist Party. As a Marxist-Leninist party of the working class, the Communist Party is a vanguard, in fact the only vanguard, notwithstanding the fact that it does not at present have political leadership of the broad masses of workers. It aspires toward that goal and conscientiously strives to establish

close relations with the workers for whose immediate and ultimate interests it fights.

The attainment of this goal is a process and by no means a smooth one. As William Z. Foster wrote: "It is not a simple task to build a mass Communist Party in the heartland of world capitalism." The Party is aware that it is still relatively small but, as Carl Davidson wrote in his critical article in the *Guardian* on the 20th National Convention, "it remains a viable force on the Left."

The Party seeks to work with all Left forces—old and new—and recognizes that it may be possible to unite organizationally in the future with other Left forces into a single party based on Marxism-Leninism. As the *New Program of the CPUSA* states: "We are certain that in the course of common action, in coordinated actions, in the exchange of views and experiences, in the discussion of differences, the basis can be laid for firmer unity. This in time may or may not take the form of organizational unity."

Since many in the New Left, as Green indicates, do not recognize the Party as either a nucleus or a vanguard, it was essential for the book to have indicated the ac-

tivities and program of the Party today and its increasing role and prestige in the mass struggles of the people, particularly among the most oppressed as well as its resolute defense of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Finally the book discusses the divisions in the world Communist movement. The book advocates unity of the movement and advises against favoring one or another socialist state. Undoubtedly unity of the world movement is imperative. But can one shut one's eyes to the vicious attacks against the Soviet Union by the imperialists, revisionists, reformists, bourgeois nationalists and opportunists, both right and "Left"? Is it not necessary to point out that the Soviet Union is the leading force in the fight against imperialism and for peace and socialism throughout the world? Regrettably this is not said in the book.

Despite these shortcomings the book strikes hard blows at anarchism and for Marxism. It will educate many of the New Left in the art and politics of the struggle for socialism. It is a welcome book which should be read by the Party and circulated widely among the Left—old and new.

IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS

FIFTY FIGHTING YEARS, Lerumo, A. The history of the South African Communist Party from early origins within the predominantly white labor movement, into a fighting vanguard of national liberation. The work is prefaced with an introductory chapter outlining three hundred years of European penetration, conquest and domination. A number of valuable historic documents are appended.

99101 Cloth 216 pp. \$4.00

A SHORT HISTORY OF SOVIET SOCIETY, Lelchuk, V. et al. Popular history begins with pre-revolutionary period and continues thru just completed 24th congress of the CPSU.

19008 Cloth 444 pp. \$3.50

THUS WARS ARE MADE, Norden, A. Study of the origins of modern imperialist war.

73143 Paper 331 pp. \$4.25

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST MONEY, BUSINESS FLUCTUATIONS AND CRISES, Erdos, P. On the development of the main features of capitalist money and a detailed study of the theory of capitalist economic crises.

43222 Cloth 466 pp. \$18.50

CEYLON-ISLAND THAT CHANGED, Mukherjee, S. Inside Marxist view of the first country where communist and national democratic forces share state power.

63179 Cloth 135 pp. \$3.00

SOCIALIST REALISM IN LITERATURE AND ART, A COLLECTION OF ARTICLES. Includes Lenin, Gorky, Lunacharsky, Fadeyev, Sholokhov and others.

write for a free copy of our latest catalog



IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS, Inc. imports books in English from the USSR and other socialist and developing countries and liberation movements. We aim to bring to the reader material not available anywhere else in the USA at the most reasonable prices possible. Included in our stock are books from the USSR, India, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Canada and the liberation movements of South Africa.

Order direct or inquire at your local bookseller.

1730 Arcade Place • Chicago, Illinois 60612