

JULY, 1967



**P**OLITICAL  
AFFAIRS

**THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS**

Hyman Lumer

**HOW TO BUILD A NEW LEFT**

Dorothy Healey

**NEW STUDY OF U.S. FINANCE CAPITAL**

Victor Perlo

**THE FASCIST-MILITARY COUP IN GREECE**

Betty Gannett

**THE THEORY OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE**

Herbert Aptheker

---

# POLITICAL AFFAIRS

---

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

---

VOL. XLVI, NO. 7

JULY, 1967

---

**Betty Gannett**, Editor      **Hymann Lumer**, Associate Editor

---

## CONTENTS

- Hyman Lumer*  
The Middle East Crisis 1
- Dorothy Healey*  
How To Build a New Left 17
- Victor Perlo*  
New Study of U.S. Finance Capital 24
- Betty Gannett*  
The Fascist-Military Coup in Greece 35
- Herbert Aptheker*  
The Theory of Peaceful Coexistence 47
- DISCUSSION ON BLACK POWER  
*Al Richmond*  
Integration or Separation? 59
- BOOK REVIEWS  
*Tom Foley*  
Communists in Asia 64
- 

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 799 Broadway, Room 618, New York, N. Y. 10003, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

# The Middle East Crisis

Among the Jewish people in the United States, events in the Middle East have aroused a pitch of emotion such as has seldom been witnessed before. This reaction stems from a deeply-felt concern over the fate of Israel, from a powerful desire to defend its existence as a Jewish state. Such feelings are wholly natural and understandable, and we Communists fully associate ourselves with them. Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, expresses it eloquently in these words:

The existence of the State of Israel is of importance not only for the people living within its borders. It has a deep meaning for the entire world but above all for the Jewish people throughout the world.

Its existence is related to a history of generations of special oppression. It is related to a world-wide struggle against anti-Semitism. The threat of Israel's extermination is linked to the extermination of six million Jews by the fascists of Germany.

Therefore one can well understand the concern, the deep anxiety of the Jewish communities throughout the world. The continued existence of the State of Israel must be the concern of all peoples. (*The Worker*, June 11, 1967.)

But the crisis in the Middle East has also given rise to a terrifying flood of intense nationalism and anti-Arab chauvinism, fed especially by the military victories of the Israeli armed forces. Concern for the welfare of the Jewish people in Israel obliterates every other consideration. That welfare is viewed as attainable only in opposition to and at the expense of the Arabs. And "defense of Israel" is equated with defense of the reactionary policies of its rulers. With such sentiments we most certainly *cannot* associate ourselves.

As Communists, we must judge events not emotionally but in the light of sober reality. We must judge them not from the standpoint of a nationalism which pits Jew against Arab, but from that of working-class internationalism—from an understanding that one cannot fight for the security and freedom of one's own people without fighting for the security and freedom of *all* peoples, and that one must proceed from the community of interests of the Jewish and Arab peoples in the fight against their common foe: imperialism and its supporters. And when events in the Middle East are examined in this light, it becomes only too clear that the decisive factor in the picture

is the aggressive policy pursued by the Israeli ruling class—a policy which betrays the interests of the Israeli people.

### *Oil Imperialism*

The basic conflict in the Middle East is not between Jews and Arabs but between U.S. and British imperialism on one side and the peoples of the Middle East, both Jewish and Arab, on the other. The issue is oil.

The fabulous oil resources of this region and the equally fabulous profits to be obtained from their extraction, have exercised an irresistible attraction on the giant oil monopolies, not least on those of the United States. A *New York Times* editorial (May 31, 1967) puts it very bluntly. Southeast Asia, says the *Times*, is only of peripheral interest to the United States. But not so the Middle East:

. . . The region is now of paramount strategic importance to this country. . . .

The Persian Gulf area produces 27 per cent of the world's petroleum and has proved global reserves of 60 per cent. American firms have a gross investment in the region of more than \$2.5 billion. There is nothing comparable in American interests that can be said of the Southeast Asian peninsula.

Nearly the whole of this immense bonanza is in the hands of eight oil companies: Standard Oil (New Jersey), Standard Oil (California), Texas, Gulf, Socony, Royal Dutch Shell, British Petroleum, and Compagnie Française des Pétroles. Five of the eight are U.S. companies; indeed, U.S. firms control more than 60 per cent of Middle East oil, while British firms control another 30 per cent.

These are the lushest oil-hunting grounds in the world. Costs of production are far lower than in any other area, in part because the oil-bearing strata lie close to the surface, but in part also because wage scales are among the lowest in the world.

In addition, the monopoly of production by a handful of giant companies makes it possible for them to sell Middle East oil on the world market at the same price as U.S. oil. Consequently the rate of profit on the former is astronomical. In the mid-fifties, it was reported, the average profit on a \$2.00 barrel of oil ranged between \$1.75 and \$1.90 (Bushrod Howard, Jr., "Goodbye to a Dollar a Barrel," *New Republic*, August 4, 1958). And more recently, according to the *Wall Street Journal* (March 14, 1966), the 1965 pre-tax profits of Aramco (which controls the total output of Saudi Arabia) amounted to 85 per cent on sales, as against an average of less than 10 per cent for all U.S. manufacturing corporations. Clearly, there

is no other investment anywhere which offers U.S. monopoly capital such phenomenal returns as does Middle East oil.

It is the pursuit of these profits, as well as the strategic importance of the Middle East as a world crossroads, that has shaped U.S. policy there and has given rise to unceasing machinations designed to secure and expand the empire of the U.S. oil monopolies at the expense of their rivals and of the Arab people.

In 1953 the Mossadegh government in Iran, which had nationalized the nation's oil industry, was overthrown with the aid of the CIA. As a consequence, the previously existing Anglo-Iranian Oil Company was replaced by a consortium in which a 40 per cent interest is held by U.S. companies. In 1955 the Baghdad Pact was engineered, with five official members—Britain, Pakistan, Turkey, Iraq and Iran, and one unofficial member—the United States. In 1959, when Iraq withdrew, it was renamed the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). The United States directly participates on two of CENTO's chief committees: those dealing with military planning and control of subversive activities (which means national liberation movements).

In 1956 there took place the ill-starred invasion of Egypt by Britain, France and Israel; of this we shall have more to say later. In 1958, when an anti-imperialist regime took power in Iraq, the United States responded by sending troops to neighboring Lebanon, on the pretext that the Lebanese government had asked for them as a protection against the threat of Iraqi attack. A storm of protest against this thinly-veiled plot to overthrow the new Iraqi government forced their removal. And more recently, with the establishment of a progressive government in Syria, U.S. plans began to take shape to bring about its overthrow—plans which led to the present crisis.

The targets of these operations are all who oppose the imperialist robbery and exploitation of their countries, and especially the present regimes in the United Arab Republic and Syria, which have taken a non-capitalist path of development and have nationalized most of their industry. The allies of imperialism are the reactionary feudal elements, such as the Husseins and Faisals who now rule Jordan and Saudi Arabia (though this alliance has been shaken by the present crisis). This is the decisive conflict, in relation to which all other conflicts and all policies of governments or political parties must be judged.

### *The Role of Israel*

In this picture the ruling circles of Israel have come forward,

almost from the very beginning, on the side of imperialism. Both the Ben Gurion and Eshkol regimes have proclaimed Israel's allegiance to the West and have made their country an adjunct to U.S. policy in the Middle East.

Israeli foreign policy has its roots in the Zionist concept of a *purely* Jewish state, constituting the homeland of *all* Jews everywhere in the world, a concept based on the thesis that anti-Semitism is ineradicable and that the only solution is the complete separation of Jew and non-Jew. Consequently, Israel has developed as a clerical state in which the Jewish religion occupies a favored position. It has developed as a state in which any Jew anywhere may claim citizenship, but in which Arabs born in Israel are relegated to second-class status and subjected to various limitations. It is a state which energetically encourages Jewish immigration but prohibits the return of Arabs who fled or were driven from Israel during the War of Independence in 1948. It is conceived of not as a country in which Jew and Arab live together in equality and friendship but as one based on displacement of Arabs to make room for Jews.

In this scheme of things it is the Arabs who are the enemies and the U.S. and Britain who are the friends and protectors of Israel. The result has been to tie Israel's future completely to these "protectors." Her economy is dominated by U.S. and British monopoly capital (it is this which lies at the bottom of her economic difficulties today). In her foreign policy, Israel is similarly tied to the imperialist powers. Thus, in the United Nations, on questions affecting the interests of African and Asian countries, the Israeli vote has virtually always been on the imperialist side. A particularly notorious case in point was Israel's vote in December 1959 against an Afro-Asian resolution recognizing Algeria's right to independence. In Africa, Israel has played the role of an ally of neo-colonialism, as for example in the provision of military training to Tshombe's troops in the Congo. Also illustrative of Israel's imperialist ties is her establishment of close relations with the revanchist, Nazi-ridden Bonn regime. And as we shall see, the dependence on imperialism is equally evident in Israel's policies toward the Arab countries.

One must, of course, take into consideration the implacable hostility toward Israel which exists on the part of Arab leaders. At its very birth, the State of Israel had to defend itself against an Arab invasion (egged on and in part led by the British). Since then the Arab states have without exception refused to recognize or maintain commercial relations with Israel. The Suez canal has been closed to her. And more, the Arab leaders have repeatedly called for Israel's

destruction as an "artificial creation of imperialism."

Certainly such demands must be unequivocally condemned. Far from being a creation of imperialism, the State of Israel was established through the action of the United Nations, with the initiative and the active support of the Soviet Union and in the face of opposition from Britain and the United States. Its legitimacy is beyond question. It is sheer foolishness, moreover, to think that the problems of the Arab countries can be resolved by wiping it off the map. Such an appeal only plays into the hands of imperialism, which thrives on such division, and aggravates the war danger. The same must be said of the carrying on of raids and counter-raids, from whichever side these emanate.

But if one wishes to do more than condemn, if one wishes to change things, it is also necessary to recognize that the most formidable obstacle to overcoming Arab hostility is the foreign policy of the Israeli government, a policy based on resort to force as the only means for securing Israel's existence.

This policy came to fruition in the Sinai invasion of 1956. In the official accounts, this action is described as one necessitated by incessant raids from the Gaza strip, which had become intolerable and undertaken on Israel's own initiative. However, the recent revelations of Anthony Nutting, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs under Eden in 1956, who resigned in protest against the policy of invading Egypt, tell a different story. The invasion, says Nutting, was the outcome of a well-planned conspiracy, of which Israel was a part. To carry out this plot, Eden deliberately deceived the British people (and, of course, the Israeli government deliberately deceived the Israeli people). Says the *New Statesman* ("Sex Lies and State Lies," May 12, 1967):

Since 1956 the evidence of collusion has accumulated to the point where it has become irrefutable. The significance of Mr. Nutting's revelations is that they provide detailed confirmation of our worst suspicions—in some respects going beyond them—from a man who was at the center of events. It is a shocking tale—one of the worst episodes in our modern history.

The invasion, despite its military successes, backfired. But the policy remain unchanged.

#### *Roots of the Crisis*

The current crisis, as we have indicated, has its roots in a U.S.-hatched plot to overthrow the present government of Syria. Among the signs of this were the massing of Jordanian troops on the Syrian

border and an abortive military coup in September 1966. Among them, too, were the growing signs of Israel's involvement in plans to invade Syria.

In the spring of 1966 the United States sold to Israel a number of Skyhawk attack bombers. This sale, following on the sale of a group of Starfighter jets to Jordan, represented a new departure in U.S. policy. It was the first time that such offensive weapons had been sold directly to Israel. Official circles in Israel rejoiced. But evidence soon began to appear that this was no act of magnanimity. The *New York Times* Jerusalem correspondent, James Feron, reported on June 11, 1966 on some conversations with Israeli officials. The following excerpt is highly instructive:

This is the way a Foreign Office official put it: The United States has come to the conclusion that it can no longer respond to every incident around the world, that it must rely on a local power—the deterrent of a friendly power—as a first line to stave off America's direct involvement.

In the Israeli view, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara outlined this approach last month just a few days before the Skyhawk deal was announced. In a major address in Montreal, one that attracted considerable attention in high quarters here, Mr. McNamara reviewed American commitments around the world and said:

"It is the policy of the United States to encourage and achieve a more effective partnership with those nations who can, and should, share international peacekeeping responsibilities."

Israel feels that she fits this definition and the impression that has been conveyed by some Government officials is that Foreign Minister Abba Eban and Mr. McNamara conferred over Skyhawk details in the context of this concept when the Israeli diplomat was in Washington last February.

The *quid pro quo* in the Skyhawk sale is clear. It became even clearer in the Israeli reactions to a number of border raids from Syria and Jordan in the ensuing months. The Israeli army was placed in a state of alert and troops were concentrated on the Syrian border. On July 14, 1966 a large-scale air raid was carried out on Syrian water installations, assertedly in retaliation for a series of border provocations but far out of proportion to anything which might be justified by them.

At the same time, talk in official circles increasingly hinted at the need for a "new Sinai." Thus, the *New York Times* (October 23, 1966) reported in connection with Security Council discussions on Israel-Syria relations:

Arab sources and some Westerners have been worried by remarks of Israel's Ambassador, Michael S. Comay, who told the Council Monday that it would be "unwise and unwarranted to draw any analogy" between this situation and the events that led up to the Israeli campaign in the Sinai Peninsula in 1956, but that the campaign did nevertheless end the terrorist raids by the "fedayeen" based in Egypt.

And in an interview with the *Jerusalem Post* (October 28, 1966), Abba Eban stated that the Sinai campaign had yielded "beneficial results."

On October 16, 1966 Prime Minister Eshkol announced in the Knesset that the government would take military action against Syria in the name of "self-defense." A month later there took place the large-scale attack on the village of Es Samu in Jordan which led to the censure of Israel by the UN Security Council by a vote of 14-0. Of this unwarranted attack even U.S. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg was impelled to state that "deplorable as these preceding incidents were . . . this deliberate governmental decision must be judged as the conscious act of responsible leaders of a member state and therefore on an entirely different level from the earlier incidents. . . ." (*New York Times*, November 20, 1966.)

Eshkol sought to justify the attack on the grounds that the Syrians were sending saboteurs through Jordan. On April 7, 1967 there took place another major air attack on Syria, with threats of even larger ones to come. And talk about the need for a full-scale attack on Syria continued, together with preparations. In an Independence Day interview, the *Jewish Chronicle* of May 19, 1967 reports, Eshkol stated that the only deterrent available to Israel against Syria is a powerful lightning military strike—powerful enough to produce a change of heart or even of government in Damascus and quick enough to prevent any other countries from rallying to Syria's support.

If there was collusion of Israel with Britain and France in the 1956 invasion of Egypt, the evidence clearly points to collusion with the United States for an attack on Syria at this time, again in the name of putting a stop to border raids. If the attack did not come off as planned, it was because of the actions of the United Arab Republic and the unexpected unity of the Arab states, in the face of the threat to Syria.

#### *The UAR Actions*

The crisis came to a head in mid-May when the United Arab Republic asked for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency

Force from its territory adjacent to the armistice line and began to mass its own troops there, and when it followed this by blockading the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping. Israel promptly began to call up reserves, denounced the blockade as a violation of international law and an act of war designed to destroy Israel economically, and threatened military action to break it if it were not quickly lifted.

In relation to these events it is necessary to clear up a number of points of confusion which the American press has assiduously cultivated. The first of these is the charge that U Thant helped precipitate the crisis by hastily agreeing to removal of the UNEF from Egyptian soil. Thant himself has answered this most effectively. He points out that the UN forces were there and had been there for ten years solely by permission of the UAR, which was quite free to withdraw this permission, and he adds that Israel had consistently refused to allow such forces on her territory. "Moreover," he states, "for all of these ten years Israel's troops regularly patrolled alongside the line and now and again created provocations by violating it." (*New York Times*, June 21, 1967.) Finally, the UN troops were not armed for combat and two of the countries supplying them, Yugoslavia and India, fearful for their safety, had asked for their return.

Secondly, the contention of Israel and the United States that the Gulf of Aqaba has been clearly established as an international waterway open to innocent passage by ships of all nations does not conform with the facts. It is based only on a unilateral declaration to that effect by John Foster Dulles in 1956. The question has never been determined in international law. On this point Roger Fisher, Professor of Law at Harvard University, writes in a letter to the *New York Times* (June 11, 1967):

United States press reports about the Gulf of Aqaba situation were grossly one-sided. The United Arab Republic had a good legal case for restricting through the Strait of Tiran.

First, it is debatable whether international law confers any right of innocent passage through such a waterway. Despite an Israeli request, the International Law Commission in 1956 found no rule which would govern the Strait of Tiran. . . .

There are, of course, good arguments on the Israeli side too, and an international court might well conclude that a right of innocent passage through the Strait of Tiran does exist.

Even if it did so conclude, however, the question would remain as to whether shipment of strategic goods to be used against Syria falls under the heading of "innocent passage."

Nor is it true that the blockade constituted a death-blow against

Israel's economy. The fact is that less than 10 per cent of Israel's foreign commerce passes through the port of Eilat, and this could be rerouted to other ports. True, the expense would be greater, but the closing of Eilat could hardly be said to be fatal.

Thus, while the blockade might well be a matter for protest and adjudication, it offered no valid reason for the U.S. proposal to "test" it by running an armada through the Strait of Tiran. And above all, *it offered no excuse whatever for the launching of war by Israel soon after.*

Thirdly, it is claimed that the actions of the UAR, together with the mobilization of troops by other Arab states, constituted preparations for launching the long-threatened war of extermination against Israel. This claim, too, is disputed by the facts. The UAR stated at the outset that its actions were taken not for the purpose of attacking Israel but for the purpose of defending Syria, with whom she has a pact of mutual assistance, in the event of an Israeli attack. This statement was repeated on more than one occasion, and no visible evidence has been offered to the contrary. Even Nasser's widely publicized threat to destroy Israel was predicated on the proposition "if Israel starts war." The *New York Times* (May 27, 1967) reports it in these words:

President Gamal Abdel Nasser said tonight that any Israeli military action against the United Arab Republic or Syria would lead to all-out war.

If war starts, he said, "our main objective will be the destruction of Israel."

Furthermore, one is impelled to ask: If it was true, as Israel claims, that Egypt's armed forces stood poised for invasion, which was forestalled only by the Israeli preemptive action, how is the almost complete destruction of the Egyptian air force in the very first hours of battle to be explained?

The evidence points clearly to the conclusion that the Israeli government, once the U.S. test of the blockade failed to materialize, determined to attack, ostensibly to lift the blockade. The *New York Times* (June 11, 1967) states:

Then, convinced they had only themselves to count on if they wanted to avert a process of slow strangulation, they decided to strike out in force at the first provocation. The provocation—one more light shelling by the Syrians and Jordanians—was not long in coming. What followed amazed the world.

*Time*, in its issue of June 25, 1967, describes in some detail the secret cabinet meeting on June 4 at which the decision to launch

war was made. The meeting discussed "pre-emptive war" and the new defense minister Moshe Dayan insisted it be launched without delay. He carried the meeting by a vote of 16-2. Detailed plans were made which were put into effect the following day.

Once having attacked, Israel continued the war, despite the UN ceasefire resolution, until her major military objectives were gained, and capped the performance with an invasion of Syria on the pretext that the latter had violated the truce.

Such was the road to war. It is clear that this was not, as we are constantly told, a defensive war on the part of Israel against an enemy seeking her extermination, but a deliberate act of aggression. More, it was the culmination of the policy of relying on aggressive military action as the means of making Israel's existence secure—a policy which increasingly gained the ascendancy in Israeli ruling circles. The final step in the process was the admission into the government only a few days before the attack, of Moshe Dayan and the ultra-Rightist Menachem Begin. Both were associated with Ben Gurion's Rafi Party which went down to devastating defeat in the 1965 elections. At issue in these elections was the defense of parliamentary forms and democratic institutions against the trend toward military dictatorship represented by Ben Gurion. Today his leading adherents are back in the government. All that is lacking is his own presence.

The dominant figure in Israel today is Dayan, the "hero of Sinai," an outspoken advocate of militarism and reliance on force of arms. It is *his* policy which has triumphed. The tragedy of it all is that for the Israeli people it is a suicidal policy.

### *A Hollow Victory*

It is already clear that the military victory, swift and spectacular as it was, has solved none of the basic problems facing Israel. On the contrary, it has aggravated them. In his *New York Times* column of June 8, 1967, Tom Wicker wrote:

Israel has resorted to violence and won its victory. Among her friends and particularly those whose ties to her are of blood and the spirit, there can only be relief and exultation. Yet, victory is not necessarily settlement; and perhaps only as the battle ends will the enormity of what has happened become clear. . . .

Nor will military triumph over the Arab states bring an end to their profound hostility toward Israel, or to the deep-seated Arab bitterness that festers on the conviction that the Western nations imposed the Jewish state on them unfairly and with callous disregard for their rights and feelings. Indeed, if any-

thing could further have inflamed Arab hatred on the question of Israel, the humiliating new defeat will have done it.

*U.S. News and World Report* (June 19, 1967) notes:

None of the crucial, long-range problems was settled by the lightning warfare. Hatred between Arabs and Israelis, and hunger for revenge, is greater than ever.

Israel remains a resource-poor land of 2.7 million people in a sea of 100 million hostile neighbors.

The cold facts are that Israel must continue to exist in the middle of an Arab world and that it cannot do so by force of arms. Such a policy can lead only to a series of wars in which the overwhelming numerical superiority of the Arabs must in the end assert itself, leading to Israel's extinction. Only through reconciliation with its Arab neighbors can her survival be assured. In the words of I. F. Stone: "No quickie military victories should blind it to the inescapable—in the long run it cannot defeat the Arabs. It must join them." (*I. F. Stone's Weekly*, June 12, 1967.)

The need for a reversal of the present Israeli foreign policy is therefore more crucial than ever, and especially with regard to the Arab refugee problem. This problem lies at the very heart of the Israeli-Arab hostility, and it is in the name of justice for the Palestinian Arabs that the demands for destruction of the State of Israel have been made.

The UN resolution which established the State of Israel also established an Arab state in Palestine. But this state never materialized. The territory assigned to it was seized by other countries during the War of Independence in 1948. Jordan took the territory on the west bank of the Jordan River, Egypt took the Gaza Strip, and Israel increased its area by one-third by taking much of the Negev, including the port of Eilat.

At the same time, in the course of the war some 900,000 Arabs living in what is now Israel—the great majority of the Arab population—either fled in panic or were driven out, to become refugees living in wretched settlements across the border. Today some 700,000 of them live in Jordan (out of a total population of 2 million in a country consisting mostly of desert), another 300,000 in the Gaza Strip and smaller numbers in Syria and Lebanon.

The question of what is to become of these refugees is the most burning source of Israel-Arab friction. The Israeli Communists have long advocated a policy of either compensating them for the property taken from them or permitting them to resettle in Israel. The Israeli

government, however, has adamantly refused to assume any responsibility for them, insisting that they are the responsibility of the Arab countries.

This attitude stems from the racist concept of a purely Jewish state to which we have already referred. "They cannot return to their old lands," said Prime Minister Eshkol in a recent television broadcast. "After all, they are better off among their own people of the same race and religion." How reminiscent this is of the language of supporters of segregated housing in this country!

It is this attitude toward Arabs which must be abandoned if there is to be any hope of living in peace in an Arab world. This is now coming to be recognized by a growing number of people in this country. In a letter to I. F. Stone, the author Paul Goodman says:

. . . it has been grossly immoral for Israel to have neglected for twenty years the plight of the displaced Arabs and not to have taken all initiatives for a settlement with its Arab neighbors, however painful and despite rebuffs. In some respects, the Israel attitude toward the Arabs has been miserably reminiscent of the American treatment of the Indians. (*I. F. Stone's Weekly*, June 19, 1967.)

This comparison is more pertinent than ever today. Ironically, most of the refugees (and nearly all the territory originally designated as that of the Palestine Arab state) are now in Israeli hands, and the question of their fate is now thrust directly on Israel. Moreover, the refugee problem has been expanded by a wholesale flight of Arabs from the west bank of the Jordan to the east bank.

There is much pious talk about the need to "do something for the refugees." But what this means in practice is indicated first of all by the severe discrimination against Arabs in Israel itself. It is indicated further by the character of the warfare conducted by Israel. The widespread use of napalm has already been established. *New York Times* correspondent Charles Mohr reported from the Sinai desert (June 18, 1967): "The Israeli Air Force used napalm freely. The evidence on the ground showed that it dropped napalm canisters on or just in front of Egyptian tanks so that the sticky, burning napalm would roll over them in waves, incinerating the crews inside." According to Agence France-Presse (June 17, 1967), doctors in the Meadi Hospital near Cairo said that 75 per cent of the military casualty cases were napalm victims, 50 per cent of whom would die. This helps to explain the tremendous discrepancy in casualty figures. Thus, Israel announced 679 military deaths, while Jordan announced 15,000 and the Arab total has been estimated at 50-75,000.

All this betrays an attitude toward the Arabs not unlike that of U.S. imperialism toward the Vietnamese people. What is meant by "doing something" for the Arabs is indicated by the following comment in the *New Republic* (June 24, 1967): "There was talk in Israel last week of turning the conquered land west of the Jordan into some kind of vast Arab reservation, under Israeli rule. But the Israelis cannot in the 20th century treat Arabs as Americans treated the Sioux in the 19th."

The point is, however, that the Israeli ruling class not only *can* but very likely *will* if it has its way. The result for the Israeli people would in the end be disastrous. The need for a reversal of such policies is inescapable.

#### *Israel and the United States*

No less important than a reversal of policy with reference to the Arab refugees is the need to put an end to dependence on imperialism, and particularly on U.S. imperialism. Continued reliance on it to protect Israel's existence can well lead to disaster.

U.S. imperialism is not pro-Israel and anti-Arab. On the contrary, as Hans J. Morgenthau points out: "The officials responsible for our Middle Eastern policy have consistently followed a pro-Arab orientation, qualified by consideration of the Jewish vote in this country. They have considered Israel a nuisance, which made it impossible for the U.S. to pursue a straightforward policy among the Arabs." ("The U.S. and the Mideast," *New Leader*, June 19, 1967.) It is the Arab states, not Israel, which have the oil, which are dominant in the area and which can influence other Moslem countries. Hence the fact that the United States has sold more than ten times as much military equipment to Jordan and Saudi Arabia as it has to Israel. And hence the fact that the CIA, as revealed by *The Nation* (May 9, 1966), has funneled money into such a pro-Arab, anti-Israel organization as the American Friends of the Middle East.

The Truman Administration, as is well known, showed no great enthusiasm for the State of Israel at its birth. The oil companies in the Middle East actively fought its creation. Robert Engler in *The Politics of Oil* (Macmillan, New York, 1961) describes the cooperation of the oil companies with the Arab states in their boycotting and black-listing of Israel, and the collusion of the State Department in the exclusion of Jews practiced by countries like Saudi Arabia. "Where Aramco accedes to Saudi Arabian demands that no Jewish personnel work in or deal with the country," he writes, "the American Government refuses passports and even screens its armed forces and Foreign

Service to make sure Saudi Arabia's sovereign 'idiosyncrasies,' to use Secretary of State Dulles's term, are respected." (P. 257.)

In the present crisis the position of the Johnson Administration has been an ambivalent one. It has expressed support of Israel and at the same time has declared itself "neutral." When the fighting broke out the Administration hoped for and later was pleased by Israel's lightning victory, which was decidedly to its advantage and at the same time relieved it of having to make painful decisions about intervening on Israel's side. Today the Administration supports the Israeli government's expressed intention to hold on to at least some of the conquered territory and speaks of a "durable" peace, having in mind a strengthened Israel which can more effectively function as a U.S. policeman in the Middle East. But at the same time, faced with the breaking of diplomatic relations and the halting of oil sales to the U.S. and Britain by some Arab states, it must seek to mend its fences in that direction, if need be by limiting its backing of Israel.

From all this the nature of U.S. policy in the Middle East is clear. U.S. imperialism is prepared to use Israel for its own ends, but it is also prepared to sacrifice Israel if it deems it necessary.

#### *The Soviet Union and the Middle East*

One of the products of the Middle East crisis has been a disturbing upsurge of anti-Sovietism. Among Right-wing elements the Soviet Union is labeled the aggressor, with the UAR and other Arab states acting as its pawns. One of the most vicious expressions of this view is the June 1 statement of AFL-CIO President George Meany, which concludes with these words:

In the present critical situation, Israel is the first target of Soviet aggression by proxy (Nasser). Clearly Israel is not the only or last target of this aggression. The freedom and security of our country, of the entire free world, are the real and final target of the Communist aggressors.

But such expressions are not confined to people like Meany. They have become widespread in Jewish circles, including some which had previously taken a more friendly approach to the Soviet Union. For example, an editorial appearing in the Chicago Jewish periodical *The Sentinel* on June 1, 1967 says the following:

By some crazy logic, the victim becomes the aggressor; the aggressor becomes the aggrieved; and dignified statesmen go through the act of pretending that this is all for real. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union, claiming to represent the oppressed peoples of the earth, takes upon itself the dishonored mantle of Adolph Hitler

as it encourages the exploiters of the Arab masses to finish the job he started.

Of this we can only say that even such veteran anti-Sovieters as Senator Dodd or Senator Eastland could do no better.

In view of these developments it is essential to make clear the true role of the Soviet Union in the Middle East, particularly with relation to Israel. This role has been consistently one of fighting to uphold the rights of all nations in the Middle East, for the maintenance of peace and settlement of all differences by peaceful means.

As for Israel, the Soviet attitude has recently been restated by Premier Kosygin in his speech before the UN General Assembly on June 19, 1967. We can do no better than to quote him:

... The Soviet Union is not against Israel—it is against the aggressive policy pursued by the ruling circles of that State.

In the course of its 50-year history, the Soviet Union has regarded all peoples, large or small, with respect. Every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national State of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union.

It is on this basis that we formulated our attitude to Israel as a State, when we voted in 1947 for the UN decision to create two independent states, a Jewish and an Arab one, in the territory of the former British colony of Palestine. Guided by this fundamental policy the Soviet Union was later to establish diplomatic relations with Israel.

While upholding the rights of peoples to self-determination, the Soviet Union just as resolutely condemns the attempts by any State to conduct an aggressive policy towards other countries, a policy of seizure of foreign lands and subjugation of the people living there.

To be sure, the Soviet Union has condemned the Israeli government as the aggressor in very strong language, and many honest Jewish people have deeply resented this since they find it impossible to accept the idea that Jews, themselves members of a people persecuted for centuries, could be guilty of a policy of oppression and cruelty toward other peoples. But we believe that the facts speak otherwise in this situation, and that in its condemnation the Soviet Union performed a service, not a disservice, to the cause of peace.

Nor have the endeavors of the Soviet Union on this score been one-sided. There is ample evidence to show that it has worked to restrain threats to the peace from the Arab side, and this has been recognized in Jewish circles.

At the annual Policy Conference of the American Israel Public

Affairs Committee in Washington this year, a panel of experts discussed the Soviet role in the Middle East. *Israel Horizons* (February 1967) reports their conclusions as follows: "These men were in full accord that Russia did not want a war and would do everything possible to prevent one, and would step in very quickly to stop it if one developed. Moscow is evidently making this clear to the Arabs themselves, and especially to Syria. . . ."

These words are almost prophetic. The Soviet Union did in fact do everything possible to avert war in the Middle East in the only way it could be averted—by exposing and combatting the aggressive policies of the Israel ruling circles as well as by seeking to prevail on the Arab countries to exercise restraint. And when war broke out nevertheless, a war which served the interests of neither the Arab nor Jewish peoples but only those of imperialism, the Soviet Union did all it could to bring it to the quickest possible end, supporting the cease-fire resolution for that purpose.

#### *What Kind of Negotiations?*

At this moment the fighting is over but the painful task of achieving a settlement still lies ahead. The Israeli government has announced that it will negotiate only directly with the Arab states, and that it will hold the conquered territory and use it as a club to compel agreement to its terms. This approach will solve nothing, since it is clear that the Arab states will never agree to such a basis for negotiations.

Fruitful negotiations are possible only on the basis of withdrawal to the previous armistice line and accepting mediation. The argument that this would only restore the conditions which led to the crisis is unfounded. Aside from the fact that "right of conquest" cannot be accepted as the basis of relations between states, there are already indications that the U.A.R. may be prepared to agree to concessions if these conditions are fulfilled. Negotiations cannot succeed if they are to be between victor and vanquished; they must be based on the need of Jews and Arabs to live together in peace. And they can be.

Of fundamental importance to the future of both Jew and Arab is the elimination of imperialist exploitation from the Middle East. A truly prosperous Israel is possible only as part of a united, independent Arab world, free to enjoy the benefits of its natural resources and to develop a modern industrial economy.

For us in the United States the task is to expose the role of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East and to show the folly of trying to guarantee the future of a Jewish state in Israel through dependence upon it.

## How to Build A New Left\*

I think we should approach this discussion in the light of a phrase by Staughton Lynd. This is a time, he says, for "compassionate solidarity." I would add the word "political." The object of this evening's discussion is not to dissect the issues of our temperamentally or in-eradicably different outlooks; nor is it to pluck the raw nerves of the past; nor sever political sinews so that nothing is left but dry bones. It is to try to put together a muscular, living and, if you will, compassionate political solidarity. We place solidarity in action ahead of doctrinal correctness or moral righteousness and, certainly, over any desire to score points in debate's gamesmanship. The times are too important and too anxious.

None of us, unfortunately, can claim with empirical evidence, that we have found the key to the creation of a mass Left in the United States. It would be well, therefore, to avoid one of the sins of the past and present: that one has the monopoly on either truth or integrity. This does not mean a slurring over of differences—that would not help the search for alternatives. They are too significant to be dismissed with sugared words. Is it possible to work for compassionate political solidarity and yet sharply debate the differences among its components. I don't know. Perhaps we will all find out tonight.

For instance, one fundamental issue is whether there is a revolutionary Left, committed to a socialist objective and therefore to the struggle for political power as the instrument for such a transformation; or, a rebel Left that harasses, annoys, needles the Establishment, but despite the most radical posture is essentially reformist, because it shuns political power in the belief that all power corrupts. In the belief that all power corrupts, it can do little more than produce slight modifications in the existing social structure. Power can corrupt. The job is to increase the controls which mitigate that danger, not to foresake the struggle because of future dangers.

These two approaches can find unity on immediate issues, of course. But, without a clear understanding of the differences, even a momentary unity has rough sledding.

\* This talk was presented on December 2, 1966, at Los Angeles Trade Technical College, before an audience of 700, in a panel discussion in which Robert Scheer of *Ramparts* and Dr. Eugene Genovese of Rutgers participated.

Secondly, I think we may have differences on what we term internationalism. Without detailing the serious mistakes we Communists have made in our approach, the concept is, I think, a decisive one for building a meaningful Left. There have always been those who will defend socialism everywhere except where the people are struggling to build it, a Left that can boast "Look Ma, I got no connections with anybody outside the good ol' U.S.A." In a period when American chauvinism is at its height, when our government is the global policeman against the peoples' liberation movements, can one build a nationally-insulated Left? Doesn't this attitude, in its own way, base itself on the mystique of the American mission as moral leader of the world?

The current issue of *Dissent*, for instance, has two articles designed to demonstrate that the leaders of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front are scoundrels, equating them with the evils of Saigon and, therefore, U.S. imperialism. Or another example, I do not think you can build a Left that panders to vulgar prejudice by equating Hungary with Vietnam, if for no other reason than that Hungary 1966 and Guatemala 1966 provide evidence of the vast difference. This does not mean adopting an uncritical approach. It does mean that we should include that world in our compassionate political solidarity.

I do not think we differ on the pressing issues. First, we must put an end to this monstrous war in Vietnam, for our sake, for the sake of the people of Vietnam, and before it erupts into a nuclear war against the whole of Asia in the name of a quite barbarous white man's "crusade against Communism." Most immediately, this means to press with all our combined muscle for an end to the bombing. Second, we must create new paths and dimensions in the struggle for equality, which is now at a crossroads. Third, we must search for every near and long-term program to fight poverty. Fourth, in view of the technological means available, we must fight to close the intolerable gap between the full and empty bellies of the world. These aims cannot be ignored. As the percipient Walter Lippmann pointed out in connection with the sidetracking of Negro aspirations: "The Indochinese War has destroyed the material foundations of all the hopes that preceded it." But to say that these aims cannot be severed does not mean that they form an inextricable web which cannot be separated for political attack.

One must fight for the here-ness and now-ness of every issue on every possible front, wherever the enemy raises its attacks. The ramparts we call you to are not the barricades of some ultimate revolu-

tion that will be thrown up on Spring Street, or the campus, in some remote 1984—or to prevent some 1984. They are in every rundown cafeteria and every dilapidated home; in the lack of a hospital, library or school cafeteria in Watts; in every welfare case in East Los Angeles and every jobless man, woman and youngster in the state. They are found in every student peace meeting repressed in Berkeley and in every protest against police brutality in Watts, in East Los Angeles and on Sunset Boulevard; in every picket line for higher wages—yes, especially in the assessors' tax rolls and the total huge tax bite, in the market prices of our food—and consequently, in every precinct in 1967 and 1968.

We know that politics can be dull and tedious. We know in our bones that you cannot win on issues without the difficult, grueling and, alas, often boring day-to-day work of organizing. Politics is not a hit-and-run affair, no splash rhetorical jab and *away we go*—although some of this may be necessary. It means working with, and staying in communities and in peoples' organizations, year in and year out, building around issues. It means developing radicals who stay that way, regardless of blunders, defeats or "combat fatigue."

And if we express impatience and sometimes rancor, it is because we hear a clock ticking. At our backs we hear not the poet's "time's winged-chariot," but something more ominous—the marching feet, the mobilizing dollars, the Wagnerian trumpets of an emergent neo-Nazism. And, quite frankly, we do not believe a Left can be built if it ignores the danger, or if it believes that it makes no difference which form of capitalist rule is dominant.

Each generation thinks that the problems it faces are unique, and that the answers it seeks are peculiar to it. In one respect, there is some truth to this. But it is, I think, necessary to remember that science progresses proportionately to the mass of knowledge inherited from the preceding generations. Modern culture would be pallid without Shakespeare, Dante or Beethoven. Modern science is unthinkable without Newton, Darwin and Einstein. Now, sorrowfully, none of us can lay claim to the genius of these men nor to that of a Marx or a Lenin. But we can lay claim to the lessons learned from the past, in order that we might work more effectively in the present and, thereby, shape the future. We can, in short, use history to clarify the probabilities of various alternatives.

In their attempt to eliminate history, the Madison Avenue image-makers have gone to great pains to present today's problems as challenges between the old Left and the new. It is ridiculous to fall for that deliberate ploy. It is nonsense to applaud everything that is

"new" without any regard to its content—whether in sociology, art, philosophy or politics. It is common sense to see if something is really new, and therefore important to grasp and utilize—or, if what purports to be "new" is only the old repeating itself in a new guise. Old ideas don't die; it is only their proponents who pass away.

In the 1966 elections, for instance, it was a young representative of the Left, Paul Potter from SDS, who grasped the essence of a Reagan candidacy when he said: "A political candidacy of Ronald Reagan, because of its ideological flavor, develops popular support for tightening up the mechanisms of social control." This is vastly different from *Ramparts* magazine, which saw Reagan only as a scarecrow put up by Edmund G. Brown to frighten the voters.

Without a view of history, the participants in today's struggles can become frustrated, demoralized and cynical—and become tomorrow's drop-outs from all struggles. I learned an important lesson from my youthful activities: that which appears immovable today can be transformed tomorrow. The working class and the labor movement of the twenties seemed even more unmoved by militant and radical appeals than they do today. But the same class stormed the citadels of trustified capital in the face of concentrated police, National Guard and vigilante terror, to organize the unorganized just a few years later.

Rosa Luxemburg, in a letter written from prison, says it better than I in the following:

There is nothing more subject to rapid change than human psychology. The psyche of the masses embraces a whole world, a world of almost limitless possibilities: breathless calm and raging storm; base treachery and supreme heroism. The masses always represent what historical conditions make of them at a given moment, and the masses are always profoundly capable of being very different to what may appear at any given moment. It's a poor navigator who steers his ship by the superficial weather signs around him, and fails to use the means science has given him to foresee approaching storms. "Disappointment" in the masses is always a compromising sign for political leaders. A real leader, a leader of real moment, will make his tactics dependent not on the temporary spirit of the masses, but on the inexorable laws of historical development. He will steer his course by these laws in defiance of all disappointments and he will rely on history to bring about gradual maturing of his actions.

Relying on history does not mean that objective laws reduce men to robots. Man is the product of social conditions which are *created* by him, and he can *change* them and *himself* in the process of strug-

gle. But it does mean a knowledge of those laws—a study of society—a sense of history which will nudge us to remember that one never knows how near one is to the next step forward. That next step comes faster as one realizes that commitment in politics must mean a commitment to living people as they are—warts, TV sets and all. In other words, a significant Left cannot be built, in my judgment, by those who are so pure in heart that they disdain the present framework within which much of the future Left is still contained.

On the other hand, the Left cannot be built if, in working within existing organizations, movements and institutions, it accommodates itself to things-as-they-are and fails to advance—step by step—a greater radical consciousness. The capacity of capitalism to absorb rebels, to coopt them—or intimidate them—has to be understood if it is to be resisted. "In short," says the Draft Program of the Communist Party, "everywhere and constantly we urge that the popular movements place their reliance on their own independent strength, vigilance and mobilization. We work for a coalition of popular movements on the elementary ground that unity multiplies their strength and should also encourage their independence." When, for instance, black power is united with working-class power, there is no power which can withstand that strength.

One can understand why young people, generalizing only from their immediate experiences, conclude that the working class is not decisive to ensure social change. But some of the older spokesmen for "New Politics," such as those who wrote the Declaration of Principles submitted to the Conference on Power and Politics, should have acquired a better sense of our society and recognized that one cannot dismiss the working class if that future community of "compassionate political solidarity" is to be created.

I would not oversimplify the problem. Certainly, 25 years of relative prosperity for a large section of the working class, has produced the contrast of a new movement of social protest developing at a time when the political consciousness of the organized sector of the class is dulled and political initiative is sluggish. Nevertheless, I would emphasize, that in a modern industrial country no substantial change can be made which does not include those who have the power to affect the economy decisively—and therefore the society that rests upon it.

In a sense, I am saying what both Stokely Carmichael and Reverend Martin Luther King urge: go into your own white communities and your labor movement and overcome the narrow prejudices there. They add to black militants: the job must also be done in that com-

munity. I would add: recognize the ever-present tensions and conflict of working class life, and the creative potential of that class, black and white, when it is aroused and conscious.

To understand our society is to grapple with its central contradiction, that between socialized production and private appropriation. In economics this is demonstrated by the fact that manufacturing profits jumped by 81 per cent since 1961 while wages rose only by 20 per cent and labor costs per unit of production declined, thanks to mechanization, automation and cybernation. We now have obsolete humans, including youngsters who have never had a job and whose chances for getting one is decreasing—with the Negro and Mexican-American bearing the main burden. When, therefore, the steel, rubber and auto workers' unions in their contract negotiations fight against the Administration's 3.2 productivity limit on wage increases, the Left should not stay aloof, but recognize in words and deeds that this fight for full employment and the shorter work week is part of the overall fight for jobs.

What I'm getting at, of course, is that the main enemy today is monopoly capital, not the liberal, or even the famed social democrat. When the Left is leading a movement strong enough to contest for state power, the liberal—and yes, the social democrat—can well be the main danger. But that is not the fact today. Has the acceptance of anti-Communist rhetoric on the part of the liberal and some socialists aided the growth of the ultra-Right? Yes. Has it encouraged the acceptance of aggression against national liberation struggles and against the socialist world? Of course, it has. Further, it is true that the liberals will vacillate, temporize and retreat—but when there is a strong and independent Left, the liberal will vacillate in that direction more often than not. *Ramparts* magazine suggests that there is no danger from an ultra-Right movement because big business does not need that aspect of class rule as yet. I have no faith in their capacity to make the right decisions. History pokes its finger at us to remember that when reaction was not stopped in its preparatory stage, its ultimate victory was assured. And that job cannot be done by the Left alone.

Left unity is not a thing-in-itself. It is directly related to the unity of a far broader movement, to defend and extend the democratic rights of today's world. As this is done, today's defensive struggles can merge into the offensive battles, not only against the ultras who would shift the arena further Right than the present status quo, but against the status quo itself. However, we believe that sharp conflict against extreme reaction is one way in which the millions

can be brought to realize that the role of the moderates in the Establishment is either temporizing or treacherous.

The elections demonstrated that the ultras in both parties utilized bigotry as a deliberate organizing and mobilizing device. One gives lip service to the struggle for equality if there is no recognition that a Ronald Reagan lacked only the Southern accent of a Bo Calloway or a Lester Maddox—and that the whiplash uses the Negro as the Nazis used the Jews.

Now, I have a sneaking suspicion that Mr. Scheer and *Ramparts* agree with me. If he did not differentiate between liberals and reactionaries, if he saw no difference between the two parties, how can one explain his enlisting the support and enthusiasm and work of all those fine young people behind his candidacy in the Democratic primary? Or does he now say that because he had his whirl in politics and didn't win, the primary is no longer useful as a medium for others to challenge the Establishment?

In short, I am urging a radical policy not for the sake of thundering invectives at the Establishment, but in order to produce a radical transformation of the society. A young Left of radical intellectuals is needed that can help produce the new theoretical generalizations from the specifics of today's struggles in today's world. A young Left is needed to help build a mass radical movement which unites the actives in the ghetto and the campus and the community and the shop in militant united struggle. But we need that compassionate political solidarity in action right now.

If even the present Left and progressive forces unite, our differences can be combined to produce a symphony, not a cacaphony. Then, in 1968, independent candidates can run as a meaningful alternative to a Johnson against a Nixon, a Rafferty against a Yorty. In three words, *The Movement*, a SNCC paper, analyzes the elections: "Don't mourn, organize." I agree.

One particular insidious promotion of Left disunity, which is very fashionable among enemies of the Left, attempts to drive a wedge between the "Old Left" and the "New Left." In reality, there is one Left, new and old, with all the variations and differences we have noted. One compelling reason for Left unity is to maximize Left strength by the most effective fusion of new and old.

*Draft Program, CPUSA, p. 116.*

## New Study of U.S. Finance Capital

The process of concentration of capital becomes more and more far-reaching and complex. Its general characteristic in the present century is embraced in the concept of finance capital, analyzed by such Marxists as Hilferding, crystallized and put in the proper political context by Lenin. Since Lenin wrote on finance capital in 1916, it has developed quantitatively and qualitatively, especially with the emergence of state monopoly capitalism as the general structural environment since World War II.

The merging of financial and industrial capital into huge economic empires is vividly exemplified in the case of Japan, where the *Nihon Keizai Shimbun* (Japan Economic Journal) has been running a series of articles analyzing the composition and mode of operation of each of the "Zaibatsu" finance-capitalist groups which dominate that country's economy. There the role of these groups, their leading part in the elaborate state monopoly capitalist structure which provides a higher level of control over all the private empires, is an open matter, which the masters of capital do not find it necessary to conceal. In fact, the Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo and other groups boast of their vast scope.

In the United States matters are different. During the nineteen thirties U.S. finance capital was exposed and analyzed in great detail, became the target of attack of the loose labor-farmer-petty-bourgeois coalition which became a factor in the reform politics of the time. The financial oligarchy was subjected to certain legislative restrictions, essentially pinpricks, yet warnings of possible severe blows to come.

In the postwar reactionary assault, finance capital struck back at this coalition on all fronts. Ideologically it tried to wipe out the very concept of finance capital. A string of apologists, including James Burnham, A. A. Berle, Jr., Gardiner Means, and Marcus Nadler claimed that structural changes had put an end to finance capital, substituting such concepts as "managerial revolution," the industrial corporation "with a soul," and "peoples capitalism." Similar revisionism, with a "radical" coating, is purveyed by Paul Sweezy, who himself once participated in the concrete analysis of U.S. finance capital.

Because of the traditional anti-monopoly and anti-banker sentiments of the American people, the capitalists go to great lengths not only to confuse the issue ideologically, but also to conceal all details

of the structure, operations, and interrelationships of the American financial-industrial empires, and of their key owning families.

The author of this article attempted to cut through this fog of concealment in his book written a decade ago, *Empire of High Finance*. Now we have an extremely important contribution, *Millionaires and Managers*, by the Soviet economist, Stanislav Menshikov.\*

How could a Soviet economist penetrate deeply into the inner structure of the U.S. economy? Menshikov brought the following assets to bear:

- Detailed analysis of published American economic material, with the assistance of members of the staff of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations in Moscow.
- Energetic study of SEC records, and other primary materials in the United States.
- Personal discussions with key members of the U.S. oligarchy, as an exchange student in the United States.
- A solid adherence to the basic teachings of Marx and Lenin, combined with a strong antipathy to dogma. Menshikov is a leader of that school of Soviet economists which has contributed to a new realism in the Marxist understanding of contemporary capitalism.

### *Evolution of the Financial Oligarchy*

The separation of the capital function from capital ownership, an objective law of development of finance capital, is distorted by the apologists to serve as "evidence" for their "managerial revolution" theories. Menshikov explores this phenomenon afresh, at a time when the socialization of production is intensified on an establishment scale, on an enterprise scale, and especially on the scale of the whole economy, crossing industry lines, with central accounting through banks.

As the function of capital management gets more complicated, more and more there develop special categories of workers who take over from the capitalist the function of administration and fulfill this function for him. In some cases, an owner of the control block of stock may also serve as an administrator. However, in that case he is paid a special salary for this work, aside from his dividend income. He is carrying on a dual function, as administrator and as owner. But this becomes relatively less frequent. Increasingly the top corporate administrator appears as a glorified hired office worker, while the capitalist preserves factual control.

\* S. M. Menshikov, *Millioneri i Menedzheri, sovremennaya struktura financovoye oligarchii* CSHA, Muisl publishers, Moscow, 1965, 455 pages. 1 r. 55 k.

Broadening out his interests, the big capitalist manages his investment portfolio, clips coupons. After awhile, perhaps in the second or third generation, he finds even this too burdensome and ineffective today, when financial management, like industrial management, requires highly specialized expertise. He hires a bank or financial counselor to handle his investments, while he occupies himself according to his tastes—business or politics, stock market speculation or sports, collecting art or women, etc. Thus a tendency to parasitism of the ruling elite is an inevitable law of development of modern capitalism. But this tendency is countered and limited by another.

The finance capitalist is not simply a rentier. He is also the head of a vast industrial-banking empire. He is concerned not only with his own sphere, but also with the function of the entire economy from which he drains profits, above all with perpetuating and aiding the expansion of the realm which makes possible the existence of his own empire. Thus the vital interest of the top capitalists in the state, in its foreign and domestic policies.

Of course, big capitalists have been key men in the American state from the days of Alexander Hamilton, and not a few presidents were chosen by the original Morgan and Rockefeller. But there is something qualitatively new in the extent to which the members of the ruling families *themselves* personally take over the key positions in the state apparatus. Currently two third-generation Rockefeller brothers are governors, while a fourth-generation Rockefeller is a state legislator. One of the governors has occupied various top federal posts, and still hopes to be President. Other Standard Oil heirs are or recently have been members of Congress. Top members of the group, themselves owning significant fortunes by now, McCloy and Black, are advisors to the President on European and Asian affairs, respectively, not to mention the hired Rockefeller functionaries, Dean Rusk and Maxwell Taylor, serving as Secretary of State and top military advisor to the President. The Kennedy family provides another well-known example of the active political leadership by the plutocrats themselves, as do the du Pont and Reynolds family members on the board of CIA-financed Radio Free Europe.

On the whole, Menshikov shows the weight of the plutocracy in the country's affairs rises. Relatively few families of the old oligarchy lose out, while more are added. The top circles expand numerically and in their domination of the nation's wealth and income. Menshikov supports this with a concrete analysis of income and wealth distribution, and an analysis of the different forms in which the oligarchy receive surplus value. A weakness in his analysis is his use

of the official figures of capital gains income (*prodazhi tzennui bumag*) as shown under the category "adjusted gross income" in the Internal Revenue Service reports (e.g., his table, p. 21). The actual income from this source is about double the amount shown in the reports, and in 1958 constituted the largest single source of income for all groups with incomes over \$200,000. The importance of capital gains has continued to increase, and the 1963 returns show it to be the largest single source for all groups with incomes over \$100,000, and to account for over two-thirds of the income of those with incomes over \$1,000,000. Also, it may be somewhat misleading to refer to this as income from "speculation" (p. 23). The possession of all vital business information minimizes the risk of the top oligarchy in stock market activities. Furthermore, a substantial part of the gains from stock transactions results from the arrangement of financial operations of the companies to pay out the profits in this form, with its low tax rate, rather than as dividends. This technical correction does not invalidate Menshikov's essential results.

He also presents a set of estimates of the personal fortunes of the American plutocracy, broken down into the old families (p. 67) and the new multimillionaires (pp. 72-73). This is the most complete attempt in decades, and the ranges given in the tables appear reasonable, insofar as they fit in with the knowledge of this reviewer.

Menshikov deals substantially with the role of control blocks of stocks, and with the forms and importance of profits of control—the concept presented in *Empire of High Finance*. Through the aggregation of such blocks of stock, control can be exercised over large corporations, and a major share of the profits appropriated with a relatively small investment. Moreover, the larger the company the smaller the relative size of the block necessary for control.

### *The Managers*

Menshikov's book includes the first really detailed Marxist study of the role of the managers. Going beyond the familiar polemics against the theory of the Managerial Revolution, he attempts a scientific analysis of the stratification of administrative personnel, and of their varied relationships to the financial oligarchy.

Part of a manager's salary represents payment for his labor, the remainder is a segment of the surplus value extracted from the workers under his command. The top administrators, engaged in manipulating departments and controlling the flow of profits, cannot be regarded as contributing to production. All of their income is a share of that taken from the enterprise's workers, as well as by expropriation

of the capital of small rivals forced to the wall.

Typically then, the manager's salary consists partly or wholly of profits in a disguised form. In addition, he gets a big hidden income in expense accounts, stock options, etc. At the higher echelons he may become a substantial stockholder, ultimately participating as part of the big bourgeoisie. But even the top administrators rarely obtain control of blocks of stock, and remain in a subordinate position to the financial oligarchy. In fact, the existence of an administrative bureaucracy, which gives the appearance of "management control," tightens control by the financial oligarchy:

The further proceeds the separation of capital-ownership from capital-function, the greater is the capacity of the capital of the plutocracy to take to itself other peoples' capital and the less is the relative minimum "control block" which is necessary. The development of a corporate bureaucracy adds to the power of the finance capitalists which results from their ownership of "control blocks," increases the "control effectiveness" of the blocks, permits reducing them to a minimum. The dictatorship of the top managers over the mass of stockholders is only a form of existence of the maximum development of the dictatorship of finance capitalists (p. 195).

#### *Banking and Industrial Monopolies*

Menshikov details the complex structure of financial establishments, their varied role as the power centers of finance capital. He calculates that the weight of financial institutions in share ownership or disposition has increased from around 33-35 per cent in 1954 (cited estimate of Perlo) to 44 per cent in 1962. Undoubtedly, since 1962, the process has gone forward still more rapidly, with the geometric growth of stock holdings of pension funds and mutual funds at the disposal of the banks and related financial institutions.

Menshikov concludes that this large share is enough "to secure full control over industry on the part of the united banking capital of the country" (p. 235). The actuality of this controlling share in each case depends on widely differing conditions, but 40 per cent is characteristic of the biggest industrial companies. After examining the ways in which control is exercised, he concludes, "Thus the banks more and more fulfill the functions of industrial monopolies, precisely as the latter in progressive degrees fulfill the role of banks" (p. 253).

This linking of the two directions of merging is particularly important. Apologetic propaganda emphasizes the situations where giant industrial corporations accumulate huge reserves, and themselves act as bankers within certain limits. Omitting or underestimating the opposite cases, where giant corporations rely on big banks and insurance

companies, they deny the reality of a financial oligarchy. In so doing they distort the concept, as if it signified the one-sided domination of banks over industry, whereas the real concept, as used by Lenin, is the merging of the two. The domination of banking capital over industrial capital is one of the paths by which finance-capitalist empires emerge. At other times the route is through industrial monopolies getting command over investment banks or other financial establishments.

Recently a different route, not discussed as such by Menshikov, has become prominent. Existing empires of finance capital are strengthened, and new ones formed, through the "conglomerate merger." By this device, one industrial corporation with powerful capital resources acquires a large number of other industrial corporations in a wide variety of fields. While some may be related, the general principle is diversification—the creation of a net of establishments selling to a wide variety of markets. This reduces cyclical instability, permits a certain amount of centralized research, selling and administration, especially significant with the modern electronic computer. Above all, it provides for centralized finance—the ability to maneuver funds between the various lines of business, and on the part of the control group to make financial killings in the process of each merger.

These conglomerate mergers are also favored because they are generally exempt from anti-trust prosecution, since they do not acquire technical monopolies over major product lines. They have tax and financing advantages from common control of a series of separate corporations. Conglomerate mergers are promoted by the increase and ramification of the armament business, which gives rise to fresh blocks of capital seeking investment. An example is Litton Industries, whose sales grew from \$125 million in 1959 to more than \$1,250 million in 1967, a tenfold multiplication in eight years, mainly through such acquisitions. In this case a grouping of lesser financiers, working with Chase Manhattan and other established financial powers, has established its own little empire, partly independent, but simultaneously dependent on Wall Street centers to finance its acquisitions.

The Midland-Ross Corporation is an example of a conglomerate merger in which one financial center, the Cleveland group, has joined various industrial enterprises within its orbit, and added others, enlarging and tightening its centralized control over one portion of its sphere of influence.

Menshikov effectively disposes of the myths of the decline in influence of commercial banks and investment bankers. He quotes extensively from Robert Lehman on the role of the investment banker, who,

according to Lehman "must be the grandmaster of the industrial chessboard of our time" (p. 269).

### *The New York Financial Groups*

The latter part of the book is devoted largely to a detailed analysis of the New York financial groups, with a listing of the corporations under the control of each of them. A new feature is Menshikov's attempt to estimate the relative distribution of power in industrial corporations where several groups share control. Thus, he estimates that the Socony Mobil Oil Company is two-fifths controlled by the Rockefeller-Chase Manhattan Bank group, one-third by the Morgan group, and one-fifth by the First National City Bank group—the remaining fraction presumably accruing to lesser influences. Obviously such estimates are subject to wide margins of error. However, in this reviewer's opinion, the totality of Menshikov's estimates of this type adds to our knowledge of the structure of corporate control.

Summary accounts of the leading "provincial groups" are also given. The groups generally coincide with those defined in *Empire of High Finance*, but several additional groups are identified, and somewhat more detail is presented for certain of the groups. There are some major changes in classification, but no more than might be expected owing to actual changes in the time interval between the two books. In the substantial majority of cases, the assignment of major influence on a given corporation is the same in both works. There follows a comparison of the value of assets controlled by various groups, as estimated by Perlo and Menshikov:

<i>Interest Group</i>	<i>Assets Controlled</i> <i>(billions of dollars)</i>	
	Perlo	Menshikov
Morgan	65.3	69.9
Rockefeller	61.4	63.0
First National City Bank	13.2	22.1
du Pont	16.0	8.4
Mellon	10.5	15.6
Cleveland	15.7	18.8
Chicago	22.0	37.1
Bank of America	14.4	29.0

One difference is the relatively slow growth shown for the Morgan and Rockefeller groups, slower than the general growth in corporate assets during the seven-year interval. This is due largely to a difference in method of accounting. Perlo, except in a few cases of roughly

equal distribution of power, assigned each company to the group with the largest single interest. Menshikov allocated shares to various groups. This tended to reduce the relative importance of the two largest groups and to increase the relative statistical importance of the other groups, now more likely to be credited with assets resulting from minority participation in control over various corporations in which the Morgan or Rockefeller groups have the largest influence.

The especially fast growth shown by the Bank of America group undoubtedly reflects an actual increase in its relative strength associated with the continued growth of California's economy. The sharp decline in the du Pont position reflects the forced divestment of that group from control of General Motors, and the corresponding weakening of its position in the Detroit banks. However, Menshikov notes, in selling shares in these companies, the du Ponts acquired huge funds with which to expand holdings in other areas and thereby create new power positions. Undoubtedly these will come to view in due course.

Menshikov's estimates of the amount of assets controlled by various lesser financial groups, in and out of New York, for which earlier estimates are not available, are of interest:

<i>Interest Group</i>	<i>Assets, 1962</i> <i>(billions of dollars)</i>
Manufacturers Hanover Trust	\$12.2
Sullivan and Cromwell-Marine Midland	8.9
Lehman Brothers-Goldman Sachs-Lazard Freres	5.8
Harriman-Newmont Mining	5.0
Dillon Read	1.7
Ford	8.9
Boston	24.4
Kerby	6.7
Texas	18.9
Crocker-Wells Fargo-Security Trust	19.7
Minneapolis-Saint Paul	10.2
Saint Louis	7.8
Hartford	14.2
Detroit	11.6

Several of these are newly identified by Menshikov as more or less independent groups. In common with Perlo, he does not identify an independent Philadelphia group, regarding the main Philadelphia banks as part of the Morgan group. Only summary statements are presented about most of the regional groups, insufficient to judge the

quality of the identification and estimate of the scope of these groups.

Menshikov probably has examined more exhaustively than most previous researchers the data on which to base the assignment of companies to interest groups. However, in view of the secrecy with which the decisive material is shrouded, much depends in the last analysis on the researcher's judgment. So Menshikov's data cannot be regarded as the "last word," quite aside from the objective changes that are taking place continually.

### *On the Nature of Financial Interest Groups*

Menshikov contributes significantly to the theory of the nature, functioning, and limitations of the financial-oligarchic groups. He states that the financial group is a "higher, more developed stage of monopolization of production and circulation than any other form of private monopolistic amalgamation" (p. 293). It goes beyond, and combines the operations of such forms as cartels, syndicates and trusts. At the same time, the mode of coordination of the segments of the group is often more delicate and intangible, less formal and precise, than in the case of the simpler types. There has been an evolution of group structure and of the method of control of companies. As corporations become larger, and the financial-industrial interlocks more complex, the size of the block of stock necessary for control is reduced. Simultaneously, very wealthy families spread their ownership not only among controlled companies, but among those outside their sphere of direct domination. The financial empire dominated by a single family tends to be superseded by unions of several or many families, amalgamating the common interests of their fortunes (p. 317).

Interlocking arrangements involving several financial centers become the norm, as in the banking syndicates which handle the financing requirements of the giant corporations. Correspondingly, there develops within the financial oligarchy, the tendency towards the formation of condominiums, i.e., the joint control by several financial groups over monopolies, the sharing of spheres of influence inside trusts and concerns (p. 318).

However amorphous the structure and indistinct the boundaries of the financial groups, they represent definite enterprises putting out particular products, trading definite commodities, transferring definite goods between definite geographic points, banks having definite locations, etc. The financial group, then, has a dual role, as a banking-industrial complex fastened together by a union of interests or common control, and as a real conglomeration of enterprises in the areas

of production, circulation, credit, social accounting. The first role concerns the area of production relations of contemporary capitalism, the second, the area of its productive forces. To the extent that actual production coordination occurs within these groups, there is a potential for colossal economy of social labor, which under capitalism is usurped by the peak monopolists. This tendency, in turn, is contradicted by counterforces, new expressions of the contradictions between productive forces and capitalist production relations (p. 320).

### *For Further Study*

No single work can possibly exhaust this complex and dynamic subject. In suggesting areas for further research, therefore, I am not minimizing Menshikov's contribution in the work under review.

One particular question calling for further examination is the changing role and relationships of the Morgan and Rockefeller groups, those top groups of American finance capital for the past three-quarters of a century. From Menshikov's discussion, it appears that the Morgan-Guaranty group has become less closely controlled, more amorphous than formerly, while the Rockefeller-Chase Manhattan group retains more of a close-knit character. Menshikov's statistics suggest no further change in the balance of power between these two groups during the past decade. But do the statistics convey the full, or even the main aspects, of the picture? Has the earlier situation of relative parity continued, or have the Rockefeller-led interests emerged as the most powerful single segment of the oligarchy, and one with a decidedly aggressive orientation in the all-important area of foreign policy? By posing these questions, I do not suggest affirmative answers, but merely sufficient *prima facie* evidence to warrant more thorough study.

Much more work is called for on the various regional groups. Soviet economists have published articles dealing with Texas and California interests, and presumably there is a considerable body of unpublished material underlying Menshikov's presentation of these groups.

Among the more general theoretical questions, attention should be focussed on the role of the financial oligarchy and the major interest groups in the mushrooming "multinational corporations" through which U.S. imperialism is staking claim to much of the world's economy. This is bringing with it a substantial increase in the concentration of economic and political power in the hands of a few of the very strongest groups, as well as a corresponding expansion in their super-profits. Details of this process should be examined, along with its

effects domestically and in the relations between the U.S. oligarchy and those of other countries.

Menshikov deals but sparingly with the place of the financial oligarchy and the interest groups in state monopoly capitalism, which has now become an all-pervasive feature of U.S. economic life. This question was dealt with somewhat more fully in *Empire of High Finance*, as in C. Wright Mills' *Power Elite*, and in the reviewer's *Militarism and Industry*. Here also much more is required, especially in examining the specific relationships of the state, the mushrooming aerospace and other armaments-oriented industries, the Pentagon, and the peak financial interests. In other words, there is need for a Marxist study of the "military-industrial complex."

Since the TNEC hearings of 1939-40, there has been no really thorough, deeply probing, study of U.S. finance capital with legal authority to pry open the secret records of the oligarchy. Thereby, the financial autocrats are permitted to continue ruling and robbing the country through what amounts to an underground network of power, violating the spirit, and probably in a hundred ways the letter, of the substantial body of anti-monopoly laws which came into being during nearly a century of anti-trust struggles.

These facts are kept so well hidden because their exposure, given the "free enterprise" traditions of Americans, would have an explosive effect on political attitudes, contribute to broadening the ranks of the country's progressive forces, to curbing the dangerous international depredations of finance capital and to the solution of the nation's increasingly urgent domestic sore spots.

Publication and widespread distribution of Menshikov's book in English will help to awaken the demand for such an "opening of the books." Aside from that, it is a major contribution to the Marxist-Leninist theory and description of contemporary capitalist economic institutions, as they have evolved in the strongest imperialist country.

Help spread the influence of *Political Affairs*. Get a new reader from among your shopmates, your neighbors, your friends.

## The Fascist-Military Coup in Greece

For the first time since the defeat of the Hitler armies in World War II, a fascist-military dictatorship has been imposed on a country in the Western "free world." In the pre-dawn hours of April 21, 1967, while the people slept, a clique of Right-wing, pro-monarchist army officers seized control of the central government in Greece and swiftly established its domination in every major city, town and hamlet of this small Mediterranean land.

Unleashing a reign of unbridled terror and repression, the military junta tore up the country's constitution, dissolved Parliament, removed local mayors, and outlawed nearly 300 organizations of the people, including the United Democratic Left Party (EDA), the Lambrakis Youth Organization, the National Union of Greek Students and scores of local labor unions accused of "leaning" toward the Left. Strikes, meetings and demonstrations were summarily forbidden under threat that these "illegal" activities would be broken up by "force of arms." Martial law was declared and military tribunals set up to try all "enemies fighting the new regime." Newspapers of the Left were banned and the entire press placed under heavy censorship.

In a matter of days, over 8,000 political leaders were imprisoned—members of Parliament, leaders and activists of democratic organizations and trade unions, newspaper writers and editors. Thousands were hurriedly shipped to concentration camps on a desolate island, some forty miles from the mainland. Included in the round-up was the 80-year-old former Premier George Papandreaou and his son Andreas, himself a prominent member of Parliament and a special target of the ultra-Right. Outstanding leaders of the United Democratic Left were thrown in jail, with the life of such world-renowned anti-Nazi resistance heroes as Manolis Glezos, released from prison only a few years ago, in grave danger.

In the name of "preventing a Communist take-over"—the phony banner reaction unfurls wherever the people resist despotic rule—the fascist-monarchist coup has destroyed the last remnant of democracy left in Greece.

Needless to say there was no "threat" of a Communist take-over. The coup was carried through to circumvent Parliamentary elections scheduled to take place on May 28. There was widespread expectation that in these elections the Rightist parties, supported by the

Royal Court, the financial oligarchy and the army officer clique, would go down to defeat, and the Center Union Party—the moderately liberal political organization—would be returned to power with a larger majority than it had received in February, 1964. It was generally assumed, too, that the United Democratic Left, which had 22 deputies in the dissolved Parliament, would increase its representation substantially. Under these conditions, a coup was the only way to forestall what in the eyes of the domestic reactionary cabal and its imperialist backers would be a major catastrophe.

#### *U.S. Collusion in the Military Coup*

With cynical hypocrisy, Washington big-wigs worked overtime to create the impression that the fascist-military seizure was planned and executed without knowledge of the Royal Court, the U.S. Embassy, the CIA and the Pentagon. Every effort has been made to prove that the 27-year-old monarch, King Constantine, was embarrassed by the coup and only went along reluctantly to avoid "civil war." The Johnson Administration assured the American public that it had expressed its "strong disapproval" and was pressing for a return to the Constitution. The foremost champion of "freedom and democracy" could not openly embrace an outright fascist-military regime without "protestations."

Actual events belied these sanctimonious White House pretensions to innocence. *The Nation* (May 8, 1967) stated editorially, "Washington's involvement in the coup explains the current campaign to dissociate the King from the junta and to make it appear that he had no direct responsibility for the illegal events."

Greece had been a private preserve of U.S. imperialism for two decades. Since March 12, 1947, when former President Harry S. Truman went before a joint session of Congress to ask for an emergency appropriation of \$250 million to aid the Greek monarchy crush an alleged "Communist threat," Greece has been a major recipient of U.S. economic and military aid. In twenty years, \$3.5 billion of U.S. taxpayers' money has been spent to bolster Greek reaction and thwart the democratic will of the people. There, as in Vietnam and other strategically located areas, U.S. aid was given lavishly, not to alleviate the people's hunger, but to transform the country into a key military outpost in the cold war.

Since 1947, the United States has sought to build up the Greek army and to entrench its Right-wing officer clique. Today, the Greek army is essentially a U.S. puppet army, trained equipped and

supervised by the Pentagon as a pro-monarchist bulwark against the forces of democracy and progress in the Mediterranean. Its general staff consists of men bought and paid for with U.S. dollars, with closest ties to the Pentagon. The Greek army could not make a single move without the knowledge of U.S. military personnel, the CIA and the Embassy.

The men in Washington have kept constant surveillance over developments in Greece. Marquis Childs, in his column in the *New York Post* (May 15, 1967) noted that already in mid-February a top secret meeting, held in Washington, was attended by representatives from the Pentagon, the CIA and the State Department—"all the powers dealing with the Greece problem." Intelligence reports at the session, he revealed, clearly indicated that "a military coup was in the making."

C. L. Sulzberger, enthused over the "dazzling efficiency" and "brilliant" execution of the "bloodless" coup, admitted that a detailed plan for such a military coup had been in existence for many years under the code-name "Prometheus" (*New York Times*, May 3, 1967). Originally drafted under NATO direction in 1950, as a "general staff contingency plan" in the event of "war with a Communist country," it was implemented and modernized in 1965 to prevent a "Communist coup d'etat." The plan provided, Mr. Sulzberger tells us, for the taking over of "key administrative and communication centers" and the speedy arrest of "Communist" leaders "to prevent underground subversion." There is little doubt this long-standing conspiracy for a military take-over was not only well known in Washington, but was prepared at its instigation, to be set into motion when events in Greece "got out of hand." Clearly, it served as the blueprint for the coup of April 21.

Many correspondents both at home and abroad, have insisted the coup could not have taken place without U.S. knowledge and direct U.S. involvement. Some have intimated the CIA was behind the take-over, in fact, had engineered it. Thus Drew Pearson wrote (*New York Post*, May 1, 1967):

Part of Greece's political uncertainty has been due to Central Intelligence. Ellis Briggs, U.S. Ambassador who served in Greece during the Karamanlis days, has written a book in which he bluntly states that he never knew what Central Intelligence was doing and that the CIA man had more money to spend than the American Embassy. Other observers have noted that the CIA secretly intervened in Greek elections, and more recently the CIA has been given responsibility for the military coup.

After the recent exposures of the sordid activities of the CIA in one country after another, this should come as no surprise. Greece, like a number of other countries, was literally crawling with CIA agents disguised as business representatives, U.S. aid personnel, military advisers and embassy attaches. Such coups are the main stock-in-trade of the CIA, when bribery and corruption do not suffice to attain U.S. imperialist objectives.

### *Truman Doctrine Launches Cold War*

The Truman Doctrine of 1947 in Greece was the opening gun in the cold war and in U.S. imperialism's drive for world domination. Under the guise of "containing Communism" and "defending democracy," it embarked on a course of open intervention in the internal affairs of any country where it felt its interests jeopardized, to impose, or maintain in power, governments that would be subservient to its dictates. Sulzberger admits this when he writes (April 23, 1967):

The United States has special interest in Greece and a commitment that transcends even the close bonds of the NATO alliance. The Truman Doctrine was first applied in Greece. It was there that U.S. military forces under General James Van Fleet, although on a relatively small scale, were introduced to counsel and help an army fighting in another hemisphere. By insisting that he would not permit Communism to upset Greek democratic forms, we established a precedent for our subsequent and far more intensive activities in Vietnam.

There it is in a nutshell! It was in Greece, in 1947, that U.S. imperialism first assumed its role of world policeman. And as in Vietnam today, it intervened not to protect "democratic forms" but to destroy Greek democracy. U.S. imperialism intervened in Greece to maintain the monarchy that had fled in exile, abandoning the people to the Hitler occupation, and was brought back to Greece under the protection of British gunfire. U.S. imperialism intervened in Greece to protect a totalitarian regime that was murdering and imprisoning tens of thousands of anti-fascist resistance fighters—the men and women who had waged the guerrilla war against the Hitler fascists. William L. Shirer depicted the true character of the men in power in Greece, whom U.S. imperialism rushed to defend in that fateful year:

... There are men prominent in the Greek Government who collaborated with the Nazis and others who did nothing to oppose

them. Army leadership has been recruited almost exclusively from the Royalists, most of whom regard even a conservative Republican as a "Communist." Quisling forces formed by the Germans to fight non-collaborationist Greeks have been incorporated into the new Greek Army. The police force in Greece is substantially the same that served the dreaded Metaxas dictatorship and later the Germans. (*Herald Tribune*, April 20, 1947.)

Thus, only two years after World War II, the United States intervened on the side of reaction in Greece against a popular uprising of the people seeking to establish a democratic republic. The people were fighting to prevent the imposition of a dictatorship, reminiscent of 1936, when King George II called upon General John Metaxas to head a terrorist regime a la Hitler, to quell the rising anti-fascist movement of that day and keep the country under its iron heel. Communists were in the forefront of that struggle, as they were during the years of the guerrilla war against the Nazis. But the issue in 1947 was not communism. Then, as now, the struggle in Greece was between feudal reaction and democracy. The EAM—the national liberation front—representing the broad popular unity of all democratic and Left forces that had resisted the Nazi occupation—called for a national coalition government representative of all political parties, in which the Greek resistance would have a voice. It was precisely such a government that first the British, and then the U.S. imperialists, were determined to prevent. No wonder, Leland Stowe, veteran foreign correspondent, whose sympathy was always with the Greek people, wrote with bitterness (*New Republic*, September 15, 1947):

What began as a plot to bar all leftists from the Greek government and to make Greece a monarchy, whether her people wanted it or not, has crystallized into unqualified domination by the most reactionary and anti-democratic elements in Greece. The middle and most truly democratic parties have been decimated, discredited and demoralized. Churchill's victory is complete—and neatly underwritten by hundreds of millions of American dollars. It could only be slightly more complete if Hitler or Franco himself had engineered it. . . .

### *Greece Becomes U.S. Military Outpost*

U.S. imperialism intervened in the small country of Greece for what it considered to be big stakes. In its overall global strategy Greece was the gateway to the Black Sea and thus to the Soviet

Union. Greece was soon to become the Southeastern flank of NATO in the circle of "containment" around the socialist world, and its territorial waters and ports would be used by the U.S. Sixth Fleet to police the Mediterranean. U.S. imperialism needed Greece as a military base aimed at the national liberation movements of the Middle East. It was not concern for democracy, but for control of Middle East oil that prompted U.S. imperialism to make Greece "safe" for its operations. Sulzberger, who often couches his interpretations of world events with a democratic facade, was somewhat franker in 1947. Writing on March 5, 1947, he defended U.S. dollar interests with his own version of the domino theory:

The United States interest in Greece is not mere sentiment. Greece controls eastern Mediterranean strategy. Should Greece turn Communist, Turkey would be politically outflanked and could no longer resist a pressure that already is onerous. Without Turkey, Iran would go under.

The United States has a powerful concern in the Middle East because in that area is Saudi Arabia and in Saudi Arabia there probably is more oil than in the United States' proved reserves.

Was it mere coincidence that the Truman Doctrine, as Victor Perlo points out (*American Imperialism*, International Publishers, 1951, p. 177), was proclaimed just a day "after consummation of the agreement whereby the kingpins of the Rockefeller oil empire, Standard Oil (N.J.) and Socony-Vacuum, were cut in on the Arabian oil bonanza?"

#### *U.S. Imperialism Supports Rightist Regime*

Today, Greece is a virtual protectorate of the United States. Little of any consequence takes place in its political arena without the knowledge and/or approval of the U.S. Embassy. With vast financial resources and a personnel running into the hundreds at its command, U.S. imperialism has penetrated the political and economic life of the country. With the help of the army it has maintained in power the extreme Right-wing of the political spectrum—the National Radical Union (ERE), composed of the most rabid pro-monarchist and pro-fascist elements within the country, representing the financial oligarchy and the Royal Court.

When, for example in 1961 it appeared that the developing democratic camp, among whom the United Democratic Left (EDA) and the illegal Communist Party had considerable influence, were becom-

ing strong enough to challenge the Rightist regime of Konstantine Karamanlis, the United States did not shrink from conniving with the monarchy, the extremists within and outside the army, to rig the 1961 elections. Indeed, the CIA, noted for manipulating "free elections" in such countries as France and Italy, not to mention Latin America, was given "credit" for extending the life of the shaky regime of Karamanlis by another two years.

But even the CIA could not save the Karamanlis regime from the wrath of the people. When it forced through new restrictive legislation, to implement the already severe emergency measures still in force from the days of the civil war, an even more powerful movement of opposition developed. Strikes, rallies, demonstrations, spread from one end of the country to the other, involving all popular sectors of the people—workers, peasants, intellectuals and professionals. The United Democratic Left and the outlawed Communist Party called for the unity of all democratic and anti-fascist forces to resist the legislation and to bring about the downfall of the government.

The breaking point came with the murder of Dr. Grigorious Lambrakis, prominent EDA member of Parliament, on May 22, 1963, in the city of Salonika. Outraged by the political assassination—traced to the neo-fascists who acted in collusion with the ERE and U.S. agents—new sectors of the population were set in motion. Half a million people, headed by the leaders of the EDA and the Center Union, marched in the funeral procession. The wave of indignation that swept the country and the world led directly to the forced resignation of the eleven-year-old Karamanlis government.

With the active participation of the United Democratic Left and the Communists, the Right-wing went down to defeat in November, 1963, and was again repudiated in February, 1964, when the Center Union received nearly 53 per cent of the popular vote and the EDA 12.5 per cent. George Papandreou became the Premier and the new government pledged to "put an end to the regime of counter-revolution" and to rid the country of "internal occupation."

#### *Opposes Moderate Regime Elected by the People*

The U.S. imperialists, deeply alarmed by the strength of the popular democratic and anti-imperialist movement within the country, did not disguise their hostility to the new regime. As Clayton Fritchey pointed out (*New York Post*, April 28, 1967), "The U.S. has never concealed its distaste for Papandreou and his following, just as it has never concealed its rapport with the crown and the army." And

Bernard Nossiter, writing in the *New Republic* (May 20, 1967), revealed that the United States immediately "launched a relentless campaign to undermine Papandreou."

With 65 per cent of the electorate voting against the Rightists, the best interests of Greek democracy required a coalition government involving the United Democratic Left, around a common program to meet the economic and social needs of the people and for measures that would close the path to fascist reaction within the country. But this did not take place. Instead, the Papandreou regime pursued a vacillating policy and failed to adhere to a firm democratic course. While it resisted pressures to form a coalition government with the reactionary National Radical Union (ERE) it pursued a course of compromise and a struggle on two fronts against both Right and Left. Stephen Rousseas, professor of economics at New York University, in an extensive article entitled "The Deadlock in Greece: Elections or Coup?" (*The Nation*, March 27, 1967), in which he did not preclude the possibility of a military coup prior to the elections, described the Papandreou regime as follows:

. . . Papandreou was well known to be a procrastinator, a moderate, a crafty politician and basically pro-royalist. Above all, he was known to be a rabid anti-Communist. It was he, after all, who had prevented the Communist take-over of Greece in 1944 when the British rushed him back to Athens as Prime Minister. . . . Without being asked, he appointed Petros Garoufalias, a beer baron and palace favorite, Minister of Defense; and he made other conservative cabinet appointments.

It is true, he did other things less pleasing to the palace. He broke the control of the rural gendarmerie over the countryside, renegotiated contracts with large foreign monopolies on terms more favorable to Greece, reformed the educational system, and introduced an air of political freedom by severely limiting the political activities of the dossier-keeping security forces, and by proclaiming a general amnesty for political prisoners. . . . If anything, he was playing, or thought he was playing, a clever game of balancing the Right against the Left. The important point is that he allowed the army, long purged of its democratic elements, to remain in the hands of the palace and the extreme Right.

But this middle-of-the-road course did not satisfy the U.S. masters of Greece. They demanded complete subservience. Together with the Royal Court and dominant financial circles, they would brook no easing of reaction's stranglehold over the nation which might endanger the cold-war front in Europe.

*U.S. Behind Political Crisis of July, 1965*

When the efforts to force the Center Union Party to form a coalition government with the Right did not materialize, a series of provocations were instigated to keep the country in perpetual turmoil and thereby hasten the downfall of the Papandreou regime. Everything possible was done to sabotage measures toward democratizing political life in the country and restoring constitutional norms. When legal means did not produce results, reaction resorted to criminal acts to compromise the government. Thus, on November 29, 1964, with 20,000 people assembled from all parts of the country, to commemorate the 22nd anniversary of the blowing up of the Gorgopotamos bridge which cut off Nazi army communications, a bomb exploded. Fourteen people were killed and scores of others injured. In typical U.S. style, the intention was to frame the Left for the perpetration of the crime in order to precipitate a political crisis and compel the Papandreou regime to resign. But the attempt backfired. Instead, it became a byword that the explosion was the handiwork of the CIA, although it was not until August 5, 1965, that the Greek newspaper *Ethnos* confirmed this, by publishing a photostat of a letter sent by the U.S. military attache in Athens to the CIA in Washington discussing the explosion as "Operation Arrow-1." Obviously, this was to have been one in a series of provocations by the CIA dug out of its bag of "dirty tricks."

In the ensuing months events moved rapidly to a showdown. When the Papandreou regime resisted U.S. pressure to resolve the conflict between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus in order to speed up the fortification of the island as a key NATO Mediterranean base; when it concluded an agreement with Bulgaria and moved toward rapprochement with Yugoslavia; when Papandreou accepted an invitation to Moscow—all hell broke loose. U.S. imperialism could not permit the slightest independence on the part of any Greek government. It saw in the steps of the Papandreou regime a threat to the maintenance of Greece as a bulwark against socialism and national liberation in Europe and the Middle East.

Money poured into Greece to "persuade" Center Union deputies to defect and thus force an immediate showdown with the Papandreou government. The Rightists demanded Papandreou's immediate resignation. Then the ace bombshell was dropped. A military tribunal charged 28 young army officers with conspiracy to overthrow the monarchy, alleging that Andreas Papandreou, son of the Premier, was the political mentor of the conspiracy, known as the Aspida affair.

This was an obvious frame-up concocted for the specific purpose of implicating the Papandreou—father and son—to promote a political crisis that would force the downfall of the government. The King, acting with dispatch, instructed the Defense Minister—a Royalist in the Papandreou administration—to investigate the conspiracy.

Only then did the Premier realize that the Rightist domination of the army was endangering his regime. He demanded the removal of the Defense Minister and threatened to purge the army of its Right-wing officers. But this action was too little and too late. On July 15, 1965, the King, with prompting from the U.S. Embassy, forced Papandreou's resignation. This palace coup of July 1965 was deliberately provoked, instigated and financed by U.S. imperialism.

#### *Events Leading to Coup by Military Junta*

For 21 months Greece has been in a political crisis, with one government crisis following the other. Under the guise of establishing stability in the country, the Royal Court has set out to prevent the holding of democratic elections and usurped authority to establish its own puppet regime. After several abortive attempts, enough Center Union deputies were "convinced" to defect to enable the Court to set up a government under Stefanos Staphanopoulos, a deserter from the Center Union Party. The Staphanopoulos government was entirely dependent on the extreme Right—the National Radical Union with its 99 seats and other Right-wing deputies, and with the backing of 44 Center Union deputies bought up with U.S. dollars.

The crisis of July, 1965 touched off a powerful mass movement, with the high point reached in a 24-hour general strike on July 27 joined by 350,000 industrial workers and office employees. Every day, for nearly three months, hundreds of thousands came out into the streets demanding a return to democratic elections and the defeat of the Rightist attempt to impose a police state on the country. As a result, the Staphanopoulos regime was shaky from the start and finally tottered in December, 1966 after it had revived the Aspida affair and gave leeway to the Rightists to demand that Andreas Papandreou be arrested and charged with treason.

The King then gave a mandate to the governor of the National Bank of Greece, Ionnis Paraskevopoulos, to form a new government. When George Papandreou, without consulting his party, called for endorsement of this "caretaker government," he was not supported by most of the deputies of the Center Union and the EDA. Thus, this government, too, collapsed after "ruling" for three months. Its ability to

function came to a standstill when the Center Union deputies pressured to prolong parliamentary protection for deputies against legal action after the closing of Parliament. It was forced to resign on March 30, 1967.

On April 3, 1967, the Royal Court, in complete defiance of the popular will, then chose the Rightist Panayotis Kanellopoulos, leader of the National Radical Union, to form a government. But Kanellopoulos was unable to muster enough votes even to get started. On April 14, he dissolved Parliament, and ordered elections for May 28, within the 45 days provided by the Constitution of the country.

The election campaign was to begin on April 23. The democratic tide in the country, despite the repressions and intimidations of the court-appointed governments, clearly indicated that the Center Union Party would win a majority. In fact, Richard Eder pointed out several days before the military coup (*New York Times*, April 17, 1967), that "rumors have abounded" that the "Right-wing of the National Union, along with army and court figures, would persuade the King to suspend the Constitution and sanction a dictatorship," to prevent the Center Union from forming a government.

The Rightists could not afford to risk a democratic election. Well equipped with American tanks, trucks, jeeps and machine guns—the military moved into action. In less than 24 hours it foisted upon the country a regime of extreme reaction determined to drown in terror and brutality the democratic aspirations of the Greek people.

The new government was formed with Constantine V. Kollias, procurator of the Greek Supreme Court, as Premier and General Gregorios Spandidakis, chief of the general staff of the army who was in charge of the operations for the seizure of power, as Minister of National Defense. But real power rests in the hands of the military triumverate—Colonel George Papadopoulos, Colonel Nicholas Makarezos and Brigadier Stylianos Patakos—men of long-standing Rightist repute with close connections to the Pentagon and the CIA. All talk of a return to the Constitution and democratic elections once order has been reestablished is so much balderdash. The military junta is determined to remain in power unless overthrown by the democratic forces in Greece. That it will not accept a "democracy of the rabble" was clearly intimated by Colonel George Papadopoulos in his first news conference when he declared: "We have a patient on the table and he must be operated upon. That is why we have to pin down his feet and arms so that he cannot move."

\* \* \*

Momentarily the feet and arms of the Greek people have been

pinned down. But it will not be for long. With the major leaders of the moderate and Left parties, trade unions, people's organizations in jail, the regrouping of the democratic front of struggle may be painful and prolonged. But it will take place. Already, as Harry Yaris reports from Moscow (*The Worker*, June 11, 1967) there are signs that patriotic Greeks are beginning to come out of the initial shock of the military blitzkrieg. He reports that leaflets by the Committee for Democratic Resistance have been distributed and that a bulletin of the Greek Patriotic Front calls for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship and the formation of a government representative of all political parties.

The people of Greece have fought monarchist and fascist reaction for over three decades. In these battles tens of thousands of the best sons and daughters of Greece have given their lives. Tens of thousands languished in concentration camps for years on end. Yet they continued their resistance. Today, as yesterday, the overwhelming majority of the Greek people oppose the military junta. Their will to freedom will not be suppressed for long.

The people of the United States must not remain silent. It is our government, above all, that bears the responsibility for the present grave situation in Greece. It was with the collusion of Washington that a despotic regime has been foisted on the Greek populace and the people denied the right to decide by democratic means the character of their own government. Once again, as in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, the sham and hypocrisy of U.S. support for "free elections" stands exposed. The twenty-year intervention in the internal life of another small country has borne its ugly fruit—reaction runs roughshod over the land.

All democracy-loving people in the United States must speak out loud and clear—and without delay. Letters and resolutions should be sent to the Greek Embassy in Washington and to President Johnson calling for the freedom of all political prisoners, for a return to the Constitution and the calling of democratic elections, for the right of the people to determine their own destiny without U.S. interference.

# IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

## The Theory of Peaceful Coexistence\*

Within the thirty minutes at my disposal, I will attempt two things: 1) an elucidation of the content of the theory of peaceful coexistence; and 2) indication of the continuity of this theory with the entire body of Marxist thinking from its inception, while also pointing to not merely continuity but also development, and, therefore, some change.

### I. CONTENT

The theory of peaceful coexistence, unanimously agreed to by all Marxist-Leninist parties in 1960, affirms that it is *possible* in the present period—prior to the total elimination of imperialism—to prevent a general war, or a worldwide conflagration. It declares that this possibility exists because there has been a qualitative shift in the relationship of forces in the world; that in today's world—for the first time—the anti-imperialist forces have superior weight than the forces of imperialism, and that this shift is not only already decisive but that it is a shift which—despite gaps and setbacks—will continue in the future.

The affirmation of the possibility of the *prevention*, forever, beginning in the present period, of a general, worldwide conflagration is new in Marxist history—a point to be developed more fully later in this paper. It is a new concept befitting what is held to be a new kind of world; we repeat, the essentially new quality in that world is the fact—or alleged fact—that the anti-imperialist forces outweigh the imperialist forces.

The concept holds that these anti-imperialist forces are objectively so; not all are subjectively anti-imperialist, but all, that in fact and for any reason and to any degree, are opposed to wars between or among states, weigh in the scales against the imperialist forces. These forces and groups include, first and foremost, the socialist bloc of nations; secondly, the already liberated former colonial peoples; thirdly, the remaining colonial and nationally-oppressed peoples; the

\* This is the text of a paper delivered at a symposium conducted by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, held at Hunter College in New York, on June 11, 1967.

Communist parties in the non-socialist countries; all other components of anti-war movements, groups, and organizations in all other non-socialist countries, including significant components of the petty-bourgeoisie and of the bourgeoisie.

The theory of peaceful coexistence not only makes significant distinctions among elements of the bourgeoisie within countries; it also makes significant distinctions among capitalist nations. In this connection, it affirms that the leading force making for war among states in the world today is the present government of the United States. This government profited most from World War II; it set as an objective the achievement of hegemony in the world, the shoring up and restitution of the colonial system, the containment and the elimination of the socialist bloc. It faces not only opposition from that bloc, and from all who oppose this program; it faces also the fact of acute intra-imperialist rivalries and differences.

The theory of peaceful coexistence emphasizes the significance of the world-wide anti-colonialist, anti-racist movements. Its emphasis consists of the following points: these movements are just in themselves and as such demand support from all Marxist-Leninists; these movements weaken the imperialist system and therefore are part of the struggle against the basic source of war—i.e., are themselves significant components of the *struggle* for peaceful coexistence.

Especially important is the fact that struggle permeates the concept. The theory does not affirm that avoidance of a general conflagration is certain; it does not even affirm that it is probable. It insists, however, that it is *possible*. To realize this possibility requires many forms of struggle. It requires a deft and careful and courageous diplomacy by the socialist states; it requires those states to continually advance in their military, economic and social efforts; it requires them to guard and preserve—or, if necessary, to rebuild—their own fundamental unity. It requires that the anti-colonial and anti-racist efforts go forward, strengthen themselves and deal blow after blow against the exploiters and oppressors. It requires that all anti-war forces expand their efforts, treasure their unity, exert themselves with militancy and persistence, never lose heart, and develop increasingly mass and ingenious forms of activity.

The concept does *not* rest upon any alteration in the Marxian concept of imperialism; it does *not* derive out of a belief that that system has altered its *nature*. The concept rests upon the estimate that imperialism's nature has not altered but that its *power* has altered decisively. The concept views, as Marxism always has, the system of imperialism as *organically* war-like; in that sense, Marxism sees the

system as fundamentally anti-human. In that sense, also, Marxism views the struggle for peaceful coexistence as an anti-imperialist struggle; it sees the struggle against imperialist war today as *the class struggle* on the global scene.

Hence, while Lenin saw the struggle for democracy as the struggle for socialism and the struggle for socialism as the struggle for democracy, and while Dimitroff saw "the struggle for peace [as] a struggle against fascism" and therefore as he added, "a struggle for the victory of socialism,"\* so now, this theory of peaceful coexistence sees the struggles for democracy, against reaction, against fascism, and against war as all inter-related struggles against imperialism and for socialism. Imperialism breeds and needs war; to oppose such war is the specific and dramatic and most vital form of opposing imperialism.

Important to the theory's view of the qualitatively new nature of the post-World War II world is the revolution in technology and in weaponry represented by atomic and thermonuclear energy. The estimate offered years ago by Professor John Somerville, is held to be sound:

Henceforth, history will no longer be divided into ancient, medieval and modern. We shall have to speak of the pre-atomic and atomic periods. There are sound reasons for this. After a certain degree of change has taken place in man's conditions of life, a new historical epoch must be marked. There is no doubt that atomic man's possibilities of living and dying will be so radically altered by the new sources of power that his society will become far more different from ours than ours now is from the Middle Ages.\*\*

Hence, the theory underlines the enormous—qualitatively new—potential for destruction and annihilation in the weapons revolutions—still in their early stages, by the way—and insists that any ignoring or minimizing of this is irresponsible and may be provocative. This does not mean that the concept calls for or suggests paralysis in the face of these revolutions; it does mean that the struggle for peaceful coexistence has all the greater urgency and consequence; and, insofar as these new weapons carry destruction to unheard of heights and make class differentiation in destruction impossible, they also can

\* Dimitroff's speech of May 1, 1936, in his *The United Front: The Struggle against Fascism* (New York, 1938, International), pp. 184-85. In the original, the quoted words are in italics.

\*\* In *The Philosophy of Peace* (New York, 1954, revised edition, Liberty Press), p. 13.

serve to make the present anti-war movement all the more broad and effective.

It is worth remarking that this emphasis upon the especially destructive nature of modern war—and this as an added reason for vigorous struggle against it—is by no means new to the Communist movement. Thus, Ercoli (Togliatti) in his Report on the Preparations for Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communist International, delivered August 13, 1935, said:

We cannot foresee what will take place when the most perfected means of destruction are brought into play on a mass scale. We know only that the next war will be a general war of all countries, a war in which there will be no distinction between front and rear, a war of destruction of everything which makes the life of a modern civilized society possible. The next war will be a war against the workers, against women and children; it will be a war of extermination.\*

In its estimate of the present world upon which was based the peaceful coexistence concept, the Communist movement saw as today's central contradiction that between capitalism and socialism, with the latter represented by the Socialist countries and by the Marxist-Leninist parties in the developed capitalist countries of Europe, North America and Asia (especially Japan). It saw as the *most aggravated* contradiction, the most intense at the present period—but *not* the most basic—that between the colonially oppressed people and the masters of imperialism. It emphasized the dialectically intertwined character of these two movements and the mutually connected character, in the historic and objective sense, of both. In the latter movement it recognized and hailed the growingly socialist content it possessed; but the theory does not relegate to the forces of reaction those elements in the colonial liberation effort which have not (yet) reached the point of socialist consciousness. On the contrary, the theory finds that segments of petty-bourgeois and bourgeois forces participate in colonial and national liberation movements and anti-racist efforts, and that such participation is genuine and consequential, even though often limited.

The struggle component of the theory encompasses political, economic, diplomatic, agitational and intellectual efforts to actively *change* conditions, attitudes and groupings within the non-socialist and even anti-socialist camps. It *struggles* on all these fronts to *alter* present rela-

\* In *VII Congress of the Communist International, Abridged Stenographic Report of the Proceeding* (Moscow, 1939), p. 446.

tionships, convictions, alliances, prejudices; in doing this, it does not give up principles but seeks in *deeds* and in *accomplishments* to overcome all obstacles to peaceful coexistence and to reduce, at least, areas of most inflamed conflict. In this effort, no area is more important than the ideological, and here the whole battle against anti-Communism and for mutual dialogue is vital.

Mention has been made above that there is an economic component in the concept of peaceful coexistence. Here emphasis is placed upon what is held to be the superiority of socialism in the economic area—an absence of cycles, and a pattern of remarkable rates of growth. The latter depends, of course, upon peace, and this adds to the intensity of the socialist bloc's commitment to peace. Furthermore, the theory of peaceful coexistence emphasizes the attractive potential in socialism's economic capacities—making possible the overcoming of the traditional scourges of Mankind—hunger, illiteracy, and foul living conditions.\*

In this whole tactic of breadth and unity, emphasis must be placed upon differences which do exist in non-socialist and anti-socialist circles. The approach must be non-exclusionary and anti-dogmatic; and it must *seek out* areas not of disagreement but rather of agreement. In this connection, the theory of peaceful coexistence naturally emphasizes the reality of the danger from the ultra-Right and the persistence of fascism in the world and the ominous character of the threat of its spread. This also means an active seeking after allies and a careful distinguishing between all those who—for whatever reasons—find themselves opposed to war-mongers and war-makers. This does *not* mean denying real differences; merging with others; giving up identity; or muting the Marxian analysis and the goal of socialism. On the contrary, it is held that such tactics follow from the strategic concept and that both are Marxist-Leninist and, therefore, are the most effective means of anti-imperialist—i.e., of revolutionary struggle.\*\*

\* Especially helpful on this subject is John and Margrit Pittman's *Peaceful Co-Existence: Its Theory and Practice in the Soviet Union* (New York, 1964, International).

\*\* It may not be amiss to offer a couple of examples of this kind of tactics from Lenin. Thus, in the elections coming as a result of the 1905 Revolution in Czarist Russia, Lenin in his pamphlet (published in November, 1906), "The Social Democrats and Electoral Agreements," held: ". . . under no circumstances can we during our election campaign confine ourselves baldly and abstractly to counterposing the proletariat to the bourgeois democrats in general. On the contrary, we must devote our whole attention to drawing a precise distinction between the liberal-monarchist and the revolutionary-democratic bourgeoisie." In this same pamphlet, he

In 1960 it was unanimously agreed by the Marxist-Leninist parties that this struggle for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and the effort to prevent a recurrence of general war constituted the central obligation of all Communists. It is important to consider that the Party whose country is daily subjected to ferocious bombardment by the U.S. government sees this as *its* central duty and understands the resistance of the Vietnamese people to U.S. imperialism as a basic part of the accomplishment of that duty. Thus, in prolonged conversations held by this writer with members of the Central Committee of the Party in Hanoi—and especially with Le Duan, its First Secretary—it was emphasized, as I paraphrased in my book, *Mission to Hanoi* (International Publishers, New York, 1966, p. 72):

The Vietnamese take very seriously the unanimous conclusion reached at the 1957 and 1960 conferences of the Workers' and Communist Parties of the world. There it was agreed that a prime task was to exert every effort to further the cause of national liberation and simultaneously to prevent world war. Both were viewed as two sides of the same anti-imperialist effort. The present struggle against the U.S. government's policy of aggression in Vietnam is held to be exactly that kind of effort. It is, then, a fundamental issue in the central task of our era—the achievement of national liberation and the prevention of world war—i.e., the implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

## II. CONTINUITY AND DEVELOPMENT

Marxism is born, of course, in opposition to capitalism: the opposition is based upon the exploitative, dehumanizing, and violent nature of the system opposed. Outstanding among its abominations is the modern system of war; central to the Marxian effort to move from capitalism to socialism is the conviction that the former produces war and that the latter abhors it and offers the opportunity for its permanent elimination. In this basic sense, then, one perceives a direct continuity in the present concept of peaceful coexistence and the roots of Marxism.

Further, organizationally, from the Inaugural Address in 1864 of

emphasized also the possibility of splitting off some of the liberal-monarchists from the center to the Left. (*Collected Works*, Vol. XI, Moscow, 1962, pp. 280-81.) Again, six years later, in the elections of 1912, Lenin argued "it is permissible to enter into agreements with the liberals against the Rights. For, despite its half-heartedness, bourgeois monarchist liberalism is not at all the same as feudal reaction. It would be very bad working-class politics not to take advantage of this difference." Article published June 10, 1912 (*Collected Works*, XVIII, Moscow, 1963, p. 126).

the International Workingmen's Association—that is, the First International—to the present, Marxists have considered the struggle against imperialist war—and for colonial and national liberation—as among their central commitments. In that Inaugural Address, one reads: "If the emancipation of the working classes requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfill that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices, and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure?" A fight must be waged, said this Inaugural Address over a century ago, against such foreign policy and for a policy which seeks peaceful construction rather than violent destruction. The same Address also stated: "The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes."

Here, then, one sees two of the central ideas of the concept of peaceful coexistence; i.e., the barbaric nature of imperialist policy and the insistence that opposing that policy was part of the revolutionary effort for socialism. It may be added, that this same Inaugural organization and struggle, to change the policy of capitalist governments and to prevent the occurrence of particular wars; this, too, of course, is basic to the idea of peaceful coexistence. Thus, that Address pointed out: "It was not the wisdom of the ruling classes but the heroic resistance to their criminal folly by the working classes of England that saved the West of Europe from plunging headlong into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic."

The Second International, in the pre-World War I period, maintained this record of opposition to imperialist war; differences, of course, existed in that International as to the best way in which to manifest such opposition, but there were no differences as to the need for opposition. Through the late 19th century and early in the 20th, every Congress of this International registered, in one way or another, opposition to imperialist war and called for various actions and measures to effectuate such opposition. Noteworthy was the Stuttgart Congress (1907) where a resolution insisted upon by Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg was adopted. Here it was declared that "wars are part of the very nature of capitalism; they will cease only when the capitalistic economic order is abolished or when the number of sacrifices in men and money, required by the advance in military technique, and the indignation provoked by armaments drive the peoples to abolish the order." Hence, the Resolution continued, Marxists must do all in their power to prevent wars and to hasten their termination should they nevertheless occur.

Here the organic warmaking nature of capitalism is stressed—as in the present theory of peaceful coexistence; added, too, is an emphasis upon armaments and their cost and destructiveness as inducing wider opposition to war which likewise appears, in heightened and transformed character, in the present concept.\*

Simultaneously, so long as Marx and Engels lived, both devoted much of their activity and writing to the anti-war effort. Engels repeatedly insisted, in his last years (especially from 1889 to 1894), that while revolution might result from the desperation general war would produce, this was by no means certain, that the suffering from war would also be colossal and that through efforts at *forcing peace* the movement for socialism could be tremendously advanced.

Basic, of course, to the creation of the Third, or Communist International, was the opposition to imperialist war and the refusal of those who created and adhered to that International to permit themselves to be blinded by nationalism so that they would ignore class realities, betray socialism and rush to the “defense” of “their” nations—i.e., of their Kaiser or Czar or Prime Minister, etc.

Address also pointed to the fact that it was possible through effort, “Socialists,” said Lenin in his 1915 pamphlet, *Socialism and War*, “have always condemned wars between nations as barbarous and brutal.” He went on, at once, however, to point out that Marxists differed from pacifists and anarchists in that they adhered to the idea of just wars, and saw these as being in particular wars conducted by colonially oppressed peoples and wars waged by oppressed and exploited classes. Soon after the Bolshevik Revolution, Lenin used the term “peaceful coexistence”\*\* for with the establishment of the first Socialist state the matter of its existing in a world still capitalist became a practical matter. That State would offer resistance and effective resistance to armed intervention or attack, but it also would always seek in every possible way to avoid such intervention and such attack and to live in the world peaceably.

Lenin, in one of his last letters—to French comrades, dated Nov. 15, 1922—called then for “intensifying and spreading the struggle against imperialist war. It is worth devoting one’s whole life,” Lenin added, “to the struggle against this kind of war.” One may in fact state

\* Helpful on this history is the remarkable volume by R. P. Dutt, *The Internationale* (Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1964); important additional data are in W. Z. Foster, *History of the Three Internationals* (International, New York, 1955).

\*\* For example, in an interview with Michael Farbman of the *Manchester Guardian*, October 27, 1922; published in *Collected Works*, XXXIII, pp. 346-52.

that it is possible to view Lenin’s whole life as exactly such a struggle.

While pursuing a policy dedicated to preventing—or postponing—war, the Soviet Union, said Lenin, was not to be expected to make concessions forever. This word of caution, too, is germane to the present and to consideration of peaceful coexistence. In his Report to the 9th All-Russian Congress of Soviets, December 23, 1921, Lenin said:

We experienced such a burden of the imperialist war which is unlikely to have been experienced by any other nation. . . . We know, we know only too well, the incredible misfortunes that war brings to the workers and peasants. For this reason our attitude to this question must be cautious and circumspect. We are ready to make the utmost concessions and sacrifices in order to preserve peace for which we have paid a high price . . . but we are not prepared to make any kind of concessions or sacrifices or do this forever.

As for those who are thinking of war against us, Lenin concluded, “let them mark this well.” Almost fifty years later—and again after unprecedented sacrifices, but now infinitely stronger and in a world one-third socialist these outlines of policy and these warnings, are to be taken to heart, are to be “marked well” by those with war in their plans.

The relationships of the strategy and tactics of peaceful coexistence to the effort at united front and collective security of the 1930’s are clear and plain. Considerable successes were achieved in the ’30’s and on that basis, the back of Hitlerism and of fascism could be and was broken in the next decade.

Still, it is to be noted that the outlook in the 1930’s in the world Communist movement was for the *postponement* of general war; any given moment was never hopeless and particular threats and tensions could be—and were—overcome, but the strategic outlook was the inevitability of general war. This may be shown most briefly, perhaps, by observing the definitive expression of the policy in the Report by Ercoli—already cited—to the VII Congress of the Communist International (1935). Ercoli noted that the struggle against war had met successes—thus, he said, it had “averted the attack on the Soviet Union” in 1930-31.

But, he went on, “We know that war is an inevitable accompaniment of the capitalist system.” And, “If the Soviet Union had not existed, the breathing space between the two cycles of war would

not have been so long. . . . Every month, every week, which we gain is of enormous value for humanity." Again:

No one can doubt that the coming war, even if it begins as a war between two big imperialist powers or as a war of a big power against a small country, will inevitably tend to develop into and will inevitably become a war against the Soviet Union. Every year and every month of respite is a guarantee for us that the Soviet Union will be in a position to better repulse the attack of the imperialists.

Finally, towards the end of the Report:

Politically, the war will be a very complicated matter. . . . Today we are a mighty army fighting for peace. We cannot foresee and no one can foresee how long we will be able to continue the struggle for peace. It may be another year, it may be more, it may be for only a few months. We must be ready at any moment.

After the Second World War there is a gradual tendency to move in the direction of the present concept of peaceful coexistence. From the beginning there is a rejection of the frequent assertions from capitalist sources of the impending nature of a new general war; and from the beginning there is an insistence that with effort such a war can be averted. But it is not until the 1957 Declaration—confirmed and adopted by all Communist parties in 1960—that the idea of the permanent prevention of a new general war is held to be valid.

Meanwhile, every day's news confirms that the predatory and atrocious character of imperialism has in no way altered—and this, too, is basic to that concept. I wish to close with three quotations reflecting that character and they will come from witnesses whose devotion to capitalism cannot be doubted by any sane person.

Two come from former President Eisenhower—and they are offered with his own inimitable syntax. One, from an Address to a Joint Session of Congress, as reported in the *New York Times*, May 8, 1953:

If we allow any section of the world that is vital to us because of what it provides us through trade—the manganese, or uranium, or cobalt or anything that we need—if we allow any of those areas either to become so impoverished it cannot produce the things we need, or if we allow it to fall into a form of government inimical to us, that wants to see freedom abolished from the earth, then we

have suffered indeed. It is in such simple facts as these, ladies and gentlemen, that the foreign policy is founded and established and maintained.

And here is the same man speaking, again while President of the United States, and again as reported in the *New York Times*—this time April 6, 1954: "We can be Americans. We can stand up and hold up our heads and say, 'America is the greatest force that God has ever allowed to exist on his Footstool.' As such, it is up to us to lead this world to a peaceful and secure existence."

It may be thought that having reached such celestial heights all else would have to be anti-climactic. Yet, I dare follow Eisenhower's heavenly pronouncement, with this editorial paragraph from the footstool's press, itself. I mean, of course, the *New York Times*, in its issue of June 3, 1967. The *Times* was displeased at the just-concluded *Pacem in Terris* conference in Geneva; it thought the consensus of condemnation of U.S. policy and activity that pervaded that conference did not reflect the "serene objectivity" that Pope John in issuing the original Encyclical had urged. In the name then of serene objectivity, and having evoked the memory of the gentle John, the *Times* went on:

The United States is going through a phase of history that resembles the experience of Great Britain, especially in the 19th century, when the sun never set on her empire. The contributions of Britain in the three centuries that began with Queen Elizabeth I were—and, indeed are—incalculable. Dozens of countries and uncounted millions of people in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and the South Pacific owe much to—whom? To Great Britain. But gratitude was never asked, and it certainly was rarely given.

Words here very nearly fail and perhaps are not needed. But to speak of the reign of Britain from the 16th century through the 19th as one earning gratitude and as offering a model for U.S. conduct—and to do this in the name of "serene objectivity"—certainly is an almost incredible piece of arrogance. It is difficult to say, indeed, whether the arrogance is exceeded by the ignorance or the chauvinism or the sheer inhumanity of that paragraph. This is the three-century stretch that covers the African ravishment and slave trade; the conquest and crucifixion of India; the attack upon and rape of the New World; the slaughters in Ireland; in Persia; in the Mid-East; the enclosure acts and poverty acts in England; the raw and unrelied capitalism of the 19th century; the interminable wars and

pacification campaigns of Britain for three hundred years! And to pick also on the picayune, the one thing Britain's ruling classes insisted upon throughout this unsurpassed history of cruelty and rapacity, was the expression of "gratitude"; those who did not express it or manifest it were suspect, indeed.

That *Times* paragraph—struck off in a moment of abandon, apparently—in its polished prose and Eisenhower's remarks with its bar-racks grammar, faithfully reflect the morals, aspirations and policies of that imperialism which has indeed replaced Great Britain as gendarmerie and blood-sucker of the "free world."

Still, despite the nostalgic visions of the *Times*, we must inform it, and those for whom it labors, that we are in the 20th century and that the 21st looms on the horizon. Mankind has endured all the gratitude-earning delights of British imperialism; and outlasted it. It will outlast the futile attempt of American imperialism to turn back time. Imperialism *can* now be chained; and in the process of being chained Mankind *can* be spared the horror of a Third World War and *can* achieve the stage of universal national liberation. Both achievements will certify the death of imperialism and the coming into its own, for the globe, of the Age of Socialism.

Meany, Lovestone and Dubinsky and their like should be exposed for their service to American imperialism. But as the record of many years shows, there are leaders even at top levels, not to mention a much wider base closer to the rank and file, who represent substantial sections of the labor movement and who cannot be classed with Meany's group. They need to feel both a more active support and a greater pressure from peace forces inside and outside the unions. The feeling that "labor is reactionary" can be dispelled by examining the differences in labor, by seeing who in labor is for peace, who is against it; who in labor wants international unity against the monopolies and who wants unity with them; who in labor is fighting for civil rights and who is covering up discrimination; who in labor pays lip service to a war on poverty and who actively presses that struggle.

George Morris, *CIA and American Labor*, p. 134-5.

## Discussion On Black Power

AL RICHMOND

### Integration or Separation?

Roscoe Proctor's "Notes on 'Black Power' Concept" (*Political Affairs*, March, 1967) were based on a report he delivered at a Northern California conference earlier this year.

The report, presented and accepted as a basis for discussion rather than as a finished statement of policy, was greeted with great enthusiasm. It is important to understand the reasons for the enthusiasm, especially the two most relevant reasons:

1. The report was seen as a bold, original and creative effort to assess new currents (new in either kind or degree) in the Negro freedom movement.

2. The report was seen as an unequivocal identification with the most militant, most radical sectors of the movement—offering its criticisms of these sectors within the framework of such identification.

The conference was distinguished by a healthy sense of excitement because the participants felt the report invited a significant discussion of relevant problems. I planned to explore critically two areas opened up by Proctor after his "Notes" appeared in *Political Affairs*. I was almost dissuaded by James E. Jackson's article (*Political Affairs*, May) on Proctor's notes. There was such

a note of finality in Jackson's judgments: questions posed by Proctor "have been satisfactorily resolved, and a rehashing of them casts no light on the current or future needs of the movement." It is questions that Proctor did not pose that have "high theoretical interest and . . . urgent practical importance."

Reconsidering the matter I still feel that some value will be served by "rehashing" two propositions presented by Proctor:

1. The thesis of "oscillation" between "the tendencies toward the status of separate nationhood, and of integration into the institutions of the United States."

2. The relationship between what some authority quoted by Proctor calls "the civil rights coalition and the Negro revolution."

The "oscillation" thesis was borrowed whole from an article (*Political Affairs*, April, 1959) by the late William Z. Foster and Benjamin J. Davis. According to this thesis, the "oscillation" took the form of successive waves, corresponding to general periods of democratic upsurge or reaction. In periods of democratic upsurge the Negro people oscillated toward integration. In periods of reaction, toward "separate nationhood."

Bringing this thesis up to the present, Proctor argues that dur-

ing the democratic upsurge of the New Deal era and the war against fascism the oscillation was toward integration, but now the oscillator has turned in the opposite direction and the next decade will see an ascendant wave of "black nationalism."

The "oscillation" thesis as borrowed and elaborated by Proctor is schematic and mechanical. Its historical schematicism is illustrated in the following. After dealing with the integrationist wave during the Civil War and Reconstruction, Proctor goes on:

This experience with integration came to a sudden end with the Hayes-Tilden presidential campaign compromise of 1876. The organized terror of the KKK, widespread Negro lynchings and other oppressive features of the "Jim-Crow" system following the defeat of Reconstruction led many Negroes to flee to the North and to develop their sharpest tendencies of independent Negro nationalism under the leadership of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association.

Then he picks up with "the New Deal of the 1930's." Obviously, there is a hazard in trying to compress more than a half century of Negro history (from Reconstruction to the New Deal) in one short paragraph. Recognizing this hazard, however, still the only symbol that emerges out of the Negro experience between 1876 and the 1930's is Marcus Garvey! Where is W. E. B. Du Bois? I do not ask the question in the spirit of ritualistic obeisance, which too often governs the use of names. I

ask it for its historical relevance. Where is the Niagara Movement, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and much more that is at least as valid a part of the historical period covered as Garvey's nationalism?

The omission underscores the vice of the "oscillation" thesis as presented. There is "oscillation" all right, but it is not registered in successive waves of integration and nationalism; *it is expressed in the contradictory coexistence of these opposite pulls*. If it were as schematic as placed then all you would need is some political barometer to tell you: For the past couple of decades we rode the integrationist wave, for the next decade we will ride the nationalist wave, but keep a sharp lookout so that we do not miss the integrationist wave when it rolls around again.

It is not like that. The contradictory, dialectical "oscillation" goes on all the time, and it arises out of the realities of Negro existence. For the Negro working class (as Proctor notes) the economic struggle for existence is in a basic sense a struggle for integration. Simultaneously, the ghetto—with its distinct institutions, its cultural and social life, its shared experience, both historical and contemporary, its confrontation with discrimination and oppression — nourishes and reinforces the sense of national identity and community. The same Negro worker may be a member of the executive board of the San Francisco longshoremen's local

## ON BLACK POWER

(an integrated body) and a deacon of a Negro church (a separate, "national" institution).

Having said this, having underscored the importance of recognizing it, more needs to be said.

First, granting this "oscillation" is a constant factor, rather than a succession of gyrations, what is the historical perspective? Are the Negro people destined to be suspended eternally between these two pulls, or will one prevail over the other? Our Party has answered this question. Historically, the integrationist pull will prevail; integration is the goal. Incidentally, it is necessary to draw the distinction between assimilation and integration (which Proctor tends to blur). Integration is altogether possible with the retention of national identity and a pride in it; assimilation, on the other hand, denotes obliteration of such identity.

Second, the opposite pulls are not static, either in their interrelation or their relative strength. Although I disagree with the schematic presentation of successive waves, it is clear (to me at least) that both in practical experience and theoretical conception the relative strength of the contradictory pulls does change; it is essential to view them in their concrete manifestation, in their changing relationship.

From a practical viewpoint, such an approach precludes the implied successive "oscillations" in Party policy, but allows for a viable political relationship with the ever-present contradictory tugs on the basis of constant examination

of their specific forms and expressions and roles at various stages of the Negro freedom struggle.

This sort of examination, by its very nature, cannot be resolved once and for all. Our conclusion that historically the main drive is toward integration, that this is the historical goal of the Negro freedom movement cannot, of course, remove the need for the constant, specific examination of new manifestations of nationalism, the reasons for them, their role in the concrete context that gives birth to them. It certainly does not follow from our fundamental conclusion as to historical direction that at every juncture everything that appears in the guise of "integrationism" is good, and everything that appears in the guise of "nationalism" is bad.

One merit of Proctor's discussion paper is that it attempts a concrete examination of new moods and movements of a generally nationalist hue in the Negro community, and is therefore a challenge to all of us to enter into such an examination, and to do the essential Marxist thing of testing theoretical premises and conclusions in the practice of ever-changing reality.

\* \* \*

I turn now to the second area of exploration—the relationship between "the civil rights coalition and the Negro revolution."

It would have been helpful if Proctor had offered a political description of what he means by "the Negro revolution." In the absence of such a description it

is not possible to discuss the conception as such. Generally, I would suggest that the term "revolution" be used with as much precision as possible, in which case it would also be used more sparingly.

Actually, what I propose to discuss then, is the relationship between "the civil rights coalition" and the more radical moods, currents and movements that have arisen in the Negro community and have, in the main, rallied to the standard of "Black Power," which does not (as Proctor notes) represent a clearly defined political platform and program.

What has transpired, it seems to me, is a virtually classical development in movements for radical reforms that have revolutionary implications.

What took shape was a broad "civil rights coalition," which was united by the goals that are inherent in the term "civil rights"; that is, the attainment of legal, citizenship rights. In the course of the struggle, as some objectives were achieved, other objectives came to the fore. In this process the differentiation between the more moderate and more radical elements within the broad alliance become more distinct. The differentiation was hastened because the new objectives related to the total economic condition of the Negro people, and therefore intruded into the economic base of society, rather than just into its legal-political superstructure. Objectives that seek materially to alter the Negro's economic status, both in terms of work opportunity and the physical-social conditions of

life in the ghetto, are, by their nature, more radical, and involve a more radical confrontation with the economic power that governs American society, that is with monopoly.

The objective radicalization of the struggle inevitably produces a differentiation within the coalition that prosecuted it in its less radical stages. This is certainly confirmed by the experiences of all colonial liberation movements. A fairly broad inter-class unity is attained in the struggle for legal independence. The alliance of classes becomes more strained, however, when the revolution attempts radical economic changes, which affect in different ways the economic interests of different classes.

It seems to me, therefore, that we cannot have a static view of inter-class relationships within the Negro community, or of the relation between the Negro freedom movement and various strata in the white sector of American society.

Surely, the more radical demands that objectively emerge from the Negro freedom movement, and their articulation, albeit imprecisely in programmatic and strategic terms, by militant sectors of the movement must affect the relationship of white middle class liberals to the struggle (and, by extension, of those who are guided by white middle class ideology). Just as surely the radicalization of the struggle must affect the relationship of the Negro bourgeoisie to it.

I believe Proctor renders a ser-

vice by attempting a concrete examination of changing inter-class relationships in the struggle, and thereby challenging all of us to join in this necessary labor.

Since the relationships are so largely determined by the level of the struggle, imprecision in defining the level of the struggle will, of necessity, distort the actual class relationships. Proctor, it seems to me, is imprecise in this respect. For instance, he overstates the attainment of "civil rights." True, there has been legislation and official statements of policy giving formal recognition to the "civil rights" of Negroes. But this is far different from giving them practical effect in reality. The right to vote, for example, although this right is formally granted now, is still an issue for very real struggle. This bears on what role the Negro middle class can still play in the freedom movement.

The placement of "the civil rights movement" and "the Negro revolution" as two distinct entities that somehow exist side by side tends to obscure the historical process whereby what is loosely called "the Negro revolution" grew out of "the civil rights movements." I think it is very important—ideologically and tactically—to comprehend and appreciate the historical development because it underscores the vital fact that the present phase of the struggle is an extension and continuation of a fundamentally democratic movement, that the present phase seeks to give practical effect and substance to what was formally won, and to deepen and expand the democratic achievement by coming to grips with the economic foundation upon which the ideological and political superstructure of chauvinism, discrimination and double oppression arose in violation of even the formal promises of bourgeois democracy.

The unity of Negro and white workers in the labor movement and a firm alliance between labor and the Negro freedom movement are the keys to progress in our country. This is equally true in both the North and South. Without this unity, labor can make no substantial gains organizationally, economically or politically. Without such unity, the Negro freedom movement is fatally handicapped in the fight to put a permanent end to the system of jim crow.

Resolution on Labor and Trade Union Problems  
18th National Convention, CPUSA.

# BOOK REVIEWS

TOM FOLEY

## Communists in Asia

This book\* is a collection of articles on the Communist and Workers' parties of Asia in the post-World War II period. The articles vary a good deal in quality. Among the best are Leo E. Rose's study of the Communist Party of Nepal, which will fill in a blank space on the map for many readers; Frances L. Starner's "Communism in Malaysia" sheds some interesting indirect light on the growing revolt in southern Thailand; Bernard Fall has an article on the Pathet Lao; Hans Baerwald covers the growth and temporary suppression of the Communist Party of Japan in a rather fair way.

On the whole, the book is a failure. Its subject is, literally, too vast and too complicated to be placed in nice, neat, political-sciency categories. Ceylon and Malaysia are both in Asia. Aside from that, what do they have in common? Professor Scalapino struggles in vain with this problem in his lead article, "Communism In Asia: Toward a Comparative Analysis." The mental blinders anti-Communist experts wear prevented him from using the 1960 Moscow Declaration; otherwise

---

\* Robert A. Scalapino, Editor, *The Communist Revolution In Asia*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, \$10.60.

he would have seen, in the articles following his, very clear illustrations of the "creative application of Marxism-Leninism" to the specific social and historical conditions of each country of Asia described.

Scalapino uses the term "elitist" to refer to the leadership and cadres of the Asian Communist parties. A non-Communist (as opposed to an anti-Communist) might well ask: why is it that of the tiny fraction of the population of most Asian countries allowed to receive an education, to see the West, and to choose between the alternatives the modern world offers, such a very high percentage became Marxist-Leninists and devoted the rest of their lives to awakening the ordinary people of their countries? Why is it that these people are fighting to end the "elitism" that feudalism and imperialism both have maintained by force in the countries of Asia? Scalapino cannot consider questions like this because his anti-Communism excludes them.

Among the most difficult problems faced by Communists in Asia are the ones related to overcoming clan, tribal, ethnic, religious and regional loyalties, based in part on isolation and socio-economic stagnation, in part on artificial divisions created by the

imperialists. The tremendous achievements of Asian Communists in actually forging national unity in the process of creating a party, while at the same time fighting feudalism and imperialism, escape Scalapino's attention. He categorizes the Communist parties of Asia as "regionalist." Scalapino ought to be called on this, perhaps by forcing him to organize an *anti-Communist* party in Burma or Nepal.

One of the very special techniques used by anti-Communist "experts" is to cull all party literature, speeches, radio broadcasts, etc., for examples of problems, criticisms, and discussions of mistakes, to assemble them all together in an article, and to present them as evidence of "growing popular unrest," "resistance to Communist enslavement," and so on, *ad nauseam*. This, in turn, is used as a basis of policy and explains some of the surprises of the century (Soviet resistance in

1941, the Bay of Pigs, etc.). People, after all, can be taken in by their own propaganda.

An example of this is John C. Donnell's article on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. An unstated assumption throughout the article is that "Hanoi" is dominated by "Peking," but in concluding, Donnell seems unsure: it is clear that even his own evidence does not support him. So, "Hanoi" is controlled by "Peking"—no, "Moscow,"—no, the "Viet Cong,"—no, it's independent—no, rye, no, whole wheat. . . . If this is an example of the basis for America's policy in Vietnam (Donnell is a member of the USAF-CIA's RAND Corporation), it explains a lot of things.

Articles such as these also have to somehow explain (away) the steady, continuing growth in size and strength of the Asian Communist parties, and there are grudging admissions of this fact in all the articles in this book.

### REPORT TO OUR READERS

We forgot to mention last month that AW in Miami sent us \$100. Since then \$45 more has come in. Thanks.

AJB sent us another \$50 in "memory of Mike Gold." A reader in Minnesota held a small party for PA and sent us \$22.50.

To-date we have received \$1100 in cash and another \$150 in subscriptions—for a total of \$1250—leaving \$3750 still to go.

If every reader will help to raise five or ten dollars—and get one new subscription—we will have it made.

Let us hear from you.

## NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

### **WHITHER CHINA?**

by R. Palme Dutt

The noted British Marxist analyzes the political and ideological struggles in China, differences in the world Communist movement and perspectives for unity.

48 pages - Price 40c

### **DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, VIETNAM AND CIVIL RIGHTS**

by Herbert Aptheker

The historic tradition of the Negro people of condemnation of U.S. wars of aggression and the continuation of this tradition today.

16 pages - Price 20c

### **U.S. NEGROES IN BATTLE: FROM LITTLE ROCK TO WATTS**

by James E. Jackson

The Negro people's struggle for freedom in the period 1957-1965 and the impact of this struggle on all other forces for social progress.

148 pages - Cloth \$1.25

### **THE VIETNAMESE NATION: CONTRIBUTION TO A HISTORY**

by Jean Chesneaux

This popular history, from the 3rd century B.C. to the Geneva Agreement of 1954, discusses the roots of the struggle for independence and the strength of the National Liberation Front. The beginning of the American aggression is described in the concluding chapter.

232 pages - Cloth \$3.95

Order from your local bookshop or

**NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS**

32 Union Square East, New York, N. Y. 10003

Add 15c postage on single titles, 5c for each additional title. Orders for \$2 or more postage free. Add 5% sales tax for New York City residents.