

Readings in American Ideologies

edited by

KENNETH M. DOLBEARE
PATRICIA DOLBEARE
JANE A. HADLEY

MARKHAM PUBLISHING COMPANY / Chicago

MARKHAM POLITICAL SCIENCE SERIES

Aaron Wildavsky, Editor

- Axelrod, *Conflict of Interest*
Barber, *Citizen Politics: An Introduction to Political Behavior*, Second Edition
Barber, ed., *Power to the Citizen: Introductory Readings*
Bullock and Rodgers, eds., *Black Political Attitudes*
Cnudde and Neubauer, eds., *Empirical Democratic Theory*
Coplin, *Introduction to International Politics: A Theoretical Overview*
Coplin, ed., *Simulation in the Study of Politics*
Coplin and Kegley, eds., *A Multi-method Introduction to International Politics: Observation, Explanation, and Prescription*
Dolbeare and Dolbeare with Hadley, *American Ideologies: The Competing Political Beliefs of the 1970s*, Second Edition
Dvorin, ed., *The Senate's War Powers*
Eyestone, *Political Economy: Politics and Policy Analysis*
Greenstein, *Personality and Politics*
Greenstein and Lerner, eds., *A Source Book for the Study of Personality and Politics*
Lane, *Political Thinking and Consciousness*
Lyden and Miller, eds., *Planning-Programming-Budgeting: A Systems Approach to Management*, Second Edition
McDonald, *Party Systems and Elections in Latin America*
Mitchell, *Public Choice in America: An Introduction to American Government*
Mitchell, *Why Vote?*
Payne, *The American Threat: The Fear of War as an Instrument of Foreign Policy*
Payne, *Foundations of Empirical Political Analysis*
Ranney, ed., *Political Science and Public Policy*
Ross, *American National Government: An Introduction to Political Institutions*
Ross, ed., *Public Choice and Public Policy: Seven Cases in American Government*
Ross and Mitchell, eds., *Introductory Readings in American Government: A Public Choice Perspective*
Sharkansky, *Public Administration: Policy-Making in Government Agencies*, Second Edition
Sharkansky, ed., *Policy Analysis in Political Science*
Strickland, Wade, and Johnston, *A Primer of Political Analysis*, Second Edition

Copyright © 1973 by Markham Publishing Company
All Rights Reserved
Printed in U.S.A.
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 72-95721
Hardcover Standard Book Number: 8410-3090-1
Paperback Standard Book Number: 8410-3092-8

Contents

Introduction	1
PART I. THE MAINSTREAM OF THE CAPITALIST-LIBERAL SYSTEM	7
1 Capitalism	9
Capitalism and Freedom <i>Milton Friedman</i>	10
Profits and the American Economy <i>U.S. Department of Commerce</i>	38
2 Liberalism	51
Concerning Dissent and Civil Disobedience <i>Abe Fortas</i>	52
Anti-Politics in America <i>John H. Bunzel</i>	58
American Strategy on the World Scene <i>Walt Whitman Rostow</i>	73
3 Reform Liberalism	85
Opening Up the Political Process <i>Jeff Greenfield and Jack Newfield</i>	86

	Business, Government, and the Public <i>Richard Barber</i>	98
4	Conservatism	109
	Radical Libertarianism <i>Jerome Tuccille</i>	110
	The Public Philosophy <i>Walter Lippmann</i>	129
 PART II. CHALLENGES OF THE 1960s AND 1970s: REFORM OR RECONSTRUCTION?		
5	Minority Liberation	153
	Toward a Transitional Program <i>Robert L. Allen</i>	155
	A New Faith—Hope for Change <i>Armando Rendon</i>	165
	The New Individualism <i>Vine Deloria, Jr.</i>	182
6	Women's Liberation	192
	Towards a Mass Feminist Movement <i>National Convention of the Socialist Workers Party</i>	194
	The Liberated Society: Visions and Strategies <i>Kirsten Amundsen</i>	217
7	The New Left	237
	The Port Huron Statement <i>Students for a Democratic Society</i>	238
	Trapped in a System <i>Carl Oglesby</i>	252

	Post-Scarcity Anarchism <i>Murray Bookchin</i>	261
8	Marxism and Socialism	279
	The Welfare State <i>Irving Howe</i>	280
	1971 Strategy for Socialism <i>National Caucus of Labor Committees</i>	299

³The economic contradictions of capitalism have not disappeared, but the system can plan to such a degree that they no longer have the explosive characteristics they had in the past.

⁴Raoul Vaneigem, "The Totality for Kids" (International Situationist pamphlet; London, n.d.), p. 1.

⁵For a detailed discussion of this "miniaturized" technology see "Towards a Liberatory Technology."

⁶Guy Debord, "Perspectives for Conscious Modification of Daily Life," mimeographed translation from *Internationale Situationiste*, no. 6 (n.p., n.d.), p. 2.

⁷Despite its lip service to the dialectic, the traditional left has yet to take Hegel's "concrete universal" seriously and see it not merely as a philosophical concept but as a social program. This has been done only in Marx's early writings, in the writings of the great utopians (Fourier and William Morris) and, in our time, by the drop-out youth.

⁸Josef Weber, "The Great Utopia," *Contemporary Issues*, vol. 2, no. 5 (1950), p. 12.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 19 (my emphasis).

¹⁰The above lines were written in 1966. Since then, we have seen the graffiti on the walls of Paris, during the May-June revolution: "All power to the imagination"; "I take my desires to be reality, because I believe in the reality of my desires"; "Never work"; "The more I make love, the more I want to make revolution"; "Life without dead times"; "The more you consume, the less you live"; "Culture is the inversion of life"; "One does not buy happiness, one steals it"; "Society is a carnivorous flower." These are not graffiti, they are a program for life and desire.

8

Marxism and Socialism

The great diversity among Marxist and socialist scholars and organizations is represented here by two selections drawn from opposite ends of the spectrum. The first reflects the evolutionary version of how socialism might be achieved. Fittingly, the author is an academic. Irving Howe is a professor of English at the City University of New York. He is also a founder and editor of the journal *Dissent*, a leading exponent of evolutionary socialism.

The second selection is one of the major documents put forward by one of the newer revolutionary socialist organizations, the National Caucus of Labor Committees. It was written by the founder and chief theoretician of the group, L. Marcus, currently the National Chairman of the NCLC.

at home—which is by no means to accept the quietistic and reactionary argument that until the war is ended nothing can or should be done at home.

Even the full realization of the “idea” of the welfare state would not bring us to utopia or “the good society.” The traditional socialist criticisms in respect to the maldistribution of power, property, and income would still hold. But to continue the struggle for such a realization is both a political and a human responsibility. And through the very struggle to realize the “idea” of the welfare state—if I may offer a “dialectical” observation—it is possible to gain the confidence, strength, and ideas through which to move beyond the welfare state. Unfortunately, American intellectuals do not seem well equipped for keeping to this dual perspective: they either lapse into a genteel and complacent conservatism or they veer off into an ultimatic and pseudo-utopian leftism. Yet, when one comes to think of it, why should it be so difficult to preserve a balance between the struggle to force the present society to enact the reforms it claims to favor and the struggle to move beyond the limits of the society? Tactically, to be sure, this creates frequent difficulties; but conceptually, as a guiding principle, I think it our only way.

Notes

¹ Michael Walzer, “Politics in the Welfare State,” *Dissent*, Vol. 15, No. 1, January–February 1968.

² Richard M. Titmuss, “Social Welfare and the Art of Giving,” *Socialist Humanism*, edited by Erich Fromm (New York: Doubleday, 1965), p. 346.

1971 Strategy for Socialism

NATIONAL CAUCUS OF LABOR COMMITTEES

While dissonant parodies of Herbert Hoover’s 1929–31 speeches are heard from today’s White House, the U.S. economy has reached the fag-end of its postwar prosperity, and is lurching toward both a new world depression and the most brutal reenactments of head-on struggles between capital and labor throughout the advanced capitalist sector.

Not only in the capitalist sector. Except to imbeciles, who foolishly imagine that “socialism in one country” is really possible, it is obvious that the relatively backward economies of the Soviet Union and eastern Europe are dependent upon prosperous conditions of the capitalist world market for successful development of the Soviet sector. Without finding a favorable capitalist market for exports, the Soviet sector cannot import those means of production which it requires from the capitalist sector. Economic conjectures in the capitalist market are thus almost direct causes for depressing material conditions of life in the less developed Soviet sector, producing social crises in eastern Europe at the same time as in western Europe.

The objective possibility for socialist transformation of the entire world is within sight, provided that we in the United States succeed in engaging the “little wheel” of socialist program and leadership with the “big wheel” of massive, emerging struggles of the labor movement and its allies. The “if” is hardly of small significance. Did the world ever see so overripe an objective opportunity for socialist transformation as in France during late May, 1968—

January 1971 draft political statement of tasks and perspectives of the National Caucus of Labor Committees.

with one of the largest Communist parties on the scene, with a massive following in the labor movement (CGT)? Repeatedly, mankind has seen overripe objective opportunities for socialism, but qualified socialist organizations either virtually did not exist or, like the CP's throughout most of the world since the late 1930s, the socialist parties on the scene have actually proven to be a major subjective obstacle to socialism where the objective possibilities have been the greatest.

Recent history demonstrates that the two dominant socialist organizations on the scene in the United States (the SWP-YSA and CP-YWLL) are inferior in socialist potential to the Parti Communiste Francaise of 1963, and, despite the adequacy of program and orientation of the third U.S. socialist organization (our own), we have seen during 1970 that about one-third of our own membership has had to be dragged kicking and screaming, from its petit-bourgeois orientation toward the emergent political struggles of the U.S. working class. It is the subjective possibilities for socialism which have to be urgently matched to the accelerating objective opportunities.

It is to that purpose that the present statement of tasks and perspectives is published: immediately for the guidance of our own organization's members, but also for the education of otherwise rudderless socialists in the SWP-YSA, CP-YWLL, and other such organizations. Considering the poor level of political literacy in our opponent socialist organizations, it is necessary to say more in this document than if it were written for members of the National Caucus of Labor Committee alone.

Membership in the NCLC

The function of tasks and perspectives resolutions for socialist organizations flows from the problem of the role of the single socialist individual in history. Unless one has a conception of how one is intervening or can intervene as an individual to alter the course of human history, then the idea of socialist politics, or tasks and perspectives resolutions, would be self-socializing idiocy.

Thus, a principal cause of profound disorientation among well-intended contemporary socialists is that on this question (the individual in history) they are "Marxists" in name only. The relevant

point is symptomized by the continuing efforts (especially since the 1930s) to set a "mature" Karl Marx into some degree of philosophical antagonism to the Marx of 1844-46. This baseless, attempted dichotomy is an effort by political semi-literates to save the appearances of their "Marxism" economic-determinist fatalism, a pseudo-Marxist view palpably based on hearsay acquaintance with *Capital* from an empiricist standpoint. Contrary to the views of such unfortunate persons, the essence of the Karl Marx of 1844-46, on which the entire "mature Marx is directly based, is Marx's successful location of the basis for a real individual human identity in the developmental processes of social evolution.

Faced with the short span of individual biological existence, the individual can realize a permanent place in humanity only to the extent that his practice has permanent value for humanity. This aspiration, which distinguished human identity from that of lower animals, has been generally expressed in modern times only in the disguise of Judeo-Christian religious ideology (or cognates), in which one's humanity is located in an afterdeath spirit world or in a contemporary spiritual contemplative life parasitizing on secular reality.

The task of liberating humanity from such mere delusions, is absolutely not accomplished by naive atheism. The solution to the aspirations of the human individual must be entirely situated within the real world. Human virtue must be located not within churchly canons, but in terms of a scientific comprehension of the order of nature. Not empiricist or positivist science, which are merely religious axioms covered with an opaque cloth. Rather, a science which takes human existence as its sole premise, axiom, postulate or what have you, and thus situates the criteria of scientific practice (whether in laboratory, classroom, workplace or streets) on the premise that the individual's understanding of nature is to be measured by his contributions to the qualitatively improving mastery of nature for the purpose of improving the quality of species existence. My identity does not reside in some fantastic "other world," but in humanity's permanent debt to my existence for that small, permanent contribution which flows from my conscious determination to act for such results.

This notion of positive individual identity within society could exist only in abstraction (e.g., Spinoza's "extended being") until

about the beginning of the nineteenth century in Europe and the United States. Capitalism's profound contribution to humanity, however unintentional, has been that of lifting humanity out of "the idiocy of rural life," and replacing the fragmentation of humanity by socialization of human existence (objectively speaking) through the growing, deepening interdependence of the world's productive forces. Today, no individual person within the advanced capitalist sector (or "workers' economies" sector) can biologically survive as a potentially productive human being without the at least indirect contributions to the production of everything he consumes by the interdependent efforts of almost every person throughout the world. No individual human being in any part of the world has the prospect of emerging beyond his present state of misery except by the collective productive efforts of society on a world scale. Spinoza's quasi-religious view—to achieve humanity for the individual through understanding one's place as an "extended being" in the causal sequence of a totality of human events—is now a practical, immediate reality of everyday life in even the most obscured and backward nooks of our society as a whole.

What each individual contributes or fails to contribute to the advance of culture and production of means of existence has rather immediate material consequences for the world as a whole. The deliberate, materially realized achievement of real humanity is now within the practical grasp of every *potentially socialist* individual within society. Individual man can not be thus lifted from the alienated state of quasi-bestiality, from the pit of anarchist despair—of each individual living for himself—into the condition in which every human individual achieves real humanity—living self-consciously as a person of importance to the entire human species present and future. An individual seeing in himself or herself the "brick" on which the foundations of future humanity are laid. An individual finding and realizing in reality that nobility which religious ideology fantastically disguised in order to deny man humanity in real life and locate the hope of being human only in the deluded "immortality" of spiritual life.

The activity of becoming such a human being under conditions of capitalist social-productive relations is socialism. Socialism is primarily a philosophical world-outlook on the whole of human history and one's Self, which drives one without "remedy" to bring

immediately into being those new modes of socialist productive relations in which each individual comes to play a conscious, determining part in shaping the productive and related policies of his entire society. Socialism is a philosophical world-outlook which drives one without "remedy" to establish the beginning of true humanity in a democratic, deliberative process through which every member of society contributes to the formulation of the policies and "plans" by which society collectively administers its own existence, a society in which every individual can secure such human rights by becoming a part of the political working class for itself.

Socialism thus necessarily begins to become actual socialism as socialists develop their world-outlook in terms of a systematic or scientific world-view of the progressive, evolutionary reproduction of man as a self-changing species. In this view, the successive forms of human society have, in effect, superseded the task of simple biological evolutionary differentiation among lower animal species as the form of the evolution of life to higher forms. Thus, actual but still abstracted socialism becomes practical socialism (socialist practice) as the philosophical world-outlook developed by Karl Marx during the 1844–46 period is applied to understanding and mastering the potentialities of the available productive forces of capitalist society, and on the basis of that understanding formulates "economic programs" for the establishment of a socialist state and management of means of production. An "economic program" through which existing productive capacities are employed to increase total social accumulation of wealth at the most rapid rate: the necessary material process-condition for qualitative improvements in the condition of life of every member of the human species.

The socialist does not foolishly imagine that such "economic programs" by themselves will win a majority of society to socialism. The irony of capitalism is that while it socializes objective productive relations on a world scale, it simultaneously fragments the same humanity into small groupings somewhat replicating man's bestial, primitive past—bitterly contending local "community" and other parochialist forms. Even the working class under capitalism does not (usually) see itself as a class, but each section of the class is divided into competing groupings along national, ethnic, regionalist, trade-union parochial, "local community," and other quasi-bestial lines. Thus, the fragmented forms of working-class organization

secrete hegemonic ideologies which are absolutely irreconcilable with the socialist view. Thus, the precondition for winning masses of working people to socialist program is the supersession of parochialist forms of self-organization of the working class and its potential allies. Socialist consciousness, the ability to recognize the need for socialist economic program, is a product of successful subordination of localist forms of class organization to mass forms representative of common class interests. To win a majority to socialism, it is first necessary to begin to qualitatively change the way working people think; to accomplish that, it is necessary to change the forms of self-organization.

This kind of transformation of consciousness is accomplished under those conjunctural circumstances in which it is uniquely possible to catalyze alliances against capitalists among previously antagonistic sections of what Marxists term "the political class for itself." The "united front" (absolutely not the "Popular Front"!) of masses of working people and their allies against *all* capitalist political formations (e.g., Democratic, Republican, Liberal, "New Priorities," etc.), or—the same thing—the Soviet form, or "strike support" alliances which bring together trade-unionists, professional socialists, unorganized and unemployed working people, oppressed minority groups, radical youth as such, on the basis of *anticapitalist* programs addressed to the *positive* material interests of the class (wages, working conditions, conditions of productive development, enlarged productive employment, etc.), are each various approximations of the political (working) class for itself forms through which the people's philosophical world-outlook is qualitatively changed, in a socialist direction.

The form of self-consciousness of one's Self as a member of an anticapitalist political class, a class which rejects nationalism, trade-union narrowness, "local community" parochialism, etc., is what Marxian socialists mean by "class consciousness." Trade-union militancy, for example, is absolutely not a form of class consciousness, although the conditions for trade-union forms with "united front" forms of political organization.

Nor is it enough to simply work to bring such class-conscious political formations into being. The development of a competent socialist economic program demands years of intensive intellectual effort by persons who accept the responsibilities of Marxian eco-

nomics as a profession. It is impossible for masses of workers and others suddenly brought together under conditions of struggle to "spontaneously" develop an economic program any more than they might "spontaneously" solve the riddles of medicine or atomic physics. The conditions for mass political formations are conditions demanding immediate and profound alternatives, and such conditions do not permit us to contemplate extended periods of education and professional development of the sort which must come immediately after successful socialist transformation. The task of the socialist is to interconnect the practical organization of alliances with the development and propagation of "economic" programs, attempting to bring the two elements of socialist practice (consciousness and organization) together exactly as the advances in philosophical world-outlook (class consciousness) among masses of people suddenly make socialist programs agreeable to them.

The task of socialists' mass practice is to connect the "little wheel" of socialist theoretical consciousness to the "big wheel" of a political class for itself movement. It is in that process that every potential Marxian socialist has the opportunity to play a decisive role as an individual in the making of future human history.

The principal functional disorders affecting well-intended socialists are summed up in the synonymous terms, "pragmaticism," "empiricism," or "opportunism." On the scale of day-to-day "ego needs," considering the short span of biological existence and the brevity of span of one's most active, formative years of adult life, the connection between cause and effect does not seem to correspond in practice to that of the Marxist theoretical world-view except at the most extraordinary moments of development. The need of the "ego" to justify its activity in terms of "organizational success" by philistine, "business-like" standards, compels socialists to waver, to dabble in organizational "short cuts." Thus, the tendency among socialists to degrade practice to a succession of tactical "fads," to attempt to predict current developments only in the short run, and to orient to current political breezes—to play down socialist perspectives in the interest of getting in "on the inside" of anything of possibly larger notoriety as a short-term, popular-radical manifestations.

This is not to suggest that the actual socialist must not also reckon with short-term movements. However, the socialist sees the

short-term and local within the longer-range and holistic. As for Hegel and Marx, the particular by itself is purely "negative," alienated. The positive significance of the particular can only be dialectical, within the whole and as the particular directly subordinates itself to and services the whole.

"Sectarianism," abstention from developments, is simply the reverse side of opportunism. The sectarian socialist opportunist, recognizing his own proclivity for such opportunism, withdraws himself from the sphere of temptation in consoling, self-righteous contemplation of his "purity of essence."

The central problem, therefore, in maintaining the continuity of socialist development of cadre-forces through successive periods of ebb and flow of radical ferment, is that of developing individual and collective mastery of Marxian theory to the extent that this represents actual knowledge and understanding of the subject rather than the sophomoric gloss-making we usually encounter among spokesmen for various socialist organizations. Without a real assimilation of the Marxian philosophical world-outlook to that extent, no professed socialist can withstand the disorienting and morally debilitating effects of short-term ebb and flow or of sharp turns in the tactical situation.

That, in sum, is the premise for the existence and membership within the National Caucus of Labor Committees: To reproduce a "hard core" of developed Marxian socialist cadres within the U.S. socialist movement, cadres who have attained the degree of intellectual and moral development to withstand the kind of debilitating vicissitudes of ebbs and flows which have previously destroyed the revolutionary potential of organizations such as the Communist and Socialist Workers' parties.

Our perspective for the left-hegemony of our programmatic views, which might seem wildly pretentious to a naive view of present arrangements, is based on an understanding of the way in which various philosophical world-outlooks are determined among various strata of the population, and of the special circumstances under which large numbers of working people and others are susceptible of almost "suddenly" being won over to our sort of programmatic outlook and organizational proposals.

The ability of our organization to function as a "task-oriented" deliberating body, to function so that we may be assured in advance

that our decisions will actually represent an essentially correct socialist decision, is based on the limiting assumption that our membership is governed by the founding principals of our organization, as summarized here. *A homogeneous philosophical world-outlook, realized as a coherent body of materialized practice.*

Understanding Current History

The developments of the past half-century can be competently understood only as a vindication ("with a vengeance") of the overview of Marx's dialectical method and economic theories represented in Rosa Luxemburg's *The Political Mass Strike* and *The Accumulation of Capital*. It is in significant part a testament to the extent of actual male chauvinism in the socialist movement that leading socialist figures have "gotten by with" deriding the overwhelmingly vindicated theoretical achievements of a "mere woman."

Of all leading socialist figures such as Karl Marx and F. Engels themselves, only Rosa Luxemburg has comprehended the ABC's of Marx's dialectical method and economic theories. Where, for example, most self-styled Marxists have explicitly or implicitly identified *Capital* as a collection of empirical constructs from a study of a capitalist "closed economic model" of "nineteenth century competitive capitalism," only Luxemburg of all leading literary figures recognizes the actual significance of Marx's dialectical method in this work. She uniquely comprehends that the essential contradiction of capitalism is located not as an "internal contradiction" of a "closed economic model," but as a contradiction between the subjective and objective side of capitalist society, between the capitalist market valuation of capitalists' (paper) capitals (property-titles in investment) and the underlying, objective social productive "use-value" relations—as Marx emphasizes in the concluding, summary section of the Volume III (*Capital*) chapter on "Internal Contradictions."

Consequently, because of the prevailing, blundering understanding of Marx's economics by such leading figures as Lenin, the Marxist-Leninist movement (in particular) has treated capitalist value-relations as essentially matters of a closed, mechanical sys-

tem, and they have foolishly denied that the development of capitalism has been dependent largely on material resources exogenous to capitalist production as a "closed system." On such mistaken premises, Lenin's *Imperialism* was written, containing a most un-Marxian (actually Lassalleian) explanation of the so-called "aristocracy of labor," and attempting (after Hilferding) to explain imperialism simply in terms of the export of capital. Consequently, Lenin's *Imperialism* has been discredited *in fact* by developments of the past half-century, while Luxemburg's analysis of the breakdown of imperialism and the emergence of imperialist, statist war economy has been entirely vindicated.

It is the anti-Luxemburgist frauds and delusions of self-styled Leninist organizations which have inevitably played so large a part in accomplishing the total abandonment of serious studies of Marx's economics in the leadership and ranks of these groupings. The overwhelming majority of such groupings, Communist, "Trotskyist," or "Maoist," have absolutely no theoretical apparatus for unravelling the processes of current economic and related developments, and are thus compelled to limit themselves to a few mere glosses on the economic situation, generally deriving their "best estimation" of the current economic situation from (at best) the London *Economist* and (at worst) the financial columns of the *New York Times*.

The essential feature of capitalist society as an historically delimited "stage" of human development is that the accumulation of capitalists' capitals depends upon massive looting of natural and noncapitalist forms of wealth. Capitalism emerges as capitalism from the looting of (mainly) the feudalist countryside, and depends today upon ravishing noncapitalist populations, natural resources, and even the depletion of potential productive labor-power in the most advanced subsector (depressing levels of existence of "poor" below that required for modern productive labor-power). Thus, in its own *specific* fashion (thus, analogous to every precapitalist society) capitalist production exhausts those natural and man-improved resources on which continued production of the means of existence of the entire population depends. The so-called "ecological crisis" is simply and essentially a reflection of capitalist production coming into confrontation with the results of its unpaid looting of the natural preconditions for continued production and even human existence.

Once the national resources for such looting (primitive accumulation) dropped below the rate of potential looting required by national capitals (about 1870), capitalism perpetuated its economic existence by imperialism, a new form whose essential feature was "international loans." Through the development of centralized banking and related institutions, purely fictitious capitalists' capitals, as well as unsold production and idle capacities, were converted into credit-debt capital. These forms of capitalization of fictitious capitals were then used as means of purchase of heavily discounted loan-capital advanced to the account of native economies as a massive, self-perpetuating foreign debt upon those subject sectors. The "hard" part of the original capital ("unsold inventories" and idle capacity) was indeed exported as part of this process, which neither Hilferding nor Lenin comprehended. This is the way in which the metropolitan capitalists realized real values to substantiate the purely fictitious portions of the principal amount and debt-service of the international loans. Masses of use-values (natural resources and unpaid native labor) were simply "stolen" to become capitalist commodities securing the fictitious valuation of the principal amount of paper capital advanced in such international loans. The characteristic feature of imperialism (1870–1913) was not overseas capitalist investment in expanded production of surplus value, but looting of existing noncapitalist and natural wealth.

By approximately 1913, the rate of capitalist looting of the "underdeveloped" sectors had reached the proportion that the possible rate of looting was insufficient to satisfy the engrossed appetites of all the imperialist nations *simultaneously*. The inevitable and most logical resolution of this technical difficulty was World War I, in which the game of "survival of the fittest imperialism" was played out in a manner agreeable to capitalist morality. However, World War I solved nothing. Apart from the dynamics of continued U.S. internal development and Latin American looting during the early to middle 1920s, and apart from the United States propping up of the toppling credit structures of Europe during that period, the entire capitalist world was in a perpetual near or actual depression from the end of World War I to the onset of the Great Depression in 1931. When the credit-expansion capabilities of the U.S. sector were virtually exhausted during the 1929–31 period, the entire edifice of the old imperialism came toppling down in the

form of the imperialist breakdown crisis which Luxemburg had foreseen. (With a delayed reaction in a French economy too rotten to immediately detect the fact of its demise.)

The final break with the old form of imperialism began to develop in the United States and Germany in the 1933–34 period. Roosevelt's NRA and Hitler's ultimately analogous programs in Nazi Germany represented the establishment of statist war economies as the new form of imperialism—*exactly as Luxemburg's correct application of Marx's economic theories had forewarned.*

The differences between the United States and Nazi Germany developments were ultimately located in the differing strategic situations of the two imperialist economics. Germany as a "have not" nation in the imperialist sense, was compelled by lack of colonies and satrapies to proceed immediately and directly to looting neighboring capitalist (even fascist—Poland) populations and means of production as well as the Soviet Union, as the only means for most urgently shoring-up the value of the Deutschemark as the autonomous monetary basis for the Third Reich's autarky. The United States, as the emerging hegemonic imperialist power, was able to loot neighbors by more "democratic" means.

Thus, in Nazi Germany, the ideology employed for mass liquidation of European Jewry was essentially the wedge-end of the liquidation of tens of millions of Europeans in Krupp's (and other smokestack baron's) slave-labor system of converting the broken, bled bodies of slave labor into a source of capital. Looted plants of French and other capitalists replaced the simple imperialist looting of noncapitalist wealth. The more general result of the emergence of statist war economy was World War II, through which the United States conquered every former enemy and ally alike (excepting the Soviet sector). The paper capital of Germany and Japan was conveniently liquidated, and the real productive forces of those countries integrated into the U.S. dollar-based monetary system at bargain-basement prices. Postwar devaluations of the Pound and Franc exemplify the means by which the United States purchased its former allies (and their former colonial possessions) at the lowest, clearance-sale prices. Through the pioneering pragmatism of the American Military Government and auxiliary, ad hoc European recovery aid, culminating in the Marshall Plan and the Common Market-EFTRA arrangements, the postwar U.S. dollar based itself

firmly on the cheaply purchased material assets of both the advanced capitalist sector and its former colonies, clearing the decks for a relatively short-lived period (approximately two decades) of postwar economic recovery of the U.S. statist war economy.

This process came to an approximate end during the 1964–65 period, a development mediated by the 1957–58 recession in the United States itself.

The internal dynamic of the U.S. domestic postwar recovery was relatively depleted following the post-Korean war credit-expansion of 1954–57, precipitating the U.S. sector into a 1957–58 recession from which the economy has never essentially recovered. The ability of the U.S. sector to survive 1957–58 was mainly based on the continuing "Marshall Plan" development of western Europe and Japan, a process which would and did continue up to the point that the superprofits made in Europe (by virtue of cheapness of European labor and currencies relative to the dollar) did not encounter the inevitable contradictions of this one-time solution to U.S. economic problems. Once Europe itself was confronted with the rising costs of actually reproducing a modern labor force (as opposed to capitalizing on productive wealth left over from World War II resources and potentials), and once the development of western Europe began to depend upon expanding markets for international loans and investments, the entire world monetary system would have begun plunging toward a new general breakdown crisis.

The imminence of breakdown began to be manifest during the 1964–65 period. The events of 1964–68 in Britain, France and Italy, less directly the developments in Greece, the demonetization of the dollar in March, 1968, and subsequent conditions in Italy and elsewhere, bespeak the downward spiralling of the monetary process toward a new conjuncture more profound in its implications than that of the 1930s.

Either socialism, or fascism and nuclear holocaust, are the unique historical alternatives for humanity throughout the world during the 1970s. There is no "middle ground."

The Rise and Collapse of the New Left

The effect of the 1957–59 period in the United States itself was to abort the process of expanded reproduction (in real terms)

within the national sector. To the extent that productive employment continued and even expanded to approximately 1953 levels (!) under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, this modest growth was mainly dependent upon supplying real wealth for means of production and consumption demanded by expansion of the "new Frontier" to broader and more distant realms of military spending and outer space itself.

Despite continued absolute growth in the size of the working class and some increase (based largely on military aerospace) in employed workers, productive employment as productive employment has essentially stagnated in the United States since 1957-58! Increasing employment during the 1961-69 period has been based on not only the expansion of military aerospace forms, but upon the proliferation of other categories of nonproductive activity, exemplified by governmental and related bureaucracies and office-building construction.

This has meant that increasing proportions of those dependent upon expanded productive employment were pushed out of the productive labor force into the ranks of the "poor" and unemployed youth, or into thinly concealed forms of imminent unemployment. The masses of black and Hispanic internal migrants to urban centers, new generations of ghetto youth, had virtually no real opportunities for progressive assimilation into productive roles (and incomes) within the United States, but were chiefly relegated either to virtual "slave labor" categories of marginal employment, or to a lumpenized scrap-heap of persons denied the material level of existence and culture to become potentially productive in terms of modern productive technology.

With the majority of youth in general, the process was sometimes more subtle. In significant part, the massive expansion of university enrollments during the 1958-68 period was essentially a form of disguised youth unemployment.

The irony of this expansion in university enrollments is that the development of a modern productive labor force demands an "open admissions" program aimed at training the virtual entirety of youth not only according to the technological requirements of the most advanced forms of production, but more emphatically to foster exactly that creative concept-forming potential which tends to be destroyed by present norms of family and institutionalized

educational life. In general, these were not the goals or content of expanded academic enrollments of the recent period.

The pseudoemployment was concealed in part by the growth of nonproductive governmental and service employments, and in a very large part by the need of an expanded educational process for more instructors. Most sociologically and politically significant was the multiversity's revealing degradation of the quality of higher education, a development which in several ways unconsciously communicated to the student the emptiness of this expansion of youthful leisure forms.

Thus, the aftereffects of 1957-58 were immediately the disaffection of increasing numbers of youth in general and oppressed minorities in particular. The way in which this disaffection became radicalism—the New Radicalism of the 1960s—was partly and significantly molded by dissimilar social reactions to post-1959 within the ranks of the organized working class. As youth and oppressed minorities became more radicalized, organized labor became—for a time—more decidedly politically conservative.

Trade unions as "economist" forms, naturally tend to be breeding places for not socialism but political conservatism of a certain kind. This general tendency of trade unions in Europe and the United States during the past century has been exacerbated during the past quarter century as the cumulative effect of the shaping of legalized trade-union institutions under the politically treacherous leadership of the Lewises, the Hillmans and (least heroic of the trio) Reuther—to say nothing of so obvious a type as the Meaney's. In periods of expanded capitalist employment of productive labor, this conservative tendency of organized labor tends to be offset by recruitment into the plants from "outside" strata of youth, proletarianized ex-farmers, immigrant national minority strata, etc. In the process of recruiting new social strata of the political working class forces into trade unions and imminent trade-union organizations, the new recruits become the social basis for a social and potentially political orientation of hard-core "older" unionists to the other layers of the political class. A "normal" process which was attenuated during the 1960s.

Thus, all the circumstances of stagnation of the early 1960s tended to make unions more distinctly politically conservative.

This combination of social tendencies provides the determining

setting for the emergence of the New Radicalism—or “New Left”—of the 1958–65 period (especially), and indirectly but definitely accounts for most of the idiotic notions which were the leading convictions among most New Lefters during those and subsequent years.

The immediate, domestic origins of the New Radicalism of 1958–65 are located in the interrelations between the two social strata who made up that movement’s loosely defined ranks: petit-bourgeois youth and lumpenized poor.

The petit bourgeois suffers a double alienation. Where the member of the working class has an immediate social identity in his comprehension of society’s dependence upon his production and productivity, and the capitalist is able to identify himself as a member of society’s ruling class, the petit bourgeois does not represent a real class in any true sense, does not represent a social formation potentially capable of reorganizing society as a whole, and is, furthermore, atomized into a mere collection of the most viciously parochialized functions (administrative appendages) of capitalist political and economic institutions. To find his “Self,” to gain a “soul,” the petit-bourgeois radical must attach himself either to the ruling class (fascism) or to the working class (socialism). Sufficiently exasperated, and lacking a working-class social orientation, the petit-bourgeois radical easily degenerates into a “political terrorist” or becomes an actual fascist or protofascist.

For most of the radicalized youth of the 1958–65 period, the sole available source of “soul” was the oppressed stratum of lumpenized blacks (later, Hispanic and other oppressed groups were added to this repertoire). The strata to which the petit-bourgeois radical turned was itself the victim of vicious alienation from real productive life, and thus a stratum susceptible to petit-bourgeois-like social value-judgments.

These radical youth were pronounced in their anti-working-class moods. Not only was the organized working class politically conservative, but the most influential stratum of New Radical youth, including numerous “red diaper babies” steeped in their parent’s political demoralization, was recruited mainly from that layer of students and younger faculty who were freed of the need to qualify themselves to become productively employed. It was the radicalized youth of leisured suburbia, a youth whose delusions were subsi-

dized by parental remittances (actual or available on call), who expressed their own social outlooks in favor of a society based on persons who rejected working for a living. This stratum was the most glibly miseducated, and combined thus the leisure and the capacity for passable double-talk to become the influential cadres of the New Radical “counterculture.”

It was this underlying, permeating social orientation of the New Left, its dominant anti-working-class moods, which inevitably found their appropriate expression in the epidemic mental-political disease of U.S. “Maoism.” Beginning with the “Bay of Pigs” incident, when significant numbers of these youth began to go beyond ultramilitant liberalism toward anticapitalist politics, the anti-working-class philosophy of these youth found in first Cuba and then Mao Tse Tung a rationalization for a “cultural revolution” without the working class. Mao Tse Tung’s empiricist ravings and Mao’s image as the leader of a worldwide peasant revolution, set increasing numbers of radicalized youth (and later, sections of the black minority radicals) into a search for a U.S. “domestic” peasant constituency, a “new working class” of professionals, social parasites and unemployed. The happily defunct “May Second Movement,” the earliest organized expression of such political insanity, was not accidentally the breeding place for the political factions at the head of protofascist/political terrorist (anti-working-class) cults such as “Weatherman” today.

The 1965 developments of the Vietnam war became the “Bay of Pigs” on an extended scale. This phenomenon, indirectly linked to conjunctural economic developments then emerging, became for masses of radicalized youth the transmission belt from impatient liberalism into anticapitalist moods and posture.

1965 represents a breaking-point in the development of New Radicalism on two counts. The first basis for dividing the development into a 1958–65 and 1965–68 period (or, 1965–69 development period) are obviously enough on premises already stated: 1965 marks the transition of SDS and similar impatient liberal groupings of youth into mass anticapitalist institutions. Less subtle, but of more lasting importance is the emergence of the beginning of a pro-socialist current within the New Left after 1965.

This initially small portion of the New Left development was immediately prompted into existence by the failure of the liberal

“community” and “poor” schemes of Tom Hayden and other apostles of engaged liberalism, a development embodied in the split of the old *Studies on the Left* editorial board after a prolonged factional feud in 1966. Despite the lag in ridding the movement of pre-1965 liberal tactical recipes, recipes which came cropping up afresh wherever the radical ferment attempted to relive the past, those who had experienced and studied the bankruptcy of Hayden’s liberal schemes were convinced of the need for an anticapitalist approach to the economic issues of life of the oppressed (and other) sectors of the working-class forces.

The culmination of the post-1965 pro-working-class (pro-socialist) development within the New Left was the 1968 Columbia Strike. It was this development which produced the forerunners and present organization of the National Caucus of Labor Committees, an organization which represents the socialist faction of the 1968 split between pro-working-class and anti-working-class factions of the fractured New Left.

The way in which the hegemonic socialist groups responded to Columbia and its aftermath has much to do with the unfortunate sides of the past two-years’ developments and also illustrates in telling fashion the constitutional incapacity of the SWP-YSA, CP-YWLL and other such groups to play a meaningfully positive role in current history.

Had cadres from the Communist and Socialist Workers’ parties intervened on the side of the socialist factions against the anti-working-class factions at Columbia (and afterward) the political situation among campus radicals would not be the dismal shambles it has become, and the revolutionary-socialist forces in the United States, instead of being generally disgraced as they are, would number in tens of thousands of committed cadres with a substantial working-class composition having developed in the wake of labor ferment since late 1969. The present, less fortunate state of things essentially reflects the very nature of the CP-YWLL and SWP-YSA, which prevents them from playing a positive political role at any crucial turn in the political situation.

Thus, the New Radicalism of the 1958–68 period is dead, the New Left is dead, and new campus-radical ferment can emerge only on the new foundation of an orientation to the exasperated class

struggles of capital and labor throughout the advanced capitalist sectors.

The Labor Movement Today

A statist war economy produces a shallow, short-lived (historically) capitalist prosperity by increasing nonproductive expenditures (such as war production, welfarism, etc.) while holding the number of the labor force engaged in production of useful commodities relatively fixed or diminishing. A war economy accomplishes its purposes in part by taxing all capitalists and pooling the accumulating funds so obtained to sustain some capitalists in war production. This permits the capitalist to have the essential, technologically advanced “edge” of Department I production, essential to the very existence of capitalist economy, without suffering the countervailing effects of employing the major portion of this technology in competition with existing capitalist commodity production. The profitability of this useless production of military aerospace goods is obtained by adding to the laundry swapping among capitalists the margin of profit provided by taxation on incomes of wage earners. In general, provided that other props (primitive accumulation) are sufficient, this war economy arrangement permits a capitalist economy to survive *with stagnating productive labor forces* for a decade or so, while increasing the proportion of total capital associated with pure social waste!

The result of such an arrangement must be, ultimately, a deflationary inflation. The pressures of inflation on the capitalist monetary system produce deflationary pressures against the production of useful commodities. This very pressure against expansion of useful production increases the cost of overall waste and debt-service per productive worker employed in producing useful commodities, so that deflationary measures exacerbate the rate of apparent “cost inflation.”

The analytical powers of pro-capitalist economists respecting this paradoxical phenomenon are truly wonderful to contemplate.

Since the valuation of capitalists’ capitals (property titles in investment) is based on a multiple of profit-earnings, the capitalist

system is prevented by monetary collapse only by increasing profits now at the expense of real incomes of wage earners. Capitalism thus responds to the new monetary crises of today by attempting to increase the mass of profits at the expense of wages (real wages). Reducing real wages contracts the internal market for useful production, thus weakening the profitability of useful production, thus compelling the capitalists to gouge real wages more deeply.

The capitalist press echoes the White House's assertion that the problem of inflation is caused by rising costs. The fraud in this assertion is the failure to distinguish between productive and non-productive costs. Obviously, if one reduces the proportion of wage earners engaged in useful production of useful commodities, while maintaining war production and other forms of waste activity, the nonproductive costs to be applied as an "overhead burden" to the employment of every productive worker increases. Thus, although productivity of productive workers actually gallops ahead at rates in the vicinity of 7 percent per annum, the nonproductive burden on each of these productive workers is growing even more rapidly, so that the apparent overall costs per productive worker are, in fact, rising. Since all of this must be paid for out of either the price of useful commodities or taxation on wages, we have the results manifest in the U.S. economy today. Inflationary deflation under conditions of rapidly rising productivity, while real wages rapidly decline!

This economic situation undermines the objective basis for continuation of the labor-Democratic Party alliances in the United States as it tends to break apart other forms of alliances between working people and capitalist political parties in every advanced capitalist sector.

The break develops unevenly. The initial effect of pressures against real wages is to make many workers initially more politically conservative in the United States, a conservatism exemplified by the worker's determination to keep up his mortgage and consumer credit payments, to cling to "legal" trade union forms, such as the "legal" company-union contract and the state legal and administrative machinery which is the formal basis for union contracts today. Fringe benefits, in the tradition of Bismarck's "labor reforms" of the nineteenth century, also make the worker initially more conservative as he becomes more militant *in defense* of what he has. More generally, he is inclined to depend more "loyally" on his un-

ion leadership (which is organically tied to the Democratic and Republican machines) at the same time he is cursing it and moving beyond it in his intentions.

For such and other reasons, there has been no *notable* rise in union "rank and file" caucuses during the recent period. A slight increase in general caucus ferment, larger formations tied to one faction of the bureaucracy against another faction in certain notable and exceptional cases, but no burgeoning trend in truly independent "rank-and-file" caucuses with significant mass support.

The "other reasons" for the lag in caucus formation within unions are more important than those already cited. The fact is, local rank-and-file caucuses have no credible basis for coming into being *as mere within-union oppositional groupings*. Making existing unions "more militant" is mainly a self-consoling delusion of those activists schooled in the socialist tactical traditions of the late 1930s and early 1940s. Making existing unions "more militant" is absolutely no *competent* alternative to what is loosely described as the "sell-out" proclivities of existing union leaderships *generally*.

Union leaderships of the CIO type do not "sell out" the membership because they are wretched in general. On the contrary, union leaderships sometimes seem to "sell out" because they, like the majority of "rank-and-file" members, refuse to undertake the sole alternative to accepting a poorer settlement. Union leaders of the CIO-type generally go as far as they think the majority of members' union militancy will carry the union in gaining additional benefits. Tiny minorities of "rank-and-file" professional insurgents are often more militant on these questions precisely because they enjoy the speculative luxuries of being out of office. The isolated militant can imagine all sorts of wonderful gains which would absolutely not seem credible to him were he faced with the responsibilities of union office, were he faced with the tactical realities which the incumbent union leadership has to face as long as it accepts existing legal forms of labor struggle and as long as the membership is unwilling to go beyond mere legal forms.

To obtain larger economic gains than are generally obtained under CIO-type union leadership today, to break through on all the important working conditions and related issues, it is essential to go beyond mere trade-union forms. Admitting that existing CIO-type union leaderships often miss a widespread upswing on mem-

bers' militancy, that they fail—even within trade-union terms—to provide the quality of leadership which could mobilize labor's subjective as well as material trade-union potentials, etc., what a union can win is brutally circumscribed by shifting policies and practices of government administration, legislatures and courts at the federal, state, and local levels. The margin of contractual wage gains and working conditions gains needed to maintain a real-wage level today tends to go beyond what the capitalist class (conscious policy of government and leading employers) will permit to be awarded. Every strike which seriously aims at maintaining real wages is no longer a simple trade-union struggle; it is already a political strike against both government and employers.

For reasons to be considered a space ahead, it is possible for some sections of the labor movement to secure exceptional concessions, like Rockefeller's overriding of Lindsay's political blunder in the famous Sanitation Workers' strike. The question of risking a political break with a significant section of the working class before the capitalist class is prepared or forced to risk such a break will sometimes cause government and employers to pull back from a head-on collision. These pullbacks, used to sustain vestiges of the labor-capitalist party alliances, will in general be less and less possible for the *capitalists* and politicians in the period immediately ahead.

Thus, a caucus based on the narrow perspective of solving problems of workers by changing the guard at the top is plain self-delusion or outright fraud. The only viable form of "rank-and-file" caucus within the shop is a local caucus organized for the purpose of linking the union membership directly to "cross-union caucuses" of various section of the political working class like the Strike Support Committee organized in Baltimore this past Fall. The only viable basis for "rank-and-file" caucuses within unions and shops is a policy of shifting the basis of struggle from unions by themselves into the domain of emerging approximations of political class-for-itself forms, as proposed in the Labor Committees' September 7 and September 25, 1970 "calls" in connection with the General Motors strike.

The relative success of the Baltimore Strike Support Committee, organized at the instigation of the Labor Committees, illustrates

several important and interrelated points for work in the months immediately ahead.

First, the success of the Baltimore Strike Support Committee was possible because it was immediately focused on a local strike of (mainly oppressed minority) bakery workers. The margins of support added by the work of the Strike Support Committee was a decisive contribution to winning that and other connected strikes.

Second, the UAW local in Baltimore County began to respond seriously to the Strike Support Committee at the point the General Motors strike (if it had continued) would have gone into a second, and more political stage. UAW members around the nation showed little interest in "strike support"—serious or "soup pail" varieties—as long as it appeared that the strike was proceeding successfully along lines which have become traditional during the past quarter-century in the United States. It was only at the point that a continued strike meant a changed political overtone for the struggle that unionists who were prepared to continue began to think in terms of "outside support" and more political forms than mere pure-and-simple militant trade-unionism.

The second point vindicates the estimation spelled out in the Labor Committees' September 25, 1970 analysis and "call." It also implies that the formation of Strike Support Committees must not be delayed until a large union's membership suddenly decides to make a turn in its strike orientation; if no strike support formation exists, to precisely what can the union so suddenly turn? Obviously, the existence of the very sort of strike support groups we instigated in Baltimore, the sort of strike support the CP and SWP-YSA refused to assist in organizing!—the progress of political-social developments in the labor movement will tend to be aborted, precisely in the way that the CP and SWP-YWLL (among other socialist groupings) literally sold out the working class by abstaining from the Labor Committees' September 7 and September 25 call, as those socialist organizations literally sold out the General Motors UAW workers.

The first point shows how strike support organization is to be built generally, focusing on those strikes and related labor struggles in which the mobilizable amount of material assistance to the struggle is a possible margin for success over defeat. This "less spec-

tacular" focus of work provides a nationwide strike support movement with the roots, the growth, the increased cadres through which to become a major factor in major strikes.

We emphasize that to the extent the so-called socialist movement responds to today's labor struggles at all, it and its campus-radical peripheries show an understandable but misguided tendency to "take a position" only on strike campaigns by national unions against large corporations or large employer associations. This amiable blunder by such socialists reflects their mechanistic state of mind, identifying a national movement only with actions by national labor institutions, etc. We are, contrary to such mechanistic outlooks, in a period of generalized and escalating class struggle, with limited socialist forces on hand to intervene. The possibility of national political class for itself formations depends significantly upon establishing "smaller precedents" for such formations on a larger scale through numerous smaller, more local successes and partial successes. The point is to mobilize support on the broadest scale for each local struggle of the form proposed in the September 7 and September 25, 1970 General Motors' strike calls by the NCLC.

The proposal to "bite off what one can chew" would itself lead to folly if we approached such work in terms of each local Labor Committee attempting to establish its own local, autonomous strike-support organization. Wherever such a formation is established, this formation must be immediately supported with telegrams and other forms of support-declarations from around the nation. A dozen persons in this group here, a score in that group there, a half a hundred on a certain campus—taken nationwide, it adds up to thousands or tens of thousands declaring solidarity with a struggle—under conditions in which the greatest subjective danger to work is a feeling of isolation. Such forms of token mobilization must of course be supplemented by material support, as feasible and appropriate. The tactical objective of such work, beyond the immediate situation under scrutiny, is that of laying the basis for a nationwide organization, an organization based largely on those small groupings brought together through support of several such local struggles around the nation.

Strike support does not mean setting up a calendar of "glorious festivities" based on when the railway workers or steel workers are

due to begin walking picket lines. National strike-support organizations is a permanent, continuing undertaking for this entire period, a form of growing self-organization of the nationwide political (working) class for itself, a process of focusing the support of everyone we can mobilize at each juncture for every strike-support effort of the "Baltimore" form in every locality they develop. *National strike support organization of the "Baltimore" form is the unfolding of a process leading directly into the creation of a mass-based socialist party capable of becoming the government and management of the U.S. economy during the present new decade.*

Our approach to trade union work must be principally oriented to creating caucuses within trade unions which are mainly premised on the perspective just stated.

This tactical and organizing work is not limited by any means to bargaining issues of local or nationwide unions. Issues of housing and other "consumer" issues of working people are just as much a part of the working class's political struggle as union struggles. Strike-support organizations means welding union members, unorganized, unemployed, welfare victims, and political socialist organizations into a united front which addresses itself to meeting all working-class working conditions, employment and real income demands at capitalist expense, whether by means of appropriating incomes of capitalist employers or through shift of tax burdens from wage earners to capitalist, or by eliminating capitalist waste production of all sorts in favor of useful production and construction in the interests of the working class.

The Labor Committees' *Emergency Reconstruction Program* for a socialist U.S. government during the 1970s represents a guide for the development of positive class demands leading toward the programmatic measures to be taken by socialist government.

The critical task in this work is that of creating united fronts which are self-consciously simultaneously representative of white workers, oppressed minority strata as such, and socialist political and black trade unionists (notably), unorganized and unemployed forces. It is a matter of the dividing line between socialist principles and pro-capitalist or merely reformist pseudosocialism that the socialist be opposed to parochialist struggle formations which exclude other sections of the political class, or which propose, as anarchists do, a mere federation of autonomous parochialist groups, each with

its own autonomous "program." The program of the united front subordinates the parochial interest to the political class interest, and the organization of the united front explicitly denounces or repudiates exclusion of rights of membership in the united front to any section of the political class which accepts the united front's program.

The immediately opposed formula for strike support is that which is usually offered by most U.S. socialist groups (whenever they elect to concretize their technical affiliation to the working class). These groups insist that "strike support" means supporting the demands of a particular union. The only admissible variation on this subordination of one's support to a union's "autonomous" program is the legalism termed "critical support," in which one notes one's exceptions to particular features of either the union itself or its program of demands or proposed tactical approaches. This is the notorious "soup pail" theory of "strike support" endorsed by the SWP-YSA and CP-YWLL, the centrist or "Menshevik" conception of "strike support." What they reject is the notion developed by Karl Marx that the political class for itself is a superior body of the class forces respecting any mere class-in-itself grouping. In strike-support work by Marxists, it is the strike-support organization, the united-front organization, which establishes the program and tactical approach for the forces involved, not the union itself. A "strike support" organization as the "local socialist soup-pail auxiliary" of a union is abomination, which has nothing in common with the serious strike support organization the Labor Committee is proposing.

While the Labor Committees may collaborate with such disgusting "soup pail" associations under certain circumstances, the reasons for and limitations upon such uneasy associations of revolutionaries with fools will be plain enough in each case.

It is essential that capitalist political organizations not be included in united front organizations. Individual capitalist politicians and factions of capitalist parties may join united fronts provided that those individuals first accept the anti-capitalist programmatic features of the united front organization. That they agree first to tax capitalist rather than wage earners' incomes as a general method of funding needs, that they repudiate the class treachery of

"ability to pay" introduced to the labor movement like a hara-kiri knife by the late Walter Reuther. A "united front" which negotiates a program of strike support with a faction of the Republican, Democratic or Liberal parties is no united front at all, but an exercise in prima facie class betrayal.

Political anti-capitalism is social and programmatic content is essential. It is not essential that the united front be organized around the specific term "anti-capitalism"; it is indispensable that the united front be constituted of social elements of only the political working class and that the program of this formation counterposes the programmatic interests of the political working class to the political capitalist class, which means rejecting out of hand all capitalist political parties and their factions.

It will, of course, be argued that such a "sectarian" posture may preclude auspicious strike support formations for certain strikes where capitalist political factions are willing to support the strike on certain (reasonable) conditions. A practical approach to getting the best compromise under such circumstances is like sharing the costs of a shared suit of clothes with a horse; the garments that represent the results of such a compromise between a two-legged and a four-legged creature will fit neither.

The objectives of the united front organization are two. First, obviously enough, it is a way of assembling sufficient masses of the political working-class forces to permit a victory in local strikes, housing struggles, employment struggles, and so forth, where the forces and friends of those immediately involved in the issue would not suffice. Second, the tactical urgency of just such formations is what makes the united front possible and the real purposes of united-front formations practicable. The united front is for its participants a qualitatively new kind of social process, in which they are forced to "relate to" dissimilar sections of their own political class in a positive way *for the first time*. It is this qualitative change in relationship of man-to-man within the class forces which produces those changes in consciousness we term class consciousness, the suddenly developed capacity for understanding man and nature with a depth and scope way beyond what one has probably dreamed in ones' earlier life, the increased mental power to comprehend socialist program and the need for socialism as the alternative. The

united front is not merely a tactical tool, although it has that purely tertiary importance; it is a way of transforming the consciousness of its participants to become socialists.

During 1970, organizations of the unemployed became a root question in many parts of the United States for the first time since the 1930s. Barring full war-economy regimentation of the United States, or a rate of inflationary expansion certain to set off an inflationary explosion in short order, unemployment will grow rapidly during 1971, with many areas experiencing the 12.5 percent unemployment rates seen in Seattle this Fall.

The early 1930s demonstrated the important role unemployed organizations can play in the mobilization of political mass strikes. The bringing together of unemployment inevitably forms organizations representative of every sector of the potential political class for itself. Thus, the positive features of such organizations ought to be obvious enough.

The difficulties become clearer once the question is posed: *What to organize the unemployed to do in their own, immediate behalf?* A person faced with protracted job loss has immediate problems which are not so easily resolved under present conditions of bankrupted state and local treasuries! *Massive organizations* of unemployed and trade unionists for extended and augmented unemployment and welfare benefits become essential to pry loose from capitalist pockets the immediate funds needed to meet the immediate needs of the unemployed and those immediately threatened with unemployment. *Who pays for unemployment? No layoffs of those presently employed!* become immediate tactical questions, immediate concrete questions during a period of capitalist recession or depression. Demands for new productive jobs in housing, school, medical facilities, transit-system construction, paid for by taxation of capitalist incomes (incomes, not "profits"), have sharpened importance. Moratoria on rent payments and mortgage payments of wage earners on their homes while unemployed, moratoria on taxation of wage earners' homes during unemployment, no evictions, and related campaigns are obvious sorts of rear-guard struggles.

It is most important among unemployed not to promise unemployed (or present welfare victims) more than is within reach with the forces at hand. Organizers must maintain a strict distinction between *agitation*, on the one hand, and propaganda and educa-

tion, on the other. Those being organized must be clear concerning what the immediate action is aimed at gaining, as distinct from what we propose to gain by the further actions we take with larger forces, etc. Every socialist must continually make the difference between *agitation* and *propaganda* clear to those being organized, especially in unemployed and welfare work. It is criminal to play "fast and loose" with the struggles of persons in such desperate personal situations.

In general, the programs for all struggles are to be *derived from* immediate applications of our *Emergency Reconstruction Program*. The program we propose for socialist government in the United States in the 1970s represents a set of historic principles *toward which* we work in terms of approximation which fit the agitational situation in which we are working.

In concluding this section, we summarize the organizational goals of the process we see embryonically represented in the Fall, 1970 Baltimore Strike Support coalition work.

The leading role in the formulation of program and in catalyzing the formation and development of political class for itself forms is the socialist vanguard organization, like the organization of the National Caucus of Labor Committees and socialist organizations allied with the Labor Committees in such undertakings. These vanguard organizations have a somewhat direct connection to broader masses of working people through propaganda (newspapers, magazines, etc.), but, in practice, the connection of the socialists to larger numbers of working people is mediated through several social strata. The most immediate such stratum is the organization of the Baltimore "cross-union caucus" type, which represents the most advanced stratum of the potential political class for itself. The more advanced working people who play an active role in such cross-union caucuses are, in turn, embedded in whatever actual or nascent local caucus formations tend to exist within unions and other parochialist institutions of the class. These caucuses within parochialist formations like the union are, in turn, the connection of the more advanced ("cross-union caucus" member) to the broader organized masses, and to the unorganized masses around the organized strata.

These four tiers of organized forces are not fixed social categories, but are determinate stages of a process leading every mem-

ber of the political working class (in principle) to socialist affiliations and world outlooks. This process relationship is demonstrated by considering the way in which "cross-union caucus" forces are assembled and dispersed in the successive flows and ebbs of united-front activities. As the result of a productive struggle along "Baltimore" lines, a certain proportion of those engaged are won to or toward a socialist world outlook, while others are in varying degrees become more sympathetic to the socialist world outlook in some degree. When the action ebbs, the cross-union caucuses tend to disperse; a handful joining socialist organizations, others return to day-to-day life of a more ordinary sort. When the next call for united-front action develops, the socialist cadre-organizations intervene with augmented forces, as a result of previous recruitments in united-front work, and (during a rise in social ferment) they more easily assemble the forces of an active "cross-union caucus," which now penetrates more deeply into the various stratifications of class forces than during the preceding actions.

As the numbers of working people developing approximations of a socialist philosophical world outlook increases in this way, the capacity of the movement to act on more advanced programmatic conceptions is increased; the movement is broadened in its penetration and deepened in its penetration of the consciousness of every social stratum of the working class involved.

It is in this sort of process, on the ascending scale of social ferment in the working class, that the socialist vanguard organization is transformed into a mass-based socialist party, and acquires its proper authority to speak for the broad masses of working people.

The Organized Socialists

In the United States today, there are three principal organized groupings of the type which terms itself revolutionary socialist, plus two organizations limited in membership to "national minorities." The first three are the Socialist Workers Party-Young Socialist Alliance, the Communist Party-Young Workers Liberation League, and the National Caucus of Labor Committees. The latter two are the Black Panther Party and the Young Lords.

In addition to this there are, of course, numerous professed "Marxist-Leninist" groupings, ranging in numbers of members from a few hundred individuals (Progressive Labor Party, International Socialists), through several of between fifty to one-hundred members, and, finally, assorted grouplets of telephone booth dimensions. None of these organizations have any historic relevance to the question of which socialist tendency will gain left-hegemony over emerging labor forces during the 1970s—except as members of these doomed organizations may end up in one of the three principal organizations through the process of splits and fusions throughout the movement. It is the three principal organizations and their relationship to the Black Panthers which will determine the course of future U.S. history in the most immediate way.

However "irrelevant" the factional struggles among the three leading socialist organizations may seem to be at times, considering the minute fraction of the U.S. population directly engaged, if one understands the social process by which a revolution is organized, in such seemingly irrelevant disputes the future history of mankind is being rather directly settled.

As to the question of the irrelevant socialist groupings, the decline of Progressive Labor Party (PL) from "third place" exemplifies the questions involved. As we noted in assessing the rise and fall of the New Left, "Maoism" ran amok among U.S. campus (and other) radicals during the 1960s because Mao Tse Tung exemplified for U.S. suburbanite radicals and lumpenized strata the notion of an anti-capitalist revolution without the working class. Progressive Labor flourished because its ultraleft former trade-union colonists had turned, out of "unrequited love," to punish the ungrateful workers, accomplishing this by publicly consorting with the U.S. "peasantry," which they located in the persons of anti-working-class radicalized youth and, wherever possible, labor-hating black militants. The radicalized youth, in turn, saw in PL's ultra-left tantrum a means of giving socialist "legitimacy" to suburbanite hatred of working people generally.

Or, to be more exact, during the 1958-68 period, PL's ambivalence toward the working class made it a suitable halfway house for radicalized youth of two species. PL became, as for John Jacobs and other subsequent protofascists, a way station half-way to the more virulent forms of petit-bourgeois anarchism and "political

terrorism." To the extent that PL's ambivalence represented an orientation (of sorts) toward the working class, it also became a transmission belt for saner radicalized youth into the Labor Committees. Now that both the protofascists and their opposites, the Labor Committees, exist independently of PL, there is no longer any reason for PL to continue existing, except for the inertial commitment of that organization's proprietors.

The International Socialists, the only other association numbering hundreds of members, is actually not a socialist organization in the sense that the SWP, CP, NCLC or PLP are. IS is principally a confederation of distinct and fundamentally irreconcilable tendencies bound together by fear of independent existence—a collection of irreconcilable factions huddled together for "warmth." The organization is a product of its times, emerging by stages from the SP during the 1965–67 period under the impulsion of emerging labor ferment of that time and briefly flourishing under the borrowed charisma of Eldridge Cleaver during the 1968 "Peace and Freedom" campaign, the IS has since then demonstrated nothing so much as an incapacity to act in a serious, sustained way in any form of "outside work." Its serious internal problems are reflected in its recent device for coping-out of NY Strike Support work during the General Motors strike. The NY-IS group entered into public cohabitation with the infinitesimal Spartacist organization on the UAW strike, an engagement which is best described as a united-front with the graveyard.

The remainder of the irrelevant groupings are sufficiently detailed in paragraph for all. The Workers' League flourishes in irrelevance by means of its single technical accomplishment, a weekly 12-page tabloid of 5,500 circulation by one of the smallest socialist organizations in the United States, an actual accomplishment it embellishes by grossly-exaggerated representations of a British co-thinker group, the Socialist Labour League. There is, next, Sam Macry's personal cult, a schizophrenic affair with one ectoplasmic foot in the labor movement (Workers' World) and a youth organization whose sympathies vacillate between anti-working-class socialism and outright protofascism. Then, including several recent splits from the decayed Socialist Labor Party, there are post office box organizations whose political-theoretical pretensions

to absolutely distilled purity of "essence" are in inverse proportions to membership rosters.

The Socialist Workers Party

During L. Trotsky's lifetime, the U.S. Trotskyist organization never exceeded a few hundred members, but was nonetheless able to exert a significance way beyond such numerical forces mainly because of Trotsky's stature as the most heroic revolutionary figure of his time, and, in part, because of the relatively exemplary role played by a handful of Trotskyists in Twin Cities, in Auto and other locations. The "failure" of the Trotskyist organization to achieve greater relevance during that period does not reflect relative weaknesses in quality of organizational leadership vis-à-vis the CPUSA but the hegemonic appeal of the Soviet Union for radicalized U.S. workers. To have become a significant force during the late 1930s or early 1940s, the SWP would first have had to split off a significant section of the CP worker-cadres.

During the 1937–40 period, the SWP, like the CP, underwent a sharp degeneration in political quality, reflecting the lack of political-theoretical competence of its leading cadres and the pressures of depoliticization in the masses of U.S. workers. Like the CP, the SWP tended to function as a group of *militant trade-unionist leaders first and as political second*. Under the sway of this political retreat, the SWP leadership became generally infected with "Stalinophobia." This moral disorder, which was not lacking in abundant empirical foundation in certain important respects, reflected an adaptation to "anti-collectivist" moods among rank-and-file trade-union militants who were becoming increasing apolitical and socially parochialists.

Trotsky himself had denounced both SWP tendencies in 1940, pointing to the wretched, apolitical trade-union opportunism of the "Northwest Organizer" publication, and the "Stalinophobia" rampant in the Cannon leadership which had just split from Schachtman!

Following Trotsky's assassination, the SWP carried its errors to the point of a wild, postwar delusion, to the effect, that it, the

SWP, having achieved the magnificent dimensions of about 3,000 members (against tens of thousands of CPers!) was now situated to ignore the CP (!) in the process of directly leading a postwar American socialist revolution! From the combined effects of such soft politics with wild delusions the SWP has never recovered.

Aggravating those difficulties in more recent years, the SWP leadership, like the CP from which the U.S. Trotskyist organizations were formed, has always been deeply infected with the same sort of anti-intellectualism one is otherwise accustomed to expect from a wretch like Stalin or some trade-union bureaucrat of the lower orders. The Cannon-Foster faction of the 1920s reeked with this social chauvinism and a correlated tendency to degrade itself before the AFL bureaucracy of that time—translating Lenin's prescriptions in *Left-Wing Communism* into a catechetical repudiation of the horrors of "dual unionism." The SWP leadership after 1938–40 equated trade-union militancy with "class consciousness," and generally emulated the centrist Bebel on both the organizational question (bureaucracy) and in equating parochialist trade-union caucus leadership with the qualities of "distilled class consciousness"—a pretext for systematically suppressing the development of an actual revolutionary intelligentsia within the SWP. ("Intellectuals" within the old SWP were expected to "fawn upon" "worker-leaders" to "ask permission to speak.") Consequently—and it remains the case today—the SWP is organized *not* to resist petit-bourgeois social influences; on the contrary, it has been virtually taken over by the worst sort of petit-bourgeois Menshevik youth during the past five years! It is organized to prevent the development of a viable revolutionary intelligentsia within its ranks, and is thus incapable of becoming revolutionary again by internal means.

From 1948 to 1958, the Trotskyist movement (so-called) clung to a precarious organized existence, on the basis of continuing to represent the political literary heritage of Leon Trotsky vis-à-vis the lies of the Moscow Trials. Three developments coming to a head in the 1957–58 period offered the SWP the long-awaited opportunity to challenge the CP for left-hegemony. First, the Khrushchev "revelations," which destroyed the myth of the Moscow Trials for every CPer who had a modicum of judgment. Second, Hungary, which destroyed the myth of the Stalinist monolith. Third, the 1957–58 recession, which called into question the demoralizing

myth of neo-capitalism. It was the third development which made the first two worthwhile.

Almost as a reflex, two SWP leaders, Myrry Weiss and James P. Cannon, turned all of their organizational talents toward a "regroupment" with whatever parts of the CP and its peripheries could be snagged into the project. Unfortunately, 1958 was not 1938; the SWP of 1958 had nothing but programmless warmth to offer the CPers. The "regroupment" failed because the SWP was constitutionally incapable of offering anyone (including itself) a programmatic perspective for socialism in the United States for the foreseeable historic future.

Then and immediately afterward, the SWP leadership did respond to political and social manifestations flowing from the 1957–58 recession (all the while denying, emphatically that that recession had had much importance). They aimed themselves at the hindside of Civil Rights, radical-youth ferment, Cuba and Elijah Muhammed; they adopted the policy of attempting to get at the head of whatever procession passed the SWP headquarters, so to speak, and represented such exertions as theoretical leadership!

Until 1957–58, the SWP had maintained a formal pretense of conjunctural orientation toward a renewed working class political struggle in the United States. This pretense evaporated in the evolution of the "regroupment" tactic. The abandonment of that formal yardstick for measuring principled political differences within the organization destroyed the only premise for *principled* factional life within the organization. During the 1958–60 period, the leading social formations around the SWP leadership formally degenerated into cliques pure and simple, the bitterest "factional" struggles mobilized within the organization without a shred of systematic political differences offered by any of the several sides involved. The result was the purge of 1961–65, which destroyed the last vestige of democratic life within the organization in the *formulation* of political policies—democratic discussion was degraded into a mere exercise of tongues after the policy had been decided elsewhere.

The first flagrant manifestation of this overt political degeneration was Joseph Hansen's rationalization of the experience of the Cuban Revolution as a "new model" for socialist revolution for the entire period ahead. The issue is not whether Cuba became a work-

ers' economy in the 1960-61 period; it did. The issue is that Hansen et al., covered up the most essential feature of the Cuban Revolution—*its absolutely exceptional circumstances*, of a sort not likely to be repeated—and abstracted from a most fortunate contingency a general “new model” for socialist revolution during an entire historic period. Since Hansen is usually consulted by other SWP leaders whenever a literary precedent is required, it is relevant to observe that Trotsky debated the problem of such “exceptional circumstances” with E. Preobrazhensky during 1929, in which Trotsky conceded that the Chinese might make a revolution along the lines the Chinese Revolution later did occur but that the person who generalized from such “exceptions” to a “new model” was guilty of attempting to cut the throat of the revolutionary movement. As one can observe in the case of those noble, misguided youth who attempted to naively repeat the “Cuban model” everywhere on instant notice, some literal revolutionary throats did become literally cut following the advice of Hansen and similarly gifted prophets of the accomplished fact.

As U.S. socialist organization's gate receipts from the influence of the Cuban Revolution ebbed during late 1961 and early 1962, the SWP found a substitute for the Cuban Revolution in a brilliant, *empiricist* study of “black nationalism” presented by Robert Vernon. Malcolm X then emerged in late 1963 and early 1964 to save the SWP-YSA from total inactivity.

The strict interpretation of Black Nationalist tailism policies (“white folks keep out”) had certain contradictions for the SWP-YSA. The obvious predicament was represented in a resolution of the Fall, 1964 YSA Plenary session: The only movement in the U.S. is the black nationalist movement, from which white socialists must abstain; therefore, except for a handful of black YSA members, the YSA must restrict itself to selling the Militant and supporting the presidential ticket of DeBerry and Shaw.

SDS “fortunately” appeared to rescue the YSA from such an horrible self-imposed death. Jack Barnes, then chief YSA huckster, went on a national sniffing tour during late 1964, during the course of which he discovered the existence of SDS, returning (via a visit to Cannon in L.A.) to propose a new turn for the YSA. This led, following a rubber-stamp endorsement by the Winter, 1965 SWP

Plenum, to the SWP-YSA intervention in the SDS anti-war movement.

1965 was a fateful year for the SWP-YSA. The 1965 SWP National Convention rationalized the slow purge of 1961-65, effectively destroying all internal political democracy within the SWP and YSA and casting off all control of the organization's political lines by working-class political criteria. The Fall, 1965 Convention also embraced the single issue anti-war tactic line in its first official version. These developments not only determined the persistent line of the organizations since that time, but have transformed the organization sociologically. As a result of its non-working-class political orientation, its opportunism, the SWP-YSA has destroyed itself politically by constituting a cancerous mass of petit-bourgeois Menshevik youth as the overwhelming majority of its organizations!

This organizational fact was politically demonstrated at the Oberlin conference of the SWP-YSA during the past Summer. The pressure of anti-working-class Menshevik forces within the SWP-YSA was manifestly so great that *the SWP responded to a new eruption of the working class struggle by turning absolutely away from it, on the premise that the “nationalist” struggle is the working-class struggle!*

Thus, while there are undoubtedly numerous valuable cadres and potential cadres within the SWP-YSA, it is an hopeless undertaking to attempt to reform the organizations from within. Should a principled factional struggle erupt within those organizations, it is of course desirable that cadres within the organizations conduct a principled struggle to the end of its course, not because they might win, but because in the course of such a principled struggle they themselves can develop. There is no hard and set rule to be applied. A revolutionary goes where he can to do what has to be done the best.

The Communist Party

Numbers of persons around the socialist movement made strong criticisms of our report in *The Campaigner* that the CPUSA

was a "sleeper in the U.S. movement." Since that report was both written and published, the prediction has been well borne out. The Young Workers Liberation League is admittedly off to a very late start as a youth organization, but its recruiting since its formation has been at least as significant as that of the YSA. The parent organization, the CP, has seemed to come alive, as we predicted, under the impulse of a resurgence within the labor movement to which the CP tends to respond as the CP. Otherwise, that organization has material resources and reactivable cadres and peripheries in many strata, including the labor movement, which make it the first force to be reckoned with in the U.S. movement today.

The most conscious weakness of the CP as an organization engaged in reproducing itself is the loss of large sections of "red diaper babies" to other socialist currents as well as to petit-bourgeois anarchism and even profascism (Weatherman). Not that organizations of this sort reproduce themselves biologically, but the loss of the "red diaper babies" reflects a cutting-off of the CP from the majority of radicalized youth.

As the revival of the CP recently shows, the CP's situation is not impossible because of these difficulties. The SWP-YSA was, without doubt, relatively hegemonic to the CP in 1968-69. It was the SWP's failure to respond positively to the new ferment in the labor movement which created a virtual vacuum in which even the moribund CP flourished. The anti-working-class bias of the YSA's anti-war and "nationalism" lines impels the sort of youth being radicalized today in increasing proportions toward the CP. It may be generally stated that the SWP-YSA are presently the main recruiters to the CP-YWLL.

Except on one notable count, the CP has all the vices of the SWP in their worst possible form, adding to that repertoire of centrist betrayal the one monstrous crime of which the SWP-YSA is not yet overtly guilty: "intervention" within the Democratic Party and similar machines.

The sole favorable distinction of the CP—vis-à-vis the SWP—is that the CP has responded far more quickly and significantly to the class struggle, even if in a disgusting way. This is a virtue only to the extent that this issue makes the CP-YWLL as suitable recruiting ground for the National Caucus of Labor Committees.

Counterrevolutionary Roles of CP and SWP

When the term, "counterrevolutionary," is employed to describe a working-class oriented, nominally socialist organization, the meaning is by no means the same as when the same term is applied to capitalist political parties, police agencies, etc. In the present usage, the term signifies systematic sabotage of absolutely necessary forms of socialist work and drawing invaluable masses of socialist cadres away from urgent self-development and activities into demoralizing and useless or worse activities. Such sabotage of socialist work, when it involves a significant proportion of socialist cadres is objectively counterrevolutionary, as the French CP of 1968 was so obviously counterrevolutionary.

Three recent counterrevolutionary crimes are sufficient to warn us of this trait in both the CP and SWP. First, the CP and SWP in the anti-war movement have intervened to oppose connecting the anti-war issue to the issue of socialist reconstruction, or the issues of the war economy to the issues of the working-class struggle. Second, the New York Teachers' Strike, where both organizations contributed their entire resources in support of a "domestic CIA" maneuver to set black minorities and trade unionists into head-on collision; in this connection the CP and SWP behaved as virtual "CIA" agents—which is otherwise instructive on how the CIA succeeds in certain operations abroad—it finds dupes like the CP and SWP in those countries to assist in setting one national minority against another (e.g., would the SWP have supported Gorbes Burnham against Cheddi Jagan?), as Ernest Mandel supported exactly such a criminal enterprise in Belgium! Third, when they respond to the labor movement, they respond with "soup pail" strike support gimmickry, acting as virtual goons of the labor bureaucracy within the socialist movement to keep support movements subordinated to the demands of particular unions, etc., and prevent a political class for itself form of struggle from developing. This was their wretched joint role during the GE strike, the Postal workers' strike and during the UAW General Motors strike.

If either the SWP-YSA or CP-YWLL secures hegemony over the left in the United States in the immediate years ahead, the so-

cialist movement in this country is doomed, and the human race is thereby virtually doomed. "Counterrevolutionary" thus seems rather too mild an epithet to apply to those organizations.

The U.S. Political Capitalist Class

Capitalist parliamentary governments and parties depend for their existence upon certain kinds of favorable conditions of capitalist economic development. The essence of the "pluralist" system on which parliamentary machines are built, through which various sections of the ruled are assimilated into such machines, is the ability of the ruling class to dole out measured doses of material and related concessions to each of these assimilated "constituencies." What we come to know as capitalist democracy is thereby limited to a very narrow range of relatively advanced capitalist sectors under conditions of relative prosperity—at least, capitalist prosperity.

When a capitalist sector is in an age to accumulate at the maximal rate by virtue of relative economic backwardness or because of other problems of national development of a conjunctural urgency, there is virtually no latitude for democratic largesse to the broad masses. Even in advanced sectors, under conditions of actual or imminent general breakdown crisis, the same rule of iron-fisted regimentation applies. Democracy is possible only for sectors of capitalism in which the productive forces have developed to a certain extent and in which political democracy is imposed upon the ruling class as a necessary correlative of a relatively skilled and mobile working class. Once a breakdown crisis faces the capitalist economy, the narrow span of democratic life erodes.

Where the material conditions favorable to measured concessions to all major sections of the ruled no longer exist, the parliamentary system persists only in a state of perpetual crisis until the economic situation is either restabilized or the parliamentary system is replaced either by socialism or some form of capitalist police-state, such as fascism.

The deepening crisis of the capitalist world monetary system since 1964–65, reflected in the galloping state and local budgetary crises in the United States, and in general, rising inflationary-defla-

tionary crisis in the economy generally, has destroyed the real basis for the persistence of the traditional "parliamentary" party machines of the Republican and Democratic parties. The Labor Committees and their antecedent organizations have predicted and analyzed this process of breakup of the "two-party" system since 1966, expressing views which have been more recently replicated in a more superficial way by capitalist analysts and some socialists outside our organization. A 40 percent President (Nixon) and a 40 percent New York City Mayor (Lindsay), accompanied by a galloping growth of the cancer of Conservatism and the increasing objective basis for significant socialist electoral formations, is the Italian state of U.S. political life.

This erosion of the parliamentary system of government during the past five years is a worldwide phenomenon of the advanced sector and its immediate political appendages. Italy has been essentially ungovernable since 1968. Capitalist government in France rests mainly on the mortal aromas emanating from the PCF-CGT. Great Britain has been ungovernable for almost the entire half-decade; the illusion of the German Federal Republic's "economic miracle" is about to be punctured. The Trudeau government's application of the "War Measures Act" is the appropriate inaugural act of the 1970s.

Interpenetrating this general tendency are a variety of shifting policy positions within the political capitalist class and its intelligentsia.

From the last years of the Eisenhower Administration until about 1968, the basic policy of the leading capitalists was as follows: (a) temporarily stabilize a statist war economy within the United States; (b) develop the economic integration of western Europe as the main, immediate prop of the sagging U.S. dollar; (c) begin applying the "Third Stage of Imperialism" policy (Development Decade) in the most serious way to Southeast Asia, Latin America, Africa, the Near East; (d) develop a detente with the Soviet Union, involving Soviet contributions to the imperialist "development Decade" program. Under this general four-fold thrust of U.S. policy, it was proposed to begin applying to the United States itself some of the infrastructural-developmental policies (e.g., O.E.O.) which the CIA and allied agencies were applying to the "underdeveloped sector" generally.

During the last quarter of 1967 and the beginning of 1968, there were several manifestations of sharp turns in the world economic situation, undermining the possibility for immediate application of the basic long-range developmental policies to which leading capitalists were committed.

These included the devaluation of the British pound, which itself set off a series of shock-waves threatening to topple the entire world monetary system *within months!* By March of the following year (1968), the U.S. dollar itself had been virtually demonetized, a development followed by collapse of the French franc and revaluation of the German mark. By the end of 1968, inflationary forces had already threatened to explode the U.S. dollar into a new worldwide convulsion thus must surely usher in a depression, a general breakdown crisis.

Under these conjunctural circumstances, the long-term policies of the leading capitalists and their intelligentsia tend to be subordinated and even seemingly pushed to one side in behalf of contradictory short-term expediencies. The "Third Stage" policy progresses in Latin American countries in its various forms as "developmental juntas in Peru and Bolivia or the Allende regime in Chile, and Robert McNamara is the most active agent of this policy at the World Bank—but there is yet no unified thrust of imperialist resources behind this "last-chance" policy of the imperialist system, since to act upon a "last-chance" tomorrow the capitalist system must first survive today—or so it seems to them.

All of the short-term programs orbit about the extremely difficult undertaking, of stabilizing capitalist property titles for a year or more by direct assaults on the real wages and established legal rights of existing trade union forms throughout the advanced capitalist sector. The ruling circles are reluctant to go as far in this as economic self-interest dictates, since they *as yet* have no political machinery capable of governing without working-class cooperation. They would prefer to destroy the trade-unions' rights by "inches," a process which proceeds too slowly now from the standpoint of accelerating economic pressures for head-on collision with major sectors of the working class.

Short-term capitalist "recovery" in the United States is not absolutely excluded, even during the present secular thrust into a new depression. Such variants merely become increasingly unlikely

every day. If such an upturn occurs for a brief period, it can only occur by means of either massive regimentation or inflationary stoking, both of which would catalyze more explosive social effects. Short-term increases in employment and superficial forms of prosperity are not excluded; they are unlikely, could only be very short-lived, and would result only in accelerating and deepening the general breakdown crisis.

The fundamental contradiction in policy for the capitalists remains the issue of labor policy. Economic interests, taken by themselves, demand an immediate, all-out effort to break the labor movement and crush real wage levels. Since capitalists' capital is a political form, rather than wealth for itself, the existence of capitalists' capital as capital depends upon the political stability of the capitalist state, the stability of governmental debt and credit, and stability of the various governmental sectors abroad which are essential, satrapal pillars of the U.S. world monetary system. The immediate political stability of the democratic capitalist states depends to a major extent on continued cooperation of large sections of the working class into political machines of the capitalist parties—as we see in the past two years of Italy, a situation which has been tolerated by the U.S. rulers of Italy only because those rulers have as yet no alternative to center-left-*left* parliamentary cretinism as the basis for some semblance of stable government in that country.

Here, politics and economics interpenetrate in the most immediate way. A sharp, head-on collision with working people, when the capitalists have not yet mustered a large right-wing, anti-union machine independent of working-class forces, will tend to bring into being the political mass strike formations which are the social foundation for mass working-class parties and successful socialist revolutions. To the capitalists, it is politically preferable to administer economic and political repression by "inches" or perhaps "feet," keeping each new progress an atrocity contained to one or another isolated sector of the political working-class forces, avoiding the clear sort of attack which would be taken as a general provocation even by trade-union bureaucrats and "hard hats." This policy of measured assaults depends, obviously, on the lack of socialist forces capable of catalyzing a mass response to an attack on one isolated sector of the class—the anti-labor policy in the United States, for example, depends upon the continued hegemony

of such "socialist organizations" as the SWP-YSA and CP-YWLL. However, this more cautious tactic (again) fails to produce the rate of profit-gains from reduced real wages which the situation of spiralling deflation demands. Thus, on the latter grounds, the capitalist class is impelled to undertake social confrontations for which it is not really prepared and, conversely, for fear of such poor correlation of social-political forces, to dally, permitting the pressures of inflation-deflation to advance more rapidly—up to the point the desperate situation plunges the ruling circles into totally irrational desperation.

Under these circumstances, it would be the height of insanity for socialists to imagine that some more liberal section of the political capitalist class will rally to halt the attack on labor by means of some new "New Deal" turn. There is absolutely no economic basis for such a new "New Deal." However, wherever large socialist organizations develop, it is almost inevitable that the capitalist parties will include a proposal (for a brief period) of "Popular Front" government (e.g., the Communist or Socialist Workers' Party grown sufficiently large, of a sudden, to be offered a minor piece of an electoral slate, etc.). The sole purpose for such an offer is to induce potentially dangerous socialist (organized) forces to demoralize their own following and to totally disgrace themselves publicly.

This is not the same issue as that of the role of certain liberal strata in opposing the systematic destruction of civil liberties. The working class comes to political power normally with the support of large sections of the petit bourgeoisie, including peasants and professionals, the characteristic representatives of this class. While the liberal politicians are customarily mere appendages of the political capitalist class, they may be momentarily shaken loose from leading capitalist circles during a sharp political turn, and can be won—as surface reflections of the petit bourgeois to support of working-class formations, provided that socialist parties move decisively and quickly at each appropriate moment for action. Socialist organizations must put themselves in the lead in the defense of civil liberties generally, not only because we are for civil liberties, but because we must create the political movement of socialists on this question which will tend to draw the viable strata of petit bourgeoisie into the support of the revolutionary-socialist movement. This work

must not be *directly* connected to nor subordinate independent political class for itself formations and work; it is a purely auxiliary, secondary aspect of the process.

Thus, given the capitalist postures and vacillations which flow from the general economic and political situation, what the capitalists do will be determined by what we do. If and only if socialists succeed in creating mass-based political class for itself formations through "strike support" organizations along "Baltimore" lines, the capitalists may well offer a "popular front" tactic to us, if we are gullible and criminal enough to seek such an "opening." In sum, what the capitalists do will depend upon what the working class does in the way of political self-organization along class lines; and what the working class does in that respect is determined by the potentially hegemonic organized currents within the socialist movement. In that sense, the secret to the future zigs and zags of capitalist policy is located not behind the governmental and corporate boardroom door, but in the dynamics within socialist organizations such as our own.

We have already stipulated the optimal course of action for the working-class forces. It is necessary, in assessing capitalist policies to concentrate immediately on the most likely and deadly blunder which might be committed by a relatively hegemonic socialist force under conditions of political working-class upsurge in the months and years immediately ahead.

It is absolutely essential to educate all working people against any participation in either the Democratic or Republican Parties or in "Popular Front" organizations (coalitions of socialist and capitalist political organizations). Wherever we intervene in the electoral field (as we must where possible), our intervention is in behalf of the clearest presentation of our full program and immediate tactical objectives. We must explain the dangers of all programmatic opportunism by socialist and labor organizations, and insist on a workers' government as the only acceptable governmental coalition at the very juncture (above all) that "Popular Front" coalitions are offered. The point at which a capitalist party seriously offers a coalition government with socialist organizations is almost invariably the point at which the socialists must move directly toward the establishment of a workers' government as such.

It must be made clear, as through the work of historians in

exposing the lessons of the past to masses of working people through our journalism and forums, that the "Popular Front" offer, provided it is made, will be an offer to socialists to enter new political forms of the "New Priorities" type (immediately, anyway), and that unless socialists submit their programs to the "hopper" of mutual, selected governmental platform-program formulation. By negotiating compromises with capitalist political factions of that sort, the socialist program is degraded to farce to the extent that it is represented in the coalition slate platform, otherwise the capitalist political faction would become a revolutionary-socialist formation in fact! Thus, the only purpose of including socialists in "New Priorities" type organizations is to induce the socialist movement to totally discredit itself.

It is under such circumstances that the traditions of the CPUSA become the most virulent, counterrevolutionary danger to the future of the world's humanity. The socialist movement must expose as "class traitors" all those who propose to intervene within "New Priorities" movements at any stage of those "movements" development, except from the outside for raiding and exposure purposes—absolutely no merger of socialist forces with capitalist political factions, left or otherwise.

A more subtle, but equally dangerous form of class treachery is already formulated by the SWP-YSA in those organizations' present view that the "national" struggle is the highest form of the working class struggle at this juncture. The SWP-YSA, seeking to attach its mouth firmly to the posterior of whatever new Pilsudski appears in black-face, has simply offered the old Stalinist "theory of stages" "pop-front" line in the thinnest of rhetorical disguises.

As we can readily document from token cases of SWP-YSA class treachery to date, their version of the old Russian Menshevism is that of entering "Popular Front" formations based on national minorities, or on a colonial national liberation movement. In that "Popular Front," *they already propose to function* as a "principled" political "loyal opposition" to pro-capitalist currents within such political capitalist formations. They might, to give them the best of it, strongly object to obvious class treacheries of the most undisguised forms. That display of threadbare conscience would have little practical value; by leading socialist cadres into the swamp of petit-bourgeois nationalist political parties, the SWP-YSA and its

cothinkers would have already sabotaged the possibility of any alternative, and their expressions of political protest against "betrayal" would be nothing more than empty, self-consoling rhetoric, a harmless, disgraceful spectacle to amuse the "CIA" types running such nationalist parties.

The National Caucus of Labor Committees

How can a mere few hundred persons, mostly less than twenty-five years of age, mostly recruited from campus-radical strata, propose to intervene in the situation in the United States today to bring about a socialist transformation within this decade? That is the question now to be answered: nothing else is worth considering at this juncture.

Our organization has some token empirical demonstration of the validity of certain relevant, scientific principles in our role in the 1968 Columbia Strike, the 1969 University of Pennsylvania Strike, and in the recent Baltimore Strike support work—among a variety of similar and less notable experiences of the same general sort during the past two years. The principles we have applied to those situations are, in general, those identified at the outset of this resolution, also identifiable with Rosa Luxemburg's analysis of the Political Mass Strike process. In that application, we have demonstrated that a mere handful of persons, armed with an appropriate conception of transitional socialist program and Marxian sociology, can become a leading force in movements hundreds of times more numerous than the initiating group. These recent proofs are less proof of the principles themselves than demonstration that our mastery of the lessons of previous history have been real and practical rather than simply literary.

The principal question for us is how to connect numerous such embryonic mass-strike developments to one another to produce a nationwide political mass-strike movement in a matter of a few years at most.

Provided that such a small group as ours has the essential program necessary for socialist state power, which we do, and provided that this small group can catalyze into being social formations of trade-unionists, unorganized and unemployed, op-

pressed minorities, radicalized youth and professional socialist cadres, this fusion of program and political class for itself forms results in the creation of mass organizations of socialists in a short historical time. That, provided that the struggle has sufficient continuity to sustain advances from one forward tactical moment to another, so that the conscious experience of increasing numbers of participating masses is progressively connected as a general process of changing consciousness, of emerging socialist class consciousness.

That was our perspective at Columbia in the Spring of 1968, at the University of Pennsylvania in the Winter of 1969, and in every other tactical undertaking which local Labor Committees have approached in collaboration with our organization's national leadership. Those are the premises for our seemingly pretentious foresight of left-hegemony for our organization.

The immediate tasks of our organization during the next six months in particular are thus as follows:

1. To accomplish a number of internal developments in organization of business meetings and other internal functions which make our internal organizational life more agreeable to cadres recruited from the working class through the mediation of "cross-union caucus" work.
2. To concentrate, through "cross-union caucus" work, on recruiting significant numbers of cadres of workers, notably including special emphasis on cadres from black and Hispanic minorities, thus increasing our immediate penetration of the working class as a whole.
3. Of increasing the frequency and circulation of our newspaper, *New Solidarity*, with increasing usage of materials of reference which provide more effective communication of advanced theoretical and programmatic conceptions to workers in shops and in communities of oppressed minorities. Not to dilute the level of political thought to a condition of "popularization," but to employ terms of reference through which advanced conceptions are more immediately communicable to advanced working-class strata.
4. Of creating intermediate forms of organization, including regular forums for workers and students, regional conferences of workers and others on urgent theoretical and tactical problems,

through which broader strata of the working class can find agreeable ways of associating with the peripheries of our organization.

5. Of developing pedagogical forms for education of workers in Marx's dialectical method and economic theories, and constituting regular classes for such education of workers.

6. Opening up new Labor Committee locals in the industrial "heartland" bordering the Great Lakes in those regions of the South where industrial development has created new opportunities and immediate needs for organizing unorganized workers.

7. Bringing every politically significant local "strike support" effort along "Baltimore" lines into national focus through every means available to our national organization. Organizing support on whatever level possible, ranging from telegrams of solidarity or up, from small groups to whole larger organized working-class forces, for struggles of this form in one area from every possible other area. Thus, to create the favorable subjective conditions for building toward national "strike support" organizations along "Baltimore" lines.

8. Of envisaging political class-for-itself approximations developing during 1971 as the social basis for possible electoral interventions during 1972.

9. Continually pressing members of all socialist organizations for "united front" work on the same general basis we pressed for such joint efforts in our Sept. 7 and Sept. 25, 1970 appeals.

10. Developing the membership of the NCLC as a centralized task-oriented organization respecting both tactical undertakings and the quality of deliberative processes required to comprehend and solve problems of "sharp turns" in the tactical situation. The principal emphasis accompanying centralized deliberative and action processes is in education in the Marxian dialectical method, as that method has been represented in the courses on which our organization was first established and in the literature we have already published on this subject.

11. Increasing the scope and depth of coverage of international socialist developments in *New Solidarity* and the Campaigner, thus giving a means for raising the notion of political class for itself consciousness and actions above parochialist national lines.

12. Developing a sustained and scholarly program of ed-

educating workers and others in the history of the socialist and labor movements as those histories bear on understanding the tasks and problems before us today.

Education Within the NCLC

The National Caucus of Labor Committees is the first revolutionary socialist organization of this present century to actually be formed on the premise of a vanguard revolutionary intelligentsia. Only in the nineteenth century, in such instances as represented by the close circles around Karl Marx or the peer group of the Polish revolutionary organization around Rosa Luxemburg, do we find a direct comparison.

At the other extreme, the more "normal" form of establishment of a self-styled revolutionary-socialist organization has been the emergence of some new expression of "apostolic succession" of alleged "true prophets" and canonical literary "Marxist" doctrine. "Marxism-Leninism," "Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism," "Marxism-Leninism-Trotskyism," and "Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Maoism," are the representative self-designations of these groupings. Each of them has come into existence either as replications of some socialist organization of the same apostolic profession in another country or as factional spin-offs from a larger socialist organization of the "apostolic" form within the same country.

In each of these instances, particularly today, the new self-styled revolutionary-socialist grouping is absolutely not premised on the assimilation of Marx's actual method and economic theories, or the application of that method and theories to concrete materials. Rather, the member of the "apostolic succession" bases himself on what he regards as a sufficient interpretation of Marx's "sacred texts" in the form of official catechism of his particular organization; the "original, divine revelation" within Marx's thought is esteemed as comprehensible only to certain, selected "true prophets" or in the resolutions and legalistic precedents of action of selected party congresses of certain forerunner organizations of the supposed apostolic succession.

The usual exhibition of this religious scholastic or Talmudist procedure reminds one of Saul-turned-Paul on the Damascus Road.

One finds in each distinct sect the arguments that certain figures became filled with the Holy Ghost of revolutionary socialism at a certain date and, in most cases, that the Holy Ghost abandoned those same mortal premises at some later date, to be superseded in tenancy by some spiritual manifestation of bourgeois Satan. The same scholastic procedures are applied to entire parties.

In this way so-called "socialist theory" has been degraded to various sequences of canonical precedents and sacred Talmudic marginal notations, all based on the working assumption that the identified popes and organizations were perfect embodiments of the Holy Spirit's influence between two more or less precisely-located dates. Thus, it represented that the utterances of those persons and organizations during such intervals are thus regarded as "true revelations" of the Divine Will, just as the Chinese Communist leadership has elevated Mao Tse Tung into a new living Buddha and located the mediation of spiritual virtue in the turning of a prayer wheel on which is pasted various selections from Mao Tse Tung's "Little Red Book."

This procedure is the means employed to argue for the currently exclusive tenancy of the same Holy Spirit in this or that particular sect today. As in the most notorious case, Healy's Socialist Labour League in Britain, the most hair-raising replications of medieval scholasticism are employed to "prove that" Healy (for example) is the only true Pope of Socialism, involving a meticulous tracing of the alleged laying on of hands, to document the migration of the Spirit of Infallibility from one Pope to the next.

This dismal, scholastic practice is itself sufficient proof that the organization so afflicted with self-deceptions is nothing better than a counterrevolutionary centrist-socialist formation within the socialist movement. The habit of representing revolution theory as a body of religious like doctrine and socialist leadership qualifications in terms of a Kantian or worse explanation of the embodiment of the Divine Will within certain leaders, is sufficient demonstration that such "theory" is merely self-consoling religious rhetoric, whose function is thus to disguise the contrary (nonsocialist) content of the organization's day-to-day practice.

The Labor Committees, by contrast, have come into being as a result of a predetermined effort to evade precisely such miserable "apostolic" degradation of socialist cadres. The Labor Committees

were founded as more or less an intellectual peer group of revolutionaries whose common denominator has been some degree of actual personal mastery of Marx's dialectical method and economic theories. The organization is essentially the outgrowth of classes in Marx's method and economic theories, and of propaganda, education and agitational work by groups formed from participants in those classes. Thus, conceding the short-comings of comprehension inevitable among any body of students new to any field of study the NCLC is based on the scientific verifiability of Marx's method and economic theories as such, rather than any set of "historical," "legalistic" or "canonical" precedents of "Marxism-Leninism."

Where weakness has been manifest in the organization, these difficulties have been attributable in each case to a lack of self-education premised in assimilation of Marx's actual dialectical method. Invariably, where economic-theoretical and political errors have become the basis for factional life in the organization, the obvious root of such blundering political conceptions has been a lack of comprehension of Marx's method, a deficiency demonstrated by the persons' sympathy for outrageous slanders against Marx's method by certain logical positivists within our organization's ranks.

These difficulties are inevitable for any socialist organization which develops itself even on the best basis. While the hard core of our organization's membership has been assembled on the basis of the educational process identified above, the NCLC has also appealed to certain strata from former campus radical ferment simply because ours is the only organization within which the individual is encouraged (as well as permitted) to pursue an active, serious intellectual life in connection with the formulation of the national organization's policies. Thus, serious, critical work by mere academic standards of undergraduate or graduate competence in social "sciences" has sometimes been regarded as a substitute for scientific comprehension premised on Marx's method and actual theories. The essential weaknesses, around the fringes of our organization, have been associated with a lag in assimilating Marx's actual dialectical method, and a resulting tendency under conditions of ebb in campus-radical ferment and a turn in the social situation toward the labor movement, to substitute mere forms of intellectual accomplishment for the actual content of the work of the revolutionary intelligentsia.

This weakness has been manifest during 1970 as a tendency of some members to accommodate to petit-bourgeois moods in the surrounding campus milieu, to divorce the abstracted form of our socialist reindustrialization program from its social setting in the emergence of actual political (working) class for itself forms. There has been a potentially dangerous tendency to imagine that the mere brilliance of our programs, analyses and predictions, addressed to almost any radical or even liberal milieu, would win over large strata by the sheer power of reason. Not accidentally, those who have succumbed to such petit-bourgeois social tendencies have failed miserably in every single prediction they offered during the past year!

This tendency, in which our organization suffers only far, far less acutely than the predominantly petit-bourgeois Menshevik SWP-YSA, reflects (again) ignorance of the ABCs of Marx's method, that the intellectual power to assimilate and comprehend the NCLC program depends upon the active social form of relations peculiar to approximations of political class for itself formations, not individual reason per se. The attempt to divorce the issue of program and the form of propagation of form from working-class social-political forms is absolutely not understanding nor agreement with our program, but the degradation of that program to a hollow shell, a mere glitter without social substance. Program for us is the subjective side of work in building political class-for-itself forms.

We seem, admittedly, to have stipulated an exception to this fundamental rule in the case of the revolutionary intelligentsia. However, that exception exists only for those persons who totally misunderstand the social basis for the revolutionary intelligentsia itself. The revolutionary intellectual is distinct from mere academic intellectuals as he, first of all, is situated to develop an overview of social productive relations on a world scale, and to situate this overview on the social basis of what the productive working class is capable of becoming, provided that class is transformed from a class in itself to a political class for itself. It is the revolutionary intellectual's dialectical contempt for compartmentalization, which makes him immediately a ruthless factional opponent of most mere academic intellectuals, and his location of his personal identity in a future political class for itself, which distinguishes him.

Like all working-class socialists, we start from the productive working class as such. Unlike all other socialist currents in the United States today, we do not stop there. We do not attempt to view the working class in itself as the potential repository of "class consciousness." We stipulate, in opposition to the SWP, CP, PLP, IS, et al., that the working class must be first transformed into itself by breaking open trade-union formations and other parochialist forms to include membership by which chauvinistic trade unionists (for example) regard as "outsiders," providing these "outsiders" represent elements of the political class for itself.

The centerpiece of this unique tactical approach of our organization is comprehension of the dialectic of the production of consciousness, understanding the social processes determining the production of concepts and entire philosophical world-outlooks among specific kinds of social formations. This comprehension demands de facto comprehension of the essential features of Hegel's *The Phenomenology of Mind*, and of Ludwig Feuerbach's corrections of Hegel, provided that Feuerbach's *Principles of the Philosophy of the Future* is interpreted from the standpoint of Marx's critique of that work, in the "Theses on Feuerbach," and in the first section, "Feuerbach," of *The German Ideology*.

Without that understanding, it is impossible to understand the relationship between socialist program and class-for-itself formations, except as compartmentalized, almost mechanistic categories, and for lack of such comprehension, to seek to connect such mechanistically rectified categories by a desperate search for a "middle tactic"—not accidentally, such "middle tactics" invariably prove to be some version of "Popular Front" treachery if not even more wretched forms of class betrayal.

This problem, which has been the characteristic difficulty of the old German Social-Democracy and the old Communist parties, has inevitably and repeatedly led those who failed to master the dialectical method into Menshevism, whether of the Russian form, the centrist forms of the 1907–14 SPD or CP-CGT formations, or the betrayals of socialism in western Europe during the immediate post-1944 period by Stalin and by western European Communist parties. Without a dialectical comprehension that the relationship of political class-for-itself formations and socialist program is direct, needing no middle tactic, every socialist organization must tend to

fall into the empiricist trap of seeking that "middle tactic," which lies only in the betrayal of the socialist struggle within adaptation to "broad," "popular" movements of a class-conciliationist form.

Thus, the capacity of the NCLC to recruit and actually assimilate new members, to absorb whole factions of the socialist movement in fusions, etc., depends upon energetically remedying the theoretical weaknesses which have been manifest within our membership during 1970.

This problem will take a special form in the process of assimilating workers as cadres. Since recruits from the working class, especially its oppressed strata, do not have the educational backgrounds to assimilate Marxist dialectical method and economic theories in the same way, with the same glib facility as student-derived revolutionary intelligentsia, there is a misguided temptation to degrade Marxian conceptions to "popularized" forms, thus degrading the education of workers to a shallow, hearsay acquaintance with a "few facts" about "Marxian theory."

The actual pedagogical problem to be solved demands precisely the opposite approach. The task of educating workers involves developing a pedagogy through which politically advanced workers can become masters of the most advanced theoretical conceptions. Unfortunately, as we turn to this indispensable task, we are confronted with a general failure of the entire past socialist movement to provide even mediocre precedents upon which we might draw.

Our national organization must therefore establish a system of "night schools" for worker-socialists in every location in which we have the physical means, penetration and available qualified instructors for this purpose. The curriculum for this school program must be essentially the same in content and pedagogical objectives as the Marcus course in elementary Marxist economics, but the presentation must be expanded in numbers of sessions and in scope of detailed content, so that the instructors can thereby engage workers attention at the level of their present educational developments, providing such students with the necessary prerequisites to master the subject on the same level as the Marcus' course for college graduate and undergraduate students.

This demands creative insight into the pedagogy of concept formations, to the point of building actual comprehension in the

student by successive steps of development of his self-consciousness. The first thing the instructors and courses must accomplish is that of making the student aware of the problem of concept-formation, of his (or her) initial starting-point of bourgeois-ideological philosophical world outlook, as Gramsci has appropriately identified this important pedagogical problem of workers' education. The course will depend for its effectiveness on destroying the student's faith in his naive, common-sense view at a very early point in the curriculum. It is on this establishment of the importance of developing an entire new philosophical world outlook, of therefore mastering the problems of philosophy per se, that comprehension of Marxian method and concepts depends.

It is necessary, from observations of past experience, to warn against instructors who content themselves with parading a mere superficial grasp of the subject as a matter of social posturing before a class. Admittedly, and even emphatically, a class has criteria which make it selective; any "lowest common denominator" approach will result in a pedagogical abortion. The point here is that the business of presenting Marxian economics is not a matter of reciting a series of canonical glosses plus several paraphrases of such glosses, nor disgusting homiletic rhetorical methods. Weak comprehension of the subject by the would-be instructor invariably produces all these and other, related disorders. The education of the educators is one of our principal problems in this undertaking.

There should be an expansion of New Solidarity for this same purpose. Without reducing the more-advanced theoretical-conceptual treatments addressed to existing socialist cadres, it is essential that the pages of our newspaper address the consciousness of working people from the standpoint of the foregoing educational policy. No bowdlerized "truisms," etc., but rather using the literary devices of irony to assist readers in reaching a state of mental crisis respecting their present concepts, in which provoked state of mind our writing in Solidarity should assist them in reaching the needed new conceptions.

Such ironies are feasibly if not easily developed by our writers and editors provided the essential irony of capitalist life is kept in view. Where the parochialized subjective life of working people causes them to develop conceptions which are appropriate to parochialized or individual-qua-individual pseudoreality, reality is

actually determined in whole processes. The elementary rule of thumb for socialist literary irony is thus as follows. First, marshal all of the most powerful (commonsensical) arguments for the parochialist delusion, and then destroy all of these premises and their associated conceptions by introducing the contradictory reality of the whole process. That is the exemplary tactic for our organization's educational work in formal classes and journalism during the months immediately ahead.