

The CAMPAIGNER

Vol. 4

Published by the National Caucus of Labor Committees

No. 1

Fidel "Joins" the Labor Committee

Dialectics of Art

Greece at a Turning Point

Towards a Socialist Perspective for Ireland

War and Revolution in the Middle East

Winter 1971

75¢

THE CAMPAIGNER

The Campaigner is published four to six times a year by the National Caucus of Labor Committees.

Editorials represent the majority view of the Labor Committees.

Subscription rate: \$2.50 for 6 issues; \$4.00 for 12 issues.

Address all correspondence to: **The Campaigner**
Box 49, Washington Bridge Station
New York, New York 10033

Editorial Board: **Carol LaRouche**
L. Marcus
Alan Snitow
Ed Spannaus
Webster Tarpley

Managing Editor: **Carol LaRouche**

CONTENTS

Volume 4, Number 1

Winter 1971

Fidel "Joins" the Labor Committee	3
Echoes from Copenhagen	12
Toward of Dialectics of Art by <i>Christine Berl</i>	15
Greece at a Turning Point: Three Years After the NATO Coup by <i>Nikos Syriotis</i>	23
Toward a Socialist Perspective for Ireland by <i>Peter Brand</i>	32
Prospects for War and Revolution in the Middle East by <i>U. Parpert</i>	
Document: British I.S. Perspectives	51
<i>Comment by L. Marcus</i>	52

Fidel "Joins" the Labor Committee

On July 11, the National Committee of the Labor Committees held an open meeting attended by approximately one-quarter of the national membership. This unusual turn-out was prompted by the preceding announcement of the presentation for internal discussion of a draft emergency program attuned to the historically-immediate threat of liquidity crisis in the U.S. This program, topically entitled, *How To Lick A Depression In A Single Day*, was discussed and adopted and published as a four-page insert to the August 21 *New Solidarity*. Later, during the Sept. 4-7 national conference, the program was re-adopted with one explicative amendment inserted.

Resorting to the terminology of socialist "orthodoxy," this program is summarily characterized as a transitional view of the process of establishing a "dictatorship of the proletariat" in the U.S. during the few years just ahead.

The program summarizes the proposed process by which the presently-fragmented masses of working people and their potential allies are organized as a democratic majority force to become the state. The program also defines the immediate objective tasks which that majority force must undertake or risk failure and fascist counterrevolution. The program is defined as "transitional" (in 'orthodox' terms) because it presents appropriate demands and policies of present day-to-day struggle as an organic part of the process leading toward the act of establishment of socialist government.

Meanwhile, *The New York Review of Books* (Sept. 24, 1970) has published the full text of Fidel Castro's much cited July 26 (1970) address on the current crisis of Cuba, with an introduction by journalist Lee Lockwood. We say "meanwhile" because a comparison of Fidel's speech with the Labor Committees' draft program is one of the best ways in which the pro-socialist layman can begin to understand the deeper implications of either document.

Thus, the title above. While Castro has taken no public notice of the Labor Committees' existence, when one examines the stated world-outlooks of socialist groups around the world, the view of the labor process expressed by Fidel in this address seems relatively identical to that almost unique, outside Cuba, to the Labor Committees and our cothinker organizations abroad. By contrast with what many U.S. socialists, anarchists, and liberals have previously reported Fidel's point of view, a careful comparison of the July 26th address with the Labor Committees' draft program might suggest that he has "joined" the Labor Committees.

Fidel As A Revolutionary "Poet"

It is the delusion of even the majority of socialists, who have never comprehended the rudiments of Hegel's *Phenomenology*, that science is occupied with "facts" in the sense that the most philistine bookkeepers define "facts." On the contrary, the "facts" of all aspects of human existence, whatever their "objective" ground in the final analysis, are judgments by human faculties

respecting human activities and tasks. It is the unfortunate reality of alienated forms of human existence (capitalist society included) that the human mental processes are generally damaged to the extent that most educated persons (among others) are unable to resolve the unconscious connections between what are dichotomized as "feelings" and "facts." It is the need to circumvent this dehumanizing division of the human experience which compels each form of human culture to produce what we loosely term "art."

The most typical expression of this activity is great poetry, with its associated forms of great music. It is in this sense that any memorable revolutionary document which unifies the "economic" and the human is properly regarded as great poetry -- whatever its prosodic qualities as such. It is in that sense that we say that Fidel's address is superbly revolutionary by virtue of its pervasive poetry, i.e. its humanistic conceptual ironies.

For example, "infantile ultra-leftists" interpret Marx's "dictatorship of the proletariat" in a fashion agreeable to anarchist-populist "emotionalism," as the imperative of "smashing the capitalist state" and essentially nothing more. "Smash" (like "iron") has a satisfying, rounded, all-inclusive ring -- to the childish mind. These unhappy if well-meaning fellows react with horror whenever a serious revolutionary individual or grouping purposes to define "dictatorship of the proletariat" in terms of such "banalities" as concrete economic tasks.

To the infantile leftist, "socialism" must maintain its purity (as emotionalism!) by conceiving of (purely imaginary) future societies in which "economic accumulation" no longer occurs, in which "growth" has been expunged from society in favor of a religious chiliast's unending simple equal redistribution of abundance. The infantile leftist conceives of socialism essentially as a Fourieristic phalansterie, as a utopian "restructuring" of institutions.

Such infantile utopianism, such **populism**, such anarchism within a shabby "socialist" disguise, admittedly flows from the problem which leads to production of great poetry. Instead of solving that problem as the true poet does, the utopian writes and chants mere declamatory doggerel,

"resounding phrases" (like the anarchist pseudo-poet) -- or, to use Lenin's term, "clowning and phrasemongering." The basis for this dismaying mental disorder among socialists is the flight into anti-intellectual emotionalism, based on a failure and incapacity to actually bridge the practical and emotional -- the widespread anti-intellectualism of so many "left" tendencies.

For example, we have observed a number of university professors and lecturers attracted to groups such as the Progressive Labor Party. With unfortunately few exceptions, the accompaniment of this political conviction is the professor's retreat even from the poor level of intellectual performance of capitalist academic life into a practice of the most "low-browed" emotionalism, sloganeering and posturing -- as if the new recruit were expiating the guilt of intellectual life by such miserable devices.

In this particular connection, Castro's speech distinguishes him from such childish ultra-lefts by the excellent poetry with which he comprehends the humanistic interpretation of Lenin's point that socialism is accounting and electricity. It is the way in which Fidel deals with the concrete tasks of just that point of view which makes his address coincide in certain fundamental economic conceptions with the Labor Committees' draft emergency program.

Man's conscious mastery of his existence (the subject of creative science and poetry) depends upon his mastery of the process of producing the material means of his existence. This means, in turn, comprehending the exact potential of existing productive forces in terms of the productive potential of an actually existing population -- at a certain level of education, productive skills and material-cultural level of existence in general. It is vulgar emotionalism to state simply that socialists must advance demands in favor of reducing hours of labor, raising real wages, etc. Revolutionary socialism begins once one considers how to employ existing productive forces to make possible reductions in hours and raised real wages. Revolutionary socialism develops as one proceeds to comprehend the actual interconnections among the quality of personal life and concrete economic programs. Once one has begun to achieve the latter, one's revolutionary outlook attains the indispensable scientific level of poetry.

The Poetry of Revolutionary Socialism

What do we mean by the term, "socialism" -- or, rather, what ought we mean by that term. It is in this connection that principal achievements of the July 26 address are to be defined.

Karl Marx defines all the essential features of socialism in the first section, *Feurbach*, of *The German Ideology*. Man distinguishes himself actually from animals as he begins to produce his material means of existence. The simplest expression of successful human existence is that expansion of production of wealth through which population increases as the same level of existence are made possible, i.e. **Accumulation!** All possible forms of human existence are distinguished from mere animal existence by **accumulation!** However, in producing human existence in this way, society inevitably exhausts the natural and man-improved means of production, which are always relatively finite in respect to any given society with its given mode of social reproduction through accumulation.

Thus, true humanity is achieved through the process of successive transformations of the mode of production and social relations, on which continued human existence inevitably depends. True humanity, the objective of socialist transformation, is established by societies which not only successfully transform their modes of production and social relations in this way but which do so consciously -- in which a whole people consciously decides its mode of production and social relations and thereby successfully overcomes the contradictions constantly imposed as the countervailing threat to successful expanded social accumulation.

Thus, socialism cannot be (for these and implied reasons) a matter of centralized planning by a beneficent elite supervising a credulous mass of the population. Socialism can only be centralized planning as a act of the collective consciousness of the population as a whole.

Socialist Man

The result of such a development of society is a new quality of individual. Not the vulgar "collectivist" man of the anarchist and fascist bogeys. Rather, the image of man as hazily conceived by Spinoza, to use the precise phrase:

individual man as "extended being." Individual man who defines his existence such that society as a whole is augmented by his active existence and would be diminished by his loss. Individual man defined as Hegel attempted to define the "Hero," individual man conscious of the necessary course of human development, who finds his identity in his positive contribution to history in that sense.

Socialist society is a mass of such "Hero" individuals, a consciously interacting mass of such "Heroes," formulating "economic" policy positively as a product of their "debates." Socialist society is one in which every individual is a policy maker in centralized "economic" policy-making, and every individual is an executive carrying out the implementation of those policies in ways appropriate to each particular aspect of the society with which he is immediately, responsibly associated.

Revolutionary socialism, more broadly defined, is the activity of a growing vanguard of individuals engaged in the process of bringing socialist society into being.

That is the poetry of revolutionary socialism, on which counts Fidel shows himself as beyond all celebrated revolutionary figures of the past quarter century.

Castro In Particular

Lee Lockwood identifies what we consider the most essential characteristic of Castro's historic importance as the "Hero" (in the Hegelian sense) of the Cuban revolution. "...but how can there be any true democracy in a society whose press does not even furnish the people the essential information needed to teach decisions on matters of vital concern to themselves? In fact, the Cuban press is so mediocre that even Fidel can't stand it..."

To which Carlos Franqui supplies the answer as reported by Lee Lockwood: "In Cuba there is only one newspaper. It appears irregularly, from time to time. It is Fidel, when he speaks to the people."

Which should be compared with a relevant passage from the Jan.-Feb. 1970 *Campaigner* (L. Marcus, *Centrism As A Social Phenomenon*; p. 58):

"It is in precisely that for which the bourgeois press has the greatest contempt, Castro's long-winded, painfully-detailed addresses to mass audiences, and coherent measures that a socialist world-outlook is approximated among the Cuban masses. It is the elaboration of a programmatic understanding of the practical connections among circumstances, policies and results of politics-in-terms-of circumstances, that a class-for-itself programmatic outlook is at least approximated among the masses of Cuban young people, despite the plain evidence of errors in certain aspects of this and other political policies...There is a vast difference between masses mindlessly committed to hysterical recitation of Mao Tse Tung's 'thought,' mere cant, and the attempt to shape the consciousness of the actual connections between practice and results in terms of the whole society."

Castro's July 26 address confirms that *Campaigner* report with a vengeance. Here is revolutionary socialism actually expressed and with an electrifying quality which has not been seen anywhere in the leadership of governments or mass organizations since the early 1920's in the Soviet Union.

Contradictions of "Castroism"

This is not to imply that the National Caucus of Labor Committees now reduces itself to U.S. "retailers of Fidelism."

We continue to disagree with what has been the more or less official Cuban version of the "theory of the Cuban Revolution" as a model. Cuban promulgation and endorsement of the anti-Marxian and suicidal hypotheses of Regis Debray is not only a grave error but has resulted in the decimation of Latin American cadres, and has assisted in the disorientation of potential cadres in the U.S.A. to a very significant degree.

In fact, the most hideous varieties of "Maoism" in the U.S. movement initially organized themselves on the basis of an impressionistic, anti-working class interpretation of the "Cuban experience," finding in Mao's actually Menshevik "theory of the peasant revolution" a rationale for what they initially regarded as the "higher form of Fidelism."

Secondly, there are aspects of the Cuban state and party, to which Fidel alludes in his address, which are hideous to us. There is indelible evidence from a variety of sources, especially the miserable quality of the official Cuban press in general, which attests to the most pervasiveness of bourgeois philistinism (including a tendency to regard the "people" as "stupid") within the state administrative apparatus and party. Admittedly, most persons under capitalism (most contemporary leftists in the U.S. included) are clinically stupid in respect to even the rudiments of actual revolutionary socialism. This same characterization cannot be tolerated respecting the masses of people once their attitudes are being transformed by mass struggles, especially when these attitudes are expressed in such heroic practices of ordinary Cuban workers as reported in Fidel's address.

It is by contrast with such philistine "socialism," the sort of centrist philistinism which is the real ideological content of what used to be termed Stalinism, that Fidel stands on the last July 26th as a revolutionary socialist of the first magnitude. We disagree with Castro on many points, but we stand with Fidel against the the prevailing stupidity of the philistine "left."

Fidel's Method And Our Own

In his address, Fidel starts from the methodological standpoint previously demanded by Rosa Lyxemburg, that economic analysis start from an analysis of the economy and its productive forces as a whole, dialectically determining the significance of each particular aspect from the standpoint of the whole. This is the most violent contrast to Luxemburg's socialist critics of her *The Accumulation of Capital* (such as Ernest Mandel), who view the Law of Value in anti-Marxist terms, as a matter of the sum of localized Value Added in terms of concrete, particular (localized) labor times.

To make the point clearer, populist economics, and the economic conjectures of populists in socialist (even "Marxist economist") liveries, starts from the assumption that Value is autonomously produced by localized groupings of workers at the local point of production, and that profit represents the capitalists' theft of part of the product produced autarchically by that local group of workers.

Admittedly, the theory of Value developed by David Ricardo agrees with such an ignorant economic "model" in certain elementary respects; thus, many pseudo-Marxists have abstracted a Ricardian (anti-Marxian) conception of the Law of Value from *Capital* by virtue of seeing only the Ricardian form which Marx criticizes to reject and supersede. They commit such widespread blunders because their sociological world-outlook is populist (e.g. Mandel's early-1960's opportunist affiliations with Renardist communalism in Belgium).

When this same point of view is encountered among organized labor (or imminently organized labor), we have the syndicalist or anarcho-syndicalist point of view, or what Lenin attacked as the "Economist" perspectives of Martov's factional allies in the Jewish Bund and Russian Social-Democracy more generally.

In all these cases, the anti-Luxemburgist view of socialist economic theory, whether populist, Mandelian, anarcho-syndicalist or the "economic theories" of the "left" trade-union opportunist, proceed from the local grouping of workers or others as the elementary, more or less autonomous basis for social value creation.

In contrast to Mandel et al., Fidel, having (consciously or not) approached the issue of applied economic theory from the same sort of vantage-point as recommended by Rosa Luxemburg, develops his analysis of the Cuban economic situation in a uniquely dialectical fashion. He begins with the social division of labor as whole, starting by defining productive labor as determined by the entire labor process.

One starts with the entire population, distinguishing those who cannot directly produce because they are young, still committed to education, old, etc. One then views the problem of meeting the material conditions of improved life for the entire population in terms of the potential product created by the entire productive sector of the population. In analyzing the process of accumulation needed to meet those human needs, one always analyzes first of all the changes in the actuarial composition of the population from a Marxian standpoint.

Continuing to apply what philistine U.S. socialists deride as "Labor Committee theory," Castro examines the fundamental contradictions of socialist accumulation. If the population is to

increase its production, he details, it is necessary to increase real wages in the form of increased education, better housing, and so forth. That is, the only way to solve the problems of humanity is to examine the over-all social division of productive labor in terms of proportions of the labor force divided into S (social surplus), V (means of human existence), and C (repairs and improvements in natural and artificed means of production). To solve problems of existence one must absolutely increase the mass of S and also increase the value of the ratio $S/(C+V)$. However, to raise the rate of social productivity (S/V) it is imperative to increase the absolute level of consumption of the population (increased expenditures for housing, education, health, etc.). On this Castro is most explicit and forceful.

The central problem of socialist accumulation is that of increasing the ratio of $S/(C+V)$ under circumstances in which the costs, C+V, are rising relative to yesterday's "productive efficiencies." In sum, there can be no socialist society without a conscious policy of rapidly increasing efficiency. Only an ignoramus could study Fidel's address and not adduce that universal lesson.

The practical question is "whose consciousness?"

Without an "intellectual elite" socialist program cannot be initially developed. Without a stratum of competent economists, all talk of program is idle chatter; to discover what can be done to actually solve the accumulation problems confronting the working-class forces one must have a competent overview of the entire economic process, at least of the general quality Fidel exhibits in his July 26 report to the people of their economy.

To progress from such a correct program developed by a revolutionary "elite," by a "revolutionary intelligentsia," it is absolutely necessary that this program be assimilated by the masses of working people and their allies. Making ordinary working people practical masters of what some foolish socialists deride as "intellectual bullshit" is the very essence of socialist practice.

Not only is that understanding essential to mobilize socialist victory in an advanced capitalist sector country, but, in fact, there can be no competent practical shaping and development of economic program without the active participation of broad layers of working people representative of every principal sector of the process of production and consumption.

Economic theorists are absolutely indispensable to developing policy, but production does not actually occur in the general form susceptible of encapsulated abstractions. Actual production and distribution depends upon a wide variety of "nuts and bolts" questions. Actual socialist planned production depends upon a competent interpretation of economic policies at the "nuts and bolts" level of daily life, and on a process of "feed back," through the masses of workers, by which problems of implementation of general policies are more or less accurately foreseen in advance of adoption.

This involves a most advanced theoretical conception, which for that reason we are compelled to identify here in a negative way. Economists generally are accustomed to a credulous LaPlaceian fantasy that given a sufficiently giant computer, fed sufficient "statistics," economic planning can be carried out to the nth refinement of detail by a technocratic elite. Hegel's fundamental contribution to humanity was to dispel the credibility of such fantasies (among actually intelligent and educated people) for once and for all.

Statistics are collections of "facts." Hegel demonstrated that "facts" as such do not exist, rather that all so-called "facts" are mere judgments. In actuality, the very best quality of facts (from a practical standard of quality) are those short-lived judgments which have rather ephemeral appropriateness to practice for a relatively short period of history.

Of course, as Kant, Hegel, Feurbach and Marx all thus far agree, there is a vast gulf between a moot judgement of existent circumstances and an assertion bases only on the paralogisms of pure speculation. Vis-a-vis speculation, especially the deductions of "proper" tactics from literary doctrines of "orthodox positions," we of course stand firmly for "facts."

The point is that the appropriateness of a fact is limited to the historically specific circumstances under which it is developed.

Since it is the essence of socialist planning to change existing "factual" relations substantially, conscious planning of production demands not merely massive "fact-gathering" apparatus, but the massive judgmental, social process through which

mew "facts" can be effectively defined for radically changed forms of organization of production and distribution as a whole.

In sum, from the most advanced theoretical standpoint, it is clear to the dialectical economist that the role of the revolutionary intelligentsia (or "elite") is limited to that of initiating the development of program, of defining those immediate massive policy changes respecting the transition from capitalism to workers' economies. As theory thus contends, so the history of various workers' economies demonstrates, that without the conscious organization (mobilization) of the masses of working people to correct and innovate further in matters of economic policy, every effort to manage a planned economy must run from crisis to crisis, with blunder after blunder.

This preceding point must not be misconstrued to mean that that crisis of the Cuban economy today is essentially caused by disfunctions of the planning mechanism. On the contrary, as Castro himself depicts the problem with sufficient accuracy, the fundamental crisis of the Cuban economy is imperialist encirclement -- not only military and economic encirclement in the crude sense, but the fact that Cuba is an "underdeveloped" economic sub-sector whose existence depends upon directly or indirectly trading on a world market dominated by prices set by the most technologically developed capitalist sector. The economic planning and management problems of Cuba must be defined in terms of what is necessary and possible within the context of imperialist encirclement.

Existing Workers' Economies

It is consistent with pro-capitalist economics that the question of socialism in underdeveloped countries is often posed in terms of "comparative economic and social systems." It is the pro-capitalist apologists and similar mentalities who attempt to define socialism vis-a-vis capitalism by comparing the material and related conditions of life in the U.S.S.R., Eastern Europe, China, or Cuba with those in the advanced capitalist sector.

Bourgeois ideology in the socialist movement used to inspire U.S. Communists and "fellow travellers" to wishfully describe the Soviet Union as a "workers' paradise," when in fact capitalist

encirclement, compounded by the Soviet bureaucracy's blunders, etc., imposed the greatest hardships on the Soviet people. Even without the blunders of the bureaucracy, simple economic ratios prevailing would not have permitted the Soviet people to achieve a standard of life comparable to that of employed workers in the U.S. or Western Europe. "Third Camp" socialists proceed on the basis of the same capitalist ideological method to "conveniently" disencumber themselves of political responsibility for the U.S.S.R., etc., by insisting that it is some new form of "state capitalist" or "bureaucratic collectivist" "imperialism."

On the contrary, we regard the Soviet Union, China, Cuba, etc., as embattled organizations of the political working-class movement, which have from the outset of their existence as workers' economies suffered the combined monstrous adversities of civil war, imperialist interventions and blockades, capitalist-imposed underdevelopment, a want of the quality of leadership needed to minimize the effects of initial backwardness and encirclement. In most instances these problems have been exacerbated by the emergence of a state apparatus and economic management embodying the most swinish philistinism.

The attitude of the revolutionary socialist toward these nations is properly derived from that general view expressed by Rosa Luxemburg in her pamphlet, *The Russian Revolution*. "The Bolsheviks have shown that they are capable of everything that a genuine revolutionary party can contribute within the limits of historical possibilities. They are not supposed to perform miracles. For a model and faultless proletarian revolution in an isolated land, exhausted by world war, strangled by imperialism, betrayed by the international proletariat, would be a miracle...In Russia the problem could not be posed. It could not be solved in Russia."

The same is true of Cuba. The responsible course is to support the viable political tendencies, of which Castro, despite all his actual and alleged past mistakes, is exemplary, and to do this mainly not by giving Castro lip-service support from the spectator's benches, but by accomplishing the socialist transformation in the advanced sector -- without which principal dedication all criticisms of the U.S.S.R., China, Cuba, etc., are degraded to childish literary speculation.

The essential immediate point under consideration here is that putting the problems of the Cuban Revolution into context, to uncover through study of Fidel's July 26 address the valuable lessons to be applied to study, program and perspectives in even our own national sector.

Weaknesses Of Cuban Regime

The principal source of weaknesses of the Cuban Revolution's present leadership is located ironically in the exceptional circumstances by which Cuba became a workers' economy as if by "accident." As in the instance of the Chinese revolution, the 26th of July Movement was a petit-bourgeois revolutionary reformist (pro-capitalist) movement.

Mao Tse Tung restored the plants to the capitalists from the hands of the workers and sincerely pronounced himself against a socialist revolution in China not only during the entire period of the Popular Front, but even after the seizure of power by the armies of the CPC. Mao & Company were forced to undertake a later socialist revolution by circumstances of the Cold War in general and the Korean War in particular, as well as the danger of counterrevolution constantly arising from the tendency for capitalist layers and less impoverished peasants to combine.

In the case of Cuba, the revolution after the first 1959 revolution is more astonishing. The CPC was at least nominally Communist in ultimate purpose and in centrist-reformist versions of "Communist" ideology. In Cuba, the July 26th movement was explicitly a capitalist national (lawyers') liberation movement.

The Cuban socialist revolution after the July 26th movement's initial revolution is a product of two extraordinary circumstances. Generally, its successful occurrence reflected internal policy difficulties of the U.S. ruling class relative to the emerging "Third Stage" policy vacillations which prevented immediate bloody crushing of the Cuban revolution when the nationalizations began. However, this would not have been sufficient; the character of the July 26th leadership, especially the cadres closest to Fidel, was decisive in exploiting this situation, defending commitments to the Cuban peasantry and rural proletariat by the resort of expropriating the major capitalists, and taking the next step, of orientating toward the Soviet Union as the only possible basis for Cuban independence in the face of U.S. imperialism and the capitalist world market forces.

For the outside world, the result among many naive and simply opportunist "lefts" (including most existing socialist "parties" in the U.S., Europe and the colonial sector) was that it "seemed" that Castro and the others had pioneered in developing a new method for establishing socialism. To a significant extent, the Fidelistas themselves have shared this delusion, as we see in their lamentable support for the Regis Debray nonsense. This history and the manifestations of Debrayism and other blunders demonstrate why the Cuban leadership has lacked insight into the problems of socialist revolution and strategy in general and has lacked the intellectual development of its leading cadres which even the Bolshevik Party brought to the October Revolution.

It is thus all the more important to note the extremely advanced theoretical development of Fidel Castro reflected in the July 26th address. There is no evidence yet at hand to suggest that Fidel is self-conscious of the implicit theoretical position he has implicitly taken in economics relative to the Rosa Luxemburg and other long-standing controversies within the socialist movement on this subject. Yet, he is not too far removed from such awareness, at least, since many of the formulations employed in his address are too sophisticated to permit the conclusion that he is merely an autodidact.

No metaphysics are required to explain Fidel's "mind" on these counts. The speech itself shows that the conclusions submitted are based on a practical theoretical overview of the Cuban economy in its world-market context. Castro developed the conclusions he submits by applying to his concrete experience precisely that method which so many critics of the Labor Committee find reprehensible.

The point is to understand the problem of Cuba exactly as Fidel describes it, which means to approach comprehension of the tasks of socialism in the U.S. from the same methodological point of view -- precisely as the Labor Committees have done in the Draft Emergency Program.

"Dictatorship of the Proletariat"

The "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," which is the subject of the Labor Committees' Draft Emergency Program, is not simply a matter of

"smashing the capitalist state," with the appended implication that somehow thereby all the major problems will begin to be automatically solved. Why "smash the state?" The point is that the capitalist "state" (as it is usually loosely defined) is essentially the body of social institutions which provide the "gun," both the actual guns and their ideological equivalents, which enforce the property-relations associated with capitalist "paper" (stocks, bonds, bills, etc.). To take over the entire financial system, immediately liquidating all stocks, bonds, notes, mortgages, and so forth, eliminates the capitalist system and its state at a single stroke, provided that this is accomplished by the political class-for-itself as an organized ruling institution.

How in the world does one imagine the class-for-itself actually seizing the financial system!? Those "lefts" who chatter interminably about such ABCs as "smashing the capitalist state" reveal by what they do not say that their socialism consists of no more than a sort of utopian emotionalism, mere "phrasemongering and clowning."

The question is: **Why is it necessary to seize the banking system and liquidate all capitalist "paper?"** Precisely because the banking system (and the paper) and it is now organized and enforced (by guns, ideology, etc.) is the principal impediment to certain urgent tasks of economic "accumulation" which is the only possible basis for actually solving the leading problems of life confronting oppressed minorities, organized and unorganized labor, and radicalized youth.

Admittedly, this has been more or less true throughout the past half-century. Throughout this half-century, despite "absolute economic expansion," the benefits of the capitalist economy have been limited to an ever smaller proportion of the capitalist world population as a whole, because capitalism refuses to employ the existing basis for economic growth sufficiently to meet human needs generally.

To meet the problems of humanity through economic growth it is essential to get the capitalist system out of our way, so that we may do the job of "economic management" urgently required. Immediately, the question of socialist transformation is now posed by the accelerating

