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Introduction

In the 1930s the Communist party played an important role in the political intellectual life of the United States. The CPUSA never was an important factor in American elections, nor did its membership, even at its height, approach the cherished goal of constituting a "mass party." Nonetheless, among the elite who constitute the world of the arts and letters—those who write and edit books, magazines, newspapers, plays, movies, and radio programs—the influence of Communist party members and sympathizers was considerable. The same was true among certain other target constituencies, such as organized labor.

The influence of communism in American life was at least temporarily eradicated in the 1950s. The causes of this eradication were several. One was the actions taken by the legislative and executive branches of government to combat domestic communism. Another was the generally conservative mood of the American body politic in the 1950s. Another was the rise of the cold war. Still another was the death of Stalin and the revelations of his misdeeds by Khrushchev at the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. The disillusioning effects of this were reinforced by the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956.

In the 1960s the election of Democratic presidents, the outbreak of the civil rights "revolution," and frustration over the war in Vietnam, all
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contributed to pushing the country leftward. In this atmosphere American radicalism enjoyed a resurgence. Like the Communists (and other radicals) of the 1930s, the radicals of the 1960s were few when measured against the totality of the United States population, but also like the radicals of the 1930s, the radicals of the 1960s quickly gained influence among the culture-producing elites far surpassing their proportion in the population.

"Radicals" in the 1960s came in many different variants. Many of these—communists, socialists, Trotskyites, anarchists—had clear antecedents in the 1930s. Some others—Maoists, Weathermen, U.S. Labor Party members—did not. But in contrast to the 1930s when communism was the most popular of radical ideologies, in the 1960s, traditional, Moscow-line communism was among the least popular. If American Communists were influential in the new radicalism, it was through their roles as activists in the anti-war and civil rights movements, and hardly at all through the attraction of their ideology.

Briefly in the 1960s Maoism experienced a surge of popularity on the radical left, suggesting that it might become the heir to the communist popularity of the 1930s, but the Maoists were stymied by the instability of the Chinese Communists. The American Maoists were repeatedly embarrassed when one after another Chinese Communist leader, whose speeches they treated as oracles of revolutionary wisdom, was subsequently denounced by his erstwhile colleagues as a "traitor" or "capitalist roader."

The Sino-Soviet split severely undermined the attraction of communist ideology of whatever variant. The allure of communism in the 1930s rested in large part on the advent of Soviet communism which confirmed the prophecy of Marxism. History was unfolding along definite, foreseen lines. The fact that the socialist revolution came first to a country where capitalism was not yet ripe was contrary to prophecy, but it was only a minor inconvenience, requiring only a small amendment to the theory. But the advent of two deadly antagonistic communisms presents a problem of an altogether different dimension. It is irreconcilable with Marxist theory. It devastates the ideas that lie at the heart of Marxism: that all history is the history of class struggle, that the struggle between socialism and capitalism is history's "final conflict" beyond which lies only the progressive fulfillment by man of his vast innate potential. It thus robs Marxism of the religio-mythic quality central to its appeal.

Whatever the cause, the resurgence of American radicalism in the 1960s was not accompanied by a commensurate resurgence in the popularity of the Communist Party, USA, or any of the rival parties modeled after the CPUSA but claiming to represent "true communism" (such as
the Maoist Progressive Labor Party). However, the fact that few of the new radicals chose to give themselves over to a traditional style communist party did not mean that foreign communism had lost its attraction to the American left. On the contrary, much of the “New Left” was sympathetic to communist movements and governments, but this sympathy was eclectic and undisciplined. It was directed least toward the Soviet Union, and most toward romantic communist leaders and groups in the Third World, such as Castro, Ho Chi Minh, Che Guevara, the Khmer Rouge. It adhered to no single party line, nor to any single state as the model of socialist utopia.

This phenomenon of undisciplined, eclectic sympathy for the communist world became one of the most important strains, if not the dominant one, of new leftism. It is a phenomenon which may continue—as long as the era of polycentrism lasts—to fill the place in the American left which was occupied by the CPUSA. This phenomenon is distinguishable as an ideology from either liberalism or socialism or communism. It needs a name of its own; I propose to call it “communophilism.”

What is a communophile? A communophile is someone who believes that socialism is superior to capitalism. “Socialism,” of course, means different things to different people, and the socialism of the communophile may have no precise content except that it is virulently anticapitalist and virulently critical of the capitalist democracies of the West. These societies are generally portrayed by the communophile as being impervious to mere reform and in need of fundamental alteration.

But if communophiles are vague about the content of their socialism, they are clear about which side of the great chasm in the socialist tradition they stand on. The Bolshevik revolution and its immediate aftermath split the socialist world into two camps. In one camp were those who became adherents of the Comintern. They soon came to be called “Communists.” In the other were those who remained adherents of the traditional socialist parties which are today grouped together in the Socialist International. These people continued to be called “Socialists” or “Social Democrats.” This split was different in character from all of the preceding factional divisions within the socialist world. Both camps denied that the other was socialist at all. Socialists in the eyes of the Communists, and Communists in the eyes of Socialists, were not mere deviants, they were people who stood completely outside the true faith. In regard to this division, communophiles stand four-square on the Comintern side. They may deplore the Soviet Union, but those whom they regard as bona fide socialists are always within or aligned with the communist camp. On the other hand, the parties of the Socialist International are not, in the eyes of the communophile, socialist at all. Tradi-
tionally, communists denied the bona fides of the socialists because the latter rejected the Soviet model. Communophiles, however, also reject the Soviet model. They deny the bona fides of the socialists for different reasons. They see the social democratic and labor parties of Europe as having made peace with capitalism. And in this they are no doubt correct. There is little reason to believe that a Helmut Schmidt, a James Callaghan, or even a François Mitterrand is dedicated to the abolition of capitalism and the revolutionary transformations of society. Yet this goal is cherished by the communophiles, and renders them contemptuous of the reformist socialists.

Then why coin a new term? Aren’t these people merely “communists”? Not exactly. The term “communist” has come to carry several important implications. It signifies an ideology, but even more important it signifies someone who is a member of a disciplined party, and who has adopted the Soviet system (or perhaps that of the People’s Republic of China) as a model. Indeed the virulence of the anti-communist reaction in the U.S. in the 1950s, stemmed at least in part from the fact that communists took orders from their party and their party took orders from Moscow. Thus communists were not just people with radical ideas, they were, in a very real sense, agents of a foreign power. Communophiles, on the other hand, are not members of a disciplined party, nor do they view the Soviet or any other system as a model to which they are devoted. The latter factor distinguishes communophiles from what used to be called “fellow travelers.” Fellow travelers were not members of the party, not subject to discipline, but they did take the Soviet model as their polestar.

In sum, communophilism can be defined by three characteristics.

- It adopts a posture toward the United States and other capitalist democracies that is not merely reformist but that suggests that these societies need to be fundamentally transformed. This distinguishes communophilism from liberalism.
- It expresses friendly attitudes toward the communist world, and unfriendly ones toward the movements associated traditionally with the Socialist International. This distinguishes communophilism from socialism.
- Its sympathies are not devoted to a single model state, but are distributed among a diversity of communist movements, mostly in the Third World, and leastly the USSR. This distinguishes communophilism from communism and distinguishes communophiles from fellow travelers.

This article shall endeavor to illustrate the utility of the concept “communophile” with the example of one of the most important organiza-
tions to have arisen out of the left of the 1960s—the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS). IPS is a Washington-based research institute which describes itself as “a source of radical scholarship.” 1 It is an influential though controversial organization, described by The Washington Post as “the first respectable offspring of the New Left,” 2 and by the New York Daily News as “the liberal equivalent of the Rand Corp.” 3 despite the fact that IPS does not describe itself as “liberal” and tends to use that label as one of approbrium. 4

When it does speak of itself as “liberal,” IPS tends to associate that label with the pro-communist “progressives” of a previous generation. In an article in The Nation a few years ago, Raskin coined the term “progressive liberalism” to describe the special brand of politics he expounds. He contrasted it with “establishment liberalism.” “Establishment liberalism,” beginning with the New Deal, sought to pursue its goals “within a system of Big Business capitalism,” says Raskin. In the 1950s establishment liberalism was represented by Hubert Humphrey and the Cold War; today it is represented by Ed Koch, Pat Moynihan and Jack Kemp, he says. The alternative, progressive liberalism, “has always stood for a dual-sector economy.” It does “not support the Cold War” and it “has doubts about the course of capitalism.” A previous generation of progressive liberals, “by 1949 . . . were blacklisted and thrown out of virtually every institution of American life.” 5

To test the applicability of the term “communophilism” this article will examine the views expressed by IPS on several topics which have been of central concern to it: the war in Vietnam; analysis of American society; Latin America and human rights; the Arab-Israeli conflict; and attitudes towards communism. The purpose is to see if these views reflect the three characteristics of communism, set forth above, which distinguish it from liberalism, socialism or communism.

Vietnam

The Institute for Policy Studies was founded in 1963 by Richard Barnet and Marcus Raskin, two former officials of the Kennedy administration. Although the dispatch of large numbers of United States troops to Vietnam was still two years away, Raskin and Barnet were already opposed to United States involvement in the war in Vietnam. Opposition to the war soon came to be the major activity of the Institute.

As the war dragged on, IPS Fellows could increasingly be found on the far end of the spectrum of anti-war opinion. Raskin and Barnet came in their writings to refer to the war as “aggressive,” “imperialist,” “col-
onialist," and "genocidal." Raskin and Barnet co-authored a book with IPS Fellow Ralph Stavins, entitled Washington Plans an Aggressive War. In it Stavins charged that it was intentional United States policy "to create widespread civilian casualties" and Barnet accused the United States of waging "an aggressive war as brutal as any in history." 7

In this book Barnet and Raskin argued that those United States government officials who participated in formulating or executing Vietnam policy were war criminals. The authors recognized that the constitutional prohibition on ex post facto laws might make it impossible to punish the guilty, but Raskin drafted a piece of legislation which would make it in the future a crime punishable by long prison terms to plan, approve, or carry out "acts of brutality against civilians, insurgent groups, and resistance movements." 8

Soon after Raskin and Barnet expounded their idea that U.S. government officials were "war criminals," IPS Fellow Eqbal Ahmad, according to the Chicago Sun Times, urged an anti-war gathering at Northwestern University to carry out "citizen arrests" of Henry Kissinger and other government officials. 9 At about the same time Ahmad was indicted together with Rev. Philip Berrigan and six others for actually plotting to kidnap Kissinger. The case ended in a mistrial when the federal jury was unable to agree on a verdict.

In 1969 Barnet traveled to North Vietnam. There he spoke at a rally expressing solidarity with the North Vietnamese cause, an action for which he received some criticism upon his return. Barnet acknowledges that he knew the North Vietnamese would use his speech for propaganda purposes. "I was absolutely certain that the speech would be used, be broadcast," he says. 10

Barnet was not the only IPS luminary to visit Hanoi during the war. Board Chairman Peter Weiss and his wife Cora, President of the Samuel Rubin Foundation, the Institute's principal source of financial support, made several trips. Cora traveled frequently to North Vietnam on behalf of the Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam, which she ran. The Hanoi government resisted all entreaties to allow the International Red Cross or any other neutral humanitarian body to have access to American prisoners of war. It blocked communication between prisoners of war and their families and refused to provide information about the names of prisoners held, their medical condition, or even the identity of the known dead. Instead it used the Weisses as couriers to carry an occasional letter or pieces of information. This near monopoly of information about the prisoners of war provides a platform from which Mrs. Weiss expounded Hanoi's terms for ending the war. 11
Mrs. Weiss also used her platform to deny charges that American prisoners of war were suffering mistreatment. Years later, when the prisoners of war were released, they confirmed reports that they were regularly mistreated and some expressed bitterness about the role of the Committee of Liaison.

After the war Cora Weiss organized a Manhattan rally which gave a hero’s welcome to the first official representatives in the United States (the U.N. delegation) of the communist government of united Vietnam. Mrs. Weiss and Vietnamese Deputy Foreign Minister Ngo Dien gave the main speeches to a throng of veterans of the anti-war movement while a bedraggled group of Vietnamese refugees and “boat people” picketed outside in the rain.13

The surrender of the non-communist governments of South Vietnam and Cambodia was not the last chapter in the Indo-China saga. Then came stories of death and starvation in Cambodia, boat people fleeing Vietnam, and then a war between the two communist countries. Throughout these events IPS Fellows continued their active interest in Indochinese affairs. Bernard Fall met his death while covering the Vietnam war. But in the 1970s, two other scholarly specialists on Indochina joined IPS. One, Malcolm Caldwell, was based in Britain where he served as co-editor of the Journal of Contemporary Asia and as a Fellow of the Institute’s European arm. The other was Gareth Porter who received his doctorate in Indochinese studies and has worked intermittently during the past decade for such groups as the Indochina Resource Center, the Southeast Asia Resource Center, and for IPS.

As stories of human rights violations, deportations, boat people, widescale imprisonment began to emerge from post-war Vietnam, several of those who had been active in the anti-war movement, notably Joan Baez, Daniel Ellsberg, the Berrigans, and the organization SANE, raised their voices in protest to Hanoi. In response a small group of activists took an ad in The New York Times to defend the Hanoi government. Among these were Richard Barnet and Cora Weiss. Without explaining how they had done so, the sponsors declared that they “have examined these charges [of human rights abuses] and find them to be based on distortion and exaggeration.” The ad went on:

True, some Saigon collaborationists have been detained in reeducation centers, perhaps 40,000 at present. But such a number is surprisingly small considering the several million Vietnamese involved in Saigon’s war effort. . . . Many of those detained engaged in crimes against their own people, including rape, murder, torture, bribery and extortion. On balance, consider the terrible difficulties left behind by the war and made worse by America’s continued hostility.
The present government of Vietnam should be hailed for its moderation and for its extraordinary effort to achieve reconciliation among all of its people.\textsuperscript{14}

Even more striking—and by far—than the reports emerging from Vietnam were those that came out of Cambodia, or Kämpuchea as it was now called. Beginning with reports by Sydney Schanberg in \textit{The New York Times} and others in the French press, the world heard mindbending stories of mass executions, appalling brutalities, and of an entire urban population, including infants and the aged, pregnant women and convalescents thrown out of hospitals—all driven at gun point on a forced march to oblivion.

These actions left the Pol Pot government with almost no defenders. Senator George McGovern was so appalled that he went so far as to ask whether we should not consider the use of military force to oust Pol Pot. But among Pol Pot’s very few defenders were Gareth Porter and Malcolm Caldwell.

Porter rushed into print with a book that charged that “the media’s coverage of Cambodia reflected the interests and values of a society that remains unremittingly hostile to revolution.” Cambodia “is only the latest victim of the enforcement of an ideology that demands that social revolutions be portrayed as negatively as possible,” he added.\textsuperscript{15} About the forced march out of Phnom Penh, Porter wrote that “the evacuation was prompted by a concern for the most basic and urgent needs of the population.”\textsuperscript{16} The people in the city were starving, he explained, so that the government sent them to the countryside where they could find food. Contrary to reports of harsh conditions along the route of march “... food, water, rent, and medical care were provided along the way.”\textsuperscript{17} But why even empty the hospitals? “The purpose of this move,” explained Porter, “was actually to save lives and give the best possible care to the sick and the wounded... It was an act of mercy for the patients. ... The [revolutionary government] had its own medical system, one that was ... far better adopted to the conditions of deprivation in which Cambodia found itself at the end of the war.”\textsuperscript{18} In sum, Porter found that the Pol Pot government deserved applause and emulation for having created “a collective framework designed to release the creative energies of the people.”\textsuperscript{19} He argued that the Cambodian “experience” has “a significance that goes far beyond Cambodia itself. We hope that it will not be lost to the American people.”\textsuperscript{20}

Porter’s book was hailed by Caldwell who reviewed it for the magazine \textit{Race and Class} which IPS co-publishes in London. “This brief but powerfully argued and moving book deserves the warmest of welcomes,” said Caldwell.\textsuperscript{21}
If the Cambodian government was actually deserving of admiration, then the Cambodian refugees who brought out the stories of unspeakable atrocities must be worthy of contempt as liars. Caldwell did not shrink from this conclusion. Writing in IPS' *Race and Class*, Caldwell exposed the fact that: "Laotian and Cambodian reactionary refugees in camps in the northern part of [Thailand] are being promised colonist landholdings in return for fevered and fabricated stories of communist 'blood baths' and atrocities in their liberated homelands for the 'free world' media. As privileged alien landowners, these lackeys will obviously have strongly anti-communist motives."

If IPS Fellows had no trouble defending the revolutionary governments of Indochina against the accusations of the refugees, they were thrown into a quandary when these governments began to fight each other. In still another article in *Race and Class*, Malcolm Caldwell offered this response.

... those of us who have been involved in the solidarity of struggles with the people of Indochina must recognize that the most important priority now is not to be disillusioned. ... We now have revolutionary regimes in power, which can in a certain sense look after themselves. ... That is not the case with guerrilla movements that are still fighting—they're the ones that require our solidarity. ... Of those in Southeast Asia, far and away the most important is the Thai Communist Party. ... The liberation of Thailand would expose the whole main island part of Southeast Asia to the front of social revolution.

So it's very important that we don't let any concern with the specifics of the Vietnam-Cambodian disputes dislodge us from solidarity with their struggle and, by extension, the struggle of the Burmese, Malaysian, Indonesian and Philippine Communist Parties."

**Views of the United States**

One other aspect of the Institute's response to the war in Vietnam distinguished it from many of the liberal opponents of the war. Most of the large number of Americans who came to oppose the war saw it as a mistake, a product of policy which had been poorly conceived, poorly executed or both, the kind of error America should and could easily avoid repeating. But in the eyes of IPS the war was not the product of mistakes but of something deeper. It was a symptom, in Stavins' words, of "the disease of an entire ruling class." 24

Raskin and Barnet wrote in 1970:

The Indochina War is not the chief cause of the American crisis but a symptom of that crisis. This self-inflicted wound is a visible manifestation of a systemic disorder. ... The war itself was not an accident
but the logical extension of a "national security" policy of permanent war on a global scale.  

In his book, The Economy of Death, Barnet took up the same theme:

You do not undergo surgery for the common cold or treat cancer with a steam kettle. Unfortunately, the cancer analogy is uncomfortably accurate. American militarism is a systemic disorder that has affected each of our major institutions. . . . We can hope the cancer is still operable, but time is short.  

How deep, how ancient were the roots of the cancer? IPS Fellows no doubt have varying views, but all seem to agree that it antedates President Johnson's decision to send United States troops to Vietnam. Stavins, for example, wrote that "the thirty-three months of Kennedy's presidency marked the makings of a totalitarian state structure."  

And before United States troops went to Vietnam, Barnet and Raskin published their first book, After 20 Years: Alternatives to the Cold War in Europe. According to the publisher's note, "the thesis of this book is that the Atlantic Alliance and the dream of a great society are in fundamental conflict." Given that conflict, it was clear what should be discarded. The idea of the "Atlantic Community," said the authors, is "obsolete and dangerous."

The foregoing reflect the consistent themes of the Institute's evaluation of American reality. The United States is an imperialist country, forever seeking aggrandizement abroad and ruled within by a "war machine." The world holds few perils for the United States that are not of its own making (although it constitutes a dire peril for many others). Such conflicts as it encounters, and there are an endless string of them, are always either direct acts of imperial appetite on the part of the United States or are contrived diversions initiated by its rulers for the purpose of pacifying the domestic populace.

The Fellows have used varying terminology to describe this system. Stavins used the word "totalitarian." IPS Fellows Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau wrote that "post-industrial America [is] a society whose values even George Orwell might not have imagined." In their book, An American Manifesto, Barnet and Raskin said that "there is a chance for peace and social justice in America only if her people are liberated from the dead hand of authoritarianism."

In his longest book, Being and Doing, Raskin used a different and creative terminology. There he said that America itself should be seen as one vast system of overlapping "colonies" arranged in pyramidal structure with the "violence colony" (the national security apparatus) at the top.
In its relations with the rest of mankind, the United States, Barnet wrote, "is one of the most violent countries in the world." The "National Security Managers" who rule it, "not content with being primus inter pares among the nations," will not "permit a pause in the relentless drive for more power." Less than one month after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, Raskin wrote that "America is . . . the one [country] most isolated from the decent opinion of mankind." The bottom line, wrote Barnet and Raskin in An American Manifesto, is that: "Americans believe that the world must be made safe for America, but for the sake of survival itself, America must be made safe for the world."  

Latin America and Human Rights

In the latter half of the decade of the 1970s, IPS devoted increasing attention to United States policy toward Latin America and the Caribbean and also to the issue of international human rights. To address these issues the Institute created an "Ad Hoc Working Group on Latin America" and a Human Rights Project.

The Ad Hoc Working Group published its report during the first weeks of the Carter Administration. It was titled, The Southern Connection: Recommendations for a New Approach to Inter-American Relations.

The theme of the report was that the United States must discard "the outmoded assumption of U.S. hegemony" and welcome "ideological diversity" or "ideological pluralism" in the hemisphere. The acid test of a willingness to accept ideological diversity was United States policy toward Cuba. Indeed, said the report, "The key Caribbean issue that the new Administration must consider is the normalization of relations with Cuba." Normalization of relations with Cuba was proposed not in the interests of a general desire to improve relations with all of our Southern neighbors. On the contrary, the report recommended various steps which would be likely to strain relations with certain Latin countries: phasing out military aid, and introducing new human rights criteria into the consideration of military sales, economic aid, and even private loans.

It was clear that by "ideological diversity" the authors did not have in mind acceptance of right-wing governments such as Somoza's or Pinochet's, the latter of which was criticized for practicing "virulent anti-communism." Rather the point was that "the new thrust of U.S. policy in Latin America should be to support the ideologically diverse and experimental approaches to development that are gaining support around the world." What kind of approaches are those? The report described
three nations as "Latin America's most challenging development experiments: Cuba has established a socialist government, and both Jamaica and Guyana are seeking to overcome the chronic problems of underdevelopment by using models different from those traditionally accepted by the United States."

It added that "Cuba has no reason to make amends for its decision to follow a socialist development alternative." The report said that the U.S. government's "hostility toward Cuba [was] part and product of its general opposition to ideological diversity in the hemisphere." The report gives the impression that the authors' appeal for tolerance for "ideological diversity" is a guarded way of saying tolerance for revolution. The report says that the "need for change . . . [is] powerful and urgent," and it calls for phasing out arms aid because this has come to be used in "the struggle against internal movements, chiefly rural guerrillas."

All in all, the approach to Latin America adopted in The Southern Connection accords well with IPS Director Richard Barnet's plea in his book Intervention and Revolution: "The first imperative is that the world must be made safe for revolution." The report's approach is not surprising in view of the fact that three of the seven members of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Latin America have been active in pro-Castro organizations. Roberta Salper, the coordinator of the group, was an official of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party which is an openly pro-Castro party. Michael Locker worked for the Castroite North American Congress on Latin America. Richard Fagen traveled to Cuba in 1969 with an SDS contingent and has been listed as a sponsor of the annual celebrations of Castro's attack on the Moncada barracks.

The IPS Human Rights Project is run by Isabel Letelier, widow of slain Chilean exile and Transnational Institute director, Orlando Letelier. Mrs. Letelier's work, she says, has focused on "the Southern Cone"—Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay. She is also working on a project concerning "indigenous populations," mainly Indians. In an interview she was asked whether the IPS Human Rights Project has done any work on human rights violations in Cuba. Mrs. Letelier responded: "The countries we take in consideration are the countries where the U.N. has issued reports on human rights." I pointed out that various international agencies had commented on human rights problems in Cuba. Mrs. Letelier responded that "we don't have data," and asked "if you could send me information about it." I said that there was ample data readily available. She responded that "there is ample work done for that . . . [but] there are not too many organizations that want to tell in this country what happens with countries that have repressive governments supported by this country."
I also asked whether the IPS Human Rights Project had done anything about the massive deaths in Cambodia under the reign of Pol Pot. She responded that "all the papers in this country have reported that. That has ample coverage . . . but, for me, the things that happened there cannot be defined as worse than what's going on in Guatemala. And almost nothing has been said..." I said that one or two million people were killed in Cambodia out of a population of seven million. She replied that "the ratio in Guatemala is more or less the same, [and] in El Salvador . . . and those countries are receiving aid from this country." When I appeared a bit startled by this response, she added: "Why don't you ask Mr. Solzhenitsyn what he's doing about human rights in Chile?"

Mrs. Letelier's awkwardness in this exchange is symptomatic of a deep ambivalence which IPS displays about the issue of human rights. IPS leaders are eager for a more aggressive pursuit of human rights in United States relations with right-wing regimes, but they are also aware that attention to human rights issues tends to kindle anti-communist feelings, which is something they do not welcome. For this reason Raskin derided President Carter's human rights advocacy. Raskin wrote, "Carter's administration hoped to recapture the world image of moral champion . . . while continuing the same imperial mischief. Its political objective was to split the Soviet elite . . . ." Barnet wrote that "watching the Soviets squirm as world attention is focused on the Ginsberg, Bukovsky and Sakharov scandals is in the tradition of the propaganda wars of the past." Barnet hastened to add that "this does not mean that Moscow's treatment of the Soviet dissidents is anything but reprehensible. . . . Denying Andrei Sakharov a decent apartment—a front-page story a few days ago—is outrageous and petty, but is it a more serious human-rights problem than the largely unreported assassinations that take place in Rhodesia almost every week?"

Barnet also noted that both Western Europe and the United States were suffering from a "decline in official respect for human rights" while "ironically, one area of the world that can point to some improvement in its human rights record is the Soviet Union, which despite its sorry record in implementing 'socialist legality' is far from the giant concentration camp that Stalin made it."

In a similar vein, IPS Board Chairman Peter Weiss has protested against the fact that "the maintenance of trade embargoes against Cuba and Vietnam . . . is largely justified, at least in part, by references to the less than perfect human rights records of both countries."

In order to combat the tendency of the human rights issue to serve anti-communist purposes, IPS leaders have promoted a broader definition of the concept of "human rights" than is generally used. "My
perspective of human rights,” says Mrs. Letelier, “is the oppressed majority, the poor.” The thought has been elaborated by Peter Weiss. Of the “fatal flaws” in U.S. human rights policy, “the first is the failure to recognize that an infinitely larger number of the world’s people are suffering—actively suffering—from consistent patterns of gross violations of their fundamental rights to work, food, health, shelter and education—their rights, in short, to live their lives instead of struggling for their existence—than from violations of their rights to freedom from torture, arbitrary detention and censorship of the press.”

Thus, Barnet proposes that the distinction be drawn between “substantive rights” which are economic and “procedural rights” which are political, intellectual and spiritual. He believes that the former must precede the latter. He says:

Without establishing the notion of minimum substantive rights for every citizen of the globe (a minimal calory intake to sustain life and health, minimum shelter, minimum employment possibilities), the procedural rights which Americans cherish and which are increasingly violated around the world—freedom of speech, assembly, press, religion, and thought—will remain irrelevant for a majority of mankind and utterly unattainable.

This perspective helps to explain IPS’ laissez-faire attitude toward human rights in Cuba. “Practical steps to reduce [socio-economic] inequities, are thus also steps toward the mitigation of the broader human rights crisis of our time,” wrote the IPS Ad Hoc Working Group on Latin America. There are some differences of attitude among IPS leaders about Castro’s Cuba, but they all concur in approving the general thrust of his socio-economic policies. From this it follows that Castro’s policies are beneficial to human rights in the long run.

Mideast

The one area in which the Institute’s activities have run into the greatest controversy is on the subject of the Middle East. In 1971, Raskin joined Arab activist Abdeen Jabara, Noam Chomsky, and others in a suit against the State and Defense Departments demanding disclosure of United States contingency plans for intervention in any future Mideast war. It was plain that what the plaintiffs hoped to expose and nullify were any plans for the United States to come to Israel’s defense in a moment of urgency. Raskin and several other IPS Fellows have spoken at conferences of the Association of Arab-American University Graduates,
which is described by the Anti-Defamation League as "the key PLO 'connection' in the United States." In 1979 when the State Department broke precedent and issued a visa to PLO official Shafik Al Hout, one of the places at which Al Hout spoke was the Institute for Policy Studies. For these and other activities, IPS has been criticized by some Jewish organizations and publications and has lost some of its sources of funds. In 1980, the Zionist magazine, *Midstream*, published a landmark expose of IPS by Rael Jean Isaac.

IPS has responded forcefully to the allegations that it has an anti-Israel or pro-PLO position. IPS Director Robert Borosage and Board Chairman Peter Weiss have labeled the *Midstream* article a "shabby slander." They argue that those who have been associated with IPS can be seen as falling into three categories: "Zionist"; those who "believe that Palestinian rights have been neglected"; and those who "have no firm position on the Middle East." Unfortunately, with one exception, Borosage and Weiss do not identify who at the Institute falls into which category.

There is little mystery about who among the IPS associates might fit into the category of those concerned about Palestinian rights. Clovis Maksoud, the Ambassador of the Arab League to the United Nations and its chief representative in the United States, was a Fellow at IPS where he gave seminars and worked on a study of the roots of the conflict in Lebanon. Cherif Guellal was the Ambassador of Algeria to the United States. During the Six-Day War, Algeria severed diplomatic relations to protest United States support for Israel. Instead of returning to Algeria, Guellal became a Fellow at IPS. Tariq Ali, a Pakistani-born resident of England has been a Fellow of the Institute and is an officer of the Trotskyite "Fourth International" which, in the words of the Anti-Defamation League, lends "unflagging support to the Palestinian guerrillas." (To be precise, the Anti-Defamation League used these words to describe the American branch of the "International." The British branch, of which Ali is a leader, is much more militant, and if anything more anti-Israeli, than its American counterpart and has been criticized by the Americans for openly advocating terrorist tactics.) Former Senator James Abourezk, who has been the PLO's most prestigious American supporter, serves as an IPS trustee, teaches at IPS' "Washington School" and works to solicit the participation of other elected officials in IPS activities. James Zogby, National Chairman of the Palestine Human Rights Campaign, was also listed as a member of the faculty of the Washington School.

IPS' European magazine, *Race and Class*, is consistently pro-Palestinian not only in its articles and book reviews about the Middle
East, but also in off-hand references to the "Palestinian struggle" which recur in articles about other subjects. For example, one issue of Race and Class reprinted four speeches given to the Annual Convention of Arab-American University Graduates: one by Mohammed Hassanein Heikal, the former confident of President Nasser, and others by the representatives of the Ba'ath Socialist Party, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and the Democratic Republic of Yemen. In another issue contained an article by IPS Fellow Eqbal Ahmad memorializing the Palestinian poet, Rashed Hussein. In it, Ahmad praised Hussein for being "clearer than many of us on the dangers Israel represented for the future," in particular, that of the "Zionists"... current drive to alienate the Soviet Jewry from its Russian patrimony." In another issue, the prison diary of an Indian woman was preceded by this introduction: "Akhtar Baluch's frequent references to struggles in other parts of the world, namely in Vietnam, in Palestine and in China, and her conviction of the need for revolution, demonstrate her awareness of being not only a nationalist, but a part of the world struggle against imperialism."

In an enthusiastic review of a book by Israeli Communist Felicia Langer, Race and Class editorial board member, Thomas Hodgkin, began with this statement: "We, the British, must have a special sense of responsibility for Israeli imperialism since we invented it." And he concluded with this one: "The basic fact which I discovered about Palestine forty years ago—that the best people are almost all in gaol—remains true today. Only now there are many more—more and better." A book which received a less favorable review in Race and Class was Noam Chomsky's Peace in the Middle East. David Caploe, an IPS Fellow, wrote that the very fact of the book's publication was a "hopeful vindication" in light of the "heated denunciations of Chomsky by Zionists and their liberal supporters." But Caploe said that Chomsky's analysis was too soft on Zionism. Chomsky wrote that Zionism—at least its Socialist variant—was once good, but had been corrupted. Caploe replied: "If Zionism originally had the progressive character Chomsky ascribes to it, then it is difficult to understand how it could take so reactionary a turn so quickly...." In addition, Caploe derided Chomsky's proposal that Israel should be replaced by a "Socialist Bi-national state." Caploe wrote: "Feelings between Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs have been so poisoned... by the Zionist establishment... that living together in peace is inconceivable, at least for the immediate future." Since Caploe makes clear his opposition to the continued existence of Israel, his dismissal of Chomsky's (and the PLO's) proposal for a bi-national state leaves unanswered what exactly he would do with the Jews who currently inhabit that part of the world.
A number of past and present IPS Fellows are involved with an organization called the Middle East Research and Information Project, or "MERIP." MERIP is described by the Anti-Defamation League as "an unabashed propaganda outlet in the U.S. for the Palestinian revolutionary movement." It has distributed such publications as Fatah's "Revolution Until Victory," and "Political and Armed Struggle," and other publications by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and the Democratic Popular Front. It sells buttons with the slogan "Free Palestine." It has contributed money, as have Libya, Egypt, and the PLO, to the Palestine Solidarity Committee. After the massacre of Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics, MERIP issued a leaflet which said in part:

The Western Establishment has freaked out. "Responsible" newspapers and political candidates continuously reach new heights of absurdity and hypocrisy in the mad rush to condemn "international terrorism," especially when it upsets their fun and games. . . .

No number of actions similar to Munich can create or substitute for a mass revolutionary movement of Palestinians and other Arabs, but with this in mind, we should comprehend the achievements of the Munich action. . . .

The laudable "achievements" were enumerated: raising morale in the refugee camps; foiling "Sadat's initiative toward settlement"; and provoking "direct military confrontation between Israel and Lebanon and Syria."

Both Richard Barnet and Marcus Raskin have denied Rael Jean Isaac's allegation that IPS has ties to MERIP. Raskin said: "I don't know anything about MERIP. Don't even ask me about it. Ask Stork. He runs it, doesn't he?" Joe Stork is an editor of MERIP Reports and probably its most frequent contributor. Stork's only connection with IPS, says Barnet, is that "Stork was once a student here." But two separate IPS publications, Race and Class and the IPS internal newsletter, the Link, identified Stork as an IPS Fellow.

Stork is not the only connection between IPS and MERIP. IPS Fellow Fred Halliday, is the London editor of MERIP Reports. The promotional brochure for MERIP Reports trumpets the names of four of the journal's regular contributors: two are Arabs, the other two are Halliday and another IPS Fellow, Michael Klare. Other IPS people who contribute to MERIP Reports are Eqbal Ahmad and IPS staff member Daniel Volman. Ahmad also signed a fund appeal letter on behalf of MERIP in which he said that "MERIP aims at discovering and dissemi-
nating the truth which, along with the rights of the Palestinian people, has been a major casualty of colonial and neo-colonial occupation of the Middle East.” The recently advertised MERIP “Speakers Network” lists Klare, Halliday, and Ahmad.

MERIP came into existence in 1971. At that time, IPS Fellow Arthur Waskow headed the Institute’s work on Middle East and Jewish issues. During its first year of existence, MERIP listed as its mailing address the same post office box used by Waskow for some of his IPS activities. MERIP has also often used IPS facilities for its meetings. When asked about this, Raskin replied that the Institute was

open . . . for points of view that are unpopular at any particular moment, which ten years later or fifteen years later become popular. So the Institute was open to the Anti-War movement, the Institute was open to the Civil Rights movement, the Women’s movement, etc. . . .

Barnet’s response to a similar question was that “all kinds of places use our building if we think it’s a legitimate organization.”

But if it is not difficult to identify who in the IPS community falls into the category of those concerned about Palestinian rights, it is not so easy to figure out who deserves the label, “Zionist.” Borosage and Weiss give one example—Weiss. Weiss may be a Zionist, but he is not a typical one. He is a leader of the National Lawyers Guild which has made statements about the Middle East that have been vituperatively anti-Israel. He was also on the steering committee of a now-defunct organization called CONAME—Committee on New Alternatives in the Middle East—which became a center for Israeli and American Jews, such as Noam Chomsky, who were exceedingly critical of Israeli policy. During the Yom Kippur War, CONAME appeared as a signatory, together with a variety of Arab groups, of a telegram to all Members of Congress inveighing against arms shipments to Israel. After the war was over, CONAME told the Jewish community that the use of the name had not been properly authorized. CONAME had not, however, notified the Congressmen of the error. Whether such a group can properly be called “anti-Israel” is arguable, but its stance was such that Time magazine listed CONAME in a news report as one of the “groups [who] speak up for the Arab cause.” In 1975, Weiss filed a brief seeking to intervene on the side of the defendants in the trial in West Germany of the terrorist Baader-Meinhof gang. Weiss’ action, to be sure, was only to uphold certain procedural rights of the defendants upon which he felt the court had infringed, and did not imply any support for the Baader-Meinhof philosophy. Nonetheless, it might be noted that there is no record of his having
made similar interventions, as other American lawyers sought to do, in, say, the Soviet trial of Anatoly Scharansky. Scharansky would seem a much more likely beneficiary than Baader and Meinhof of the voluntary energies of a lawyer who is devoted to Zionism.

When asked in an interview what pro-Israeli activity at IPS balanced its pro-Arab activities, Raskin cited only one thing: IPS, he said, had given a small grant to Simcha Flapan. Flapan is the editor of the Israeli magazine, New Outlook, and is a crusader for Israeli recognition of the PLO and creation of a Palestinian state.

Who else at IPS might qualify as a "Zionist"? Perhaps Paul Jacobs? Perhaps Arthur Waskow? Jacobs was an IPS Fellow, and a lifelong radical who had wended his way through various parties and movements of the Left. IPS Fellow Saul Landau said in an interview that "there was nobody who loved Israel more than Paul Jacobs." After the Munich massacre, Jacobs made a trip to the Arab world to prepare a report for IPS which was later published in Ramparts. He met with members of Black September and kindred groups, all of whom he referred to respectfully as the "resistance movements." He spoke no word of moral condemnation of the Munich massacre, but seemed to suggest that it was a tactical error. He wrote:

Media deeds, like Munich, obscure the real issues, cover up the real grievances, throw a heavily charged cloud of emotionalism over injustices and allow micro-violence to be castigated [i.e., the massacre], while macro-violence goes unnoticed and unheeded [i.e., Israeli policy toward the Arabs].

Arthur Waskow was the center of Jewish and much Middle East-related activity at IPS throughout most of the 1970s (Waskow has continued these activities since he and other dissident IPS Fellows left IPS in 1977 to form the Public Resource Center). Waskow's activities focused on building a Jewish rationale for the philosophies and activities of the New Left. He was instrumental in organizing the Jewish Campaign for the Peoples Peace Treaty, a Jewish march on the Pentagon, Jews for Urban Justice, and similar things. He wrote in 1971: "We, the whole Jewish people, have been commanded by our tradition to preach the destruction of America."

In the midst of the Yom Kippur War, Waskow circulated a "dear friend" letter urging that American Jews "push solely for a cease-fire—not for more arms" for Israel.

If Weiss, Jacobs, Flapan and Waskow are the "Zionists" who counterbalance the pro-Palestinian-rights position of Maksood, Guellal, Ali, Ahmad, Klare, Halliday, Stork, Caploe, and others at IPS, it may be
said that both of these groups have one thing in common: they both devote their energies, as far as the Middle East is concerned, to criticizing Israel.

Communism

IPS leaders are eager to refute any suggestion that they are pro-Soviet. As their main piece of evidence, Barnet, Raskin and Saul Landau in separate interviews each directed my attention to an article defending Solzhenitsyn which Raskin published in *Ramparts* in 1974. Barnet called it "the first article" supporting Solzhenitsyn; while Raskin made the more modest claim that it was the first *on the left*. Neither claim is true. Nonetheless the article is a spirited defense of Solzhenitsyn, both of his rights and of his importance, although it calls his writing "basically paranoid." In the article Raskin decries the Soviet practice, of which Solzhenitsyn was but one victim, of discrimination against individuals because of the class status of their ancestors. "This *classism* is a central problem for the revolutionary socialist countries," wrote Raskin. "Some have handled it better than others, as in the case of Cuba and China." This plaudit for China will sound strange to those familiar with the Chinese practice of official discrimination and prejudice against the members and the offspring of the "five black varieties," the social strata said to have been the "exploiters" in pre-revolutionary China.

Raskin's assertion is representative of much that is spoken and written at IPS. There is not much sympathy for the USSR, but there is a good deal for other communist countries and communist movements, especially those in the Third World. Barnet, for example, has called the Chinese revolution a "towering achievement." Eqbal Ahmad has referred to the governments of China, Cuba, and North Vietnam as "the forces of liberation."

The lack of sympathy for Soviet communism is often expressed by likening the Soviet Union to the United States. Thus, for example, Raskin wrote in *Being and Doing* that "state socialism which occurred in the USSR merely turned out to be the mirror of corporate socialism in the West." IPS Director Borosage said in an interview that both the U.S. and the USSR have "systems of governance or political economy that lead to dead ends."

One difference between the two is that in the case of the Soviet Union, "out of that failure is coming a whole range of social experiments... that I find interesting," says Borosage. The examples he enumerates of "interesting social experiments" are "Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, Cuba, Nicaragua."
One other difference between the U.S. and the USSR is that the international conduct of the former is usually described as the more belligerent of the two. Barnet for example refers to the United States routinely as “imperialist.” In Roots of War he wrote that since 1940 “the United States has engaged in a form of permanent war. . . . America’s permanent war can be explained primarily by looking at American society, and . . . America’s wars will cease only if that society is changed.” I asked him in an interview if the Soviet Union is an imperialist country. He responded this way:

I think that the Soviet Union has been expansionist in the sense that it held onto areas peripheral to its pre-war expanse by the use of military power, however I do not think it is a country with unlimited territorial ambitions. . . . It is fundamentally . . . a status quo power."

One thing that most IPS leaders seem to agree on is their dislike for anti-communism. Barnet and Raskin wrote in An American Manifesto that “anti-communism, militarism, and fascism” are three ideas which must be combated through “‘political education.” At an IPS conference Cora Weiss, the Institute’s principal “angel,” decried not anti-Communism, but “anti-Soviet Communism” as “a hereditary disease transmitted over the past sixty years.”

Another thing about which there is much agreement is Cuba. Orlando Letelier, the former Director of TNI, IPS’ international affairs division, wrote to Beatriz Allende of his hope for Chile that, “perhaps some day, not far away, we also will be able to do what has been done in Cuba.”

After Letelier’s assassination, he was succeeded as TNI Director by Saul Landau. In an interview I asked Landau about his attitudes toward Cuba. He said: “I have a friendship with Castro based on personal contact. . . . Over 21 years, probably I would say his successes far outnumber his failures. . . . He is one of the most brilliant politicians in the world today. . . .” About Cuba’s military intervention in Africa, Landau said, “I think that what he did in Angola was very important; what he’s doing in Ethiopia I think is crazy.”

I asked Landau, “Is there any other government in Latin America that you think has done as much good for its people?” He responded: “No. Nowhere near, nowhere near.”

I asked him if Castro is a dictator. He said, “I don’t think he’s a dictator, I think he’s a leader with enormous popular support, great popular support, which means his policy is not dictated to the people, but is most of the time very well in tune with them.”

I asked what Landau thought of human rights violations, such as the twenty-year imprisonment of Castro’s fellow revolutionary Huber Matos.
Landau acknowledged some human rights violations, but said about Matos that he "was tried and convicted ... of attempting to lead an armed insurrection." When I expressed disbelief, Landau responded:

I've seen the trial transcripts, spoken to the witnesses. ... I don't think there's a question about it. There was a trial; there was lots of testimony taken; and Matos himself admitted that he was indeed organizing his officers to act against the government. ... Huber Matos was put in jail, I think, for correct reasons.

The fact is that Matos was convicted of slandering the revolution by saying that it was moving toward communism. The main piece of evidence was a letter he had written to Castro, his old friend and comrade-in-arms. Far from organizing his officers, Matos' letter explained to Castro that he had resigned from his position as governor of Camaguey province because of his disagreement with the course the revolution was taking. I didn't think to ask Landau who were the witnesses to whom he had spoken, but I learned later that the main witness at the trial was Castro; another was his brother Raoul. Castro had also appointed the judges and the prosecutor, and had called for Matos' execution in a public speech preceding the trial. Far from admitting his guilt, Matos called Castro a liar at the trial.

In a speech reprinted as an IPS pamphlet, Board Chairman Peter Weiss said that it is a "categorical imperative ... that we dispense, once and for all, with the utterly foolish notion that capitalism can bring about economic and social justice in the Third World. It is doubtful whether it ever could; it is absolutely certain that it cannot do so in its present confused, hysterical, and morbid stage." Weiss has been active in the National Lawyers Guild which is the American affiliate of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, a barely camouflaged communist front whose president has received the Lenin Peace Prize and which busies itself with such activities as denouncing Israel's Entebbe rescue mission as a "crime against international law." IPS Director Borosage, who has been a member of the National Lawyers Guild since law school, vigorously denies that it is a communist front. He said in an interview that the proof of this is that "two years ago ... there was a huge fight with the Maoists" inside the Guild.

The Institute says it takes no positions as a corporate body, and IPS spokesmen emphasize that it embodies a range of viewpoints. It would seem fair to say that the Institute's seven most important leaders have been the three who have been its directors—Raskin, Barnet, and Borosage; the three who have been directors of its international program—Ahmed, Letelier and Landau; and its board chairman, Peter
Weiss. An examination of the views of these seven about communism does in fact reveal a spectrum of views, but it is a rather narrow one. All seven are "anti anti-communists" and their views about Third World communist movements range from hesitating approval of at least some to enthusiastic approval.

The European wing of IPS has still fewer scruples about communist movements than the American wing has. Borosage noted the American contingent "almost completely comes out of a liberal, pragmatic philosophical basis" while the European contingent "almost completely comes out of a Marxist or at least a liberation basis." It might be added that the Americans seem to have transcended their liberal origins, while the Europeans seem still to display their Marxist ones. A sampling of the Institute's European magazine, Race and Class, is illustrative.

The magazine's editor, IPS Fellow A. Sivanandan, sometimes comments on United States race relations. In one issue, Sivanandan said this about James Baldwin: "When the fight for rights was over—for the vote and property and a place in the sun—opening up the road ahead for the long and protracted and deathly struggle against capital and the state, against exploitation on a world scale, against death-dealing imperialism, Baldwin was not there." In contrast, in another issue Sivanandan wrote a panegyric to Paul Robeson who defected from the U.S. to the USSR, and who Sivanandan praised as the "forerunner" of the whole civil rights movement. "The purpose of life for Robeson was to be free," said Sivanandan.

IPS Fellow Ken Jordaan wrote about Mozambique:

To break with imperialism, to eliminate the African parasitic classes, to generate a surplus for industrial investment from a self-sufficient agricultural sector, given the agrarian bias of the African economies—these then are the principal strands of which authentic socialist policies are woven. China had to choose this long and arduous march toward socialist accumulation.

In 1975 when the socialists and centrists in Portugal succeeded in turning back the Communist bid for power by trouncing the Communist party in Portugal's first free elections, Race and Class carried this item:

To take the election results at their face value is to ignore the lessons of one year of struggle. The secret vote gave a voice to sections of the population which, because of their previous connections with fascism and because of their fears and economic interests, had remained otherwise isolated and powerless. . . . If the democratic revolution in Portugal has followed a tortuous path, that path has persistently pointed to socialism. But it is not . . . by the ballot box that it will be achieved.
Upon the communist consolidation of power in Laos, with the help of the Vietnamese army, a Race and Class article said: "After thirty years a People's Democratic Republic of Laos has been established. A revolutionary new future lies ahead for the people of Laos; a future which can now be one of their own making."\textsuperscript{104} Other comments on Southeast Asia included such observations as that communism triumphed in Vietnam because of "the superiority of the ethical ideas of Ho Chi Minh"\textsuperscript{105} and the good news that "despite strong repression and the arrest of many leaders, the CPP [Communist Party of the Philippines] continues unabated to lead the revolutionary movement."\textsuperscript{106}

When the Portuguese exodus from Angola left three black nationalist movements contending for power, Race and Class was vociferous in its support for the Cuban and Soviet backed MPLA as opposed the FNLA or UNITA which at various times had received American, Chinese or South African support.\textsuperscript{107} A book which proposed a united front of the three black movements was panned in Race and Class as "myopic Trotskyism."\textsuperscript{108}

Race and Class used to carry occasional articles applauding "Somali socialism." Race and Class's Africa expert, Basil Davidson, wrote a few years ago about Somali strongman Siad Barre that "we in our country have much to learn [from] . . . Siad's thought and that of his fellow revolutionaries in Somalia." When Somalia's rival, Ethiopia, became a Soviet ally, Somalia turned to the West. Since then there have been no further items in Race and Class about the Somali revolution.

Race and Class also carries much material about women's liberation. One issue reports that "through the documents of the People's Front for the Liberation of Oman . . . the crucial role of the women's struggle emerges, both as an aim of revolution and as a result of female participation on all levels."\textsuperscript{110} Another issue reported the good news that "the movement to criticize Confucius and Lin Piao constitutes the most concentrated and analytic attempt to date to bridge the gap between social production and an improved female status in China."\textsuperscript{111} Still another carries this report:

One has only to talk to any 40-year-old Cuban woman, to watch her eyes as she discusses the difference between her life before 1959, and her life now. . . . One has only to spend time with any 20-year-old Cuban woman to understand that she is completely free of areas of conflict . . . which we ourselves never totally overcome.\textsuperscript{113}

There is more—lots more—in this vein. It represents a kind of eclecticism of the left, but only on the far or communist left. Never is this balanced by articles supportive of the moderate left. For example, the
British Labor Party and the German Social Democratic Party are both members of the "Socialist International" and both were in power during much of the seventies. Yet there were no articles in Race and Class applauding socialism in Britain or West Germany. There was however an editorial in 1976 decrying "the rising tide of fascism" in Britain\textsuperscript{113} and an article the same year with the ominous title "West Germany: a Tradition Returns" which warned that Britain "can ignore Germany's headlong rush to the right only at our extreme peril."\textsuperscript{114}

Conclusion

From this survey of IPS positions on various issues of importance to it, a pattern can be discerned. The attitude toward the United States political system, and ones like it, is unremittingly hostile. The United States appears as a society not in need of mere reform, but rather one which is fundamentally flawed. It is suffering, to use Richard Barnet's metaphor, from a cancer not a cold. Just as consistently, communist movements, especially in the Third World, are treated with favor, although not always uncritically. No sympathy is expressed for socialist (in the sense of the Socialist International) or other moderate left elements. Thus in Indochina, IPS was not among that part of the United States anti-war movement which supported "third force" elements; its sympathies clearly lay with the communist factions. In regard to Latin America IPS expressed strong sympathy for one communist and two pro-communist governments, but none for the numerous social democratic, Christian democratic or other moderate left groups or parties. In the area of human rights, IPS campaigned for stronger United States actions against human rights violations in non-communist countries, while it opposed United States complaints about human rights in communist countries. In regard to the Middle East IPS exhibited much sympathy for the Arabs, but little for the Israelis despite the fact that throughout almost all the years of IPS' existence Israel had a socialist government.

If IPS' sympathy for the communist world was consistent, it was also eclectic. The Soviet Union is almost never praised. Communist China has been praised on occasion. So has China's communist enemy, Vietnam. And so has Vietnam's communist enemy, Cambodia. Occasionally support is expressed for the communist regimes of Eastern Europe; more often for those of the Third World, notably Cuba, and for communist movements not yet installed in power. There is no strict consistency. Nor is there any evidence of discipline or a party line.* There is rather evidence of a general attitude that the future of mankind lies, as it should lie, with the communist world. Within that framework, there is much
disagreement and uncertainty. This ideology is a product of polycentrism. It has taken over the influence that communism once exercised on the American left. It is distinguishable from liberalism, socialism, and communism. It is time that analysts had a name for this ideology. I propose to call it "communophilism."

*A best-selling novel depicts an organization obviously intended to be suggestive of IPS as "a classic communist front operation" manipulated by Soviet bloc intelligence agencies. If the allegation is true, it might mean that one or more of the members of IPS are in fact covert disciplined communists and therefore not communophiles as defined in this paper. The purpose of this paper, however, is not to plumb for secret beliefs or loyalties among the members of IPS—a task for which this writer has no resources—but to test the applicability of the concept "communophilism" to the publicly expressed opinion of IPS. The validity of that test is not affected by the possibility that some members of IPS hold other opinions which remain unexpressed.
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