ECONOMISTS DENOUNCED

STATEMENT READ BY A GROUP OF RADICAL ECONOMISTS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 29, 1969

We have come to denounce the American Economic Association, and to denounce the dominant economics for which the AEA provides the organizational support.

Economists in the United States work as a group, and work contrary to the interests of the masses of people. The affluence and the power of the economists derive from their support of the elite, the elite which controls the institutional structure and the sources of power that perpetrate and reproduce the oppression of millions—the economists are the sycophants of inequality, alienation, destruction of environment, imperialism, racism, and the subjugation of women.

Economists are the priests and prophets of an unjust society. They preach the gospel of rational efficiency, justifying the reduction of man and nature to marketable commodities; they treat human beings as capital and tell us the poor are poor because they lack "productive skills"; all they tell us about the war in Vietnam is how to fight it more efficiently; they apply mathematical models that "prove" that foreign investment helps the development of poor countries; they continued on page 2

NOTES ON THE AEA CONVENTION

Peggy Howard Yale University

Noticed above all: The absurdity (hypocrisy?) of the countless papers within the neoclassical paradigm, assuming perfect competition, perfect knowledge, and especially the unimportance of economic power, side by side with the two markets with whose rules academic economists are most familiar.

The labor market:
Where the cost of information on all sides is exorbitant.
Where variations in the cost of information are a central equilibrating mechanism.
Where Yale students can get interviews with schools which deliberately hide themselves from the graduates of non-prestige universities.
Where a woman gets twice as many interviews if she does not write out her first name.
Where those with the power and influence to improve the market will not do so because they and their students are the ones who benefit from its "imperfections."

The textbook market:
Where advertising costs, particularly cocktail parties and free books to professors (high income) on the flimsiest excuse, must cause a minimum 10-15% mark-up on textbooks to students (low-income). Where, again, those who benefit will do nothing to threaten the "market imperfections."
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STATEMENT (con't. from page 1)

tell us that racism is the result of "personal preference"; they
tell us that private property and
wage differentials present a sys-
tem of personal material incentives
"necessary" for "growth."

But the economists do not merely
praise the system; they also
supply the tools—indeed, they
are the tools—instrumental to
the elites' attainment of its un-
just ends. They show how to manip-
ulate people so that the system's
hinges are smoothly oiled. Econo-
mists are minimizers of just dis-
content: in the face of police
riots in cities, it is the econo-
mists who develop "people appease-
ment" programs to prevent rebel-
ion; when a reactionary government
controls a poor country, economists
are set to "rationalize" and
"stabilize" its economy; when stu-
dents rebel on campuses, it is the
industrial relations economists and
game theorists, the rational arm of
the police, who provide the program
for repression.

The American Economic Association
must be denounced as the organiza-
tion through which these economists
operate. But further, the AEA plays
directly destructive roles in our
society. It serves to insure the
perpetuation of professionalism,
elitism, and petty irrelevance. It
serves to inhibit the development of
new ideas, ideas which are reflective
of social reality.

Our conflict with the AEA is not
simply an intellectual debate.
The AEA cannot lessen our condemna-
tion by their willingness to partake
in debate, or by their willingness
to provide a room to radical econo-
mists at this meeting. Our conflict
is a basic conflict of interests.
The economists have chosen to serve
the status quo. We have chosen to
fight it.

NOTES (con't. from page 1)

Rules for a typical session:
Three of the "best" teachers from the
"best" economics departments in the
country read technical papers which
they know cannot be communicated
orally, whereupon three others
read!! "discussions" of the papers,
whereupon (nobody is so impolite to
break into the talk of any of the
people who, sitting up at front,
have a temporary monopoly on inter-
esting ideas), the chairman asserts
that "we've" really run out of time
but that he will accept one or two
brief questions. As if the rules
were deliberately designed to pre-
vent the embarrassing possibility
that the ideas presented might be
challenged. The possibility that
people might think together non-com-
petitively about a session's topic
is apparently never considered.

8:30, Sunday morning, session on the
teaching of high school economics:
Three papers are read, each desper-
ately trying to be academically
respectable, followed by three read
discussions. At the end there is
five minutes for questions. I raise
my hand, am recognized, and ask:
"Why, in a panel on teaching, did
you read down to us three papers,
and then read three discussions,
which we couldn't understand and which weren't very interesting anyway? Was there no teacher capable of leading an open discussion on what, as economists, we might want to teach children, why, to whom, and how?" Two of the panelists nodded, the chairman said he had thought the format of the sessions was imposed by the convention and that he hadn't considered the possibility of changing it, one of the discussants asked me afterwards why I hadn't said something before the end (disrupted?? the program??, I guess I was too well socialized), and two or three people came over to me and told me of exciting things they were doing or thinking about economics in elementary and high school. Here we had the basis for a really good discussion, but it never occurred because people followed the rules.

"The Grants Economy as a Social Process," session:
Someone reads a paper for Professor James Buchanan, who is snowed in, Buchanan's analytic breakthrough is the application of a supply and demand type model to "social disorder." On a graph whose vertical axis measures badness, and whose horizontal axis measures legal constraints, he plots behavioral and law-making functions. The rise in student unrest is represented by an upward shift in the badness of behavior function. It is absurd! But maybe you have to be a child to break the rules and yell out "the emperor has no clothes on," when everyone can see his nakedness. The five-minute discussion period passes and I say nothing.

The URPE counter-conference:
Waiting for the URPE panel on discrimination against women in the labor force to begin. A middle-aged man, an economist, comes up to me and asks: "What's going on? What are all you girls doing up here." I answer politely, following the rules of feminine behavior. It is only later that it occurs to me to wonder what would happen if I went up to a six-person male panel, average age of 25, and asked: "What's going on? What are all you boys doing up here."

After the panel on discrimination against women, I am explaining my ideas to a fellow graduate student, Yale-trained, who did not attend. I tell him that I am trying to understand the mechanism by which separate markets for "men's jobs" and "women's jobs" are maintained, with accompanying wage discrimination, how this dual market involves the warping of women's and men's conceptions of themselves and each other, what groups think they benefit from the market dualism and therefore seek to maintain it, and what changes would be necessary before a substantial reduction in discrimination would be possible. My friend's first comment, following the rules he had been taught in graduate school, is: "Have you estimated loss in GNP caused by the inefficiency of discrimination yet." On discussion, it appears that he really thinks that if you simply show policy makers that discrimination costs the economy a 1% loss in GNP (whatever that means), you would convince them to take the measures necessary to end discrimination.

The business meeting:
Taking part in the attempt to read a statement out of order. Consternation that the symmetry and order of the meeting was being disturbed by non-officers on and near the stage. Convergence of the big people in economics, whose names we all know from reading lists, trying to cope with this disruption to the established order. Passivity of the little people, junior faculty at prestige schools, senior faculty at other schools, and graduate students, who sit back, follow the rules, and watch the show.

So, we broke the rules. We attempted to read a statement out of order; specifically, before the business meeting was called to order. We chose to speak out of order to dramatize our refusal to be bound by (or, more realistically, our resolution to break away from) the prevailing rules of professional structure which guide the economics profession.
TOWARDS A BETTER CONFERENCE

Howard M. Wachtel
American University

Before URPE's Conference, Towards a Radical Political Economics, brother Stephen Michelson said that if the sound were turned off, there would be no way to distinguish us from the AEA. And he was right!

I am not going to comment on the breadth or quality of the individual sessions we had -- some were first rate, others were disappointing. But what should we have done, that we did not do.

First, there were too many large sessions and insufficient small groups raps. At no time did we have any sharp questioning or interchange of ideas. Next time we should set aside a portion of each day and several hotel rooms for small group raps with the presenters of papers and their discussants. We have to attend to the form of our sessions as well as the content.

Second, we did not attend to URPE's organizational imperatives. How can we relate to the movement? How can we raise money for radical economic projects (research, action, establishment of radical experiments, etc.)? Where can we get jobs together so that we do not fall into the establishment trap of being a house radical in the midst of orthodox economists? We should have scheduled regional URPE meetings so people could have become better acquainted, as well as meetings of people around particular interest areas. We didn't talk about our activities for the next six months -- the Review, Newsletter, or Summer Conference.

Third, the participation in the conference was far too heavily dominated by the Eastern Academic Establishment.

Fourth, we should have charged a small fee for non-members of URPE -- say $2. -- which would have raised several hundred dollars.

Fifth, we failed to get to know each other. We didn't even have a party or make any music!

Let's pay attention to these needs in planning future conferences.
REATIONS TO THE URPE MEETINGS

James Weaver
American University

There is only one word to describe the URPE meetings during the AEA convention--disaster. It was a horrible mistake for URPE to have gone to the AEA and we should never go back. The format of our panels destroyed them. There was none of the informality of other URPE conferences. It wasn't possible to relate to other people in such a setting. The vibrations were just bad.

The only note of optimism I could salvage from the meetings concerns the business meeting to discuss whether to disrupt the presidential address, business meeting, etc. The most important argument made against disrupting the presidential address was that it would upset William Fellner--perhaps to the point that he would be unable to deliver his address. The group voted against disrupting the presidential address, largely, I think, for this reason. There is hope for a group which makes political decisions on such a basis. We still maintain some of the openness, the humanism and the gentleness that were characteristics of the early New Left.

I thought the decision to disrupt the business meeting was a mistake and the statement read there is certainly not going to win any great prizes for depth of analysis or for writing style. The visits to recruiters made more sense because the recruiting is something over which the AEA has control. The AEA does not control the actions of economists--unlike the AMA--and to attack the AEA because economists do bad things is rather meaningless. Perhaps more effective demands of the AEA would have centered on the publishing operations. Who publishes the AER? How many blacks are employed? What kinds of issues does the AER deal with? These are matters over which the AEA does have control.

In the future, URPE should limit itself to regional conferences and one national conference in the summer. A 3 or 4-day conference in late August somewhere in New York or Pennsylvania would probably be most convenient. Since it would be very difficult to get cheap accommodations in any resort area during August--maybe a college campus would be a possible alternative. Would it be possible to hold a summer URPE conference at Stony Brook or Geneseo? Does anyone have any other suggestions for a conference site?

Please send your ideas and suggestions on a summer conference to members of the Steering Committee who will be meeting to discuss this question during the spring.

The members of the steering committee are:

Millie Howe, Reed
Larry Sawers, American
Jim Weaver, American
Alan Shelby, Berkeley
Bob Posner, Oberlin

Mike Zweig, SUNY at Stony Brook
Elliott Sclar, Box 207, Cambridge, Mass.
Art Mac Ewan, Harvard
Lourdes Surkin, Columbia
Bob McBride, Wisconsin
After the URPE sponsored panel on "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation" at the New York City convention, a Women's Caucus was formed which will be open to all women regardless of whether they are URPE members. The purpose of this organization is not to duplicate the functions of URPE, but rather to focus on the problems of women.

Some of the goals of the organization discussed at the first meeting were:

1. To create a unity among women who, in their work or study situation, are isolated from others of their sex.

2. To attack discrimination in employment by publicizing incidents of discrimination and confronting their perpetrators and the AEA. Regardless of our success in each individual case, we hope to be able to raise consciousness among large numbers of women and men.

3. To promote research on the economic and social position of women. We discussed the need for a radical reinterpretation of existing studies as well as new empirical and analytical work.

4. To facilitate research by assembling a bibliography on this subject. (Please send bibliographical references to Colette Moser, Department of Economics, Indiana University, 1825 Northside Blvd., South Bend, Ind. 46615.)

5. To establish ties with other women's liberation groups.

We urge all women who are interested in joining this organization to send their names and addresses to Harriet Zellner, 532 West 111th St., New York, N. Y. 10025.

Staff

Manuel Agosin,
Sara Nicoll, Lourdes Surkin,
Lawrence Tharp

Copyright by the Union for Radical Political Economics,
P. O. Box 227, Cambridge,
TAPE RECORDINGS OF:

Towards A Radical Political Economics
URPE Meetings in New York City
December, 1969

TAPE I

1. Income Distribution and Redistribution
2. The Economics of Empires
3. Urban Political Economy
4. The Development of a Radical Theory

TAPE II

1. Relations Between Rich and Poor Countries
2. The Political Economy of Women's Liberation
3. The Political Economy of Inequality
4. Comparative Economic Development in Socialist Countries: China and Cuba

also available (1 track)

"Towards A Radical Political Economics"
by Paul Sweezy, comments by Herb Gintis and Sam Boules, from N.E. Regional URPE Conference, Cambridge, November, 1969

PRICES

four tracks

either tape $7.50
both tapes $13.50
1 tape,
any combination of tracks $10.00

two tracks

either tape (on 2 tapes) $12.00
both tapes (on 4 tapes) $22.00
any two tracks $7.00

postpaid, high quality recording tape, 3½ ips

The Physical World
209 West Newton St.
Boston, Mass. 02116

(no profit expected from this business; any that results will revert to URPE)
THEORETICAL NOTES

James O'Connor
San Jose State College

Many of the categories of bourgeois economics and Marxist economics appear to be similar - markets, wages, profits, interest, rent, prices, production, investment, consumption, employment, and unemployment are leading examples. Bourgeois economics has erected an elaborate theoretical structure on the basis of these categories. Traditional economists have failed to go much beyond the theoretical structure designed by Marx himself. Compared with bourgeois economics, the technical side of Marxist economics has remained undeveloped (for example, to my knowledge, in the U.S. in recent years there has been only one solid Ph.D dissertation written in the traditional technical Marxist idiom - a study of the falling rate of profit completed by Shane Mage at Columbia University). Thus, on the one hand, well-known Marxists such as Paul Baran, Maurice Dobb, and Paul Sweezy have borrowed freely from the technical apparatus developed by modern macro-economics. And, on the other hand, radical economists until recently have shown little interest in Marxism, on the grounds that whatever is valid in Marxist economics has been integrated into the corpus of macro-theory and further developed and improved on.

It is true that Marxism has little to offer radical economists in search of a body of thought that will help to reveal the mechanics of operation (as opposed to the causes) of the development of advanced capitalist society. Although Baran and Sweezy's concept of "economic surplus" (among others) can be regarded as a useful theoretical category, but this misses the point. Marxist economics does not consist of the study of the relationship between abstractions, such as income and consumption, demand and prices, or exports and imports. For Marx, all economic categories are social categories, which consist of specific, discoverable social relationships. To cite the two traditional examples, wages and profits reflect the production relations between wage labor and capital, and the division of profits into dividends, interest, rent, etc. reflects the relations between capitalists, rentiers, and landlords in the context of specific market and political structures.

The same method can be applied to the entire catalogue of technical economic categories. To take some examples, "taxes" consist of the social relations between corporate capital (whose representatives administer the state budget via control of the Federal executive), local and regional capital (whose representatives fight for specific tax policies in the Congress), employees of the state (whose
organizations place demands on the state budget; state dependents (who are also struggling for a share of the budget), and taxpayers as a whole (who are in an incipient stage of revolt). To understand the existence of taxes, the structure of the tax system, the tax burden, and the movement of taxes through time requires analyses not only of the "taxable capacity" of the population in terms of the effects of taxes on "incentives" to work, invest, save, and so on, but also, and most importantly, of the production, social, and political relationships between and within the capitalist and working classes.

Again, "exports and imports" and the "balance of payments" reflect the production relations between labor and capital and within the capitalist class in a number of different countries, as the May, 1968 revolt in France dramatically demonstrated. Any analysis of the balance of payments must be based squarely on an analysis of the class struggle in the advanced and underdeveloped countries (among other relations). To take a final example, "inflation" cannot be attributed basically to "deficit spending" or "monopolistic pricing" (to cite two common explanations), but rather to the relations between labor as a whole, organized labor, corporate capital, bankers, the alliance of bank and non-financial capital represented in the Federal Reserve Boards, and so on.

In other words, Marxists believe that the economy is in reality the society, and that economics is the study of society. It is not so much that Marxism gives different conclusions than bourgeois economics (note the remarkable similarity between various stagnation theories and Marx's theory of the falling rate of profit, a similarity due not only to the fact that modern macro-economics has borrowed much from Marx - cf David Horowitz, editor, Marx and Modern Economics - but also to the fact that Marxists and non-Marxists live in the same world and are sometimes able to arrive at the same conclusions via a different route). It is mainly that Marxism gives a different way of thinking, and thus the possibility of evaluating conclusions in terms of their "inevitability or necessity" and "possibilities of modification."

The Radical Caucus of the Latin American Studies Association will meet in Washington, D.C., April 17-18 at the Statler Hilton Hotel. Members of URPE are invited to take part in the Caucus and to participate in the sessions.

A study group on Imperialism in Latin America, to meet bi-weekly, is being organized in New York. Contact David Barkin at New York University for information on either of these activities.
URPE CONFERENCE ON MAYDAY

The American University
Washington, D.C.

Jim Weaver

An URPE conference will be held at American University on Mayday--Friday, May 1 and Saturday, May 2. Mayday must become an URPE holiday. The theme of the conference will be Economics and the United States: What Are the Alternatives?

All URPE members and friends are invited to submit papers on one or both of the following questions:

1. How should economics be restructured?

2. How should the U.S. economy be restructured?

The papers should be mailed to me by April 1 in 100 copies. The papers will be distributed in advance to everyone who has registered for the conference by April 1. All those planning to attend the conference should mail in their registration form and $5.00 as soon as possible.

The schedule will be as follows:

FRIDAY

10:00  Coffee and donuts
10:30  "Restructuring Economics" -- Sam Bowles.
12:30  Lunch
2:00   Discussion groups.
4:00   URPE Business Meeting
8:30   Party

SATURDAY

10:00  Coffee and donuts
10:30  "Alternatives to Economic Growth" -- E. J. Mishan
      Discussant: Herb Gintis

      "Yugoslav Socialism: A Political or Social Model for
      Whom?" -- Branko Horvat
12:30  Lunch
2:00   Discussion groups
4:00   URPE Business Meeting
The discussion groups will be organized as follows:

They will be very small (10-15) and will be led by people who have written papers. The purpose of these sessions is to engage in dialogue on these important questions. The model for such dialogue is the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Robert Hutchins describes the process as follows:

Our general object is to learn from one another. This means that we try to engage in dialectic rather than eristic. We do not often try to score debating points. We try not to make speeches...We try to engage in a conversation that will be illuminating to us all because we know that we are not ourselves capable of understanding the problems.

I have been very impressed with some of the transcripts of sessions held at the Center, in particular the one entitled Students and Society.

It would be worthwhile to tape our sessions and publish edited versions of the papers and the tapes. We do not have many possible suggestions for people to read. Ever since the Time article has appeared, I have received letters and phone calls from people asking—"What is your program? What have you written? Where can we get some ideas of what URPE is all about? etc." I do not think this conference would produce any definitive program. I would be opposed to trying to draw up an URPE program for restructuring economics or the U.S. economy. However, this conference might produce some URPE programs—which we could publish and distribute to illustrate that URPE people do have alternatives to the status quo.

This conference will also provide an opportunity for us to plan a summer conference, if we decide to have one.

REGISTRATION FORM

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
City __________ State ___________ Zip _____
Telephone ______________________
Can you provide housing? ____________
Do you need housing? ____________ (Bring sleeping bag)

Please enclose $4.00 (low-income) or $6.00 (high income) for printing, mailing, food, party costs and return by April 1st to: J. Weaver
Dept. of Economics
American University
Washington, D.C. 20016
A two page leaflet prepared by the URPE National Committee for use in recruiting is reprinted here for comment and possible revision by URPE members. Copies for distribution are available in quantity from URPE/Cambridge.

Union for Radical Political Economics

THE UNION FOR RADICAL POLITICAL ECONOMICS (URPE) evolved out of a conference in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in September 1968. The conference brought together those people in economics who saw the need for drastic re-examination of the role of the economist in our society. This meeting represented an initial attempt on the part of dissatisfied economists to look at their own work in light of the need for political and social change. Common dissatisfactions with the economics taught and practiced in this country led to the foundation of URPE as an organization.

URPE has held national conferences in Philadelphia during the Alternate Job Market in December 1968, and in Charlevoix, Michigan, in August 1969. The organization publishes occasional papers, a Newsletter, and the Review of Radical Political Economics. Regional conferences have been held in New England, California, Washington, D.C., and Ann Arbor, and there are various chapters organized around the country. Through these meetings and publications, and in their relationships with one another, URPE members are seeking to develop critiques of traditional economics, an understanding and critique of American society, and new styles of life which integrate the personal and professional. URPE members have participated in the development of radical courses, in political organizations, in advocacy economics work, and have offered their specialized knowledge to local groups who are working toward social and political change.

URPE was founded at a time when the Vietnam War, the Black Rebellion, the urban crisis, and an increasing alienation from the style of life in the United States had made manifest the limits of American Capitalism. URPE members have looked to find whether there was anything in their economics training which was helpful in understanding these events and the processes which brought them about, and in envisioning possible alternative forms of society and strategies for achieving them.

In this process, critiques of the economics we have been taught are being developed. For some of us, although the tools of formal economics appear to have their uses, the basic questions of neoclassical economics appear wrong, in that they take for given in their parameters the very institutions of society, and the
attitudes imposed on the individual by society, which we are challenging. The American celebration implicit in the notion of a
grand Neoclassical Synthesis seems to us a cruel sham. Some mem-
bers of URPE consider furthermore that traditional economics is
not merely more limited in its uses than most curricula imply; it
may be a distinct social evil, in that it trains students to avoid
the larger questions relating to capitalist institutions and modes
of decision making, and inhibits the challenging of these institu-
tions and their operations.

Beyond the choice of analytic tools, and beyond their
critique of the American economy, many URPE members are also dis-
satisfied with their life style as economists. Along with any other
professional discipline, being an economist can mean a fragmentation
of life, and a separation of thought from action. This separation
is seen as harmful to the development of the life style and the
mode of social relationships which many URPE members wish for them-
selves. Similarly, the very notion of "expertise" is felt by some
in URPE to embody an elitism not compatible with a good society.
Whether the attainment of satisfying personal life styles and
reduction in compartmentalization of our lives are either immediately
possible or can coincide with action for radical change in society
are questions which continue to face our members.

URPE does not seek to impose a unified political line.
We base our organization on our shared concerns. URPE provides
a forum for its members to present, develop, and share ideas.
It will increasingly provide a vehicle for its members and chap-
ters to experiment with new forms of action which will enable us
as political economists to apply the portion of knowledge which
we have acquired toward effecting fundamental social and institu-
tional change.

We invite all who are at this convention of the American
Economics Association who are open to our concerns to visit our
literature table, and to attend our sessions.

---

UNION FOR RADICAL POLITICAL ECONOMICS
P.O. Box 287
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

I enclose $______ for 1970 membership.

Dues: $7.50 Low-income  $15.00 High-income

Name ______________________________________

Mailing address ______________________________________

city state zip

School or organization ______________________________________

Areas of special interest ___________________________________________
AGENCIES OF SOCIAL CHANGE: TOWARDS A REVOLUTIONARY STRATEGY FOR ADVANCED INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES

(An all-day conference organized by the Bertran Russell Peace Foundation and the Socialist Scholars Conference New York, November 29, 1969)

Lourdes Surkin, Columbia University

It was a predominantly "marxist" conference—the highlights of the day being the talks by James O'Connor, Ernest Mandel and André Gorz (we heard Mandel on tape, his visa having been denied for the second time this year. On stage, an empty chair had his name on it). Other panelists were Art Fox, Paul Sweezy, Stanley Arnowitz and Steve Zeluck. Held in Town Hall, it was a theater-like, consumption-oriented experience, with a heterogeneous, tense and at times aggressive New Yorkish audience.

O'Connor's talk on "The Making of Socialist Consciousness" was a digression on modern capitalism as a generator of new needs and expectations that it cannot fulfill and, consequently, since unmet needs and expectations call for new political solutions, as a source of "anti-bourgeois consciousness." Modern capitalism, by disintegrating earlier cultures—the neighborhood, the candy store, the village and the town, the family, the rural sharecropping culture—and re-integrating culture around commodity production and consumption, makes it more difficult to escape from alienation. The new proletariat experiences alienation in many different ways; for "middle America," still preoccupied with the acquisition of more things, it does not become a radicalizing force. For an increasing minority, however, alienation leads to a re-definition of well-being and of needs and towards radical solutions and politics; these are the roots of the black, women and youth movements.

Mandel started by pointing out that a revolutionary strategy will only be successful when historical conditions are ripe. Marxists have to prove that capitalism is disintegrating; the U.S. hegemony in the world is being tested not so much in Vietnam as in the capitalist world as a whole. Capitalism faces three main sources of conflict, namely, its inability to solve the problem of economic growth in the third world, that of poverty and inequality in all countries, and the mutilation of life and increased alienation resulting from a large-scale industry and monopoly capitalism. The working class has not lost its revolutionary potential: in Australia, Argentina, Italy, Britain, Germany workers are in motion. They are not merely concerned with higher wages and shorter hours; they are questioning and challenging hierarchical structures and the organization of labor and job division itself. This new awareness and struggle is in full swing in Europe, but we must make clear that capitalism cannot be abolished peacemeal; it has to be overthrown, not reformed. Diffusion of revolutionary consciousness is of great importance but it does not answer the question of what to do when a factory is taken over by workers (France 1968). Struggle and action are also at the roots of revolutionary change; the impact of the student movement on the working class
cannot be underestimated (the present upsurge in Europe started after the French upheaval of May 1968). Organization is also necessary in order to go beyond isolated experiences. This, of course, applies to the international sphere as well: since imperialism is a world system and the international corporation its most typical unit, the need for organizing surpasses national boundaries.

Gorz stressed the following points, some of which overlap with Mandel's:

1. The need for action. Theory should be theory of practice, and scientific analysis only one side of Marxism. The need for overthrowing the system does not stem from scientific analysis only; the existence of class struggle is first.

2. "Revolutionary violence" is necessary but not sufficient to exercise control; the need to demonstrate that the working classes are capable of exercising power has to be emphasized. Workers' control is, on the other hand, not an end in itself but a temporary means toward crushing the capitalist state.

3. The power of top management has not diminished—although no longer personalized, it has been hierarchically systematized and consolidated while workers remain fragmented and alienated. That is why Gailbraith's technostructure is a myth.

4. The Leninist theory of a vanguard party is inapplicable to the West today. Instead, resistance must spring from "initiative at the base," from acts of rupture and from the building of direct popular control. A new revolutionary party will be born from the growth and combination of these nuclei—its final aim being its own liquidation, i.e., not to replace one state by another but to abolish the state altogether.

NEW YORK CHAPTER OF URPE FORMED

At this writing, the New York chapter of URPE has had three meetings. We have decided to conduct a seminar on topics of interest to the radical movement, with sessions every other Saturday. Ray Franklin of Queens College has presented a paper on the relationship between party and class in the United States and the third world.

At the last meeting we discussed radical teaching methods and the teaching of radical economics. We have decided to form a panel that will be available to talk at different colleges and universities in the New York area about radical economics, both courses and teaching methods. For further information, contact David Barkin, New York University.

Another activity the New York Chapter will be undertaking in the future is the formation of a talent pool to provide economic analysis for radical community groups. The main thing is that we've gotten together and are finally talking to each other. If you are in the New York area, we urge you to join us. Contact Lourdes Surkin, 240 W. 102nd Street, N.Y.C. 10025 or phone 865-0216.
A conference on U.S. imperialism in Asia was held in Washington in November previous to the Mobilization march. In workshops and plenary sessions participants in the conference began to analyze exactly how the U.S. and U.S. controlled agencies such as the World Development Bank penetrate and control the economies of the underdeveloped countries.

There were 14 workshops on such topics as the International Monetary Fund and how it works to foster U.S. private investment overseas, led by Arthur MacEwan of URPE; corporations with investments in Asia, led by Peter Wylie of Leviathan and Jim Shoch with the Pacific Studies Center; and the strategy of people's war, led by Eqbal Ahmed, professor at the University of Chicago.

There were workshops on each of the countries of Southeast and East Asia focusing on their economic and military ties to the U.S. The people leading the workshops came from universities, radical research groups, and movement organizations. Most of the workshops were taped and it's hoped that the proceedings can be published soon. (For details, contact the Committee of Returned Volunteers, Box 380, N.Y.C., 10003)

The role of Japan in the U.S. Asian strategy was emphasized by Oda Makota, who planned his visit to this country to coincide with Premier Sato's visit to Nixon. He spoke about Japanese imperialism in Asia and Japan's function as middleman for U.S. interests in SE Asia and Korea and of the growing pressure from the U.S. to build up Japan's military forces in order to protect these interests. He was particularly interested in creating solidarity here with the struggle of the Japanese people against the renewal of the Japan-U.S. Mutual Security Treaty in May 1970. This treaty enables the U.S. to maintain military forces on Japanese soil within close striking range of N. Korea, China, and Vietnam.

The groups sponsoring the conference called themselves the Pacific Rim Coalition and included: Asian Americans for Action, Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Committee of Returned Volunteers, Leviathan, New University conference, and the Pacific Studies Center.
CORRESPONDENCE

More on the Politics of URPE

I applaud your demand that we become more relevant to movement problems than we have, but I do not agree that this requires us to "define the politics of URPE." Similarly, to my mind, Don McKelvey points us toward a most productive role whereas BACSE does not; I cannot agree that the two represent a single "tendency."

The problem is indeed, as you state, that we have two audiences, the "profession" and the movement. But this does not mean that we need different forms of analysis for the two or that we must choose between them. Exactly the same kind of information that is desperately needed by the movement will provide us with appropriate academic "credentials." True, it may require that data-filled and jargon-replete articles be prepared for one group while simpler and less theoretical articles be prepared for the other, but scientists of all kinds have done this for years. However, if we define our politics first, we are likely to end up, as BACSE appears to have done, by forming conclusions prior to the analysis. And this will not only cause us to forfeit our professional audience but it is likely also to restrict our influence with the movement to a very small and already convinced group.

The two most useful things I have run upon through URPE illustrate the range of things that can be done. First, some brief notes in an early newsletter about Somerville, Mass., showed how careful empirical work could illustrate the way ghetto dwellers pay most of the external costs created by the racist organization of our metropolitan centers. Second, a talk by Herb Gintis showed how we might restructure our theoretical framework in order to attain more humane results. This is the kind of work that, if I read him correctly, McKelvey asks for. In contrast, BACSE starts off with the political proposition that capitalism is bad without evident thought about which tendencies derive from technology, which from monopolistic influences, which from inequalities of income distribution, which from externalities, etc., and without such identification — which is by no means easy — the results are unlikely to be of much significance to the movement. It is not sufficient to state that marginalism and Keynesianism support the status quo; that much is obvious. The problem is to show why the apparently positive analyses turn out to be normative — and then to revise them so as to yield a more humane alternative.

David B. Brooks
CORRESPONDENCE: A Letter from England

Dear friends,

Having heard about URPE from two socialist economists from the USA, I thought you would be interested to hear that we are beginning to get together over here too.

The idea of bringing together socialist economists here occurred to a number of us over the past year or so. Coming into contact through particular political organizations, through conferences such as the annual Workers' Control Conference, and simply meeting in our various universities, it was clear that there was a growing number of practising economists - teachers, independent researchers, and students post- and undergraduate - who considered themselves socialists and were involved in socialist activities.

After a number of preliminary soundings and discussions, we decided to bring everyone together for a conference in January 1970....We decided to limit the conference fairly strictly to lecturers, researchers and postgraduates, and to professional economists rather than social scientists in general. This was partly in order to keep the numbers manageable for our first meeting, and partly to ensure that common professional interests in the subjects under discussion would reduce the amount of sectarian dispute to which such gatherings are usually prone, at least over here. Generally the response has been good: we expect to have about 45 - 50 at the conference, and maybe more.

Having seen the first copy of your review, and talked to two of your members, I'd like to make some comments on the scene here as compared to the US. First, perhaps, because we never had a McCarthy, there have always been a number of Marxist economists working in British universities - they have not been limited to outside work. Because of this, Marxist theory is more available here, and provides a theoretical focus which you seem to lack at present. On the other hand, many of our Marxist scholars have little contact with any political movement: thus we face more than you do the problem of scholasticism. I'd be very interested in how you feel about this very simplistic characterization.

Secondly, leading in from this, we are definitely not radical political economists, but rather revolutionary socialist or Marxist for the most part. My main criticism of the first issue of your journal is certainly that it goes little beyond liberalism. But I gather from your members here (Don Harris from Madison and R. G. Steinman from Princeton) that this is changing. My own opinion, which would be shared by many in our group, is that only within the Marxist tradition can we find any theoretical tools with which to combat bourgeois economics (and in this tradition I include Kalecki and Sraffa as well as Dobb and
Sweezy), and further that without a general revolutionary perspective extending well beyond the academic 'struggle' we might as well not bother - i.e. I am not interested in substituting marxist scholasticism for bourgeois.

Exactly how representative these views of mine are should emerge from the conference. In any case, I am certain that it is very important that whatever permanent group we set up over here should maintain permanent contacts with URPE....After the conference, we will report to you on our plans - e.g. whether we are going to start a journal - and then work out how best to cooperate.

I look forward very much to hearing from you. Over here there is a definite scent of optimism in the air; if the same is true in economics faculties in the States, then together we should really be able to get things moving.

Hugo Radice
847, King's College,
Cambridge CB2 1ST,
England.

LOOKING FOR NEW APPROACHES TO GRADUATE STUDY IN ECONOMICS?

Then consider American University. In addition to learning orthodox economics, a student has the option to specialize in the POLITICAL ECONOMY OF SOCIAL CHANGE - the use of socio-economic analysis to study the process of social change in collaboration with other bodies of knowledge, particularly economic history and philosophy of history, anthropology, sociology, and social psychology. Problem foci include historical economic development, contemporary underdeveloped countries, and depressed urban-regional groups in advanced societies.

The Department's Mission underscores the principle of democratic governance of the academic unit and the value of intellectual controversy as a basic means of learning.

We encourage interested students to apply and ask faculty members to advise their students of our program. More information can be obtained by writing to:

Dr. Charles K. Wilber
Chairman, Department of Economics
The American University
Washington, D.C. 20016
CORRESPONDENCE: Change the Name

If you can change the name of the organization to "Union for New Political Economics," I can persuade many colleagues to join. You see, the activities may remain exactly the same, but the name (label, exterior, face) should be readily "salable" (sellable?). Also, a palatable name would make it easier to be heard on a national or international basis.

Even the most liberal economists may hesitate to join a "radical" organization; but the "same lady in a different dress" (or more attractive one) can survive and thrive. Please give the matter serious consideration.

Dr. J. B. Bright  
P.O. Box 6322  
Columbus, Georgia

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE REVIEW

Howard M. Wachtel (Editor-in-Chief) American University

Though most URPE members and friends have welcomed the establishment of a Review of Radical Political Economics, they have been less generous toward the stuff that comes between the modish yellow covers. For this we have no one to blame but ourselves. I am convinced from the papers presented at our conferences, that we have more ideas in our heads than we have put on paper.

I would attribute this to several reasons:

1. Many papers we have received were apparently written primarily for other journals. These papers have interesting analyses embodied in them but stop short of extracting the potentially radical implications from the analysis.

2. We are still too heavily dependent upon the norms of the profession for problem definition, articulation of hypotheses, and radical interpretations. This does not imply that the editors will be willing to accept for publication poorly developed analyses; nor does it imply that reasoned speculation on the basis of good analysis will not be welcomed.

3. Though we have defined ourselves as radical political economists, we have not yet given sufficient substance to this designation. We would welcome explicit radical political-economic work, experimenting with new methodologies applied to unique problems.

None of us expect this vacuum to fill very rapidly. Nonetheless, we would see this as the direction for URPE's publication program. If you have papers which do not precisely fit the criteria, you should send them to us anyway. Ideal types are hard to find in any environment but are especially so in one as new and experimental as URPE's.