

WORKERS WORLD

VOLUME I, NO. 1

MARCH, 1959

TEN CENTS

Only The Socialist Revolution Can End War and Depression

Hail the Communes!

The Communes are a new and higher stage of the Chinese Revolution. We proudly defend them against the red-baiting assaults and vicious slanders of the pen-prostitutes of capitalism, and if need be, against the bomb-happy generals of imperialism.

Hail the revolutionary energy of the Chinese youth! Hail the brave emancipation of the courageous Chinese women! Hail the devotion of the young students and intellectuals who labor in field and factory, side by side with the workers and tillers of the soil in the most back-breaking labor!

(Our enthusiasm for, and solidarity with, the Communes is not one whit lessened by our irreconcilable political differences with the Chinese leadership. But it is necessary for the American workers to know *first and foremost* that the workers and peasants of revolutionary China have made a tremendous achievement for the benefit of labor throughout the world.)

only socialist solution

Berlin is in East Germany Belongs to the Workers

By John Black

The capitalist propaganda mills are grinding out reams of misinformation designed to confuse the American working class about the conflict between the Soviet Union and the U.S. over the city of Berlin.

Social Democrats, revisionists and the Kremlin bureaucrats are doing their share in clouding the waters, hiding the underlying class lines.

There exist in Europe two Germanies. One is the Federal Republic, West German stronghold of the finance monopolists, heavy industry Ruhr Barons, the Catholic hierarchy, revanchist neo-fascists, and NATO mercenaries. This Germany is allied to U.S. imperialism, is its main prop on the continent.

The other Germany is the Democratic German Republic (DDR), with its socialized industries, planned economy, allied to the Soviet Union and the other workers states.

The conflict over Berlin must be seen in the light of the conflict between the two Germanies. Berlin is a capitalist enclave deep in the heart of the East German workers state. The capitalist segment of Berlin is of immeasurable value to the capitalists of West Germany and the U.S. as a base from which to sally forth against the new social system of socialized industry and planned economy. As such, this outpost of reaction presents a threat to the social gains made by the workers in the DDR, a threat now redoubled since the U.S. has equipped West German capitalists with nuclear weapons. A capitalist Berlin within the workers state serves also as a base of operation to the anti-Soviet NATO crusaders for their planned reconquest of the whole of the East European bloc of workers' states.

Berlin in the hands of NATO warriors remains an important spy and propaganda post and an economic warfare base. Continued access to Berlin to the planes and trucks of the capitalist NATO army, cutting a strategic swath across hundreds of miles of DDR territory represents a standing military threat to the workers state.

The political and military value to world capitalism of this outpost within the workers countries is underscored

by the annual subsidy of \$300 million which is poured into the capitalist segment of Berlin via the West German Adenauer government.

With the State Department and other agencies preparing the American workers for the possibility of military intervention in Berlin it is imperative to state categorically that any such move would be a counter revolutionary effort by world capitalism. It would be the elementary class duty of all advanced political workers to give unconditional support to the DDR and the Soviet Union in any conflict that might arise over Berlin.

It would matter little if U.S. forces, West German NATO soldiers or the provocations of the Social Democratic rightwinger Willy Brandt, Mayor of West Berlin, provide the incident over which conflict arises, it is our duty to explain to the workers that the conflict is between a workers Germany and the Capitalist U.S., aided and abetted by Adenauer and the West German capitalist class.

A base for Wall Street

At stake are the fundamental social advances that have been made by the workers of the DDR at a very great sacrifice. Overcoming the handicaps of war damages, postwar dismantling by the Soviet Union, loss of valuable fuel and raw material areas in territories ceded east of the Oder-Neisse line, the burden of military occupation, an economic blockade by the capitalist West, the workers have created a mighty industrial complex. They have done this in an area that had been predominantly agrarian and small manufacturing. Not the least of their obstacles on the road to laying the economic foundation to future advances has been the political line of the Ulbricht regime, which discouraged working class initiative and stifled proletarian democratic participation in the working out of the plan.

The continued existence of a capitalist half of a city hundreds of miles within the DDR, with the unbridgeable hostility of the two Germanies, one a workers state, the other capitalist, is like an undetonated bomb from World War II

(Continued on page 12)

Those who preach otherwise Are deceiving the workers

We are living in an epoch of convulsions and catastrophes. It is characterized by a race between imperialist wars and proletarian revolutions. Twice in a third of a century, imperialism has launched world wars that took the lives of millions, maimed and crippled countless millions of others. This is not to count the innumerable "little" wars that predatory finance capital unleashes from time to time on the helpless colonial and semi-colonial people.

Not a single world issue dividing the Great Powers of this planet has been resolved in the past fifty years except by force. Yet the statesmen talk peace and plan conference after conference, but in truth they are lulling the people to sleep while the preparations for war feverishly move on. The peace talks grow louder. The armaments grow bigger. And the worst role of all is played by the bourgeois pacifists who provide a smoke screen to cover the war moves.

Marxism has always taught that social convulsions, catastrophes, war and revolutions are the inevitable qualitative changes after the cumulative, quantitative growth of years if not decades of "peaceful" development and sharpening of irrepressible class antagonisms.

Our task is to prepare the masses for these eventualities, not to sing them to sleep with pacifist lullabys. But that's just what the petty bourgeois pacifists, "Socialists" and "Communists" of all varieties are doing now. We say: without a proletarian revolution, imperialist war is inevitable. That is the Leninist teaching on this subject and that teaching is still valid.

The other "Socialist" and "Communist" groupings cannot face up to this reality. They are either gutless and spineless, or befuddled by bourgeois pacifist propaganda. On the eve of great crisis, they yield before imperialism.

We aim to re-establish the rightful position of Marxism as the independent class ideology of the proletariat in mortal combat against

(Continued on page 2)

Demand Human Rights For All Unemployed!

It is almost two years since the United States' capitalist economy went into a decline, the third such postwar business crisis. By all the important indicators, according to every recognized expert and student of the "ups and downs" of the economy, this is the most severe economic shakeup since the depression days of the Thirties.

There are even areas around the country, like Harlan County in Kentucky, the mining towns in Pennsylvania, the textile communities in New England, and the industrial metropolis of Detroit, where the workers are living in the very setting of The Great Depression. Factories closed down, homes boarded up, empty stores, workers standing on endless lines for their miserable unemployment checks, families waiting on equally long lines for a measly relief or welfare allotment, all these are once again familiar scenes for the working class.

And there are no rosy predictions for the future. We are told to resign ourselves to a "permanent pool of between 4 and 5 million unemployed workers." Shades of Harry Truman who said about the "slight recession" during his tenure in office, that "three or four million unemployed in a free enterprise economy is supportable!"

Let us not forget all those cheap campaign promises made by the capitalists' stooges in both the Republican and

Democratic Parties for several months preceding the 1958 elections. They each in turn promised they would take us out of the "recession." And where are their guarantees now!

Ike reneges

Only a few short days ago, the Eisenhower government announced it was *not* going to renew its emergency program of extended unemployment insurance coverage which gives the jobless worker an extra 13 weeks of benefits. It was an unnecessary measure, said Eisenhower, because the economy was on a "curve of rising prosperity." Rising prosperity sounds like a terrible joke in the minds of the millions of unemployed workers, now estimated to be at the 5 million level, and expected to rise in the following months.

The simple truth is that neither capitalist party can control the operation of the capitalist economy in its boom or bust phase, for it operates independently of the wish-thinking of any of its champions.

The many-millioned ranks of unemployed workers can not and must not rely on the soothing words and sweet promises of the capitalist politicians, to improve their conditions. It is only through their own actions, mass marches and demonstrations, that the jobless workers can rejoin their brothers in the

(Continued on page 3)



TROTSKY

WORKERS WORLD

Editorial office:
46 W. 21st Street, New York, N.Y.

Editor: Vincent Copeland

Volume I, No. 1 — MARCH, 1959

222



LENIN

Only Socialist Revolution —

(Continued from page 1)

all these other tendencies, who seek to degrade Marxism to the level of an ideological category within the framework of bourgeois thought.

American workers need a new party. The reason is clear. All the old radicals, socialists, semi-socialist and so-called communist organizations in this country are completely bankrupt. Twelve years of capitalist repression and phoney prosperity have broken their will, corrupted their class consciousness and reduced them to an impotent conglomeration of warring groups united only in their disdain for and renunciation of the Bolshevik principles of Lenin and Trotsky.

There can be nothing worse for the advanced socialist-minded workers in America than to abandon the perspective of a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party in favor of an eclectic hodge-podge "socialist" organization. There can be nothing worse than to preach "socialist unity" at a time of complete theoretical chaos and confusion in the ranks of the advanced socialist workers. The clarification of revolutionary ideas must always take precedence over organizational combinations in the building of a genuine Marxist-Leninist party.

Away with the Horse and Buggy

The Khrushchev revelations on which some groups banked so much did not begin a revolutionary renaissance in the labor and radical movement. Instead, there began a retreat (which has now become a rout) to pre-Marxian non-class-struggle socialism.

To saddle the American workers with such "socialism" is to ask them to use Stone Age methods for the solution of Space Age problems. We, on the other hand, want to go forward with the revival and development of the Marxist-Leninist principles. We are the moderns. The "new" revisionists are throwbacks to the distant past.

Our outlook is global in character. That means we defend the socialist interests of the proletariat and its revolutionary allies everywhere on the globe. In this modern epoch, it means also, that we are class patriots, not only of the working class of the country where we happen to live, but the working class of every country, in every land.

The Russian, Chinese, and East European proletariat, having overthrown the rule of the capitalists and landlords, have established states of their own, no matter how deformed. And it is our bounden duty to defend them with all our might.

The rise of Sputnik and the fall of the stock market in October, 1958, were dramatic symbols of the raging struggle between two world social systems that are based on diametrically opposed class structures—one, the dying system of capitalism and the other, the nascent system of socialism. In this struggle, there can be no neutrals. We take our side wholly and completely with the new social system.

In any war of the imperialist countries against the Soviet Union, China or Eastern Europe—or any colonial countries—we stand firmly and unequivocally on their side, which is the side of the working class.

Following the classic position of Lenin, we are defensist in relation to the workers states, and defeatist in relation to imperialism. We are proud to have advanced this principled position under the acid test of the Korean War, when most groups were either equivocal, half-hearted, or downright capitulationist.

A New Party Needed!

Today, all the other socialist and communist groups show an abhorrence and dread of the oncoming world struggle. Peace-lovers at their best, and peace-mongers at their worst, they are akin to the ancient Catholic priesthood, which peddles indulgences to befuddle the masses.

All the more is it necessary to have a party which will call a spade a spade—a party that will not hide class truth in the interest of narrow, sectarian organizational gain—a party that does not worry first about bourgeois public opinion and only secondly about its principles—a party that is fearless in the face of an imperialist witch-hunt, and can say what is, whether it be in Pittsburgh or Moscow, in Oshkosh or Vitebsk.

The necessity for such a party does not flow from mere abstract principle. It flows from the fact that class deception aids class oppression, whereas class truth leads to class liberation.

It was not without reason that Marx and Engels, more than a hundred years ago, proudly proclaimed on their banner, "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

Food for Thought

Two significant events—one in Moscow, the other in Peking—should exercise a profound effect on the thinking of the Vanguard group. The events we refer to—the one apparently entirely unrelated to the other—are the speech by James Jackson at the 21st Soviet CP Congress, and the letter by Mao Tse Tung to William Z. Foster (Sunday Worker, Feb. 22, 1959).

The Vanguard group is a section of revolutionary workers who have been driven out of the Communist Party for their vigorous and relentless opposition to the crass opportunism and treacherous policies of the official leadership of the American CP.

The group has displayed a remarkable degree of energy as well as stamina; it has an admirable working class composition and is strong among Negro and Puerto Rican workers. Unlike the Gatesite capitulators, they are revolutionaries at heart, as any class conscious worker in contact with them can easily see.

The group thinks that the opportunism of the Foster-Dennis leadership is strictly home-grown, and has no sanction whatever from the Soviet CP. "Titoist" is the characterization they apply to the American CP.

The grim tragedy of their situation is that they identify their own revolutionary socialist convictions with the corrupt policy of the Kremlin hierarchy. They imagine that the real betrayers are not Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and their Stalinist predecessors, but Foster, Dennis and Co.

It Were Only True

Would that this were so! What a mighty problem would be solved!! The tasks of advanced workers everywhere would be reduced from gargantuan to pigmy proportions, and at what saving in time, energy, sweat and blood! It is really regrettable that Vanguard's analysis is so woefully naive and out of this world.

We recommend to them a careful and critical examination of the two pronouncements from Moscow and Peking. In our view these should serve as an eye-opener:

The speech by Jackson was an unmistakable indication that the Moscow leaders had validated not only the general political line, but the leadership of the American CP as well. The ostentatious manner in which Jackson was given the platform at this congress, and the considerable publicity afforded to him in the Soviet press, under the circumstances, can only be interpreted as confirmation of Moscow's satisfaction with the current line of the CP leaders in the U.S.A.

But the keenest disappointment to the Vanguard leadership must have been the letter by Mao Tse Tung to William Z. Foster.

This was no ceremonial form letter that Mao was obliged to write in answer to Foster's letter. In his letter, Mao went far out of his way not only to praise "the great Communist Party of the United States," but also to characterize Foster as the "glorious leader of the American working class," a description which must have amazed even Foster himself. And as though to make doubly sure that no Vanguard member mistake his words, Mao also added: "I could see you are the soul of the great Communist Party of the U.S. and the great working class and people of the U.S."

Now, no one knows better than Mao himself, that the official leadership of the American CP is not a signatory to the Moscow declaration.

The failure of the American CP to sign that statement is regarded by the Vanguard group as proof positive not only of the cowardly capitulation of the American CP to U.S. imperialism, but of its outright treachery to the workers state bloc—or the "socialist camp" as they call it. This is why they call the American CP "Titoist" and revisionist. But the refusal of the Yugoslavs to sign the pact did not go unnoticed by the Chinese CP, as everyone in the Vanguard group knows by now.

Why then this letter of Mao's to Foster?

Whatever else might have been in the back of Mao's mind, his letter served not only to add prestige to Foster's badly tarnished standing with the ranks, but served as well the purpose of deepening the rank-and-file members' faith in the false leadership and policy of the CP.

Facts Are Stubborn Things

All the more is the pity, since the Vanguard group has displayed unstinting loyalty to the cause of the Chinese Revolution, and enthusiastic support for the Chinese communes. The group vigorously combatted the Sunday Worker for its cringing line against U.S. imperialism's role in the Quemoy crisis last year. (The Sunday Worker, like its contemporary the Militant, borrowed the line of the liberal bourgeoisie that "Chiang Kai Shek is dragging the U.S. into war," a case of the proverbial tail wagging the dog.)

The two pronouncements, coming from Moscow and Peking, should serve as food for thought for the Vanguard leaders; food no doubt, that is difficult to digest, but vitally necessary for the group's objective of a "genuine communist party."

Illusions die hard. But facts are stubborn things, said Lenin. And our Vanguard friends consider themselves staunch Leninists.

We trust that they will look for deeper causes for the degeneration of the American CP than the mere weakness in the make-up of the present CP leadership in the United States.

Bessemer Rights Fighter Condemned to Chain Gang

by Ronald Jones

Bessemer, Ala.—With the chain-gang-ing of Asbury Howard, Sr., 52, an outstanding Negro civic and militant union leader, February 23 for having a poster painted portraying a Negro in chains pleading for help in his fight for equal rights, the white supremacy courts of Alabama continue writing their blood-stained and sordid story of justice in the courts where Negroes and union militants are concerned. The case of this heroic fighter has been in the making for more than two decades.

Mr. Howard, president of the Bessemer Voters League and an international vice-president of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, began serving a six-month jail sentence after losing an appeal from a January 24 conviction on charges of violating a local ordinance prohibiting the publication of "intemperate matter tending to provoke a breach of peace or/and matter prejudicial to good morals."

In a telegram to president Eisenhower, Raymond Dennis, executive board member of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, declared that "each day we allow Asbury Howard to remain chained on the streets of Alabama for the 'crime' of having a poster painted . . . makes our proclamations for freedom and democracy abroad a sham in the eyes of other nations."

The new national "poster case" was touched off when Asbury Howard Sr. was arrested January 21 and charged with violating a Bessemer city ordinance against "obscene, lewd, nude, scurrilous, libelous" publication. He had given a sign painter a cartoon, taken from one of the national Negro weeklies, to be reproduced in connection with a vote registration campaign of the Bessemer Voters League. The cartoon carried the drawing of a Negro in chains saying, "Lord, Help . . ." A line to be added to the poster read: "Vote today for a Better Tomorrow." The poster was never completed, for it was confiscated from the local white artist whom Howard had hired for the reproduction.

The sign painter, J. McAlister, was

also arrested and charged similarly as Mr. Howard.

At the trial January 24 in City Hall in Bessemer Howard and McAlister were convicted and sentenced by Judge James Hammond to six months in jail and fined \$105.

Freed on a \$200 bond pending a hearing on his appeal (which he lost February 23) of his conviction, Mr. Howard and his son, Asbury Howard Jr. were brutally attacked by a mob of 40 to 50 white men. One member of the mob struck Howard S. on the back of his head with a black jack, opening a cut which required 10 stitches. This vicious attack occurred in full view of several policemen, but they saw only enough for the younger Howard to be charged with "disturbing the peace." (In the face of world-wide criticism of the circumstances of his arrest, Asbury Howard Jr.'s case has been "passed indefinitely.") None of the white supremacist attackers were arrested.

As a result of vigorous complaints filed with the FBI by Mr. Howard and urgent requests for investigation of the brutal beating by Rev. M. L. King Jr. of Montgomery and Rev. F. L. Shuttlesworth of Birmingham, Justice Department officials announced they were asking the FBI to look into the matter.

The Chicago Afro-American Heritage Association joined with the American Civil Liberties Union in demanding full-scale federal probe of Howard's attack and conviction.

Leo F. Sparks, president of the Association, reported that a national campaign had been launched by that organization to reverse Howard's conviction and stated that the freeing of the militant southern leader was one of "the most significant struggles for achievement of democracy and the establishment of civil liberties in the nation."

Patrick Murphy Malin, executive director of the ACLU, in supporting the case said: "The beating of an American citizen by a mob in the presence of local police is not only of importance to the citizen under attack, but to all

Americans who believe in the sanctity of the law and fair treatment by law-enforcement officials." Mr. Malin further stated that "at least a de facto conspiracy had occurred when, in violation of federal civil rights law, police officers stood by as two citizens were assaulted in City Hall while there under compulsory process."

For the 52-year old veteran union organizer the dangerous ground he now treads is not new.

"First," he said, speaking of his past, "there was that shooting scrape in Jonesborough (just outside and south of Bessemer) in 1932 between the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers and a Steelworkers union."

"They had attacked our men without provocation. We were trying to set up an integrated union. After they beat up some of our people one day, our people came prepared for them the next time."

"There was shooting back and forth and some on the other side were injured. On our side were colored and white workers fighting together — the other side was all white."

Jobless Workers Demand Action!

(Continued from page 1)

shops. Mass marches on the state capitals, such as the March on Lansing, Michigan, and the March on Columbus, Ohio, succeeded in getting federal surplus food for the unemployed. Mass demonstrations defeated the bosses' "right to work" laws. And mass picket lines won many a strike. Only when the workers vote "no confidence" to the bosses and to the puppets in the bosses' government, and gain confidence in their own ability to unite and struggle, will they begin to solve the many serious problems facing them.

No credit to Reuther

Signs are mounting daily that the ranks of the unemployed workers are beginning to be heard. On February 6, at Lansing, Michigan, Walter Reuther issued a call for a "massive march of jobless workers on Washington" to "dramatize their serious plight." No credit, however, is due Reuther for sponsoring the call for the Michigan March. Two days earlier, he had given short shrift to a rank and file committee of his own union, the Production and Skilled Workers Unemployed Committee, which had presented the UAW Executive Board with a program, including mass marches and demonstrations (in which they had already participated), to get the unemployed back to work. Weeks later, on February 24th, Reuther settled for a "mass conference" in Washington. This represented a compromise between his original "mass march" and the position of George Meany who thought a simple "legislative conference" would do the trick.

So far, no date has been set for the legislative conference. This indicates that the union leaders are only blowing off steam, even with this watered-down imitation of a mass action. They cannot be expected to be serious in carrying out this plan without much greater mass pressure being exerted on them.

A real fight needed

It is up to the mighty rank-and-file of American labor to take up the idea of the March on Washington, make it their own, put the heat on the leadership, on Congress, and on the President. They will have to make bold demands for a radical break with the Meany-Reuther line of pussy-footing with the Democrats and catering to the corporations.

Above all, the American workers need a 30 HOUR WEEK AT NO REDUCTION IN PAY. This would not only spread the work to those now out of work, it would soften the burden of those workers who now labor at fantastic speed and find it almost unbearable to complete a 40-hour week.

One stop-gap measure that all American labor should support RIGHT NOW, is to EXTEND JOBLESS AID TO ALL UNTIL JOBS ARE FOUND FOR ALL. Hundreds of thousands of workers have run out of unemployment insurance, and still do not have jobs. Many have lost their homes. This human misery

"The city dropped a charge against me of discharging a firearm in the city limits, but the county had me charged with assault with intent to murder. I was fined \$500."

"Then, while I was in Washington preparing for the 1957 Prayer Pilgrimage, they bombed my house. No one has been arrested in connection with that bombing until this day."

"Fortunately, no one was home and very little damage was done."

When asked about his continuing the vote registration drive, he said: "Yes, I'm going ahead with the vote registration campaign. We're already in it."

In the person of Asbury Howard can be seen the fighting spirit and vision of the awakening Negro and union militants of the South. He is a personification of the growing union of the Negro and the labor movements. For aroused black America of the South he speaks, and eloquently too, when he says: "The price of freedom comes high, but whatever the price, I'm willing to pay it. Our fight for first class citizenship will continue."

must not spread any further—And it must be eliminated!

Workers: trust only in yourselves. Organize your own committees. Make your own demands on the Government and make the labor leaders present these demands also. Only the most powerful independent movement of the working people can wipe out the misery of unemployment. But it can be done! And the unbeatable American working class can do it.

From a Letter on African Revolution

. . . I was very pleased to read the fundamentally correct criticism of the Militant editorial on the Ghana Conference by Comrade "E" from West Africa.

It is almost unbelievable but the Militant's reply shows that the original editorial was not a "slip" or accidental. In fact the patronizing and pedantic editorial answering "E" is a further step in revisionism of the most basic nature.

What unbelievable hypocrisy on the part of the writer of that editorial to excuse himself for hailing the national bourgeois movements of Africa without the least criticism or without an independent proletarian revolutionary line . . . as if to say—we are an American and not an African paper!! But that is not the main crime of that editorial, serious enough as it is to strike such a tone with a comrade on the firing line.

The SWP can't admit that they were wrong and so they simply deepen their error into a betrayal of the guiding line of the permanent revolution. In their answer on the relationship of the proletarian revolution to the bourgeois revolution (they don't talk about proletarian revolution anymore they call it socialist tasks now so as not to exclude Lamont and Gluck) they say that the task is to support the bourgeois nationalist leadership wholeheartedly "while fighting for the political independence of the workingclass in preparation for providing consistent leadership to the struggle."

This highlights the theoretical contents of that editorial: *the revolution in stages*. What else does it mean to support the bourgeois nationalist wholeheartedly while preparing for the time when the consistent leadership of the independent workingclass movement is required? On what basis are the comrades in Africa to organize independently if not on the basis of proletarian revolution? Organizing means also to lead struggles and means coming into open class conflict with the native bourgeoisie. Of course where the Nassers and Nkrumahs are attacked by imperialism we will be there fighting for their lives with means and methods quite alien to them. But the Militant has quite a different concept. Today support for the national movement and tomorrow the fight for socialism.

Comradely, J.B.

30 Hour Week Only Answer In Steelworkers' Job Crisis

by J. Wilson

The number one problem of the steelworkers in the Youngstown area, even more than in the United States generally, is still the depression. This is so in spite of the fact that steel operations have climbed to a point in excess of 80% of capacity rating—the biggest economic upsurge since the brief upswing at the end of the steel strike in 1956.

The Youngstown workers understand very well that the upswing is based to a great extent on stockpiling in advance of the coming steel wage negotiations and the expiration of the steelworkers contract, July 1. That this is a pre-strike stockpiling boom is openly admitted by the Youngstown Vindicator and the whole capitalist press. This sets about a four month time limit on the prosperity, such as it is.

But the increased productivity, though very brief, has also changed the workers' problems. The question of who would be the next laid off has shifted to who will be the next called back and who will be called back at all. This is a matter of great anxiety to thousands who are approaching the end of their two year period of layoff. (After two years their service is "broken" and they are dropped from the seniority list altogether.) The corporations are following a policy of calling back as few workers as possible to handle the increased production, even paying the workers on the payroll overtime in some instances.

But in the meantime, the steel industry is changing technologically. Only one out of three Bessemer converters in the Youngstown district is being operated, and one of them, at the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co., is being permanently dismantled. The Lowellville Plant of the Sharon Steel Corporation is closed and shows no sign of reopen-

ing. This plant normally employed about 1200 workers. The creation of a permanent army of unemployed is one of the outstanding traits of the planless development of Steel.

The depression has resulted in speed-up on the job—making for worse working conditions. This, combined with automation and technological improvements, has resulted in the corporations having about 10% less workers than before the depression, and turning out the same amount of steel.

As a result of this trend and of the experiences during the past eighteen months of depression, the steelworkers are now strong for the idea of the thirty-hour week. The growing pressure in this direction is reflected in the call for a shorter work week voiced by George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO. The steel union leadership, like the Reuther leadership in the Auto Union, will stay away from this far-reaching and highly explosive demand unless organized mass pressure of the rank and file forces them to take it up.

It is this organized pressure that is lacking; the membership still looks on the leadership as hired agents who "get things" for the workers.

This period of trade union passivity seems to be coming to an end. The 1958 slump, with its mass unemployment, shook the workers up badly and caused the Ohio "revolt of the working class" in the 1958 elections in crushing "right to work" and GOP candidates. Now the workers are watching the Ohio Legislature, U.S. Congress and the Steel union negotiations to see whether the so-called political friends and the union leaders will come up with any effective solution to what is still the number one problem in the country—UNEMPLOYMENT.

A Left Communist Opposition in the Soviet Union That's What Khrushchev Hints in His Summary Speech

Every class conscious worker, every Socialist and Communist will greet with joy the great advances of the Soviet Union and the new gains made by the workers and peasants in the land of the great October Revolution. For the Soviet Union in spite of the many serious deformations, is still the fortress of the world proletariat—beacon light to all the oppressed. And its great technological successes are a tremendous source of inspiration for all who strive for a Socialist world.

Therefore, when Khrushchev declared in his summary speech at the 21st Congress that "this Congress . . . marks our country's entry into a new historic period of development, the period of the extensive building of a Communist society," it was cause for jubilation everywhere among class conscious workers.

While Khrushchev did not define the new period in concrete terms, all had reason to believe that it was going to be a higher, better, more developed period of socialist construction. The magnitude of the Seven Year Plan is enough to evoke the admiration of all the peoples of the world and the envy of the enemies of socialism and the Soviet Union.

The economic plan however, bold, imaginative and far-reaching in scope as it is, *deals with production targets mainly*. Such plans of course are not new in the Soviet Union.

We take pride that it was Trotsky

who proposed the first comprehensive plan for the industrialization of the Soviet Union, a plan which was subsequently adopted by Stalin, in complete contradiction to his own previous position on the subject.

The real problem

The great, big question however that Khrushchev tried to, but couldn't evade at the Congress, and which the Soviet working class has been looking forward to with great anticipation, was not the plan for production (this they assume as a matter of course), *but the plan for a more equitable distribution of the national income*.

It has long, long been forgotten in the Soviet Union of the Stalinist era that a vital and absolutely indispensable aspect of socialist planning is the rational and equitable division of the national income in accordance with the existing level of the productive forces and technological equipment. For if, as Khrushchev says, the USSR is entering a new period—and an extensive one, as he puts it, in the building of "a communist society," then the question of the division of the national income among the social groups in the Soviet Union is all the more on the order of the day.

Heavy industry again

Khrushchev assures us at the beginning of his speech of the necessity of giving priority to heavy industry. But

there was never any dispute among genuine Marxists that that should be so. How much and to what extent can only be a tactical question depending on the level of the productive forces, the international situation etc. But when it comes to the question of consumer goods, workers *must know* the character of the goods—articles for mass popular consumption—or Dachas for the elite?

Precisely put, the issues are these: Is the economic gulf between the social groups in the Soviet Union narrowing or widening? As one Five Year Plan succeeds another and as the sum total of the goods increases from year to year, is the gulf between the mass of the people and the privileged strata becoming wider, and are steps being taken to narrow it?

On this key question, a report to a congress of the Soviet Communist Party has long been overdue. It, in fact, has not been given attention since the days of Lenin and Trotsky.

It was presumed, however, that when the Soviet government announced late last year that it was at last taking an accurate census of the population (which incidentally hasn't been done since 1939) that this was for the purpose of presenting the census results to the 21st Congress. This of course would be done, it was assumed, with a view towards examining not merely the bald statistical aggregates of the various Union Republics with respect to popula-

tion, but the *income status*, that is, the real economic position of each social group in the Soviet Union, beginning with the humblest unskilled worker, the lowest paid, all the way up to the top of the pyramid, the loftiest group on the summit of the Soviet hierarchy; to the "socialist millionaires," be they on the wealthier collective farms, at the head of giant factories, in the army or among the elite of the intelligentsia.

Unfortunately, one would look in vain throughout the seven-hour-long speech of Khrushchev, plus his summary, for any presentation of these vitally necessary statistics. Oh, yes, there are the statistics on production, on steel, on oil, on gas. And they are all very necessary and very good, especially if accurate. But with respect to *income* the report is strangely silent.

It is not because Comrade Khrushchev was unaware of the problem. On the contrary, his report shows evidence that he all too clearly understood that it was *the* problem at the Congress. Comrade Khrushchev shows his understanding by a diversionary comparison with the U. S. A.

The diversion

"In the United States," he says, "the capitalist class appropriated more than half the national income, while making up only about one tenth of the country's population." How true! How true! As if the Congress or the workers have any doubt on the score!

"But in the USSR," he continues, "the working people receive about three quarters of the national income for the satisfaction of their material and cultural requirements. The rest of the national income, which likewise belongs to the working people, is used to expand socialist production and for other social needs." True enough again. But that is not the issue, as Comrade Khrushchev knows very well.

The basic issue is *who gets what* share of the national income and in *what proportion*. What does the janitor, the sweeper, the gardener, the artist, the lathe hand, the assembly man, the industrial manager, the scientist—what do they get—what proportion of the national income goes to each group? Comrade K who, by this time has already consumed at least five of his seven hours, at last comes to the point.

"In articles, and lectures," he tells us, "some scientific workers allege that distribution according to work signifies application of bourgeois law to a Socialist society. They ask whether the time has not come to shift from this principle to equitable distribution of the social product among all working members of Society."

Then with the bluntness characteristic of him, and with the confidence that he will not be contradicted, at least at this Congress, he answers: "We cannot agree with this."

New trend emerging

Whoever those unnamed "scientific workers" may be and however inaccurately they may formulate the theoretical presentation of the question of the distribution of the national income we think they are *on the right track*.

We send them our heartiest congratulations for courage and fortitude. They reflect (no matter how vaguely) the *left* opposition in Soviet Society—the opposition of the broad masses—against the privileges of bureaucracy. Their question is evidence that the social trend in the Soviet Union is at last being reversed—from right to left.

Heartened by the tremendous technological successes of the USSR, the mighty rise of Communist China, the momentous surge of the colonial revolution, the economic depression in the capitalist world, advanced Soviet workers are criticizing the bureaucracy from the *left*. The pendulum has at last started to swing in the other direction in the Soviet Union itself.

This is the kind of "thaw" we were looking forward to, not the Pasternak kind, the kind that the bourgeoisie and the Social Democratic lackeys of all types have been so loudly acclaiming.

The Cuban Revolution

Will Castro Solve the Problems Of the Cuban Workers and Peasants?

The Cuban revolution and the Castro regime have evoked considerable interest and discussion in the socialist movement. Perhaps we can best illustrate our own position by reviewing an article in the February issue of the Vanguard.

This lengthy story is full of revolutionary enthusiasm and admiration for the Cuban Revolution. Its attack on American imperialism as the main enemy is healthy and free of that opportunist cover-up so often found in the Worker and which repels the Vanguard group as well as ourselves.

The Vanguard raises excellent demands for the American labor movement, which can be summed up in the formula: "Full solidarity with the anti-imperialist struggle of the Latin American peoples, and their full economic and political freedom."

The demands, like the article, are fine in themselves. However, in all this lengthy article, there is one question that is neither asked nor answered. The key and fundamental question facing the Cuban workers, and for that matter, the entire Latin American proletariat—the question within which all other questions are combined—is *where does the Cuban CP stand on Castro?* (Or for that matter, where does the Vanguard group stand on Castro?)

That is the question the workers need an answer to. Here is the answer:

Castro is a militant bourgeois nationalist. He wants to *limit* imperialist exploitation, not to overthrow it. Failure to tell this to the Cuban workers and peasants is to deceive them—and to deceive them most cruelly in time of revolution when a false step can bring on catastrophe.

Castro talks of freedom. But there can be no real freedom in Cuba when all the raw materials and public utilities are owned by American monopolies and practically all the rest of the economy is dependent upon them.

Castro's Plans

Castro wants a *bourgeois* solution to this problem, a solution based on the imperialist retention of private property in the means of production. The Cuban workers and peasants need a *socialist* solution to the problem, based upon ex-

by Sam Marcy

propriation of this same private property in the means of production. Castro therefore wants a *deal* with American capitalism. He has said so plainly and openly.

And *why* does Castro want a deal with U.S. imperialism?

Castro represents native Cuban capital. Under the Batista regime, native capital was only a miserable broker between the U.S. monopolists and the Cuban workers and peasants with a tiny clique of Cuban capitalists on the American gravy train with Batista. Castro wants native capital to be a "partner" in the joint exploitation of the workers and peasants of Cuba. He wants to drive a hard bargain with Wall Street capital. We want to abolish it.

Castro has to consolidate his power over the workers and peasants prior to the making of such a deal. And in the face of the continuing revolutionary upsurge in Cuba ("The Cuban episode . . . is but one stage of a vast revolutionary process."—Vanguard), the Yankee imperialists are accommodating themselves to the deal with Castro, the basis of which is to be the retention of the U.S. Monopolies' power on the island. Even now they are operating with the slogan: "We're doing business as usual during alterations."

Now the CP of Cuba, notwithstanding all that the Vanguard says, *supports* the Castro regime. On this, they are the same as the CP of the United States. And Foster-Dennis and Co. know it, even if the Vanguard does not.

What to Do?

Of course every revolutionary Marxist who is genuinely interested in the emancipation of the Latin American proletariat from the yoke of Yankee imperialism is for a principled *united front* between a working class party and a bourgeois nationalist party against imperialism. Such a united front should have existed during Castro's military struggle against Batista. The united front, however, is limited by the socialist interests of the workers and peasants.

It is a life and death necessity for the working class to keep its own independent program, and march under its own independent banner, when marching alongside of Castro against the Batista agents of U.S. imperialism. It is a life and death necessity, because Castro, being linked by political, social, and even personal ties to native Cuban capital, must inevitably turn against the workers when his limited aims are accomplished.

Native capital in Cuba depends upon U.S. capital for its very existence. The development of the socialist revolution in Cuba requires a merciless break with the Castro regime, which is now trying to consolidate its power over the workers and peasants. Naturally, and of course, every class-conscious worker will be in the first line of defense against any attempted return of Batista. But without the independent organization of the working masses under a genuine communist leadership, the hegemony of U.S. imperialism will be re-established through Castro himself.

Castro is a Caribbean imitation of his Nasser-Nehru prototype. This is a more or less militant bourgeois nationalist type, capable of temporary, unreliable opposition to imperialism under the pressure of the revolutionary masses. The leaders of this type are supposed to be "neutral"—that is, neutral in the diplomatic aspects of the struggle of the Soviet bloc against imperialism (the Cold War). *But they are not neutral in the class struggle.*

We shall not have to wait for Castro to assume the personal dictatorial powers of Batista, before he attempts to discipline the whole labor movement. (He has already removed the top CP leaders from the Trade Union Federation.) And he will not have to grope very long to find methods to do this. The hypocritical "pacifist" Nehru, and the "neutral" nationalist, Nasser, have already shown him the way.

If the Vanguard group had as many members as there are Communists that have been hanged, shot, or thrown into the jails of Cairo and New Delhi, the Vanguard group would be a mass party in the U.S.A.

It's worth thinking about, comrades.

ever since the death of Stalin and the Khrushchev revelations of 1956. We are quite sure that it is not the opposition they are looking forward to, but it is the opposition which, in no matter how vague or weak a form, gives expression to the needs of the Russian proletariat and holds promise of regenerating the Soviet State.

How interesting that our present day American "socialist" critics of all hues and stripes have not noticed this at all. Could it be that the bourgeoisie did not prompt them as they did when the Rightward trend began with the death of Stalin?

To return to his report to the Congress: Nikita Khrushchev then seeks to bolster his case by well-warmed over

"Doctor Zhivago is . . . a historic utterance . . . as crucial to our moral and intellectual life as the Hungarian revolution to our political life."—Irving Howe in the New Republic.

"Dr. Zhivago" and the Hungarian "revolution" are certainly two of a kind. The bourgeois-liberal Irving Howe is quite right in feeling an affinity for both.

and badly digested quotations from Marx, Lenin, and Engels regarding the transition from socialism to communism and concludes with this warning: "It should be borne in mind that, with the present level of production, there is not enough of the good things of life for all, and we cannot as yet fully satisfy the requirements of the people."

What brought on this remarkably frank admission is made clear by the next sentence: "This (cry for) 'equalitarian Communism' would only eat up our stockpiles, make extended reproduction impossible and block successful expansion of the economy. We must advance step by step, creating the material and spiritual requisites for a methodical transition to Communism."

False polemics

But let us ask Comrade Khrushchev, "Who at the Congress proposed equalitarian Communism at this time? Who at the Congress averred that the level of production was sufficient for such a purpose? Who proposed the 'eating up' of our stock piles? Who, in fact, Comrade Khrushchev, are you arguing against, in this false polemic? Is it not a fact that the issue is not the introduction of equalitarian Communism—we are a considerable distance from that as yet—but the narrowing and better still, the abolition, of the monstrous social and economic privileges enjoyed by an aristocratic stratum that operates as a parasitic growth on a healthy social organism?

Instead of squarely meeting the question of the enormous growth of inequality, and the formidable social barriers that divide Soviet society as a result of them, Khrushchev preferred to introduce a false polemic as a substitute for a discussion of this problem.

The length to which he went on to demolish equalitarian communism is testimony to the widespread opposition to the ever growing gap between the living standards of the masses and the bureaucracy.

Khrushchev and the Levellers

"We cannot disregard," says Khrushchev, "the fact that levelling would lead to an unjust method of distribution—

Bloc with Khrushchev To Fight Zhivagoes

Trotsky once spoke of the Butenko faction in the Soviet apparatus and the Reiss faction. At that time, Butenko stood for the restoration of capitalism; Reiss stood for the restoration of communism—the communism of Lenin and Trotsky.

The difference between the Pasternak opposition and the Butenko opposition is merely one of form and terminology.

In the struggle against the rightist Butenko-Pasternak opposition, we make a principled united front with the centrist Khrushchev faction to save the Soviet republic, and at the same time to regenerate it on the basis of revolutionary struggle against the right wing.

the bad worker and the good would receive an equal share, which would be

Communist strategy:

to the advantages of slackers. The material incentive for people to work better, raise productivity and produce more, would be dampened. And Khrushchev ends his attack with this admonition: "Levelling would mean, not transition to Communism, but the discrediting of Communism."

Levelling! The time honored invective of all the possessing classes against the dispossessed since the beginning of class society, and now an argument in the hands of the First Secretary of the Party which proposes to introduce into the Soviet Union "a period of the extensive building of communism."

But who are the unnamed "levellers"? Did any of them perchance take the floor at the Congress? Obviously Comrade Khrushchev, you are arguing against an anonymous opposition—the Soviet working class.

"The slacker and the good worker"—how does this argument against communism differ from the arguments of Rockefeller or Morgan? It is an utterly opportunistic argument against equality. For the question of material incentive is objectively and historically not based on the fact that some people would be idlers and others would work. It is based on the fact that originally it was necessary to give greater material rewards as a concession to the upper stratum of the workers, the petty bourgeois, and the remnants of the possessing classes in order to win their collaboration for the new workers state. This was doubly necessary in Russia because of the terrible poverty and the scarcity of material goods.

The real idlers

As for idlers—the place to look for them, Comrade Khrushchev, is in the ranks of the bureaucracy, and least of all among the workers. With respect to material incentive between worker and worker, we doubt that the broad masses or any serious spokesmen for them are contemplating its abolition at this stage of Soviet development. We know without the slightest doubt, however, that the best and the most powerful incentive to the most rapid development of the productive forces and the production of material goods in abundance for all is precisely what you are so silent about in your entire seven hour speech—the elimination of the gross material and social privileges which weigh so heavily on the back of the entire Soviet working class!

You quote Lenin—"Until we reach the 'higher' phase of Communism, Socialists demand the most stringent control by society and by the State over the amount of labor and the amount of consumption."

Real Communists, Comrade Khrushchev, have never doubted this for a moment. Here again you falsify the issue, the real one of course is: Who shall exercise "stringent control" over whom? Democratic popular control over the amount of labor and articles of consumption by the masses over the bureaucracy is what is at stake in the current politics of the Russian people. Your talk is a camouflage of it.

Khrushchev refutes Deutscher

Since all Marxists agree that being determines consciousness, that social being determines social consciousness, the wide disparity between the income of the masses, and the income of the upper strata of Soviet society cannot, but be the real source of the deep seated social and political antagonisms which sooner or later will break out in the Soviet Union.

Of course, the voluntary liquidation by the bureaucracy of its own social privileges by peaceful means would be a highly desirable objective. But all history teaches that no social group ever surrenders vast material and social advantages without a struggle.

Khrushchev's tirade against equalitarian communism (actually a defense of privilege) clearly refutes Deutscher's theory of the self-reform of the bureaucracy, and gives renewed validity to Trotsky's prognosis of a political, that is proletarian revolution in the USSR.

It goes without saying that this revolution has nothing in common with the Hungarian episode which Wall Street is still so loudly cheering, and against which we sided with the Red Army.

The Red



Leon Trotsky

The White



Boris Pasternak

Which Side Are You On?

"The Whites were now close enough for the doctor to see their faces. They were boys, recent volunteers from the civilian population of the capitals, and older men mobilized from the reserve. The tone was set by the youngsters, first-year students from the universities and last-year students from the gymnasiums.

None of them were known to the doctor, yet half the faces looked familiar. Some of them reminded him of former classmates and he wondered if they were their younger brothers; others he felt he had noticed in a theater crowd or in the street in years gone by. *Their expressive, handsome faces seemed to belong to people of his own kind.*

Yurii Andreievich had no rifle; he lay on the grass watching the course of the engagement. *All his sympathies were on the side of these heroically dying children. With all his heart he wished them success. They belonged to families who were probably akin to him in spirit, in education, in moral discipline and values. . . .*

It occurred to him to run out into the field and give himself up, thus obtaining his release. But that was dangerous, too dangerous. While he was running with his arms raised above his head he could be shot down from both sides, struck in the back—by the partisans in punishment for his betrayal and by the Whites in misunderstanding of his motives.

But to look on inactively while the mortal struggle raged all around was impossible, it was beyond human strength. *It was not a question of loyalty to the side that held him captive or of defending his own life, but of submitting to the order of events, to the laws governing what went on around him. To remain an outsider was against the rules. You had to do what everyone was doing. A battle was going on. He and his comrades were being shot at. He had to shoot back. . . .*

So when the telephonist at his side jerked convulsively and then lay still, he crept over to him, took his cartridge bag and rifle, and, going back to his place, emptied the gun, shot after shot.

But as pity prevented him from aiming at the young men whom he admired and with whom he sympathized, and simply to shoot into the air would be too silly, he fired at the glasted tree, choosing those moments when there was no one between his sights and his target. He followed his own technique.

But alas!—however carefully he tried to avoid hitting anyone, every now and then a young attacker would move into his firing line at the crucial moment. Two of them he wounded, and one who fell near the tree seemed to have lost his life.

At last the White command, convinced of the futility of the attack, ordered a retreat. . . .

Leaving the telephonist, Yurii Andreievich went out into the field to the young White Guardsman whom he had killed. The boy's handsome face bore the marks of innocence and of all-forgiving suffering. "Why did I kill him?" thought the doctor. . . .

He and Angelar nursed Seriozha back to health. When he was well they released him, *although he did not conceal from them that he meant to go back to Kolchak's army and continue fighting the Reds.*

—DR. ZHIVAGO. Part II, Chapter 11

This quotation sums up the *reactionary essence* of "Doctor Zhivago."

The radical apologists for the White Guard Pasternak, argue that the above-quoted section of the book is only an accidental aberration, a temporary deviation from the lyrical, Tolstoyan theme found in some other less politically partisan sections of the novel. Let there be no confusion on this score!!! Pasternak's reactionary social and political philosophy permeates the entire narrative so completely that even one who understands the degeneration that has taken place in the Soviet Union, finds it difficult to believe that a Soviet citizen really wrote it.

But the pro-capitalist character of the novel is perfectly clear to the Book of the Month Club, Radio Liberation, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, Hollywood, the refugee Hungarian "Freedom Fighters," and the anti-Soviet Eisenhower—although it escapes the attention of the radical movement, part of which now concerns itself with an abstract discussion of "freedom for art and the artist."

To answer the tenth rate question that now titillates the petty bourgeois radicals—i.e., "Should the book by Pasternak be published in the Soviet Union?"—we say: "Yes, it should be published not in the interest of free speech for the enemies of the revolution, but in the interest of bringing out into the open all the counter-revolutionary supporters of Boris Pasternak, so the workers may know who is who."

Zhivago-Pasternak requires and deserves a thorough Marxist treatment and analysis. To begin that analysis, however, we must ask two questions infinitely more important to the working class than whether this reactionary book should be published in the Soviet State:

1. Could any revolutionary socialist or communist who was really pro-Soviet be pro-Pasternak?

2. How is it possible that a book so hostile to proletarian revolution, to Marxism, Bolshevism and the international working class, could be written in the Soviet Union, the workers fatherland, forty years after the October Revolution . . . unless it represented a strong social tendency in the upper crust of Soviet society?

Proletarian Left Wing of SWP Splits, and Calls for Return To Road of Lenin and Trotsky

Our Statement:

(By the former National Committee members of the Socialist Workers Party—Sam Marcy, Vincent Copeland, Jack Wilson, Ronald Jones and Dorothy Flint, representing New York, Buffalo, the Youngstown Steel area, the South and supporters in the West.)

Before we begin our direct appeal to the working class, it is incumbent upon us to give an account of our own revolutionary past.

We were the proletarian left wing of the Socialist Workers Party. We have now split with that party, which has gone farther and farther to the right in recent years, so that we can openly fight for orthodox Trotskyism, which is the authentic Marxism-Leninism of today.

After years of patient and loyal effort to keep the SWP on a course of principled revolutionary politics, having exhausted all avenues of struggle within its confines, we are forced to break into the arena of open conflict for the leadership of the revolutionary working class movement.

Year after year, and world shaking issue after issue, the majority of the SWP leadership have yielded under the pressure of the ever-sharpening global class struggle which has pervaded every domestic event from inner-union conflicts to the execution of the Rosenbergs. They have retreated from principled communist strategy and tactics in the fight for American socialism and the world socialist revolution. And their retreat has been too consistent, and over too long a time, to still hope that they will be capable of leading any advance in the future.

Therefore the time has now come when we the Leninist left wing, must break with the opportunist right wing. We Leninist-Trotskyists analyzed the rightist direction the SWP majority was traveling during the long years of the Cold War. We now take that analysis to its logical conclusion. Once more and again, we hold aloft the shining banner of revolutionary Marxism, and call upon all the advanced workers to gather around it.

What is our answer To the Soviet question?

Each section of the radical movement, absolutely without exception, be it opportunist, ultra-left, centrist, or Anarchist—as well as Bolshevik—takes a position of some kind on the USSR. And it cannot be otherwise, since the Soviet Union is the consequence of the first successful workers revolution in history, and that revolution poses the question of power to all workers everywhere. Furthermore, the sharp collision of interest between the Soviet Union and our own imperialist ruling class poses the question of every radical party's attitude to the American capitalist drive against the Soviet Union.

The class struggle in the United States cannot be brought to a victorious conclusion by leaders with a wrong or hazy idea about the Soviet Union and the Russian Revolution. Those who are most serious about taking state power in the United States must be the most serious in their interest in the Russian question. Trotsky called for—

Unconditional Defense Of the Soviet Union

The SWP majority dumped this slogan during practically the entire Cold War. The Militant spoke about "our Red Army" when the U.S. capitalist class was sending lend-lease to the Soviet Union and Earl Browder could get in the back door of the White House. But the Militant could find no way of giving political support to the beleaguered Soviet State when U.S. imperialism wielded the A bomb and the H bomb against it. Trotsky always promised that in the hour of danger, the Bolshevik-Leninists (Trotskyists) would be the best friends and supporters of the Soviet Union against their "own" capitalist class. But when that hour struck, the SWP caved in under the pressure of anti-Soviet hysteria.

Our tendency maintained an uncompromising stand, and pressed within the SWP for a clear position in favor of the Defense of the Soviet Union and the other workers states. Maintaining the line of Leon Trotsky that we must be "the best soldiers in the Red Army," we hold that that is the first duty of the international working class to defend without condition, all the gains of the Russian Revolution from all its enemies without and within.

Revolutionary anti-Stalinism And bourgeois anti-Stalinism

The SWP right wing has long ago dropped all slogans that might identify it as a real partisan of the workers states, but it has devoted much time to attacking Stalinism.

In an age when being opposed to Stalinism means different things to different people—and is the fashion on the left as well as in the camp of the class enemy, it is more than ever our duty to make clear beyond all possibility of misunderstanding just what the revolutionary opposition to Stalinism really is and should be.

We are unalterably opposed to the privileged and parasitic caste, the Soviet bureaucracy, which has fastened itself on the workers state, and which has imposed a class collaborationist line on the world communist movement, making the potentially invincible western European CP's into impotent parliamentary hostages of the capitalist class.

We oppose the conservatism Of the Moscow leadership

This Soviet bureaucracy and its program serve to disarm the vanguard elements of the world working class ideologically, and stand in the way of the final overthrow of capitalism. The bureaucracy is nationalistic in its conservatism, and helps, or refrains from helping, the colonial and proletarian struggles, on the basis of purely Russian considerations (which to some extent are identical with its own narrow caste interests) rather than the needs of the world movement.

For example, the Communist Party of India has been told by Moscow to alter its line of opposition against the capitalist Nehru in the interest of Soviet foreign policy. (What a disgrace that the whole radical movement of the world has said hardly a word against the hypocritical Nehru who imprisons Communists and would probably close his eyes if someone hanged them as well!) The "communist" government of the Indian state of Kerala is instructed not to nationalize the industries or expropriate the capitalists, leading to the disgraceful event last summer, when the Kerala cops beat up and shot striking workers. (Hardly anybody bothers to criticize the Stalinists for this, of course, because this kind of shooting is so pleasing to bourgeois public opinion.)

But it is from this point of view that genuine communists should criticize the bureaucracy. Any revolutionary criticism of the bureaucracy must be from the point of view of irreconcilable hostility to the capitalist class.

The Gates-ite renegades

It is not necessary to explain that the whole bourgeois world criticizes the bureaucracy from quite another point of view. But apparently it is necessary to explain that John Gates, Joseph Clark and Howard Fast also criticize the bureaucracy from a bourgeois point of view. The SWP majority has hailed these famous deserters from the class struggle as allies in the fight against Stalinism!

This turns the fight against Stalinism into a vulgar, pro-bourgeois operation which helps Wall Street, and only refurbishes the false reputation of the Kremlin.

Gates, Clark and Fast and similar political figures have gone over to the camp of capitalism under a smokescreen of anti-Stalinism. But they have been whitewashed as potential revolutionary socialists by the Militant. This can no longer be called a "mistake" or a "misunderstanding." Every child knows that John Gates is anti-communist as well

as anti-Stalinist. But the right wing SWP no longer even considers itself communist so everything is in order here.

Proletarian political revolution And bourgeois counter-revolution

We insisted against the SWP majority many years ago that the "Peoples Democracies" of Eastern Europe were in reality deformed workers states. (The majority finally and reluctantly agreed to this in 1950.)

We supported the struggle of the workers in these states to take political power into their own hands and abolish the privileged bureaucracy in favor of genuine communism, where leadership is based on devotion and ability rather than special material rewards.

When the workers of East Germany demonstrated against higher work norms and against the bureaucrats, when the workers of Poznan marched against the bureaucracy, and when the first Hungarian workers demanded proletarian democracy, we supported them in this effort. But we warned that the absence of a genuine proletarian vanguard party at the head of the working class would lead such movements to fall prey to the ever ready leadership of bourgeois counter-revolutionary forces, and the numerous friends of US capitalism. (And this is exactly what happened in Hungary.) We warned that no overthrow of the bureaucracy can possibly be progressive unless there is a genuine communist party to take its place.

But the SWP raises the slogan of "political revolution" without any qualification or any clear call for communist leadership. This comes down to advocating any kind of revolution at all against the Stalinist apparatus of the workers' state—from the left or right. This is at best a matter of irresponsibility, and at worst, a left cover for the aims of the U.S. State Department.

Bourgeoisie led Hungarian masses In a tragic counter-revolution

The SWP right wing went into raptures over the Hungarian counter-revolution. They hailed it as an example of "political revolution." We disagreed. Our tendency stood up under the pressure of the world-wide capitalist hysteria and we supported the final intervention of the Red Army which saved Hungary from the capitalist counter-revolution and salvaged the new property relations from the capitalist restorationists. (The American "communist" party did not dare to take this position at that time any more than the SWP did. The pressure of bourgeois hysteria was too much for them.)

The Hungarian workers rose in justified insurrection against the bureaucracy, but they lacked a revolutionary party to steer them in the direction of regenerating the Hungarian Workers State, rather than restoring capitalism, which their Social Democratic and bourgeois "Smallholder" leaders were hell-bent on doing. A restoration of bourgeois political democracy had already taken place. The restoration of bourgeois property relations was to come later.

Everybody, including the SWP, said that the Hungarians were establishing "democratic socialism." But the supposedly revolutionary SWP leaders never answered the question: how is it that the Norman Thomases, the Max Shachtmans and all the assorted right wing socialists in the world are in agreement that this "democratic socialism" is such a good thing?—or the even more interesting question, how is it that nearly all the capitalist statesmen also agree that this "democratic socialism" is such a good thing? (Incidentally, didn't all the right wing socialists oppose the 1919 revolt in Hungary that Lenin and Trotsky supported?)

We are uncompromising in our advocacy of workers democracy (if that term is taken to mean the regenerated dictatorship of the proletariat). But we are utterly opposed to democracy for Kovacs, Tildy, Mindszenty and their reactionary friends, under conditions of danger to the workers power, and we must tell this frankly to the workers of the world.

The SWP conciliates with Tito; Tito conciliates with imperialism

The SWP right wing hailed Yugoslavia as a workers state only after the Stalin-controlled Cominform had driven Tito into the arms of imperialism. We recognized the existence of the Yugoslav workers state from the outset, called for its defense, and exposed the reactionary character of the Tito leadership as well as the reactionary nationalist motivation of Stalin in forcing the 1948 break.

The SWP has yet to take a clear stand on Tito's bloc with Wall Street against the USSR and particularly Red China (which Tito calls "neutrality.") Only a few months ago the SWP leaders came out for "critical support" of Tito in their theoretical magazine. But they have never demarcated their "critical support" from the critical support given to Tito by Dulles.

Petty bourgeois tears For Boris Pasternak

The bourgeois anti-Stalinism of the Militant is best expressed today in its support of the viciously anti-Soviet book, "Dr. Zhivago" by Boris Pasternak. They flatly identified Pasternak with the struggle for "workers democracy" thus hopelessly compromising the whole idea of proletarian regeneration with the idea of bourgeois restorationism. (Militant of Nov. 10, 1958.)

The anti-Stalinism of the Militant has become indistinguishable from that of the liberal bourgeois critics of the Soviet Union, and in fact even these are often to the left of the Militant, as in the case of "Dr. Zhivago."

As for the tenth rate question of whether it was right to suppress the book, we too are for publishing it in the Soviet Union, but we are for calling it by its right name—a White Guard political thesis in literary form.

Negro struggle and class struggle

Just as every radical tendency can be judged by its position on the Soviet Union and China, so can it be judged by its position and conduct in the Negro struggle. The SWP-right wing pays a great deal of literary attention to the Negro movement, but it has surrendered any claim to a vanguard role in the actual struggle of the oppressed and exploited Negro workers. Without confidence in the working class, it has yielded leadership to the Negro middle class intellectuals and preachers. In New York, it discourages its own members from getting into the kind of jobs that would put them into daily contact with the Negro (and Puerto Rican) people.

Without confidence in the working class, the right wing opposed the slogan for a workers (inter-racial) defense guard at the height of the white supremacy terror in the South, and launched the safe demand for the sending of federal troops of the Wall Street government to the South instead.

It was our tendency that took the initiative in the fight for Willy McGee (within the SWP) and the fight to save Jimmy Wilson, as well as the earlier Rosenberg case. It is our tendency that has taken the initiative to build a revolutionary group in the South. And we are the first tendency to have done it, since the CP's earlier days. The SWP right wing dragged its feet when it came to building the party in the South, or even trying to.

The Negro movement of the South, with all of its drawbacks, and even with the habiliments of the church still clinging to it, is most probably the torch which will light the whole powder barrel of the American working class. Only a party with strong cadres in the South can hope to lead the coming socialist revolution.

Regroupment

Every serious Leninist is and must be for a regrouping of all the cadres who want socialism, who want the successful outcome of the class struggle in a government of the working class. And we are for this with all our hearts. But the SWP right wing had a different idea of regroupment. They had an idea that was in opposition to building the revolutionary vanguard party of the proletariat.

We fought in the SWP against a regroupment which aims at the emergence of an organization made up of a hodge-podge of groups on the lowest political common denominator—a non-class struggle, socialism. The SWP is steering toward a catch-all, broad and inclusive organization which would agree only on the word, "socialism" and the phrase, "independent class politics"—in election campaigns. This is a liquidation of the class struggle concept of the road to socialism and the acceptance of a pacifist, humanist, and class collaborationist program. We counterpose to this, the regroupment of all those who stand for the unconditional defense of

the Soviet Union and the other workers states, the class struggle road to proletarian power in the United States, and the creation of a Leninist vanguard party.

The SWP tried out its new regroupment line with the American Forum and with the Young Socialist Alliance, but neither of these organizations proved strong enough to become a vehicle for all the half-baked radicals, reformists, pacifists and humanists with whom the SWP wanted to ride. So the "Independent-Socialist Party" was formed.

The ISP mish-mash

We opposed the right wing majority's surrender of program to the pacifist mish-mash of the ISP. We explained as follows:

We can be for support to independent socialists running against capitalist candidates. But we should never give such support without making our own position clear. This means we can support the "socialist" Lamont; but at the same time we must condemn his support for the capitalist politician Stassen. And we must take up and expose Lamont's humanism (which he counterposes to Marxism) far more vigorously than if we were not supporting him. And the same goes for his remark that "the class struggle is passé."

It is all right to give critical support to candidates who call themselves socialist, but it is then all the more necessary to explain to the workers why the program of these candidates will not really lead to socialism. The Militant carried out this task by censoring passages from the ISP leaders' speeches which clearly revealed their anti-class struggle line. And when they did publish a full text, they had little or no editorial comment (or *wrong* comment, as in the case of Dan Roberts' line on German unification which practically duplicated the idea of unity through bourgeois "free election").

How to switch From bourgeois anti-Stalinism To vulgar conciliationism

The SWP was conciliating politically with the bourgeois pacifism and parliamentary reformism of Lamont, McManus and Co.

Furthermore, the SWP, which labels us as "pro-Stalinist" did not think of Lamont and McManus as pro-Stalinist at all. Lamont could be for all kinds of class-collaboration, humanism, bourgeois pacifism, but because he publicly criticized the Soviet attack on "Dr. Zhivago," he was "coming their way." Aside from the complete theoretical impotence revealed here, this is *conciliation with the bourgeoisie*.

The SWP is deathly worried about "conciliation with Stalinism," but they did not hesitate the moment they had the chance, to conciliate with the bourgeois wing of Stalinism (Gates, Fast, Clark, McManus, Lamont!)

We do not mean to insult McManus and Lamont who are in many ways courageous figures, by bracketing them with the renegade Gates and Co.—but their theoretical line is very close to these gentlemen. For example, they agree with Gates in being for "peaceful co-existence" in principle. And if the Soviet Union were compelled to rupture that "peaceful co-existence," they might very logically condemn the Soviet Union, and not be for its defense at all.

And at the same time Snuggle up to Social Democrats

We proposed the Leninist tactic of "critical support" for the candidacy of CP leader Ben Davis (with whom we seriously disagree) before he was ruled off the ballot. But the SWP political committee would not even discuss this proposition, thus revealing that their "regroupment" approach was only an approach to the more respectable radicals.

The SWP leaders justified last September's hodge-podge where Harold Davies, Lamont, Otto Nathan and A. J. Muste spoke at the Hotel New Yorker, by saying that this would provide a large "regroupment" arena. But when Ben Davis asked for the chance to speak at this meeting, he was turned down. The CP members who would have come to hear Ben Davis were apparently not part of the "regroupment" arena the SWP wanted to reach, but the admirers of the British Social Democrat, Harold Davies, were.

Now Stalinism may be theoretically as wrong as Social Democracy. But every little child knows that the Social Democracy is considered friendly to American imperialism, and the Stalinists are considered hostile.

This "revolutionary" intransigence toward the persecuted Stalinists sits very badly on people who are so conciliatory to the Social Democrats and the more acceptable and respectable semi-Stalinists.

No clarity, no class position— Even on the Wallace question

But it was the same SWP right wing which now submerges itself in the pacifist milieu, which stood aside, covering itself with left phrases, when the Wall Street red baiters took the knife to the Progressive Party movement. Our tendency favored critical support for the Progressive Party (in spite of the "leadership" of Wallace), without a merging of the programmatic banners.

But at that time, the hysteria against the Soviet Union and the CP in America was at a fever pitch—so the SWP said that the PP was a "third capitalist party" and that we, the proletarian left wing, were "conciliating with Stalinism."

Only fear of the witch hunt at its peak can explain the resistance of the SWP right wing to our determined effort to have the party take the initiative and involve itself in the fight for the lives of the Rosenbergs. The Militant only acted on this case after there was a world-wide outcry, and after even the Pope in Rome had interceded for these class war prisoners.

Where the Militant now champions the fight for the release of Morton Sobell, it should be noted that the SWP right wing did not discover this case (which was part of the Rosenberg case) until long after the execution of the Rosenbergs and the sentencing of Sobell.

Parliamentary road to socialism

The SWP has raised a whole series of cadres in the atmosphere of frantic election campaigns. These campaigns have only had the effect of establishing the harmless respectability of the SWP in the eyes of the labor bureaucracy and the petty bourgeois "regroupers." And they have miseducated the SWP cadres and diverted them from the class struggle itself.

We favor socialist election campaigns in which it is possible to raise the class consciousness of the workers. But we reject the year-after-year Norman Thomas-type election campaign as a pale parliamentary substitute for the "independent class politics" the SWP thinks it is.

It is noteworthy that while the SWP majority has been most vociferous (and well-meaning of course) about the "political revolution" in the Soviet bloc, they have been soft pedaling the idea of proletarian revolution at home in capitalist America. The teachings of Lenin and Trotsky on the seizure of power by the proletariat have more and more been shelved in favor of the parliamentary road to socialism.

It is good to remember that the parliamentary socialists of Germany in 1914 were all in favor of revolution—in France. And the socialists of France were all for revolution—in Germany.

Talk in bourgeois America about a political revolution in the Soviet Union by a tendency that puts all its energies in the ballot box, and is not interested in conducting even one small strike in New York City, deserves a harsher word than we wish to employ here.

For proletarian recognition Of Revolutionary China!

Unlike the right wing majority, we hailed the victorious Chinese Revolution in 1949. We fought for the acceptance of that momentous workingclass victory within the SWP for six years before the majority would grant—on paper—that the capitalist state in China had been destroyed and that a workers state had emerged.

But this was an illusory victory for us. In the face of U. S. imperialism's hostility to the Chinese revolution in all its forms, the Militant has not said one word about the new and unprecedented development of the Chinese communes. It is more than a year since the appearance of these revolutionary formations, and the whole capitalist press is attacking them. But the Militant fails to oppose this attack and explain to the workers of the United States what a phenomenal step forward this represents for the whole working class.

John Foster Dulles has expressed the hope that a revolution "of the Hungary type" will occur in China. Should such a "revolution" occur—and we are sure that it will be defeated if it does—the SWP with its false position on Hungary uncorrected, may very well support it and forever condemn itself as even a progressive, much less a revolutionary, tendency.

As for us, by cutting ourselves off from the Militant, the SWP and their petty bourgeois mockery of Trotsky's position, we will be able to fight openly for the defense of workers' China as well as the Soviet Union, for clarity in the workers' movement, and for a new revolutionary leadership.

Thus we will lay the basis for the regeneration of Bolshevism, and insure the socialist victory of the workers of the world.

The Priestly Servants of Wall Street

Polish Freedom — And Catholic Power

by V. Grey

The right wing radicals have generously hailed Wladislaw Gomulka's relative opposition to the Kremlin, and have given him "critical support."

But what about the "critical support" that Cardinal Wyszynski and the Catholic Church gives Gomulka? What do these radicals have to say about that?—And why is the Church given so much consideration by Gomulka? Some people think this is a matter of "freedom of religion." Is this really so?

Wyszynski was made a cardinal in the first place in papal recognition of his services in combating communism in Poland. And he was muzzled and "detained" by the Polish Government for the same reason. But he was released from detention and made Primate of Poland by Gomulka after the "revolution" of October 1956. The American Communist Party and the other radical parties neither understood, nor wanted to understand, the real meaning of this action.

The elevation of Wyszynski to the mediaeval office of Prince Primate was an opportunist act to mollify the backward peasantry and the greater part of the city population of Poland. The pact between the Cardinal and the tightrope walking politician was one of the results of the events of October 1956, events which seem to have pleased all shades of politicals in America from right to left—but were far better analyzed on the right than on the left.

Is it "freedom of religion?"

The pact had nothing to do with "freedom of religion" or "freedom of worship."

It was also a bargain between one who represented the power of the state (the army, police, etc.) and one who represented a much needed support of the state—the Catholic Church.

For example, the Church gave "criti-

cal support" to the regime in the following important way:

During the crucial election of January, 1957, when many anti-communists were on the ballot, the Church, following a "go slow" policy, wisely gave its support to Gomulka so as to forestall a complete social overturn that would invite the intervention of Soviet troops. As the New York Herald-Tribune said on January 19, 1957:

"Roman Catholic opponents of communism joined trade-union groups and professional associations in pleading today for . . . completely pro-regime ballots."

"The virtual dismantling of the Communist system of collectivized farms . . . and the beginnings of private investment in joint state-private capitalist ventures—these were held out as reminders of what Mr. Gomulka has achieved and may be expected to defend, or even expand, if Polish anti-Communists do not follow the Hungarian example of seeking too much too soon." (!)

Poland is a 95 per cent Catholic country. After over a decade under a workers regime, it is more Catholic than ever. It is largely due to Stalinism itself of course, that religion was not liquidated. (If life on earth is unbearable for the masses, they will look for a better life in heaven.) But it is one thing to blame Stalinism for not having educated the masses. It is quite another thing to gloss over the backwardness of these masses. It must be clearly understood that the priests have a tremendous power because of it.

For example, on August 26, 1957 no less than 700,000 Poles gathered at the Shrine at Czestochowa from all over the country to demonstrate their loyalty to the Virgin Mary, "Queen of Poland"—and more specifically to Cardinal Wyszynski. Sixteen Polish bishops and 3,000 priests were present.

This demonstration was a pro-bourgeois political demonstration. The priests who led it were nothing but bourgeois agents in clerical garb.

The "Miracle of Vistula"

On August 26 is also held the Feast of the Blessed Lady of Jasna Gora (J.G. is the monastery of Czestochowa). This feast is associated in the minds of all Poles with the "miracle of the Vistula" when the Blessed Lady turned the Trotsky-led Bolshevik army back from Warsaw in 1920.

By the spring of 1957, the Church had gained back its old influence in the public schools—making them all parochial, literally restoring the cross to the classroom. This went so far that the regime itself grew panicky and on March 18, 1957, Trybuna Ludu (main newspaper of the Polish CP) accused the Church "of not only teaching religion in the schools, but at the same time teaching intolerance," saying "a really very serious situation has been created in the schools" and adding that children who failed to attend religious instructions were treated by most of the other children and even by some teachers "as Jews (!) or even anarchists (!)"

(The Communist Party is just as anti-Semitic as the Church in Poland. And it has justly been criticized for this in the West. One would think, however, that the Western critics of the Polish CP had never even heard of the anti-Semitic Polish Catholic hierarchy. Polite silence about the Catholic anti-Semitism while hailing "freedom of worship" and criticizing the Polish CP is invaluable and not-so-critical support to the class enemy.)

Trybuna Ludu showed weakness as well as panic when it said "We wish to be tolerant, but we are asking for tolerance, too." And the paper concluded its lament by saying that it well understood that the "Polish road to socialism" was "linked to the Polish devotion to religion." (When was this Stalinist be-

trayal of Marxism ever exposed in the Western press?)

Where were the "critical supporters" of Gomulka on this crucial issue of Church and State? Why did they have so little to say about it? Surely it was not because they feared to offend the religious sensibilities of the American workers, since in this capitalist United States, the principle of separation of Church and State has been well established for the last 183 years!

And why has the radical press been so politely silent about the 12-man Catholic delegation to last year's Polish Parliament? Surely these Catholic politicians do not symbolize the great principle of "freedom of worship." The capitalist press seems to understand this matter, however. And they understand its political meaning, even if some radicals can still persuade themselves that this, too, comes under the heading of "freedom of religion."

The New York Times of January 22, 1958, carried a frank and lengthy article about this Catholic group in Parliament and told how its leader, Stanislaw Tomma was alarmed that the "gains of October" were disappearing. Stomma told the Communist Party leaders to stop worrying about being "over-

The moderate, temperate, and courteous New York Times editorializes that human beings in China are now "reduced to the level of a zoo."

They may be referring to the fact that before the present "appalling" situation, the Western imperialists used to shoot and torture the Chinese people at will—a procedure not usually applied to the protected animals of a zoo.

whelmed by the numerically stronger forces opposed to Communism," as the author of the article put it, and held out the improved situation of the peasants (who could now buy, sell land) and as a proof that the government could endure, if it "took into consideration the attitude of the people" (meaning the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie).

Gomulka strikes back

By last summer, things had gone so far, that the Gomulka regime, having consolidated itself somewhat, and having obtained a measure of support from Moscow, began to deal some blows at the Church in return. (But there was no audible applause from the "critical supporters" or any other radicals, as there should have been.) One of these blows was a crack-down on the exclusive Church monopoly in the distribution of foreign charity donations (mostly from the United States), a monopoly which the Polish Church had re-established after October 1956, for the first time since 1949. This, of course, raised a furor all the way from the United States to Rome.

Monastery as commercial center

Last August, the regime went so far as to start a vigorous press campaign against the famed monastery of Czestochowa (see above) as a commercialized center for all sorts of illegal trafficking. This must have taken the courage of

desperation. (The Church complained that even the Nazis had not dared to attack this holy place.) The attack on the monastery was launched on August 13, just two weeks before there would have been a repetition of the mass religious demonstration in honor of "the Queen of Poland" at this monastery as in the two previous years.

Pro-Capitalist priesthood

Wyszynski countered with a call for protest prayers throughout the country. This had the effect of mobilizing Catholic opinion and energy against the regime. The government campaign against the cardinal died down.

Finally, no other cardinal from the whole Soviet bloc has visited Rome in several years. Wyszynski has made the trip not once, but twice, since "October." He carries the aegis of world capitalism in his red hat, and wields the weapon of capitalist subjugation in his sceptre.

The Stalinists may employ stooge-priests to lull the workers and praise the bureaucrats. This of course, should be condemned. But the stooge-priests of the world bourgeoisie, with their powerful nerve-center in Rome, represent a far greater immediate danger to the workers' power. The reactionary Catholic hierarchy of Poland are not the less dangerous for being clever politicians. And precisely the deficiencies of Stalinism provide the greatest opportunities for their clever politics. By all means let us criticize the Stalinists for opening the way to the hegemony of the pro-capitalist priesthood. But let us also pinpoint and say openly, who, in Poland, is the direct representative of world capitalism.

Polish Jokes

These two reactionary jokes now current among Poland's cynical intellectuals, give us a faint idea of the anti-communist, and in reality pro-capitalist, sentiments prevailing in Poland.

* * *

"Under capitalism, man exploits man. Under socialism, the reverse is true."

* * *

"Thank God for the Soviet Union. It gives us a buffer state against China."

Revolutionaries in Japan

A new organization named the Communist Federation has been formed in Japan under the leadership of former members of the Japanese Communist Party. The very active Japanese secret police identify them as Trotskyist.

American press dispatches state that "the group aims at achieving a violent revolution in Japan."

We hope it's true, because this is bourgeois language for the seizure of power by the immense majority and for the immense majority—something the so-called Trotskyist SWP in America have forgotten about in recent years.

Steel for Indo-China

Viet Nam (the workers state in the north) is building a 100,000 ton steel plant. CHINA is supplying a large part of the money and materials.

Mau Mau Struggle May Revive Soon

Against the background of the growing revolutionary struggle of the African masses, a trial is taking place in Nairobi, Kenya, which may reopen the case against Jomo Kenyatta, imprisoned since 1953 for his leading role in the Mau Mau movement.

Rawson Mbogwa Macharia, one of the key government witnesses against Kenyatta signed an affidavit that he and other witnesses were bribed to lie about him. Now Macharia is being tried for perjury in making this affidavit.

It will be necessary to hear Kenyatta as part of Macharia's trial, but the British imperialists (who are still running Kenya) are so frightened of the possible results of even a court appearance of this great and popular leader, that they will probably interview him 500 miles from the courtroom in Laki-taung prison.

With the tide of African nationalism rising into Kenya once again, there is at the same time a new reactionary "Kenya European Congress" being formed. It represents the extreme right wing of the European "settlers" (rich landed proprietors and exploiters of the Kenya masses—they are less than one per cent of the population).

The leader of this congress, retired Air Commander, E. L. Howard-Williams, is editor of a newspaper called the "Independent" which is so viciously anti-African that it has actually received warning from the British Colonial administration to soften up a little.

But neither the right nor the left shows much sign of softening. Things seem headed for a new show-down in Kenya, but this time, with so much more of Africa in revolt, than in 1952, there will be much more chance of success for the masses.

The Woman Worker

Back in the depression of the 30's, Hitler in Germany clamored for the exit of women from factory jobs back to the home, to the jobs of housework, childbearing, and childrearing, and those jobs only.

In the U.S. too, now that there is a recession on, we have lately been exposed to this same clamor, not so much from the Hitlers or would-be Hitlers in Washington, as from a different bunch of spokesmen for the capitalist class. These people hold forth in the pages of magazines that women read, and give out with sage sermons from the pulpits. Some fifteen years ago, these same preachers and editors were urging women to leave the confines of their four walls, to abandon the "noblest profession of them all—homemaking," and go into industry in the service of war.

Why all these changes in attitude toward working women by the spokesmen for the capitalist class? Why was the working woman at one time hailed as the defender of the "Free Enterprise"

system and now, a few short years later, condemned as the root of so many ills of our society? Why is she currently being blamed for everything from unemployment and juvenile delinquency to the deterioration of the male personality?

In this column, we would like to discuss why working women are neither the saints nor the sinners they are supposed to be. We plan to show how they, like men in capitalist society, are victims of wage slavery, and sometimes double victims; how a boom economy uses them and how a crisis-ridden economy discards them. And we are going to show what can be done about it.

Why women go to work, conditions of employment both at home and in the factory, unionization of women—these are some of the subjects we shall take up. Our readers, both men and women, are invited to send us their comments and suggestions. Short accounts and letters about actual conditions on the job will also be appreciated.

China Aids Algerian Struggle How About the Soviet Union?

The recognition of the Algerian Government in Exile (the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic) by the Chinese People's Republic is an act that should be cheered by the colonial masses and in fact by all class conscious workers throughout the world.

The communique issued by the two governments meeting in Peking on Dec. 20, 1958, in addition to the usual convention stuff, "expressed their firm support for the Asian and African peoples in the struggle against colonialism . . . and that all foreign troops should [be] withdrawn from Asian and African countries."

It is significant that this diplomatic move by China was given little publicity either in the West or in the Soviet Union. And it is especially significant that the recognition of the Algerian Provisional Government by the Chinese was not followed by recognition from the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe.

The extension of diplomatic recognition by the Chinese showed first a bold initiative and second a growing ability to act independently, within certain limitations, from the Soviet Government. This is not the kind of independence, however, which the imperialists and their Social Democratic lackeys and sycophants are waiting so anxiously to see.

Tito a different story

The capitalists and their "socialist" friends loudly applaud the "independence" and "neutrality" of the Tito

Government (since the break with the Cominform), for instance. But there is no such chorus of congratulations to the Mao Government in China.

This is not to be wondered at. The independence shown by the Chinese Government in this case is an act of assistance to the oppressed colonial people, and it is directed squarely against imperialism. But the "independence" of Tito as shown by his conciliation with imperialism and particularly by his "neutrality" during the Korean War, will go down in history as a base betrayal of the aspirations of the colonial people—and the brutal manner in which he was expelled from the Cominform etc. will never be accepted as an excuse for this betrayal.

But why has the Soviet Government not extended diplomatic recognition to the fighting Algerians? No explanation has been forthcoming, either from Moscow or any of the CP's throughout the world—least of all from the New York Worker. The only public excuse offered to date appeared in a recent issue of the National Guardian in an article by Anna Louise Strong. Her explanation was that it was due to a "division of labor" between the Chinese and the Russians.

This is a bald falsification. As with many of the things Strong has written about the Soviet Union and China, she here dispenses two apologetics with each piece of accurate information she gives us from her travels.

In this case her statement is false to the core and an obvious apology for the ugly role that the Soviet hierarchy has played in the Algerian liberation struggle. Nowhere is this better known than in Algeria itself. The insignificant size of the Algerian CP is the most eloquent testimony to the Kremlin's reactionary role as a brake on the struggle for colonial independence.

This role has been played by imposing a chauvinist policy on the French Communist Party. This is evidenced by the latter's slogan for Algeria — "A peaceful solution in Algeria" rather than "the unconditional independence of Algeria"—a slogan which not only is Leninist but corresponds to the demands of the Algerian people.

Of course there has been token assistance given by the Eastern European workers states, but that is strictly a means for protecting themselves from the wrath not only of the colonial people of Algeria, but of all the class conscious workers of Europe and Asia as well.

Soviet bloc recognition of the Provisional Government would mean a complete and definitive rupture with their policy of aiding and abetting French imperialism in Algeria. This is a rupture that Moscow is unwilling to create at this time, because it hopes to win French imperialism's friendship for its own diplomatic needs—a vain hope anyway.

It is all the more commendable that the Chinese have recognized the revolutionary Algerian regime in oblique opposition to the Kremlin, when they are still materially dependent upon the Soviet Union to such an enormous extent.

Jim Crow Buses Out in Atlanta

by A. T. Simpson

Atlanta, Ga.—At the end of last year the city of Atlanta was faced with five major Civil Rights Cases: 1) a suit against the Georgia Business College; 2) a suit against the public schools; 3) a suit against the Atlanta Airport — where discrimination is still practiced; 4) a suit against the NAACP; and 5) a bus integration suit. All of these cases were reviewed in the courts, but only one of them has been completely resolved.

For more than a month now, since the judge in the Federal District Court ruled that segregation on the local buses in the city of Atlanta is unlawful, the citizens of Atlanta have been riding the buses unsegregated without any report of violence or threat of violence. Only one argument over the new seating arrangement came up. It involved two teenagers, and the dispute was settled peacefully.

The majority of the Negro citizens upon hearing of the decision, did not immediately begin riding the buses on an integrated basis. This was due to the fact that a group of Negro ministers called for a delay of action until after a mass meeting which they called. However, many felt the meeting unnecessary and instead, began riding the busses on an integrated basis as a result of that feeling.

This group of Negro ministers, who had appointed themselves as leaders of the Negro community, staged two mass meetings in a church, and passed out circulars containing a nine point list of recommendations which they hoped the Negro citizens would go by, in an effort to prevent any violence. (They were really trying to create a pale, mechanical and almost imitation of the mass meetings in Montgomery, Alabama in 1956-57. It worked just the opposite of Montgomery, slowing down integration instead of speeding it up.)

At both of the meetings, the church was filled to capacity with citizens waiting to find out what further steps should be taken. Both gatherings turned out to be nothing more than prayer meetings.

After these two "mass meetings" more Negro citizens started riding the buses on an integrated basis, on their own, and have continued to do so without any reports of violence from the whites.

Thus Atlanta has joined the more than thirty other southern cities in a peaceful integration of the buses. As to whether Atlanta will join those other cities which have begun to integrate their schools without violence — it remains until September to be seen.

Atlanta has led the way in the industrialization of the South. The question is: will she take the lead in peacefully resolving her Civil Rights cases? The answer to this question lies to a very great degree in the minds and hearts of the white working class. The white workers may, of course, be whipped up by the Klan and the White Citizens Councils even in Atlanta. But the record established in the bus integration situation proves that the white workers are not nearly so prejudiced as they might seem.

Times anti-imperialist?

"Nyasaland is 99.6 per cent black, yet the federal legislature in Salisbury has 29 white members and only six Africans."

So editorializes the New York Times, in a moment of rare liberalism, about British colonial oppression. But the Times has never commented on the fact that the Negro people of the United States, over ten per cent of the population, do not have one single representative in the U.S. Senate out of 98 members of the august body.

Doesn't surprise us

Howard Fast is now broadcasting over Radio Liberation—reading appropriate excerpts from "Dr. Zhivago."

Bankers' Strike

The bankers are on strike against their own government. They are trying to force the rate of interest up so they can make more money on government bonds. Here is the story:

Last month the U.S. treasury could not sell its own bonds. That means it couldn't borrow money at the rate of interest it wanted to pay.

The Treasury had to pay off nine billions worth of bonds that had come due. (The various banks owned most of these bonds—the "public" only a small fraction.) The Treasury did not have the money to pay, so they tried to sell nine billion more in bonds to pay off on the first nine. But they found takers for only seven billion.

They offered 4½ per cent interest on the new bonds, which is more than twice what they offered during the Second World War—and yet they could not get enough buyers for these supposedly Giberaltar-safe bonds at this attractive interest.

This means that two billion dollars of the government's income must go toward paying off the cash they still owe for bonds that have come due—ore else they will have to raise the interest rate in order to sell more bonds (that is, borrow more money). And barring some drastic reverse in the present trend, this is exactly what the government will do. That way the bankers will make more money.

But Bankers Not So Smart

At the same time, these bankers are cutting the throat of their own system. Here is why:

Their strike to raise the interest on government bonds is one of the first class causes of inflation (infinitely more so than any increase of workers' wages).

And inflation hurts the bankers more than it does other kinds of capitalists. This is because their wealth is all in dollars, in mortgages, bonds etc. that have a face value in a specific amount of dollars. And when prices rise, the bonds, mortgages, etc. (unlike stocks), keep the same price, or even go down in price because the fixed rate of interest is no longer considered high enough, and fewer people want to buy them.

Inflation and National Debt

But how does raising the interest on government bonds help to cause inflation?

Government bonds are each a small part of the national debt. The totality

of the government bonds is about equal to the whole national debt. An increase of only one per cent of interest on all these bonds amounts to nearly three billion dollars (which must be paid every year). It is an additional expense for the government that can only be raised by issuing new bonds (unless taxes are raised, of course).

The constant issuing of new bonds is becoming a greater and greater pressure on the real value of the dollar.

This is because the bonds are treated by the banks that hold them as so much real wealth upon which they can borrow more money. And this has the effect of putting more money into circulation than there is really wealth to back it up. Then the real value of the dollar goes down while prices go up. In other words—inflation.

Some Reminders from Lenin

—on the class struggle road to socialism

"Never, except in the sentimental fantasies of the sentimental simpleton Kautsky, will the exploiters submit to the decision of the exploited majority without making use of their advantages in a last desperate battle, or series of battles."

—on the proletarian dictatorship

"The transition from capitalism to communism represents an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters will inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope will be converted into attempts at restoration. And after their first serious defeat the overthrown exploiters . . . will throw themselves with tenfold energy, with furious passion and hatred grown a hundredfold into the battle for the recovery of their lost "paradise," on behalf of their families who had been leading such a sweet and easy life and whom now the "common herd" is condemning to ruin and destitution (or to "common" work)."

"There cannot be any middle course between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat."

—on the need for a party

"If there is no revolution, then Kautsky turns his back on revolution. Kautsky does not betray a shadow of an understanding of the truth that a revolutionary Marxist differs from the ordinary philistine in that he is able to preach to the ignorant masses that the maturing revolution is necessary, to prove that it is inevitable, to explain its benefits to the people, and to prepare the proletariat and all the toiling masses for it."

All from the "Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky"

Iraq — the facts at last

How to Strangle a Workers' Revolution

The full story of the tragedy and betrayal in Iraq can now be told. It is a story of revolution and counter-revolution. When the revolution broke out on July 14, 1958, it was as the Chinese said, a veritable earthquake in the Middle East. Contrary to popular opinion in the West, it was not merely an officer-corps "palace revolution" but a tremendous spontaneous surge of the popular masses, which toppled the government of the Quisling British stooge, Nuri as Said.

This mass upheaval was the real motivation behind Nasser's clandestine visit to Khrushchev a day or two later. When the visit was disclosed to the public, it was explained to the world by one set of journalists that it was for the purpose of getting Soviet military assistance in the event of U.S. intervention in Iraq; and it was explained by another set of journalists that it was to make sure that Khrushchev did not send such assistance.

But whatever was said about military assistance, the real assistance that Nasser sought was *political*. He sought a guarantee that the Communist Party of Iraq would submit to the bourgeois nationalists completely.

The real story

The tempestuous mass movement which had developed in Iraq on the overthrow of the old regime, was literally in the hands of the Communist Party. This is what Communists, the world over, and especially in America, should know.

The CP had built up mass support in Iraq with lightning speed after the Suez invasion of 1956, and formed a so-called "popular front" with the bourgeois nationalist parties under the name of the National Front Committee. The parties were: the Baath, the Istiqlal, the National Democrats, and the Communist Party.

Only the Baath could be considered as having a Social Democratic following in the Western sense of the word. The others are bourgeois parties with left and right wings more akin to Nasser and Nehru's ideology.

The big, big story that all class-conscious workers (and especially Communists) should know, is that the CP commanded the support of the popular masses—especially in the crucially important city of Baghdad.

This was clearly evidenced by the formation of a popular militia that commanded de facto support in the capital city, while the military junta originally headed by Col. Aref and subsequently by Gen. Kassem, commanded a vaguely defined de jure support.

To any Marxist who knows the ABC's of Lenin's teachings on the seizure of power in time of popular revolt, the situation in Iraq in the July days was an obvious repetition of the situation in nearly every proletarian revolution since the earliest in Paris just 88 years ago this month, and all the way to the

Russian and subsequent revolutions of our time.

The situation was a classical repetition of a "dual power" in Middle Eastern garb.

The Aref-Kassem bourgeois nationalist clique commanded only a modicum of popular support, and that clearly among the possessing classes. But the CP and their mass organizations had the *armed support of the people*. This popular militia was nothing less than the soviet of workers and soldiers councils as in Russia, October 1917, in Berlin, 1918, and in Spain (Ovieda) 1936.

All that remained for the Iraqi revolutionaries was simply to declare the de facto government the de jure government, to make the real government the legal government, and this would have been the seizure of power.

What Nasser wanted

But that is exactly why Nasser made his hurried trip to see Khrushchev — *to prevent this from taking place*. (The imminent danger of a popular revolution had been communicated to Nasser by his now-overthrown friend, Aref.)

The five-column banner headline in the July 19 N.Y. Times said, "Nasser Makes Secret Flight to USSR—Appeals to Khrushchev not to take any action that would threaten world peace." Most readers took this to mean that Nasser tried to restrain Khrushchev from *military intervention*—whereas in reality, he made a plea for a Moscow "Cease and Desist" order to the Iraqi Communists, an order against seizing the whole power which they were so closely on the verge of doing.

"President Nasser said Mr. Khrushchev had told him that the attitude of the United Arab Republic toward communism was a 'matter of internal policy which concerned the United Arab Republic alone.'"—N.Y. Times, Feb. 22, 1959.

No blame whatever should rest on the shoulders of the young, heroic, and revolutionary leadership of the Iraqi CP. The treachery that followed, and the blood bath still to come, are clearly the responsibility of Khrushchev and his Kremlin clique.

What the masses got

Iraqi Communists should have learned from the object lesson of the heroic Tudeh Party of Iran which in 1953 was in a similar situation, had even greater popular support, and had the presumed advantage of a common border with the last year). But what is news is that *this* straddling the fence between the counter-revolutionary military clique with the Shah, Pahlevi as their main symbol, and the workers and peasants, led by the Tudeh Party, then as now, the Kremlin (Stalin at that time) ordered *restraint*. Then followed so cruel and bloody a suppression of revolutionary workers and peasants that it would make the tortures of Batista seem humane by comparison.

The weeks and months that followed the July rising in Iraq saw a steady shift of power from the people back to the generals—from the workers and peasants back to the landlord-compradore bourgeoisie. This process came to a climax only last month when Kassem suppressed the workers' militia on the grounds that it was in competition to the "duly constituted government" of Iraq.

The militia submitted to this only because of Moscow's policy. And this was the handing over of the arms of the oppressed class to the oppressing class—the acme of class treachery, as Lenin taught. The blood bath in Iraq is still

to come. But there is time to reverse the course.

The Arabian revolution will not be downed. No fundamental problem of the workers and peasants has been solved—and the clique headed by Kassem is least able or willing to solve any such problem.

In this, the first issue of our paper, we express our pride in the heroic struggle unfolding in the Arab world, and send our warmest and most heartfelt greeting to the class-conscious workers and Communists still in the jails of Damascus and Cairo.

Success Story

A couple of weeks ago, Steven A. Carter, an Iowa boy of 19, landed his first job. This isn't news. Lots of 19-year-old boys are getting jobs every day (though not as many this year as last year). But what is news is that *this* boy's first job pays \$11,081 per year—that's \$213 a week, or \$5.32 an hour. Not bad for a kid just starting college! And there are a lot of disgruntled people who say America isn't the land of opportunity it used to be!

It might make you wonder if the 19-year-olds in New York City—the tens of thousands who work for \$1.00 to \$1.25 an hour in the sweatshops—just don't have the proper get-up-and-go about them. It might make you wonder why these boys don't "think big," like Steven A. Carter, and think \$5.32 an hour instead of \$1.00 an hour.

One of the secrets of Steven A. Carter's success is that he pleases his boss. In fact he pleases his boss so much, the boss says *publicly* that this boy is worth not \$11,081 but \$14,000 a year! (And it's a rare boss that admits he pays an employee *less* than he's worth!)

Of course, this boss happens to be the employee's father, U.S. Representative Steven V. Carter, who hired his son at government expense to work in his congressional office.

The Pursuit of Happiness

by Kitty Fisher

"The pursuit of happiness." . . . Did you ever puzzle over what those words mean? I have, because they always have seemed rather vague to me. Somehow, other pursuits are usually more clearly defined.

For instance, the corporations have the right to pursue profits if it takes them anywhere in the world. And the might of U.S. arms stands ready to enforce that pursuit. But does a worker really have the right to search for decent living and working conditions under capitalism? I think I found the answer in an item in the Buffalo Courier-Express of February 11.

This news story tells of a mother and her six children who were going to be "deported" to Florida by the Erie County Welfare Department. The woman, whose name wasn't released, has come to New York state and spent her summers as a cook in migrant labor camps for the last five years. Hard for a mother with six children? Almost impossible. The pay for migrant farm labor is probably the lowest of any industry. But the winters were even harder for this young woman. Then she would return home and was at the mercy of the State of Florida. The relief allowance there for this family of seven was \$81 a month. That comes to \$11.14 per person for a month's food, clothing and shelter.

This year she decided she couldn't go through another winter in Florida. So, in October, while the executives and their wives were flocking south to the beaches and the racetracks, she said

How to be safe

Notice printed on a factory bulletin board:

"Injuries as reported for the above departments have increased from a total of 19 in January 1958 to a total of 44 in January 1959. This is a percentage increase of 131% while the balance of the plant has shown an actual decrease.

"Unquestionably we are working at a higher tempo than we were in 1958. This presents more hazards but also demands greater caution on the part of each individual. We have definite safety rules which must be respected, etc. etc."

signed, "safety engineer"

A wisely anonymous worker wrote the following comment on the same sheet, below the above message, with a pencilled arrow pointing at the safety engineer's signature:

"The main reason for the increase in injuries is because we have increased our work output 100%. The only person who doesn't get injured is the person who doesn't do any work. He might get blisters on his —."

Doctor gives poison

Dr. Gunderson, president of the American Medical Society, was recently asked by a Congressional Committee about previous testimony that the Soviet Union was turning out twice as many doctors a year as this country. He said he didn't think the Russians were putting a high priority on medicine—and why not? Because—

"The Soviet Union channels its men of science into missile and other fields, with the result that its physicians are 90 per cent women," he said.

And of course the great number of Soviet *women* doctors, even if twice as many as the doctors in the United States, doesn't amount to a high priority! Nor does the American Medical Association put a high priority on medicine in *America* since it discourages half the population from being doctors at all.

Free enterprise abroad

Pepsi-Cola international's sales promotion manager is training route salesmen in the MAU MAU territory—N.Y. Herald Tribune.

Editorial Note

Our new paper, Workers World, will come out every month as a 4-page paper. We are compelled to make the present issue into 12 pages because we have a duty to make absolutely clear to the workers' movement just where we, a new party, stand on all the great questions now confronting mankind.

In future issues of our paper, we shall deal with more immediate problems of the workers and attempt to confine ourselves to no more than two or three articles of an international or highly political character.

Workers World will sell at ten cents a copy, subscriptions one dollar a year, bundle orders of ten or more at six cents apiece. Order from Workers World, 46 W. 21 St., New York, N.Y.

goodbye to her friends and relatives and moved to Buffalo, New York. Here, far from the palm trees and the sun-drenched segregated beaches, she hoped to find a slightly better life for her family.

But this is the winter of '58-'59. There are 65,000 workers unemployed in the Buffalo area, 12% of the labor force. What job can a mother of 6 children get, when there are plenty of single girls available with more education and experience? So she applied for welfare and received \$241 a month.

"Triple what the family received in Florida's welfare rolls," is the way the paper put it. Can she buy three times as much comfort with that money? Not with big heating bills, winter clothes for six kids and higher food prices. But even so, it meant a little more "happiness" for this family.

That is why, when the Welfare Department ordered her to return to Florida and graciously had the bus-tickets all ready, she refused to go. In line with their current drive to cut welfare rolls (at a time when unemployment is disastrously high) they refused her any help because she has relatives in Florida who could be prevailed upon to help support her. So, on Thursday, Feb. 12, when it was 8 degrees in Buffalo and 79 degrees in Miami, she gave up her welfare rights rather than return to Florida.

"The pursuit of happiness." . . . ? Perhaps. But the right to catch up with it? Not under capitalism.

Third International Founded Forty Years Ago

Forty years ago last week, the Communist International was founded, and held its first congress in Moscow, March 2nd to 6th, 1919. We doubt if much of a fuss or even mention of the anniversary will be made in Moscow, or anywhere else for that matter.

The founding of the Communist International was probably the most significant event in the postwar revolutionary epoch that followed in the wake of the great socialist October Revolution which gave rise to it, under the theoretical and political leadership of Lenin and Trotsky. It existed as a thoroughgoing revolutionary workers international only for the first four congresses—roughly to the time of Lenin's death. But its impact on the labor movement has been unequalled in history.

The degeneration of the Soviet Union under the leadership of Stalin, led to the decay of the International and the corruption of the world proletarian vanguard. But like the First and Second Internationals, it fulfilled a historical function. The final dissolution of the CI in 1943 was no more than a mere ceremonial deed as it had long ceased to be a revolutionary force, but acted, in the hands of Stalin, as a brake on the world

workers' movement.

We reproduce below extracts from the Manifesto of the Communist International to the Workers of the World, written by Leon Trotsky, and unanimously adopted by the Congress. We also reproduce the manifesto of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI) on the fall of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in August, 1919.

The crushing of the Hungarian Revolution of 1919 was hailed by the world bourgeoisie and their Social Democratic lackeys. This is in sharp contrast to the attitude of the world bourgeoisie and the various "Socialists" on the intervention of the Red Army against the Hungarian insurrection of 1956.

While the causes for the discontent of the Hungarian workers are safety and exclusively the responsibility of the Stalinist leadership, the insurrection fell completely under the leadership of bourgeois restorationist elements, composed of a bloc of the bourgeois Smallholders Party and the Social Democrats, both of which parties had pledged their lives in an agreement signed in 1943, to preserve bourgeois private property and the means of production.

From Founding Manifesto Of Third International

Seventy-two years ago the Communist Party proclaimed its program to the world in the form of a Manifesto written by the greatest heralds of the proletarian revolution, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Even at that time Communism no sooner entered the arena of struggle than it was beset by baiting, lies, hatred and persecution of the possessing classes who rightfully sensed their mortal enemy in Communism. The development of Communism during this three-quarters of a century proceeded along complex paths: side by side with periods of stormy upsurge it knew periods of decline; side by side with successes—cruel defeats. But essentially the movement proceeded along the path indicated in advance by the *Communist Manifesto*. The epoch of final, decisive struggle has come later than the apostles of the socialist revolution had expected and hoped. But it has come. We Communists, the representatives of the revolutionary proletariat of the various countries of Europe, America and Asia who have gathered in Soviet Moscow, feel and consider ourselves to be the heirs and consummators of the cause whose program was affirmed 72 years ago. Our task is to generalize the revolutionary experience of the working class, to purge the movement of the corroding admixture of opportunism and social-patriotism, to unify the efforts of all genuinely revolutionary parties of

the world proletariat and thereby facilitate and hasten the victory of the Communist revolution throughout the world."

If the First International envisaged the future course of development and indicated its path; if the Second International gathered and organized millions of workers; then the Third International is the International of open mass action, the International of revolutionary realization, the International of the deed.

Bourgeois world order has been sufficiently lashed by Socialist criticism. The task of the International Communist Party consists in overthrowing this order and erecting in its place the edifice of the socialist order. We summon the working men and women of all countries to unite under the Communist banner which is already the banner of the first great victories.

Workers of the World—in the struggle against imperialist barbarism, against monarchy, against privileged estates, against the bourgeois state and bourgeois property, against all kinds and forms of class or national oppression—*Unite!*

Under the banner of Workers' Soviets, under the banner of revolutionary struggle for power and the dictatorship of the proletariat, under the banner of the Third International—*Workers of the World Unite!*

Resolution on Hungary, 1919

Comrades!

The greatest treachery has been committed. The Soviet power in Hungary has collapsed under the pressure of the imperialist robbers and the monstrous treachery of the social-patriots. The leaders of the Second International, who supported the imperialist slaughter, broke the international protest strike. The imperialist robbers, led by Clemenceau and Wilson, have become quite shameless. The ultimatum they sent runs: "Overthrow the Soviet Government, and we will leave you in peace!"

The wholly despicable character of the former Social-Democratic Party has also been shown up. It swore fidelity to the proletarian dictatorship. It signed the agreement with the Communist Party of Hungary. Then it united with that party. At solemn meetings, at the congress of Soviets, at the party congress, it declared that it would fight to the last drop of blood for communism and the revolution. By uniting with the communists, it adhered to the Third, Communist International.

That party now carries the mark of Cain on its forehead. It has sold out the proletariat, the revolution, the glorious party of Hungarian communists, the International. By concluding a secret treaty with the Versailles murderers and with their own counter-revolutionaries, supported by the gold of the imperialists and the bayonets of the executioners, it overthrew the government of the communist proletariat. These "true socialists" are now restoring private property. The League of Nations Powers are each sending a regiment to support them. At the head of the government stands Peidl, a murderer of workers, the Hungarian Noske.

The treacherous character of the social-patriots has been exposed. Just as the Scheidemanns and Kautskys in Germany drowned the proletarian revolution in blood, just as the social-revolutionaries and mensheviks are objectively helping the Tsarist generals, just as the entire yellow Berne international is selling out the working class, wholesale and retail, to the predatory "League of

The Long Hard Winter

by Theodore Kovalsky

It's a long, hard winter, and spring is slow coming.

Out of the dead gray sky the snow lashes down like chips of despair. Morning is gray, and afternoon is gray too until the grayness thickens into dusk, spotted forlornly with street lamps.

Under the grayness and the snow, looming hard and unyielding in the wind, the armory stands like a huge, sinister rock, and into an opening in this rock, a long black snake is making its way, almost without movement. Almost without motion the long, black snake lies coiled, its length dragging a thin line across the sifted snow.

Draw closer. The black length of the snake breaks into particles, and you see them, separate individuals, human beings, men and women and children, standing patient and wretched in the wind and the snow and the cold. They are patient, for they have no need to hurry. Poor in most ways, some of them truly destitute, they are rich in time. No job calls to them. No one urges speed. If they come here or if they do not, it is all the same. If they live or if they die the workings of the capitalist system will not speed up or falter. For they stand a little to one side of the stream of life. Their faces are pinched with cold. They stamp in the snow, rub their hands and hug their bodies to bring warmth or the illusion of warmth. And they wait. Time passes over their heads, and the wind and the snow come down.

Follow the line as it inches into the building through the massive doors and down the steps into a vast room. The faces relax. Nobody stamps anymore. The wind howls but stays outside. The living cold no longer tears at the waiting people, but the dead cold of the great room lies down upon them. And patiently, almost without motion they move forward, moving as the line moves.

High above them, diffident shafts of gray light droop from window slits. Beside them crouch the tanks.

It is strange to see the tanks. They crouch like sleeping monsters in a row, silent, inert dragons. The waiting people know what the tanks can do. They know they can rush and wheel in snarling action. They know that flame and death can leap from those long snouts. The people look a moment with awe. But the dragons sleep, and the people pass on. Some of them think, "Here we are. We have nothing. We come here for food, 'surplus' food so that we do not starve. And we must pass these instruments of death which have cost a thousand fortunes to create. And more of them are being created daily. And we have nothing and wait in line for our dole of flour and powdered milk. . . ." And they pass on.

The line curves past great heaps of bags and boxes. Patiently, resignedly the people show their cards. Each receives his butter, his meal, his box of bitter powdered milk. It is food, and it will keep them alive, so they come and get it. But they receive it without joy. Only one thing is really good: the cheese. Only the cheese gives them some of the protein their bodies need, since they receive no meat and can afford to buy none.

But there has been a change. Now there is no cheese! Temporarily or permanently—who can tell which?—no cheese will be given out. A woman begins to argue. Her voice rises, and her face swells with indignation. Her eyes glare with rage and frustration. But the men giving out the packages shrug their shoulders. They only work there. They don't make up the lists. What do you want from them? The woman's anger is defeated, drains away leaving helplessness, hopelessness. The line moves on, then breaks up, each member going his own way, head bowed against the darkening wind.

It's a long, hard winter, and spring is slow coming. The people hurry now, clutching their shopping bags in numbed fingers. The snow stings the flesh like flying splinters of pain, stultifying thought. They see, they feel only the winter. Spring is long coming.

Nations," so the Hungarian social-traitors have surrendered the Hungarian Soviet Republic, the pride of the world proletariat, to be torn to pieces.

There is no place in the Third International for the provocateurs and paid hangmen of capital!

The Communist International, mourning the fall of the Soviet Republic in Hungary and the loss of its glorious leader Tibor Szamuely, calls on the proletarians of the world to rally still more closely under the communist banner, to strengthen still more the offensive against the fortress of capital.

In the greatest historical struggle of our day there will be great victories and cruel defeats. But the bloody experience of Finland and Siberia has shown us that in countries where once the Soviets have had power no lasting victory of the counter-revolution is possible. Everywhere the waves of insurrection are rising. Our final victory is as inevitable as the fall of the bourgeoisie and the social-traitors.

The Communist International calls on the Hungarian proletariat to stand firm in courage and fortitude. To work, Comrades! Start at once the organization of an illegal communist party. The bloody lesson of Hungary has taught the entire world proletariat that there can be no coalition, no compromise, with the social compromisers! The stratum of opportunists contemptible leaders must be swept away. New men must come to the head of the movement. They will come from the working class. For it is to them and not their enemies that victory is assigned.

Soviet Hungary has fallen—long live Soviet Hungary!

Long live the Hungarian Communist Party!

Long live the workers' revolution of the world!!

Long live communism!

Berlin Should Belong To East German Workers

(Continued from page 1)

still lying beneath the new social foundations of the East. The ousting of the capitalist island in the DDR is a prime prerequisite for the future forward march of the workers cause.

Workers' gains at stake

Any union member, even the most politically backward worker can readily understand this situation. It's similar to that in a fully organized factory with one hold-out non-union department. No union could tolerate the existence of one open shop department within an organized plant. Sooner or later the union would be broken in the plant or else the department would have to be organized.

The plans of U.S. capitalists for Germany are clear-cut. All wings of the two capitalist parties have a common aim and only slight tactical differences. They want to reverse the process of social revolution in the DDR. They want to unify Germany under the hegemony of the German capitalists. Maintaining a foothold in Berlin is only a part of their overall aim. The debate on policy over Berlin in the circles of the ruling class boils down to the negligible differences of opinion whether representatives of the two Germanies should sit in on the proposed Foreign Ministers Conference or not. Dulles wants to keep it all to the decisions of the Big Four (U.S., Great Britain, and France versus the Soviet Union). Senator Mansfield wants to draw the representatives of the two German governments into the discussion.

The initiative in opening the Pandora's Box of Berlin at this time came from the Kremlin. Khrushchev's proposal to give the DDR the right to control access to Berlin and his proposal that all foreign troops are to be withdrawn from Berlin, opened up the debate again. Both of these proposals

are progressive and deserve all-out support. But there is reason to suspect that this proposal by the Kremlin is but the opening gambit in a maneuver to force a negotiated European Security Agreement designed to commit the major powers to the preservation of a status quo. Past indications are that the Kremlin considers the DDR and the interests of the German workers as expendable quantities in such a deal. More than once the spokesmen of the Kremlin have flirted with the idea of a reunified, neutral and capitalist Germany.

What is the deal?

Even this time, although Khrushchev has given promises that the Soviet Union will stand by the DDR, there are overtones of this grand sell-out in the proposals of the Kremlin diplomats. The withdrawal of all troops, the disengagement of the two Germanies from both NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the banning of nuclear weapons in both parts of Germany and the constantly repeated proposal to negotiate a Confederation, all suggested items for the agenda of the 28 power conference Khrushchev counterposes to Dulles' Big Four conference, give revolutionary workers much reason for the greatest vigilance.

What can Confederation mean for two Germanies with diametrically opposed social systems? Either Confederation will be a facade, a paper front behind which the class struggle will continue to rage as before, or it would mean the imposition of one of the two social systems on the other. Either the revolution in property relations that has been carried through in the DDR would be extended to the larger and more powerful West Germany, or the capitalist counter-revolution would triumph in the DDR. The acute danger still remains that the Kremlin is prepared to throw the DDR to the wolves in return for the promise of a disarmed, neutral (and inevitably capitalist) Germany, and a negotiated European Security Agreement. At this writing it seems to be holding firm.

Such a deal would sacrifice the real social advances of the DDR to paper promises that a united capitalist Germany would stay neutral. It would benefit neither the world working class nor the Soviet Union. All the signatures of all of the capitalist foreign ministers at the proposed 28 power conference would not change the nature of the anti-Soviet drive of the German capitalist class; nor would the signing of a European "Security" Agreement permit the Soviet Union and the workers states to lower their guard or to save one single cent on disarmament. Such promises to live peacefully side by side with the revolution are easily given by the capitalists and just as easily broken.

Capitalists only respect power

There is not a class conscious worker who would believe that the nature of capitalist imperialism can be altered by a signature to a contract to co-existence. Yet the Kremlin bureaucrats, just like ordinary mush-headed American labor bureaucrats who trust in the promises of Wall Street office boys in the U.S. Government, are basing all their plans on the hope of getting the same kind of promises from Wall Street's international department.

Revolutionary communists must first push for the ousting of the capitalist armies from Berlin, then they must demand that all foreign troops be withdrawn from German soil, and must remain on guard that these demands not be bartered away by the Kremlin in return for worthless capitalist promises to co-exist with the workers' states.

The "Militant's" position

What is the position of the Militant, organ of the Socialist Workers Party, on the Berlin crisis? An article on January 5 succeeds in filling much space without taking any stand on the conflict that threatens Berlin.

Of course it has some harsh words for the U.S. State Department, and it clearly indicates the importance of Berlin to the anti-Soviet planners in the Pentagon, but it hastens to distribute with high impartiality, the "blame" for the present Cold War, on both the ca-

COLD WAR CONTRADICTION

Ben Gurion, Prime Minister of Israel and enthusiastic supporter of the West against the Soviet Union, is less than enthusiastic about the Western choice for Nobel Prize.

Dr. Zhivago "is one of the most despicable books about Jews ever written," he says.

SOVIET CONTRADICTION

Why did the Soviet authors' five thousand word rejection of "Dr. Zhivago" published in Novy Mir, fail to mention the book's anti-Semitism?

pitalist powers and the workers' states. It virtuously castigates both for turning Germany into the focal point of the Cold War by "carving up" this area after the war.

Now that the Militant editors have apportioned the blame to their own satisfaction, we would like to know if they are going to wash their hands of it all? What kind of revolutionary workers' paper is this, that comments and analyzes without clearly taking a stand or a side at the very moment when the ruling class of its "own" country threatens to send tanks rolling, and planes flying, to maintain its position in Berlin by force and open aggression.

Don't we have a right to know just where the Socialist Workers Party is going to stand if and when the U.S. makes good its threat to blast a path to Berlin? If the conflict breaks out, it will be necessary to say openly we support the Soviet Union and the DDR. It will not be possible to hide behind the platonic reaffirmation that it is "up to the German workers" to solve the problems of Germany.

The Militant is being slightly less than honest about the German question when it fails to make clear that Khrushchev has already raised the slogan for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from German soil. For years the revolutionary left has demanded that all troops should be pulled out of the Germanies. The Militant just fails to notice that this is actually one of the demands which Khrushchev makes at this time. The Militant is so anxious not to be identified with the Kremlin that it fails to notice that Khrushchev himself is calling for the withdrawal of all foreign troops. Our duty in this situation is to make certain by the mobilization of world working class strength that the Kremlin does not weaken in these demands, that Khrushchev does not bargain them away in the course of the coming negotiations, if they take place at all.

To our own ruling class we must say: we will not support your counter revolutionary plans for Berlin and Germany. To the workers of the DDR we say: be bold and courageous and don't let your achievements be bargained away at the conference table. Our duty here is to demand the immediate withdrawal of the 10,000 man garrison from West Berlin. Not one U.S. worker shall spill his blood to keep Berlin capitalist.

Ike, the bond salesman—

"Maintenance of a 'sound dollar' the President said, requires action by many individuals and groups. . . .

"The President said that without continued sales of savings bonds the debt management of the Treasury would become 'well-nigh impossible.' Continued sales, he declared, require confidence in the dollar."

New York Times, Feb. 26

From a Memo To the SWP (Aug. 18, 1958)

Benjamin Davis, a Negro leader of the Communist Party, is running on an independent ticket (People's Rights Party) for State Senator in Harlem. This provides us with an opportunity to make a special appeal to Negro militants and to potential revolutionists among the CP ranks. We can implement this opportunity by utilizing the Bolshevik tactic of *critical support*.

"Critical support" in this case means that we can criticize the CP's de facto support of the Democrats, while we help to mobilize workers behind Ben Davis against both Democrats and Republicans. We can make known our suspicion that the motivation for the whole Davis campaign is to cover up the CP's basic support to the Democrats, and its sabotage of the Independent Socialist Ticket. At the same time we can show that a heavy vote for Davis for State Senator would be repudiation of the CP's own class-collaborationist line in the gubernatorial election.

"Critical support" also means that we can criticize the CP's basic pacifist and class-collaborationist world political line. We can subject the CP to a withering Trotskyist criticism, while at the same time we can point out that a vote for Davis is a break with the capitalist parties. Ben Davis is an outstanding victim of the class war. We can hail him as such, while at the same time we can prove that he can't conduct the class war while remaining in the Communist Party. . . .

This tactic would tend to counteract the poison that the CP has been spreading about Trotskyist "anti-Sovietism"—particularly if we explain that the CP's defense of the Soviet Union is of a petty-bourgeois, utopian character—that we support Davis for his wish to defend the Soviet Union, but not for his conservative, pacifist, Stalinist method of defense.

In short, the tactic would enable us to take the offensive against the CP on both the organizational and political fields. It would reduce the prestige of the CP leadership with the CP ranks and at the same time raise our own prestige as the genuine communists.

Among other methods of implementation, we might take a full page ad in the National Guardian.

Workers' Story

According to the conservative Bureau of Labor Statistics, there were 4,700,000 unemployed people in the month of January. This is the highest official figure for any January since 1941.

And U.S. industry is now producing nearly as much as it produced in the bonanza period of 1957 before the "recession" began. How much do they have to produce, and how many billions do they have to "earn" before they can put the unemployed back to work?

Bosses' Story

If a smart capitalist shopper had bought \$79,000 worth of General Motors stock in 1947 and held it until today, he would have made as much profit as ten GM workers were paid in wages during that whole period from then until now.

That is, his original \$79,000 would now amount, with all the dividend, stock splits, and increased values, to almost half a million dollars.

1956 Bulletin on Hungary

reprinted!

"Class Nature of the Hungarian Uprising"

by V. Grey

35 cents

"The Global Class Struggle"

(with a new introduction)

by Sam Marcy

35 cents

Order from

WORKERS WORLD
46 West 21st Street
New York 10, N. Y.

In Our Next Issue:

Black Nationalism and White Chauvinism by SAM MARCY

Also . . .

FROM THE TWENTIETH CONGRESS TO THE TWENTY-FIRST