

WORKERS WORLD

Vol. 2, No. 11

222

JUNE 1, 1960

TEN CENTS

March on Capitol Makes History in Atlanta

Atlanta, May 17 — Thousands of student youth, joined by hundreds of adults, marched in this city's biggest demonstration against segregation. Radio and TV announced that the march was taking place, drawing huge crowds to the capitol.

(There were demonstrations throughout the whole country on May 17, the anniversary of the Supreme Court's 1954 decision against school segregation. They were called by NAACP and labor groups. Similar groups called this one, but never expected such a big turnout in this deep South city, and were themselves unprepared for it!)

In spite of all sorts of obstacles and mishaps (which included the Uncle Tom over-caution of certain adult advisers), it was a day of glory and good feeling for Negro liberation fighters.

Nearly a thousand of the marching mass, it is true, were turned from the goal of the capitol by the police. But many hundreds of others did reach the capitol grounds and stayed there in spite of the warning from city officials to the college presidents that "the situation looked very tense."

If the situation was "tense," it was from the threats of city police and state troopers especially mobilized for the occasion. The white working people of Atlanta generally seemed undisturbed. And in fact many whites at the capitol held babies in their arms. Hardly the kind of action of people expecting to participate in a race riot!

However, it was reported that E. L. Edwards, head of the U.S. Klans, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, was in the crowd. This should be duly noted.

If this was true, Mr. Edwards got an eyeful. He didn't have good news to report to his sheeted friends tonight, no matter what dirty work he might be planning. And he certainly didn't get any new "pledges" on May 17 for the pillow case fraternity!

Revolutionary Students in Japan

Once again the militant students of Tokyo have heroically protested the United States policy of making Japan a footstool for war on China.

On May 23, about 1,000 students under the leadership of the militant Zengakuren, sang the *Internationale* and chanted slogans of peace and socialism outside the home of Prime Minister Kishi across from the Japanese Parliament.

The new U.S.-Japanese Treaty they were protesting has opened a

Spy Plane Exposed Capitalists' War Plans—So—

Now They're Staging Phony 'Policy Debate'

Stevenson and Kennedy Righteously Ask Spy Inquiry

By V. Grey

The biggest mistake an American worker can make is to think that the Democratic politicians want to investigate the spy plane incident in order to stop the Republicans from going to war.

It is *Wall Street itself* that is stage managing the phony national "debate" in order to distract attention from their stepped-up war preparations.

A section of the capitalist class is exploiting the honest anti-war sentiments of the masses and replying to the tremendous opposition to the spy planes with cynical, fraudulent, election-campaign ballyhoo.

Stevenson and Kennedy — and that great "liberal" Republican, Nelson Rockefeller—are getting on the "peace" bandwagon and heading straight down the road to war!

The only differences among these gentlemen are over how best to deceive the masses, how best to keep them in chains, and how best to drive them to war.

The prettiest proof of this that we have seen in many a day is this: They are going to have their great hearing about the American military's biggest war provocation *behind closed doors—behind the backs of the American people!*

Eyes of Colored Masses Are on Negro Labor Convention

The founding convention of the Negro American Labor Council meets in Detroit on May 27-29. The Council idea is a big step in the right direction for Negro labor. But the convention will have to take up more concrete matters than the broad generalities so far announced if there are to be any further steps.

The whole reason for being of the Negro Labor Council is to fight for equality on the job for Negro workers. All the rest is window dressing.

Among the speakers listed to address the convention are George Harrison and Walter Reuther.

George Harrison is president of the lily-white Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks. He has no right to be at such a convention except to announce a full and dynamic program of integration in the union he leads.

Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers AFL-CIO, as well as head of the old CIO, has for years resisted electing a Negro member to the

Executive Board of the Auto Workers. He will of course make a "fighting," flamboyant speech at the convention. But if A. Philip Randolph lets him get off the platform without even bringing up this disgraceful fact, he will be in effect abdicating the leadership the Negro workers expect from him.

(It will not be possible to gain job equality for the average Negro auto worker, if the great mass of Negro members of the UAW cannot get one single representative on their union's Executive Board.)

George Meany arrogantly asked Randolph last fall: "Who the hell appointed you the representative of the Negro union members?"

Now Adam Clayton Powell says that when this convention elects Randolph as president of the new Council, that will be the crushing answer to Meany. Powell is right. Randolph has a hundred times more right to represent the Negro membership than Meany even without the election.

But with the convention of the Negro American Labor Council, we are in a new stage of the struggle. Now we shall see how Randolph represents as well as whom.

The Negro workers are the most oppressed section of the American working class. A convention that represents them truly will have to break with the policies of the corporations and the corporations' Democratic and Republican stooges. It will have to break with the Reuther-Meany policies of collaboration with the bosses.

Let us also hope that it declares its solidarity with the struggling African masses and with the Cuban Revolution.

Balance of Terror — ?

According to the hard-boiled "realist" school of capitalist thinking, World War III is not upon us because there is a "balance of terror."

That is, both the Soviet Union and the United States each have enough atomic and hydrogen bombs to devastate the world several times over, and therefore neither one nor the other wants to start a war which would end in its own destruction.

According to this way of thinking, the best insurance against war is in the

Sane Nuclear Policy

—And now they're working on the most "efficient" bomb of all. It's the *Neutron Bomb*. Won't hurt a brick in Wall Street. It just disintegrates people.

addition of more and more atomic bombs, etc., and newer instruments of destruction in the interests of keeping the terror in balance.

Mad as this thinking might appear, there is a counterpart of it among the well-meaning pacifist liberals and even many radicals.

These people think that the capitalists would never start a war because they would be virtually committing suicide. If this were really true, then it would indeed be correct to plead for more atomic bombs, not less! If this were really true, the capitalists could be depended upon to prevent war in the interest of saving their own lives.

But it is not true.

The capitalists are driven to war by the needs of their outlived, and now insane, economic system of exploitation. The only way to prevent them from making war is for the working class to disarm them and destroy their power to make war by abolishing their system.

U.S. Refuses Arms to Castro But Sold Plenty to Batista!

Cuba needs arms to defend itself against the assaults of counterrevolution. But it cannot get them from the United States.

However, the United States sold planes to the bloody Batista dictatorship, 500-pound bombs (which Batista dropped on Cuban cities and towns), and even Sherman Tanks.

According to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, "These arms were used against the Cuban people with the full knowledge of the American military mission and the American Embassy. Still no protest of any kind was made to Batista."

Batista was an outright stooge of the United States sugar and fruit capitalists. He was carrying out the policies of U.S. imperialism, keeping wages low and profits high. So Batista got the U.S. arms.

The Castro government is *not* a stooge government. It opposes the dictatorship of the American United Fruit Company and the Wall Street sugar interests. It tries to give the land to those who work on it. So Castro does *not* get U.S. arms.

Doesn't this prove that the U.S. government is nothing but the executive committee of the capitalist class?

Labor Support

New York City—Over 15,000 workers demonstrated here on May 17 to show their solidarity with the Southern sitdown movement.

The rally, held in the garment-manufacturing district of the city, was called by the New York Central Trades and Labor Council. It marked a new high in labor support.

Sidney Poitier and Harry Belafonte accompanied union leaders on the platform.

WORKERS WORLD

Editorial office:

46 W. 21st Street, New York, N.Y.

Telephone: AL 5-0352

Editor: Vincent Copeland
Manager: Dorothy Ballan

Vol 2, No. 11 — June 1, 1960

TROTSKY

Published Twice Monthly

LENIN

Crisis Pushes Stocks UP!

Big business made billions on the Summit crisis. War stocks started to go up *some days before* the Summit was called.

As the New York Times market analyst said on May 13: "Much of the strength of the market . . . stemmed from customers' realization that *peace was not likely to break out* at the Summit Conference."

And after the actual end of the Conference for which they blamed Khrushchev, the Herald-Tribune financial expert wrote the following on May 18:

"Mr. K wrote the market letter and got an immediate response in a spirited demand for airplane and defense-associated issues that turned what has been an irregular stock market into a sprightly one.

. . . There must be a few capitalists who went home last night with smiles on their faces."

—Quite a few, as a matter of fact!

Rosenbergs and Sobell

In their embarrassment for the recent spy plane incident, many newspapers started raking over the ashes to find some stories of Soviet spies.

Some even went so far as to publish pictures of the martyred Rosenbergs and gave the impression that there was no question at all about the Rosenbergs' guilt.

The Rosenbergs were accused of giving the Soviet Union the "secret" of the atomic bomb. But nowadays most high school students of science know that the "secret" is available to any country that has the productive system capable of producing the bomb. Moreover, by 1953, the year that the Rosenbergs were executed, the Soviet Union was graduating considerably more scientific engi-

neers than was the United States.

The Rosenbergs were electrocuted during the Korean War at the height of the McCarthy witch-hunt. They were never heard by the Supreme Court and never even allowed a re-trial when new evidence was discovered by their defense.

Morton Sobell, who was convicted along with the Rosenbergs in the same trial, on even flimsier evidence, is still alive in Atlanta Federal Penitentiary.

It is easy to see why U.S. capitalism is so determined not to give him a new trial or make any move that would be interpreted as believing in his innocence.

The innocence of Sobell would point immediately to the innocence of the Rosenbergs.

Charity for Segregation

John D. Rockefeller, Jr. was a "great benefactor of the Negro people," says Jet Magazine.

He donated over \$6 million to Negro institutions during his lifetime. He gave \$537,000 to Hampton Institute, \$501,000 to Tuskegee and \$5,240,000 to the Negro College Fund.

(His father built and endowed Laura

Spelman College, and gave other grants besides.)

Rockefeller also gave many millions to all-white universities in the South. If he was really such a "great benefactor" of the Negroes, why didn't he tell the white universities they couldn't have his money unless they admitted Negro students?

Algeria and the Summit

Buried in all the bombast about the Summit was the news that the revolutionary Algerians requested the Summit conferees to take up the question of their freedom from France.

The way things stood before the U-2 spy plane incident and the subsequent blow-up (which imperialism really wanted), this request didn't stand the chance of a snowball in the desert.

But now things are different. The pundits are already betting that the Soviet Union may emulate China and recognize the Algerian Provisional Government and send heavy shipments of war materials.

Considering that Khrushchev has already climbed down considerably on the Berlin issue, this is not as probable as we would like it to be. *But it is possible.* Trust imperialism to put the pressure on so that the Soviet leadership will have to aid the colonial struggle in its own interest.

That goes for the whole African liberation struggle, too. Britain and France had openly talked about getting an agreement at the Summit *not* to send arms to Africa. Now the agreement is off.

However, Khrushchev may still be very unwilling to arm the African revolutionists, because he still *hopes* for an agreement with imperialism.

The workers cannot take it for granted that Khrushchev will automatically turn to a revolutionary policy because he has come to a dead-end in his policy of conciliation. But the very existence of the Soviet Union as a workers state must compel its leadership at one point or another to aid the struggling colonial people.

Summit or no Summit, every honest worker must demand that the Soviet Union recognize fighting Algeria and arm the African revolution.

MAIL BAG

Truman Doctrine

Editor, Workers World:

Our ex-President, Harry S. Truman, says: ". . . any invasion of private rights would give aid and comfort to segregationists and provide them not only with an excuse to prolong their resistance to integration, but would afford them the excuse to invade the private rights of Negroes."

Mr. Truman, our girls can't walk on the streets without being bothered by loud-mouthed white men. When our boys go out for the evening, the fear they may mess up with some white hoodlums and end up like Emmett Till is with us until they are home safe again. A lot of whites' idea of fun is

to break up a colored party or social affair. Just what private rights of Negroes were you thinking of, Mr. Truman?

Segregationists haven't needed any excuse for segregation for a hundred years. We're trying as hard as we know how to give them an "excuse" to shorten it.

So "common sense and good will" will solve the race problem! We haven't seen much of either from the leaders of the white South. Your kind have "solved" the problem your way for a long time. Now we're trying to solve it *our* way. Your way has made the South rotten with low wages and ignorance for colored and white. Our way is the way of the South that is to be.

Think that over on your morning walk, Mr. Truman!

South Carolina Mother

High Price Paid For Cuban Sugar

Actually Lines Wall Street's Pockets

The United States capitalists all hate the new regime in Cuba.

Then why do they give Cuba a higher price for its sugar than they give other countries? Why do Senators from sugar states in the South or sugar-beet states in the West encounter such a blank wall in Congress when they demand that this subsidy to Cuba be taken away?

For the simple reason that the bulk of "Cuban" sugar is still processed by Wall-Street-owned mills in Cuba.

The eight largest U.S. sugar corporations in Cuba (far larger than the Louisiana interests etc.) usually make over 20 per cent a year profits. And even with most of their lands taken over by the Cuban government

and run by co-operatives, they will now still have control of the sugar crop through their possession of the mills. If they can force the newly independent farmers to take a low enough price for the raw sugar, they will still make something close to their old profits—if the U.S. sugar subsidy continues.

It will only be when the Cuban workers really expropriate the American sugar billionaires and take over the mills, the docks and railroads, etc., that the U.S. government will withdraw the higher sugar price for "Cuba."

Until that time, the worker-consumer of the U.S. will continue to subsidize Wall Street's Cuban sugar companies.

Castro, Communism, and the SWP

Which Side Are You On?

There are two kinds of defenders of the Cuban Revolution.

The first kind defend it because the Cuban struggle against imperialism is part of the struggle for a workers world and for Communism.

The second kind defend it only insofar as it is *not* Communist.

Among this second group is the opportunist Socialist Workers Party.

Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary of the SWP, said in a broadcast reported in the Militant of May 9:

"I found no evidence that Cuba is a Communist-dominated regime as has been charged. On the contrary, my impression was that the Communist Party has been essentially by-passed in the revolution—that the leaders in the revolution are men and women indigenous to the Latin American scene. . . ."

This is the statement of a man who obviously thinks Castro-ism is *better* than Communism. It is the statement of a man who thinks the Communists of Cuba are *not* "indigenous." (Russian agents, perhaps?) This statement is a not-so-subtle attack on Communism itself. It is a *safe* way to "support" the Cuban revolution, a way that will commend itself to all liberals, humanists and petty bourgeois "men of good will"—but certainly not to the revolutionary workers of the world.

Was this an accidental formulation of words in the flurry of replying to a red-baiting radio announcer? No. For in the Militant of April 18, we find in a prepared statement by the same author, the following words:

"Not once, but dozens of times, I was told (in Cuba) that although a Communist party exists in Cuba, the country has not gone 'Communist.' They meant by this that Cuba has 'no totalitarian government, no concentration camps.' Instead, I was repeatedly told, Cuba enjoys freedom of thought and expression to an extent heretofore unknown."

Whatever "they" meant by "Communists," it is clear that Farrell Dobbs prefers a state run by the bourgeois-nationalist Castro to a workers' state run by the Communist Party. Dobbs often criticizes the Communist Party for its lack of democracy. But he has never once criticized it for not aiming to take the state power in Cuba!

The pity of all this is that it is *just because* the "country has not gone Communist," that the very limited gains of the revolution are still in great jeopardy. (This of course, does not occur to the Communist Party itself. Nor does it bother our "Socialist," who so innocently equates Communism with "concentration camps.")

The truth is that imperialism still has the power to make a come-back in Cuba precisely *because there is no Communism in Cuba*. There are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of factories, railroads, docks, etc., built by underpaid Cuban labor and the materials paid for with the super-profits bled out of previous generations of Cuban labor. There can be no freedom in Cuba while these still belong to capitalism.

Is it too much to expect Farrell Dobbs to call for their expropriation without compensation and operation under the control of the Cuban workers? Apparently it is! Nowhere in the hundred-or-so columns the SWP has published recently on Cuba, can you find such a "Communist" thought!

The Dobbs statement ends on this note:

"America cannot afford the reactionary policy the State Department is following in relation to Cuba. We need a radical change and we need it now."

This is now a common type of language in the Militant. Its editors have learned, like the CP leaders they attack, to appeal to "Americans" rather than to *workers*, to advise, capitalist "America" what it can "afford," and refer to the capitalist state as "we."

A major editorial in the same issue of the Militant ends as follows:

"As Americans interested in truth, the good name of our country and the welfare of mankind, hasn't it become the duty of each one of us to examine where we stand on Cuba?" . . .

"Are we on the side of tyranny or liberty? Let's make our position known!"

* * *

As workers interested in *class truth*, in the good name of *Marxism* and the welfare of the *working class*, we would like to ask the supporters of the SWP:

Are you on the side of *capitalism* or *Communism*? Make your position known!

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

A 6 mo. sub to WORKERS WORLD for only \$1.00 — 1 yr. for \$2.00.

Fill in coupon and mail to:

Workers World, 46 W. 21st St., N.Y. 10, N.Y.

NAME

STREET

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

Defense Guards Needed In South To Insure Peaceful Voting For All

McCormick County, South Carolina, has only four Negroes "qualified to vote." There are 2,625 Negroes of voting age and 2,077 whites.

The last colored person that dared to vote there before this year, Rev. Archie Ware, was nearly killed when he tried it in 1948. He was 66 years old at that time.

In nearby Edgfield County and Greenfield County, men have been shot and tortured for attempting to vote.

The new Civil Rights Law is supposed to protect the rights of Negroes to register and vote. The federal government is making mild inquiries to "find out" what the trouble is in these areas where the colored actually outnumber the white.

The trouble is all too clear.

The capitalist class of the South rules mainly by the trick of "white suprem-

acy," that is by keeping the Negro down and telling the poor white he is "superior" to the Negro.

Under this system no Negro can be allowed to hold office, and especially when the Negroes outnumber the whites, Negroes cannot be allowed to vote.

That is why the new law is going to prove to be a fraud in McCormick County and a lot of other counties in the South.

Martin Luther King's plan for non-violent voting protests for Negroes this fall may work in some areas where the Negro vote is not decisive. But in McCormick County, there will be a struggle.

Negroes will need armed protection if they vote in such places as McCormick County. Now would be the best time to begin organizing interracial Civil Rights Defense Guards so there can be peaceful voting in the fall.

China Shakes The Youngstown Vindicator

By Mose Peterson

An editorial in the Youngstown Vindicator succeeds in 'Vindicating' Trotsky's frequent emphatic statement that "Revolution is the locomotive of History."

Speaking for the dead 'Teddy' Roosevelt, the Vindicator pointed out that this politician for American Imperialism coined the word "Chinafication" as a symbol of weakness and atrophy and helplessness. "What," the Vindicator asks, "would be his feelings if, reincarnated, he could see the China we now know?" Then the Vindicator goes on to say this about Revolutionary China—

"A China being pushed and prodded into a new life! A China being transformed into one of the four principal steel-producing nations of the world! A China where weakness and atrophy and helplessness are being swept away by driving initiative and dynamic strength

and terrifying aggressiveness. And, to cap it all, a China reaching out even into Latin America, Roosevelt's pet foreign sphere of influence, which he used to steer and shape—at which, when it displeased him, he used to read the riot act and brandish the Big Stick." . . . "Some U.S. Government officials . . . reported that Red China was likely to become 'a major military and industrial power before the end of the present decade.'

"A fine prospect," mourns the Vindicator, "for the whole world, including Latin America. . . ."

"So that's 'Chinafication' in our era," concludes the Vindicator. "Surely, if Roosevelt could return to life and compare what it was with what it is, would not his flashing eyes become clouded with unbelief—would not his fists, in his stupefaction, drop, unclenched and limp, to his sides? And would not what he had to say crackle and sizzle—assuming, that is, HE COULD SAY ANYTHING AT ALL!"

We should thank this Capitalist newspaper for the unintended tribute to the Chinese revolution and with this unqualified endorsement by the enemy class, we will redouble our efforts to bring the same benefits to American soil.

Congolese Struggle To Oust Belgian Imperialists

By Eleanor Stephens

On the eve of the elections that "will lead to independence," the Congo is seething with revolt against Belgian capitalist rule. Belgian authority is crumbling away. Thousands defy the ban that forbids more than five to gather in a public place, and Belgian officials cower in fear of their lives. In city and village rings the cry, "Uhuru" — "Freedom!"

Why are the black peoples of the Congo in revolt just at the moment when "freedom" and "independence" are within their grasp?

By the end of June 2,000,000 African Congolese are expected to vote for their own representatives to their own parliament. And none of the 115,000 Belgian settlers there will have a single vote in these elections.

Doesn't this mean the Belgian rulers are bending over backwards to give the Congolese a fair deal?

No, it doesn't!

It means only that the wily Belgian overlords (following in the footsteps of their British cousins) intend to grant the form of independence while keeping the essential reins of power in their own hands.

The Congolese army of black men is officered by Belgian white men — from the corporals up to the commanding general. And the Belgian capitalists mean to keep it that way—elections or no elections. But the people of the Congo know they can't be free while their exploiters are in command of every gun and bayonet in their land—and they mean to change it—NOW!

The Belgian rulers intend to continue the policy of "divide and rule" they have employed ever since King Leopold seized this fabulously rich land in 1876. They intend, by giving a few land grants here, a few soft jobs there, to keep on setting one tribe against another, one province against another, the army against the police and the police against the workers and peasants.

But the people of the Congo have learned how that trick works, too. And they are striving for a national leadership—a leadership that will weld their

tribal and regional loyalties into a structure of steel — the Congo Nation!

The successful struggle for a nation—in the Congo as in all colonies of imperialism, can only take place because

of the dynamic force of the class struggle. The African working class, as it drives out the imperialists, is at the same time marching on the road to the world socialist revolution.

Fighting to Get Belgium Out of the Congo



These are Belgian Congo Workers fighting for their freedom in Leopoldville last year. Struggle is still raging.

Simple—Isn't It?

Dr. Thomas P. Melady says that "Africa is in direct line for Communist conquest," according to the New York Courier.

He said that "a well-known Bishop in Nigeria believes that the next 25 years will determine whether Africa will be Christian (i.e. dominated by Christian capitalists—Ed.) or Communist."

"If the good doctor and the good bishop want to stop Communism in Africa, let them (1) raise the wages of the Africans to the level of the Russians, (2) create an Africa for the Africans as China is for the Chinese.

Prosperity?

According to no less an authority than David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers, AFL-CIO, 10,000 steelworkers' jobs were "closed out" by automation last year.

And this is prosperity, don't forget!

Publishing Date

Our present issue of June 1 is out early. Being a twice-monthly, we shall publish again on June 17 (thus leaving a lapse of three weeks).

Remarkable Aly Kahn

"The remarkable Aly Khan is dead!" exclaimed a well-known society editor.

Gene Tierney, Joan Fontaine, Yvonne de Carlo, Lady Furness, Kim Novak, Merle Oberon and a number of French, Italian and Greek movie stars are now mourning for him.

What was so attractive about this "remarkable" man?

The newspapers have given us salacious hints about his exceptional virility, his rare vitality, his almost diabolical sex appeal and his absolutely indefinable charm.

He was a balding, hail-met fellow, getting a little fat. But that was only on the surface. Deep down, where it counts, he had 800 million dollars.

—Remarkable, indeed!

The Rising Cost of the "American Dream"

By Frederick Matteger

in your barn.

You ought to have a truck. You need a modern barn and a clean, ventilated milkhouse with running water (and since there's no city water available, this isn't easy.) To do repair work around the farm, you need a variety of tools, such as welding equipment—and the ability to use it.

In all, you need about \$50,000 worth of cows, land and equipment.

Now you can start producing milk.

Now that you've got it, you get about nine cents a quart for it. Yes, I said nine cents. As a matter of fact, if you are trying to farm on a shoestring and don't have the equipment to pass dairy company tests or the Dairymen's League inspection, you may have to sell for much less.

You may have to sell your milk to a small independent dairy or cheese factory. You may have to sell it for as little as five cents a quart.

But worse yet, you may not even be able to sell it at all! The small cheese factories and the independent dairies are nearly all gone—gobbled up by the big

ones. And so are the small farmers.

Now, the just-barely-big-enough farmer is facing a new crisis. It seems that automation on the farm is here.

Until recently farmers put their milk in milk cans. The milk cans were put in a cooler in the milk house. These cans were then picked up and taken to the dairy company. Now the dairy companies have instituted a different method: milk tank coolers. In its most complete form this cooling system has a pipe line running from where the cow is milked to a cooling tank. The cooled milk stays in the tank until a tank truck comes along. Then the milk is pumped directly into the tank truck.

The large dairy companies are pressuring all farmers to get these tanks. A higher price is offered if the farmer will install a cooling tank. When enough farmers have tanks the truck drivers then pick up only the milk from the tanks. Farmers who have no tanks are out of luck. They must sell out or buy tanks. But a tank costs between \$2,000 and \$3,000.

As one dairy farm village resident said, "Pretty soon there won't be anything but big farmers. The little farmer is done."

After the Summit

The Suslov-Molotov Group — And the New Opposition in the USSR

By Sam Marcy

Has the collapse of the Summit Conference revealed the elements of a possible shift in Soviet foreign policy? Is there a leadership struggle in the ruling circles of the Soviet C.P. based upon fundamental differences in foreign policy?

To properly answer this question in the context of the present international situation, we must first have recourse to the fundamental orientation of American imperialism. In any war crisis that the strategists of U.S. finance capital are preparing, they must first make certain that the onus for such a crisis is put squarely on the shoulders of the Soviet Union. If this was true in an earlier period, it is doubly true in the age of atom bombs and missiles.

Truth in their own class interest

Nevertheless, in their own self-interest, and as a result of the acute contradictions in their own camp, the American ruling class, or more precisely, sections of it, are obliged to reveal the true origin and nature of the war crisis in all its ugliness. Rarely has this ever been done with such extraordinary frankness and timeliness as it was done by Walter Lippman on that historic Monday—the day of the virtual collapse of the Summit Conference. In this now widely quoted article (*Herald-Tribune*, May 17th), Lippman stated:

"... when the plane was captured, Mr. Khrushchev opened the door to the President for a diplomatic exit from his quandary. He did not believe, said Mr. K., that Mr. Eisenhower was responsible for ordering the flight.

"Unfortunately Mr. K. knew that Mr. Eisenhower must have authorized the general plan of the flights but he preferred to let the President say ... that he did not authorize this particular flight. ... Instead, Mr. Eisenhower replied that he WAS responsible, that such flights were necessary. ... This locked the door which Mr. Khrushchev had opened. It transformed the embarrassment of being caught in a spying operation into a direct challenge to the sovereignty of the Soviet Union.

"This avowal ... was a fatal mistake. For it made it impossible for Mr. Khrushchev to bypass the affair. Had he done that, he would have been in a position of acknowledging to the world, to the Soviet people, to his critics within the Soviet Union, and to his Communist allies, that he had surrendered to the United States the right to violate Soviet territory. NO STATESMAN CAN LIVE IN ANY COUNTRY AFTER MAKING SUCH AN ADMISSION." (our emphasis).

Dress Rehearsal For an attack on the USSR

It must be remembered that Mr. Lippman is not a journalist-prone to using loose language. The last two sentences of his article quoted above, were calculated to bring to the fore the full gravity of the situation. They were calculated to break through the thick fog of propaganda which presented the ominous significance of the U-2 invasion as "just another incident in the Cold War" instead of a dress rehearsal for a possible attack on the USSR!

It was not deep attachment to abstract truth, nor love of "peace" and "disarmament," or any of the other shibboleths which are droned into the ears of the masses day in and day out, that obliged Lippman to write this. It was the self-interest of a section of the ruling class that motivated him to write this at the critical moment.

This section is oriented toward a detente (agreement) with the Soviet Union, based on the "containment" of China, the stifling of any new proletarian revolutions in Asia, Africa, or Latin America, and the "neutralization" of Berlin as the chief *quid pro quo* to Khrushchev if he "shows good faith" in executing his side of the agreement.

Home-made crisis

The singular importance of Lippman's admission, lies in the fact that it puts the onus of the war crisis squarely on the shoulders of the U.S. It makes crystal clear that the crisis was manufactured right here at home—not in the USSR. And as though to buttress his conclusion with empirical evidence, Lippman goes to unusual lengths to convince his readers by revealing that he had

a private conversation with none other than Khrushchev's "personal emissary, Mr. Zhukov..." who informed him "that about March 15th, American policy had suddenly hardened against a negotiation about the status of West Berlin and that this was a reversal of the understanding given to Mr. Khrushchev by the President at Camp David."

This makes doubly clear that the initiative for fomenting the crisis stems directly from Washington—and not Moscow. The general public has been led to believe that it was Khrushchev's "threatening" speech on West Berlin at Baku on April 25 which began to boil up the crisis, whereas in reality it had merely been a reaction to Eisenhower's reversal of the Camp David understanding regarding West Berlin.

All this is vitally significant for all class-conscious workers, socialists and communists, and particularly those who are interested in the internal evolution of the USSR and the direction of its foreign policy.

A "diplomatic exit"

In this connection, it should be noted that it was Khrushchev "who opened the door to the President for a diplomatic exit," as Lippman puts it. (Why the representative of a workers state should have to cover up for the President of the most predatory imperialist state, only the apologists for Khrushchev know.) Equally significant is the fact that Eisenhower was unable to avail himself of the "exit" provided by Khrushchev. And the explanation for this lies solely and exclusively in the overwhelming pressure of the military and their financial supporters and friends in the Wall Street community.

It is not without interest that during the entire period of the crisis, the stock market registered steady, consistent gains by all the war issues. The world-wide combat alert ordered by Defense Secretary Gates, himself a Wall St. banker, was timed to coincide with the Summit Conference. Lippman's admission that this "readiness exercise, though not the last stage before actual war, is one of the preliminary stages to it," is not only a symptom of the war fever in the Pentagon, but an accurate measure of its preponderant influence on the actual direction of events in this period.

To create the impression, as Khrushchev does, that this trend could be reversed six or eight months later by a new President, is sheer deception of the masses.

Finally, it cannot be over-emphasized (as Lippman states) that Khrushchev was put in "the position of acknowledging that he had surrendered the right to violate Soviet territory," a position so utterly full of risk and peril, that "no statesman," let alone the leader of the most powerful workers state in the world, "could live in any country after making it."

Reaction to Pentagon

In the light of this, it is apparent that whatever happened in the Soviet leadership following the U-2 invasion, was a REACTION TO THE UNBRIDLED IMPERIALIST ADVENTURISM OF THE PENTAGON, and not the pursuit of an independently conceived new orientation in Soviet foreign policy.

However, it was only inevitable that once the U-2 was downed, and the State Department and Eisenhower not only admitted their responsibility, but also brazenly asserted that such flights would continue—that the struggle of political tendencies, groups and factions in the USSR, long kept under cover under the false facade of a mythical political and ideological monolithism, would become enhanced, stimulated, and sharpened.

A different kind of opposition

It is not possible on the basis of the scanty information available in the Western press to accurately gauge the character of the current opposition. But its broad outlines are apparent. Its chief trait is resistance to Khrushchev's overly conciliatory attitude toward Western imperialism. It is not the kind of opposition that the bourgeoisie is likely to become lyrical about, as they did about the Hungarian and Polish opposition.

Class-conscious workers, socialists, and commu-

nists have nothing to fear from it. They should in fact welcome it. Contrary to the slanders in the capitalist press, it is not a "war faction," a counterpart to the imperialist adventurers in the Pentagon. The howls of the kept press "of a reversion to Stalinism," whenever there is even a hint of new, militant initiative in Soviet foreign policy, are a tissue of lies—but they also contain some elements of truth.

This may be embarrassing to those self-styled Trotskyists who have long ago abandoned the teachings of the great revolutionary thinker. But Trotsky himself foresaw the possibility of a further shift to the right after the demise of Stalin.

Meaning of 20th Congress

The 20th Congress of the Soviet CP, which took place in the shadow of Stalin's death, marked just such a shift to the right, although it was accompanied by the easing of the lot of the workers. We were the only political tendency that correctly took note of this development.

The subsequent victory of the Khrushchev-Mikoyan faction over the Molotov-Kaganovich group, made the shift to the right more apparent, especially in the field of foreign policy. It must not be forgotten that the main charge against Molotov was that he was obstructing the "peaceful co-existence" policy of the Khrushchev group.

Khrushchev and Mikoyan inaugurated their reign with an open disavowal of the Leninist theory of the road to the proletarian revolution; and complemented it with a deepened and much more conciliatory attitude to imperialism, which Khrushchev has carried to an extreme with his summitry maneuvers.

"Reversion to Stalinism?"

History rarely, if ever, retraces its steps. And in the case of a reversion to the general practices of Stalin, it is quite impossible. The soil for it is no longer there. The principal circumstances that gave rise to Stalinism—the cultural and technological backwardness of Russia and the isolation of the new workers regime, are no longer present—nor will they ever return.

When the bourgeoisie employs the word *Stalinism* as a derisive formula, they refer to those repressive features of Stalin's regime, by which he defended the gains of the revolution as against them.

When Trotsky referred to the repressive aspects of Stalin's regime, he meant those features by which Stalin not only surrendered gains won by the revolution, but in the process, practically destroyed the entire leading cadre of the Bolshevik generation. The imperialists had no objection whatever to these aspects of Stalin's rule.

The lumping of revolution and reaction under the umbrella of the same formula—as in the word *Stalinism*—is one of the elements in the mechanics of class deception employed time and again by the bourgeoisie.

It happens many times in history, that a nascent, progressive and revolutionary movement, because of its clandestine character and weak beginnings, seeks old, authoritative and respected symbols or personalities in which to mask its revolutionary opposition. The early class struggles of the proletariat are replete with such examples.

New waters in old channels

The revolutionary authority of Trotsky has been too much vilified over too long a period and is too dangerous a symbol in the hands of a still weak and inarticulate opposition. Hence the possible appearance of such old figures as Molotov—or the elevation of such personalities as Suslov. But these are of purely transitory character. They can at most serve as old channels through which the new, proletarian spring waters will rush and overflow the bureaucratic banks that now hinder the socialist development of the USSR and inhibit the creative initiative and revolutionary energy of the masses.

* * * *

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again. . . ." With it will rise the revolutionary authority of Trotsky, co-leader with Lenin of the great October.