


PROGRESSIVE LABOR MAGAZINE

PLM



Vol. 12 No. 3
Summer 1979
75c

Fighting Racism

To Fight Racism, Build the Party—page 4
History Shows Workers Attack Klan—page 60



Also: STUDENTS IRAN SOVIET ARMY MAY DAY '79

Subscribe!

CHALLENGE

The Revolutionary Communist Newspaper

PROGRESSIVE LABOR PARTY

June 6, 1979—Volume 16, Number 2

10¢

Workers Attacked By Energy Crisis Profits

BOSSSES GAS UP FOR WAR & FASCISM

The current gas shortage is a body blow to the U.S. working class. U.S. society is built around the use of the auto. In many cities and areas the auto is an absolute necessity of life to go to work, to shop and to accomplish many other tasks required to get through the day. And, of course, the car is important for recreation. The absence of public transportation in many places — or limited, often collapsing, public transportation — is designed to promote the use of the auto. The profit system revolves around the sale of the auto, reaping enormous profits for many industries.

WITH FUEL PRICES DOUBLING AND RE-DOUBLING the working class is being forced to take a huge wage cut. This price-gouging includes home heating oil and other vital forms of energy. And as if to add insult to injury, it is becoming more commonplace to spend hours upon hours in lines at the gas pumps to pay exorbitant prices for gas. These hours of waiting on line, along with the necessity of working two jobs, have made a mockery of the forty-hour week. After all, we wait on line for gas, in most cases, to get the fuel necessary to get to work.

The bosses' government, through their puny mouthpiece Karter, basically has told us to suffer. The bosses constantly tell us that the gas shortage is our fault: we "use too much." However, it was only recently that the big oil companies were vying for our business. It was commonplace to get some glasses or some other useless junk to get us to buy this one or that one's gas. Over and over again we are told that we must pay more for the less gas we will be compelled to use. Karter claims that gas prices have to be unfrozen so that rising prices will get us to use less gas and allow the oil companies to make even greater profits, so that they will invest more money in obtaining new areas of oil. (After-tax profits of the 26 leading oil companies in the last ten years were \$94 billion. Their capital investments were \$175 billion; \$39 billion was paid in dividends. — Washington Post, March 23.)

In the following order of importance, the government states these as the reasons for the fuel shortage:

- * The problem is increased gas consumption by the U.S. motorist;
- * The problem is the Iranian "revolution" which cut supplies last year by 848,000 barrels per day, and is still not back to earlier levels;
- * The problem is Arab perfidy: The Arab bosses have raised prices and will not increase production;
- * The problem is the hard winters of the last two years;
- * The problem is panic buying, manifested by "topping off."

THESE ARE SOME OF THE REASONS THROWN AT US FOR the shortage. However, according to the figures of the American Petroleum Institute, for the week ending May 4 the average daily supply of crude oil was 14,146,000 barrels. A year ago it was 14,178,000. These figures show no significant change of supply. Neither do the figures on consumption indicate any major shift in demand. Demand in March 1979 was 7,269,000 barrels per day; in March 1978, 7,256,000 barrels per day. Thus, the major reason claimed by the government — overuse by the people — is a myth. And so is the tangent of "topping off." What difference does it make in supply if a motorist, desperate to get to work, buys ten gallons of gas once a week or two gallons five times per week. "Blaming the victim" is the bosses' favorite propaganda ploy used against the workers.

To find out some truth about energy requires a political approach. The bosses are faced with several problems which they are trying to solve at the expense of the working class. Only last week Senator Hayakawa of California, in his crude way, inadvertently gave the game away. He pointed out that the poor for too long had used the auto. Now, he claimed, gas should be so expensive that they could no longer use the car. In other terms, it means that U.S. bosses are finding it harder and harder to exploit foreign workers because U.S. bosses' fortunes are slipping badly, in this case, in the rich oil fields of the Mideast. So U.S. rulers are exploiting U.S. workers even more, to keep up their sagging profits.

In the Mideast more Arab states, especially the oil-owning Arabs, are opposed to the Israel-Egypt peace deal pushed by the U.S. This has resulted in deepening contradictions between the U.S. and previously docile friends. The safe oil of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and elsewhere is in jeopardy. As Joseph C. Harsh said in the Christian Science Monitor of March 29:

"The oil-owning Arabs are all left out of the political deal. It is therefore anathema to all of them. The United States is more, not less, involved with Israel and Egypt, and finds itself therefore farther than ever away from the Arabs who own the oil.

"This is of course a glorious opportunity for Moscow, and precisely what the original Carter approach was intended to avoid. Mr. Carter wanted an arrangement tying Moscow in, not out. Now the United States is in, and Moscow is out, and free to cultivate Arabs at will.

"Obviously, Mr. Gromyko went to Damascus to renew friendships."

Even among the few Arab lands favorable to the Egypt-Israel peace deal there is suspicion that U.S. capabilities are dwindling. Drew

(continued on page 2)

PLEASE USE SUBSCRIPTION BLANK ON PAGE 80

PL★

Summer 1979 Volume 12, Number 3

PROGRESSIVE LABOR MAGAZINE
Published by Progressive Labor Party
GPO Box 808, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201



To Fight Racism, Build the Party 4

This editorial shows clearly why no force but socialist revolution can wipe out racism, and why we must build a mass multi-racial movement under communist leadership. Also discussed is the history of the left's mistaken adherence to nationalism.

The Retreat From Revolution 10

In 1917 the Bolsheviks called for "the armed people" to replace the standing army. This article details how the Soviet Union gradually abandoned this principle in favor of a bourgeois-style military. How these events parallel the development of revisionism is also seen.



The Growth of Capitalism in Iran 30


Written by an Iranian student, this article disproves the theory that Iran is feudal, and shows how British and other imperialists helped it become capitalist. An editor's note updates the situation in Iran and points to some weaknesses in the article.

Students Must Ally With Workers 50

Originally published as a PLP pamphlet, this article shows how the ruling class relies on the universities as a training ground for racism, and shows that only by allying with the working class for revolution can students realize their aspirations.

Racist History of the KKK 60

Working-class fightback against the Klan is the key aspect of Part II of this article, which details how the KKK's violence and racism, in service to the ruling class, make them the enemy of all workers—and how the working class must unite multi-racially to finish them off.



May Day 1979 40

Poetry 48

The articles appearing in PL Magazine are published because the Editorial Board believes they are generally useful in the political ideological development of the international revolutionary communist movement. However, only the editorial and documents of the National Committee of Progressive Labor Party represent the official policies of the Party.

notes and comment

We welcome letters from readers about articles in PL Magazine and related topics as well as comments on the magazine itself. Please write to:

PL MAGAZINE
GPO Box 808
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11202

Smash the Klan

To the Editors:

I would like to make several comments about the article on the KKK in the Spring '79 issue of PL Magazine.

First of all, keep up the good work! I found the article very informative and the analysis of their role today in building the U.S. ruling class's drive toward fascism particularly useful in my work in the military.

I would like to point out that the revitalization of the KKK and the Nazis in several key industrial cities in the U.S., Europe and elsewhere is a tactic in the overall strategy of the ruling class in those countries to divide the working class and keep it down. They also use this racist hysteria to justify use of military force to save their skins in the Middle East and Africa. The development and growth of these racist groups is essential to the development of a base for fascism, and is due to the irreversible decline of capitalism in this final period of its historical development.

I would suggest the author of the article do more research into the ruling class connections of these scum. As we have seen from newspapers and TV, the ruling class firmly supports and publicizes these vermin. In the government we have senators and congressmen like Robert Byrd who was—and probably still is—a Klan member. We can see these fascist groups being built in the schools, communities and in the military with the consent of the government.

One other point is that these groups get tremendous support from "liberal" groups like the

ACLU. Just recently, on a trip through my home state, Texas, I turned on my car radio and was shocked to hear an ad for the KKK! It was a 30-minute recruiting program for the Klan, boasting of their murderous history and attacking Mexican immigrant workers, blacks, Jews, etc. This program was on one of the largest AM stations in the Southwest, reaching tens of millions in four states. I taped the program on my cassette recorder and sent it to the FCC in Washington, complaining that these racists should be banned from the air. The complaint was sent to the only black FCC commissioner. The reply I got was that it wasn't illegal for the KKK to be on the air as long as they didn't use any four-letter words! They could talk about torturing black people or lynching immigrant workers from Mexico and be on the air! Now which is obscene?

In Seattle, Wash., on a non-commercial station, the Nazis were given eight hours of air time. They played their songs and made recruiting pitches. This station is run by Trotskyites, the "International Socialists" and other obscure "left" grouplets. These fakers have a left cover, but under the guise of "free speech" they boost the growth of fascist organizations. When members of PLP and InCAR busted the heads of some Nazis at the University of Washington last year, the Trots tried to attack the anti-racist, anti-fascist fighters because we were depriving the Nazis of the "sacred right" of free speech. As far as we in PLP and InCAR are concerned, Nazis have no rights at all. In fact, we say "Death to the Nazis! Death to the KKK! Death to all fascists!"

Finally, let me say that I find

it peculiar that some people say that we support the KKK or are helping it by showing some old pictures of the KKK. I say hog-wash! The fact of the matter is that the Party and InCAR have been instrumental in stopping the Nazis and Klan from establishing a working-class base in key industrial cities. This is no small accomplishment. We did this by mobilizing hundreds of people—workers, students, and others—onto the streets to physically and ideologically smash the KKK. This does not mean that they won't try again or that the fascist movement may not take some other form that may be more difficult to identify and fight. It means we must continue to build the International Committee Against Racism, and build the Party within the working class to get the message of multiracial unity and the fight for socialism to every worker who wants to hear and understand. As a consequence of this work, if it's done right, we'll see the demise of the KKK and the entire thrust toward fascism will be turned around.

D.W. Threepersons
New York

Capitalism Kills

To the Editors:

To pursue the controversy over the determinants of health and disease in capitalist society, I would like to reply to the letter of H. Weiner in the Spring '79 issue of PL Magazine. Although I don't disagree with the main point being raised, that industrial diseases have an importance out of proportion to their absolute contribution to death

and disability, I think Weiner misses the point raised in the letter he was criticizing. As a communist organization, we focus our interest on the processes that maim and kill the working class, and industrial workers first of all. Despite the urgency of job-related disease, it is a distortion to overlook the fact that the vast majority of industrial workers—90 to 95 per cent?—are not killed on the job. If we are interested in reaching industrial workers on health issues, it would follow that we need a broader focus than just what happens on the job. That was the point I was making in the letter. In fact, I never said, as Weiner claims, that it is more important to focus on diseases caused by tobacco, alcohol and diet. The issue of relative importance of various health problems and the focus for Party literature was not discussed in the letter he is criticizing. Looking over the last 30 or so Health Column articles in Challenge, 12 were related to occupational disease and 6 or 7 to tobacco, diet or life style.

Over the last few years there has been a gradual shift in the attitude of working people toward health issues. Not too long ago it was "being a sissy" to worry too much about occupational hazards. There was also the attempt to portray anyone worried about problems with nuclear power as an environmental nut. The same can generally be said about the health hazards of food, cars, etc. Now people are learning more clearly just exactly how the ruling class is killing them, and as one letter to Challenge pointed out, as they become more involved in a movement to build a better society and realize that a better world is possible, they are even more concerned about health issues. We must fight the cynicism and despair that capitalist culture breeds. What are the real threats to health, and what is the relative importance of each in our strategy of organizing a communist movement? For example, we had totally ig-

nored the dangers of nuclear power plants, but today that is a very real and legitimate mass concern. Unfortunately I don't think we have adequate answers for strategy to organize against the destruction of health under capitalism. The current policy of the Challenge Health Column is to give about half of the space to occupational issues. Overall I think it is true that we have not been consistent in focusing on job-related health problems. Nevertheless, it is a serious mistake to ridicule concern over other health threats by claiming, as Weiner does, that such efforts would "turn the Party into a 'protest' group a la Ralph Nader that organizes around 'consumer' issues."

Dedication to the well-being of the working class is certainly broad enough to encompass all those issues.

Richard Cooper
Chicago

Note:

ATTENTION MILITARY PERSONNEL

THIS IS YOUR PERSONAL PROPERTY AND CANNOT LEGALLY BE TAKEN AWAY FROM YOU.

Department of Defense directive 1325.6 says "the mere possession of unauthorized literature may not be prohibited."

REVISTA PL

—PL MAGAZINE in Spanish—

A Spanish edition of PL Magazine is now available, including Put the Line on the Line (Winter '78), Armed Insurrection (Apr.-May '78), the May 1979 PL statement on the anti-nuke movement and a summary of other major articles. Copies may be ordered at 50c each, using the coupon on page 80.

To Contact PLP

National Office:

PROGRESSIVE LABOR PARTY
220 E. 23rd St. (7th Fl.)
New York, New York 10010

ARKANSAS:

Little Rock: Box 1562
Little Rock, Ark. 77203

CALIFORNIA:

Los Angeles: 706 S. Valencia
Los Angeles, Cal. 90006
San Diego: P.O. Box 14103
San Diego, Cal. 92114
San Francisco: P.O. Box 562
San Francisco, Cal. 94101
Sacramento: P.O. Box 5523
Sacramento, Cal. 95817

CONNECTICUT:

Storrs: P.O. Box 149
Storrs, Conn. 06268

ILLINOIS:

Chicago: P.O. Box 7814
Chicago, Ill. 60680

INDIANA:

Gary: P.O. Box 2052
Gary, Ind. 46409

KANSAS:

Wichita: P.O. Box 3082
Wichita, Kan. 67201

MARYLAND:

Baltimore: P.O. Box 13426
Baltimore, Md. 21203

MASSACHUSETTS:

Boston: P.O. Box 512
Boston, Mass. 02215
Worcester: P.O. Box 185
West Side Station
Worcester, Mass.

MINNESOTA:

Minneapolis: P.O. Box 8255
Minneapolis, Minn. 55408

MICHIGAN:

Detroit: P.O. Box 85
Detroit, Mich. 48221

MISSISSIPPI:

Tupelo: P.O. Box 1022
Tupelo, Miss. 38801

MISSOURI:

St. Louis: P.O. Box 2915
St. Louis, Mo. 63130
Kansas City: P.O. Box 23021
Kansas City, Mo. 64141

NEW JERSEY:

Newark: Box 6104
Newark, N.J. 07106

NEW YORK:

Buffalo: PLP, Rm. 447
Baldy, SUNY at Buffalo
Buffalo, N.Y. 14260
New York City: P.O. Box 808
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11202
Suffolk County: P.O. Box 356
E. Setauket, N.Y. 11733

NORTH CAROLINA:

Durham: P.O. Box 3172
Durham, N.C. 27705

OHIO:

Columbus: P.O. Box 02074
Station B
Columbus, Ohio 43202

PENNSYLVANIA:

Bethlehem: P.O. Box 5358
Bethlehem, Pa. 18015
Philadelphia: P.O. Box 1224
Philadelphia, Pa. 19105
Pittsburgh: P.O. Box 4750
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15206

TEXAS:

Houston: P.O. Box 8510
Houston, Tx. 77009

WASHINGTON:

Seattle: P.O. Box 24182
Seattle, Wa. 98124

WASHINGTON, D.C.:

P.O. Box 3081
Washington, D.C. 20010

WEST VIRGINIA:

Wheeling: P.O. Box 1234
Wheeling, W. Va. 26003

WISCONSIN:

Madison: P.O. Box 3001
Madison, Wisc. 53704

For more information about the Progressive Labor Party, or to discuss PL's ideas with PL members, write to addresses above.


Editorial

To Fight Racism, Build the Party

Historically, the question has been raised within and outside the revolutionary movement of whether racism can be generally defeated within society, particularly within the revolutionary movement. Confidence in the ability of the working class and its vanguard to defeat racism has been weakened because of, at least, two major developments:

1. For the past two centuries in the U.S., the capitalist development was nurtured and expanded as a result of virulent racism. Without going into specific details, most of which we are already familiar with, it can be said that a combination of terror, systematic racist ideas, and sharp racist practices by the ruling class helped create vast wealth, profits necessary for the ruling class to expand its economic and political system. Racism, advocated and practiced by the ruling class, has always won over some of the working class and others.

2. Racism has a wide acceptance amongst the masses. Its inevitable counter-reaction is nationalism. Often nationalism has had a progressive veneer. Thus the international communist movement and its appendages, faced with sharp racist practices from the ruling class, and sometimes strident nationalism, retreated from a class orientation—a revolutionary outlook based on winning the dictatorship of the proletariat. This retreat from the only perspective that could defeat racism led to the communist vanguard advocating similar nationalist schemes advocated by the ruling class. Presumably, communists felt that nation-



alism under their leadership would be better than nationalism under the leadership of the ruling class. In this manner nationalism has become the "Achilles heel" of the communist movement. Capitalist ideology can not serve the needs of the working class. However, it should be pointed out that before the communist movement, including the U.S. communist party too, completely abandoned a revolutionary perspective, they did develop much thought and action which led to making the fight against racism a broad mass issue.

But, finally, concessions to racism and nationalism within the movement eroded whatever revolutionary aspects the line of the movement had. Nationalism and great power chauvinism (racism) became the central aspects of the line of the international communist movement.

These concessions to racist ideology and practices took at least five forms:

1. In one form or another, the C/P communist movement advocated separation between black, white, and Latin workers. The most extreme form of this, still being advocated today by some Maoist forces and others, is the notion of the fight for a separate black nation. This concept was also advocated during the thirties in Cuba. The communist international claimed that Oriente

Province could and should constitute a black nation. The goal of black nationhood was based on Stalin's formulations of what constituted a nation. So in the U.S. it was deduced that the "black belt" in the "deep south" fit Stalin's criteria for nationhood.

2. Within the party and the general movement that the party led, black, white and Latin forces were usually segregated organizationally.

3. Within the mass movement the communists advocated—as many so-called leftists still do—that blacks and Latins should act independently of whites, and vice-versa.

4. The communist movement did not advocate an explanation of the class nature of racism. Racism was not viewed as being injurious to all workers. As a matter of fact, the CP advanced the myth of "white skin privileges."

This wrong notion implied and often stated that white workers were as guilty of racist oppression as the ruling class. The concept of "white skin privileges" was based on the sometimes correct fact that white workers received higher pay and generally more of the "goodies" of capitalism. Thus, the party saw the discrepancies between white and black workers not only as ruling class oppression but the oppression of black

workers by white workers. This was another form of missionaryism. It obscured the class aspect of racism.

5. This missionaryism had the effect of the communist movement seeing itself as the vanguard of the white working class who had to "unite with the black people." The CP advanced the concept that whatever the black liberation movement did was O.K. because, this movement, not the CP, was the vanguard of the black people. The black people were viewed as one entity. This gave rise to the formula of all-class unity, which in fact meant consigning the leadership of the black workers to the black petit bourgeoisie. This meant turning over the black workers to the ruling class, because the petit bourgeois leadership in the black, and later the Latin, movement only opted for a better deal for themselves under capitalism.

Of course this summary outline could be expanded into a book filled with variations on these themes, and their implications. However, for our purposes it is important to see that our party has rejected all these forms of right-opportunism. Our party has confidence that no matter how virulent racism is spewed forth by the ruling class, **workers, all workers, in their self-interests, must sooner or later unite and defeat racism.** Our party has full confidence in the working class. Our party views itself as leader of the entire working class. The old CP had little confidence in the working class, black, white or Latin, and consequently did not view themselves as the leader of the working class. The old CP actually saw the ruling class as the only force capable of leading the working class. Within this "fact of life," the CP saw themselves as merely reforming the more glaring inequities of capitalist life.

With this in mind, it is crucial to understand that we are building a party of a new kind. Our party rejects separatism within the party. **Especially**, we reject separatism of any form outside the party. The actuality of building a mass, multi-racial movement around a working-class line under the leadership of the party is a vital aspect of the party line. Multi-racial formations break down ruling class-inspired, and often-enforced, segregation. Multi-racial unity strengthens the working class. It gives the working class confidence in one another.

Workers who can reject racism and nationalism are serious enemies of the ruling class. A multi-racial movement

creates a better basis for developing a multi-racial party. Workers come into the party with some training in the strategy of multi-racial unity.

ONLY SOCIALISM CAN DEFEAT RACISM

We completely reject any idea that racism can be defeated short of socialism. We surely reject the notion advanced by the CP of "all-class unity." In other words we reject the false notion that a black boss is "better than a white boss." This leads to the rejection of the idea that bosses can lead workers into serious revolutionary activity.

When our party was first formed we harbored, and acted on, an understanding of the fight against racism drawn from the old communist movement. Perhaps it would be an oversimplification to say

It is difficult to hold onto serious racist concepts if you are building a multi-racial movement.

that we thought if we simply restored the most apparent revolutionary aspects of Marxism-Leninism, denied then by the Soviet revisionists, we could still hang onto the vestiges of opportunism relative to the question of racism. True, we dropped the most obvious opportunist notion of fighting for a "black nation," but we clung to the concept of separation, with all its racist and nationalist implications.

Over a period of time, based on our practice and studying others' practice, historically and currently, we came to reject these false ideas. This was also accomplished through inner-party struggles. The premise was that revisionism did not have only the more obvious aspects, like the denial of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We decided that there had to be other important secondary aspects. And it was around the question of national-

ism, as well as great power chauvinism, that our party actually made a decisive break with opportunism. It is around the national question—which is the watershed of opportunism—that our party split with Revisionism. Often the question of nationalism keeps popping up to disrupt our movement and the working-class struggle, Nationalism often promotes the sharpest internal struggle in our party.

Standing the question of nationalism on its head, it must be seen that nationalist goals, programs, tactics, etc. encourage increased racism and enhance its chances of flourishing. Nationalism fortifies all the bourgeois concepts of racism. The main aspect is to promote disunity between workers. This weakens their efforts to organize in the strongest way against capitalism and for socialism.

Thus, in evaluating the fight against racism within the party, we must view it from this perspective; are we, as a party, fighting for this line? Are we as party members fighting to carry out this line? If our line is correct relative to all the different opportunists on the “left” and other liberals, then is not our party in the forefront of the fight against racism, both in thought and in deed? If we view this question of the fight against racism in some other manner, there is a great danger that we will reduce this important question into a nebulous, subjective matter. This would injure the party and be a disservice to the class struggle.

It is posed this way because the question of racism both within the old movement, and in our party now, is often viewed from a weak vantage point. In our party it is sometimes said that “racism within the party is a secondary matter, but if it is not dealt with it could become primary and wreck the party.

This point is valid. However, we must be specific and clear about what are the actual racist manifestations within the party, for example, the failure to build the International Committee Against Racism (InCAR), the failure to more vigorously approach black and Latin workers in our base with the line of the party and not clearly putting forward a clear working class line in the fight against racism. This gives us the appearance of missionaries and makes us seem like the revisionists. Another weakness we are correcting is winning more black and Latin members into

leadership. This includes fighting for their leadership and also collectively fighting against whatever forms of opportunism they manifest. Failure to fight against weaknesses or to engage in frank political discussion or struggle with black and Latin comrades is paternalism or missionaryism within the party. Fear of white workers is a twist-off of paternalism, because it shows we have no confidence in the working class, and thus come to view black and Latin workers as political patsies.

TO DEFEAT RACISM, BUILD THE PARTY

So it is correct to say that if we do not apply the line of the party around any of its vital aspects it threatens the existence of the party. The failure to build the fight against racism is right-opportunism. And as was pointed out, the failure to build a correct fight on the question of racism did help subvert the communist movement.

Because of capitalist ideas and practices, racist ideas and actions are sometimes carried into the party. This phenomenon will continue for some time to come, especially as we grow more rapidly. The party must fight these remnants of racism. However, it would be incorrect to view these carry-overs of racism as phenomena which are going to undermine the party. There is no evidence for this. The errors made on this score can be dealt with and corrected. In fact they are being corrected consistently.

The qualitative step in defeating the residue of racism in party members is winning them to the LINE AND PRACTICE OF THE PARTY. One of the first steps in this process is the building of a multi-racial movement. It is difficult to hold onto serious racist concepts and deeds if you are building a multi-racial movement and a multi-racial party. Forces that meet the racist and fascist development head-on certainly have no stake in perpetuating racism within the movement, and the party. Working around the party line creates the possibility of wiping out all vestiges of racism.

In the old movement there was a material basis for being a crass racist. Many overt racists and nationalists were recruited and did function in the old CP. They were able to do this because of the line and organizational formations of the CP. Separation was the main aspect of

the movement's life. Separation was so imbedded in the old movement that it was not limited to blacks, whites, and Latins. All ethnic groupings were separated. The party built mass Jewish organizations. They built groupings for Poles, Hungarians, Russians, etc. The general organization was called the International Workers Order (I.W.O.). And in the party, ethnic or nationality clubs were set up to match the racist mass movement the party had built. (At one time over 500,000 workers were in the I.W.O.)

Some say that remnants of racism are the important secondary weaknesses which could turn the party around. This becomes a diversion from the fight for the line of the party. So errors concerning the remnants of racism, sometimes real, sometimes imaginary, become the main focus of the fight to develop a sharp anti-racist thrust by the

The big problem between our comrades and workers is...anti-working class bias.

party. The source of this error is the failure to see that **right-opportunism is the main error in our party**. An important aspect of right-opportunism is the failure to develop the fight against racism to its fullest potential. The failure to single out the main weakness in the party gives vent to subjective and false notions.

For example: Occasionally it is heard from members that "the party is a racist party." This stems from one of two things: (1) In the mass movement the party will not give way to nationalist developments. The party will not unite with black leaders who are either politicians, bad union leaders, or businessmen; (2) Occasionally a black or Latin comrade will be a victim of racism in the Party. This may take many forms; one is the resistance to black and Latin leadership. Occasionally the reference to racism is completely subjective. But even where it is absolutely correct, there

is no basis to generalize from this, and draw harmful conclusions.

Yielding to subjectivity—the inability to estimate accurately important and less important issues—is a problem. One manifestation of this appeared at a recent National Committee meeting. Without recounting the event, one summary drawn should be that the leadership is weak in fighting subjectivity, and in singling out the more important political aspect.

Occasionally the heat and struggle demonstrated about a racial slur within the party surpasses sentiments evoked against the ruling class. Sometimes this sentiment surpasses the need for sharp criticism against right-opportunism within the party. Occasionally, sentiments against the party and actions against the party by party members are sharper than against the ruling class. Because of subjectivity, many comrades expect perfection within the party and they show their disappointment in a harmful way. Only the ruling class oppresses workers—black and Latin workers. The party does not! The party, whatever its defects, consistently fights racism and exploitation. And because of the line and practice of the party, it has emerged as the center of the anti-racist struggle. The party is the General Staff of working class emancipation and revolution.

Given the fact that the Party has cast off all the old notions of separatism, a "black nation," black and white "acting independently" in the mass movement; given the fact that the Party has developed a real class line on the nature of racism, how it affects ALL workers, etc.; given our concept that only Socialism can defeat racism; given the actions of the Party on a mass, national and international scale of fighting racism, in the unions, against the KKK/Nazis, on the immigrant question, etc.; given the development of the Party to a point where 50% of our recent convention was composed of black, Latin, Asian and Native American members; given the presence of such members in virtually every area leadership in the country and making up 40% of the National Committee; given the development of the line on nationalism in advance of any other Party in the world—these developments show in life the modest advances the party has made internally and externally.

Naturally this doesn't mean that the character of the Party and our line as anti-racist is irreversible, but if that

danger exists it comes not from the Party being racist a la capitalism's racism, but rather from opportunism, not winning new recruits, members and ourselves to this line, reflecting a lack of confidence in the line and/or in the working class we are trying to win to it. Nor does it mean that we should not deal with such incidents swiftly and sharply, struggling to eradicate whatever anti-Party, racist thought or actions that do exist, and hurt the Party's ability to make a revolution. But we must be clear on the differences between what happens on this question inside and outside the Party.

The struggle against racism outside the Party is an antagonistic contradiction between the working class, led by the Party, and the ruling class (the source of racism). The struggle against racism inside the Party is correctible, given a real fight for the Party's line, not an opportunistic one, along the main concepts outlined above.

The fight against right-opportunism, for right-opportunism is the universal phenomenon within the party, must be developed and understood more clearly. For example: It is true that black, Latin, or female leadership is sometimes resisted. But this would be too simple to leave it at that. The main aspect of this resistance by the members is the unwillingness to fight for the party line. When a black, Latin, or women members enter the leadership, do party members do less? We think not! Basically, we all resist carrying out the more revolutionary aspects of the line.

It is true that we are not base-building and recruiting sufficiently from black and Latin workers. Are we recruiting enough white workers? Is it the case that the white comrades are recruiting scads of white workers? Is it true that black, Latin, or women comrades are recruiting scores of these workers? This is not the case! Why isn't this happening? The universal aspect is opportunism about fighting politically with all our base and other workers. Our members usually win other workers with little regard to the racial composition of those workers. Black and Latin workers seem to respond equally favorably to political approaches from white workers. If we fail to understand that right-opportunism is the main weakness in our party, we can make the question of racism into a political football, seeing many errors as racially inspired.

The other side of the coin—so to speak—is that our members, black,

white, Latin, and women, are putting themselves on the line in the fight against racism and for socialism (and have done so in the past. An impressive string of activities from coast to coast should give us confidence that racism will eventually be defeated, and socialism won. We have won ourselves to a certain level of activity. We must do better! But our line and actions should give us lasting confidence in one another that racism/nationalism is being seriously combatted, and that our members have been qualitatively won on these questions.

Even more important is the constant reaffirmation that our line about racism and our fight for socialism can win ever wider support from workers of all types. Our recent efforts in Tupelo once again prove that we are on the right track. It also shows that important strides can be made even with a relatively few people if we work correctly. For example: It was no particular problem for our white comrades to work in a predominantly black community; intensive—rather than occasional—political work produced good results. In other words, placing the line in an all-round political-personal relations has verified our line that base-building is crucial to political progress. Our comrades lived with, talked with, danced with, argued with, the workers of this area in a way that they should duplicate in their everyday home-town political activity with all workers whom they are trying to win.

A big problem between our comrades and workers generally is not racism, although it is a problem. The problem is "anti-working-class bias." For the many reasons we have often spoken about, we have yet to develop full confidence in the working class. This impedes our political ties to all workers. Tupelo once again shows that there is no reason for this bias, and that workers in large numbers will respond to, at least, important aspects of our line.

The fight against racism can best be developed in these ways:

- A serious understanding of the need to build InCAR and to build it.
- Failure to build the party aggressively is to weaken the fight against racism.
- Failure to win Black and Latin workers into the party and to party leadership is bad.
- Failure to win white workers, especially to an anti-racist line must be overcome!

The Soviet Army

The Retreat From Revolution

Marx drew certain lessons from the experience of the workers in the Paris Commune, the first historical example of the dictatorship of the proletariat.


Among the most important was the need to abolish the standing army and to rely upon the political dedication of the working class, rather than upon bourgeois military discipline and training.

Paris could resist (the onslaught of German troops in the Franco-Prussian war, which had utterly routed the French army) only because, in consequence of the siege, it had got rid of the army, and replaced it by a National Guard, the bulk of which consisted of working men. This fact was now to be transformed into an institution. **The first decree of the Commune, therefore, was the suppression of the standing army, and the substitution for it of the armed people.**

(Marx, "The Civil War in France," emphasis added).

In **State and Revolution** (August 1917), Lenin repeated the need for a socialist state to dissolve the bourgeois army, **Selected Wks.**, Vol. III, p. 297. He attacked the Mensheviks and phony "socialists" of the Provisional Government for refusing to do this.¹

Both before and immediately after the October Revolution the Bolsheviks agitated and organized precisely for this position. They attached great importance to work in the



IN THE BEGINNING: The Bolsheviks called for replacing the standing army with an armed working class. At left, the storming of the Winter Palace by armed Petrograd workers. At right, a women's militia unit in Petrograd.

military, succeeded in neutralizing the standing army at the front and in Petrograd (and in winning some units) by fomenting disobedience between officers and soldiers. The Bolsheviks' main armed force in the October Revolution in the major cities was the Red Guard. These were armed workers, not rigorously trained but politically dedicated to the proletarian cause. It was the Red Guard irregulars who marched out of Petrograd and defeated Kornilov's attempt to crush the revolution in August, 1917. They did so again against the Cossack troops of General Krasnov outside Petrograd in November. In December, 1917, the old Tsarist army at the front, already hopeless as a fighting force due to the class warfare fostered by the Bolsheviks between officers and men, was then formally demobilized. When the Brest-Litovsk Treaty with Germany was signed on March 3, 1918, the fledgling workers' state was formally at peace and

without an army.

When the Civil War began in earnest in May, 1918, the Bolsheviks had to improvise various tactics. Among them—and at first it was **only** a tactic, viewed by many or most of the Bolshevik leaders as a temporary expedient—was the formation of a formal, standing army, organized along bourgeois lines, commanded by experienced officers from the Tsarist army.

During the 7th Party Congress in March 1918 Lenin had argued for a regular military system as a temporary measure only. In the resolutions drafted for this Congress by Lenin and passed, the standing army is not viewed as a permanent institution. In the "Resolution on War and Peace," for example, the Congress promises "to train systematically and comprehensively in military matters and military operations the entire adult population of both sexes." (Lenin, **Selected Works**, Vol. II, p. 600).

Many of the facts in this article are from Erickson, J., *The Soviet High Command*.

1. See also the P.L.P. essay, "The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the Reversal of Workers'

Power in China," esp. "The Question of a Standing Army," in the *Road to Revolution*, III Special Issue of *PL Magazine*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (November, 1971), pp. 29-31.

In his "Report on the Review of the Program..." to the 7th Congress Lenin repeats the Bolsheviks' determination that "Soviet power is a new type of state without a bureaucracy, without police, without a regular army" (II, p. 609). As recently as February armed workers from Petrograd had defeated German troops near Petrograd, and Ukrainian peasants were fighting a partisan war against the occupying German army.

Nonetheless, Trotsky was put in charge of forming a new Soviet army at the same Congress, as People's Commissar for war. Trotsky, as a long time Menshevik, held a relatively much more economic determinist concept of socialism than did the Bolsheviks. Whereas it was 1931 before Stalin based his political program on the notion that technique was neutral, "technique decides everything" (*Works*, Vol. 13, p. 43), Trotsky advocated this from the very beginning. Trotsky believed that an army organized along traditional bourgeois lines and run by an elite of highly trained officers was the only form of defense a socialist state could have. He thought that military 'science' was neutral, that there was no such thing as a specifically proletarian military art. Upon his appointment he put ex-Tsarist officers, including members of the Tsarist General Staff, in the command staff of the Red Army. He reintroduced the old distinctions between officers and men, the officers' privileges, the severe discipline of the Tsarist military.

Trotsky was opposed, as we shall see. But at no time did the left within the Bolshevik Party break totally with Trotsky's conceptions. All Bolsheviks agreed that some form of standing army was necessary in the present circumstances, even if only as an emergency measure. Trotsky's success in winning the Party to retaining thousands of Tsarist officers and the fundamentally bourgeois organization and discipline of the standing army shows that his erroneous ideas were shared, though in varying degrees, by all the leaders of the Bolshevik Party.

II. Commissars and "Dual Command"

The Provisional Government had sent "commissars" to the Tsarist Army at the front to enforce its writ upon the conservative commanding officers. The Bolsheviks took over this practice. Many ex-Tsarist officers proved politically unreliable, and desertions to the White armies (largely made up of ex-Tsarist

officers like themselves) were common. The Soviet government assigned politically reliable "commissars" to each commander. This was a precaution to ensure that the commander, whose political loyalty could not be relied upon, did not sabotage the military operations. Under the system of "dual command" all orders had to be signed by the commissar as well as by the commanding officer before they were valid. The "military specialist" or *spetsy* (as the ex-Imperial officers were euphemistically called) were to have control over operational and "strictly military" matters, while the commissar was to ensure the political correctness of the orders.

This system of "dual command" (DC) revealed the contradiction at the heart of the Soviet military policy. The Bolsheviks were making a compromise of principle. In effect they had **neither** a standing army organized strictly along bourgeois lines, **nor** a militia of the "armed people" as advocated by Marx and Lenin. They could not choose the first, because the workers and peasants would not stand for it—and because the Tsarist officers were not to be trusted—in a word, because only the bourgeoisie could "rely" upon such an oppressive, authoritarian structure. And, as the Bolshevik agitation within the Tsar's army had proven (and as similar communist agitation in the German, French, British, and American occupying forces showed as well), the standing army was none too reliable even for the bourgeoisie!

Yet the Bolsheviks basically did not trust the peasantry. In fact the history of the Civil War showed that peasant soldiers fought fiercely to prevent the Whites from winning out and taking back the land confiscated from the landowners. We should ask: if the peasant soldiers fought so well under the command of Tsarist officers and in a largely bourgeois military formation, why could they not have fought even better if they had been organized differently, led by political incentives rather than compulsion?

In fact guerrilla-type forces led in a basically non-elitist way by communist commanders from the working-class were prominent in the Civil War. This was the group, within both the army and the Party, which most vigorously op-

posed Trotsky's reliance upon the bourgeois *spetsy*.

This contradiction—between bourgeois organization and leadership, and working-class politics—was the fundamental cause of the class struggles within the U.S.S.R. around military policy, just as it was the cause of the struggles around governmental and economic policy. In the military it was not decisively resolved until World War II, when the Soviet Union finally opted once and for all for a bourgeois-type standing army.

Contradictions in the Army During the Civil War.

Different groups within the Soviet military immediately arose as a result of this contradiction. These may be summarized as follows:

1. Guerrilla-type leaders. The most famous of these was V.I. Chapaev, subject of a famous novel of the 1920's by Dmitry Furmanov, who served with him. Chapaev was a dashing working-class soldier who typified the extreme distrust of the Tsarist *spetsy* shared by many workers and peasants. Naturally such purely guerrilla forces and commanders did not fit in well with the system of a centralized army organized along bourgeois lines.

2. The political commanders, mainly men who were dedicated Bolshevik cadre first and military men secondly. There were commissars, such as Ordzhonikidze, Kuibyshev, Kirov, Gusev, Shvernik, and Mekhlis. Stalin, too, was a commissar of this type, probably the most outstanding one. These men too were in general fiercely opposed to Trotsky's reliance upon Tsarist *spetsy*, and became opponents of Trotsky during the inner-party debates of the 1920's. However they did not fight to have the concept of a standing army abolished altogether.

3. The worker-commanders or "red commanders," mainly men from working-class background who were communists first but who became military commanders and remained so after the Civil War. The best-known examples of these were Semyon Budyonny and Klim Voroshilov, who organized and headed

up the famous "Konarmiya" of Isaac Babel's stories, the First Cavalry Army. Politically these men were allied to the second group.²

4. The so-called "young professionals." These were largely men who had been junior officers in the Tsar's army and who rallied to the Soviet side early after the Revolution. Mikhail Tukhachevsky was the outstanding member of this group, and others included Yakir, Yegorov, Uborevich, and Vatsetis.

These men came to occupy most of the pre-eminent positions in the Soviet Army during the late 1920's and 1930's. They were closely associated with Tukhachevsky, and were the main group executed or eliminated along with him in the Military Purges.

5. The ex-Tsarist *spetsy*, who remained an important force within the Soviet Army until the late Twenties and,

Bourgeois organization and working-class politics was a central contradiction in the Soviet military.

in individual instances, even beyond.

Of these groups, the first had little influence in military thinking. *Partizanshchina* soon became the official description for the negative aspects of the Chapaev-type commanders and groups: lack of discipline and unwillingness to co-ordinate activities closely with a central command was the fundamental complaint (however, Trotsky considered anyone who opposed his views guilty of *partizanshchina*, or anarchy). Groups Two and Three became associated with Stalin and Frunze, later Voroshilov, who championed their views. This group constituted the Left wing of the struggles

2. Budyonny had been an NCO (Sgt.) in the Tsar's army, having been drafted in 1903. Timoshenko, Rokossovsky, and Zhukov, among the outstanding leaders of the Soviet Army in World War II, all rose first from Voroshilov's and Budyonny's

First Cavalry Army. Stalin too was closely associated with it. Mikhail Frunze, not associated with the *Konarmiya*, was in this group as well, a professional revolutionary-turned military man, also bitterly opposed to Trotsky's *spetsy*.



SOVIET OFFICERS—OLD AND NEW STYLES: Red Army commanders at the front in 1920, Marshal Zhukov in 1945. World War II saw the final triumph of bourgeois rank and privilege in the Soviet armed forces.

around military politics. Group Four became the Right Wing of these debates in general.

The Fifth group, the **spetsy**, had no direct influence on political discussions. However their influence became strongly felt because, once the young Soviet state had decided upon a standing army, some form of formal, bourgeois-style military leadership became necessary to manage that army. So that the **spetsy** had a great influence upon the thinking of the military communists and the Bolshevik Party in general, just as the technical specialists did in the economic realm. The **spetsy** in all fields were one of the main routes by which bourgeois ideology—acceptance of the distinction between mental and manual labor, the need for material rather than political incentives, etc.—infected the Party.

In the summer of 1918 Stalin, along with Voroshilov, Shchadenko, and other political commanders, saved the im-

portant Volga city of Tsaritsyn (later renamed Stalingrad in 1925 in commemoration of this feat) by ruthlessly overriding and ignoring Trotsky's **spetsy** who had been charged with defending the town. Stalin arrested the **spetsy** and anyone in the town suspected of anti-Soviet sympathies. Anyone captured supporting the Whites in any way was shot. Lenin appears to have attempted to compromise between Trotsky and Stalin, and kept them apart for the remainder of the Civil War.

During the Warsaw campaign of 1920 Tukhachevsky, commanding the advancing Soviet armies, again came into conflict with Stalin, military commissar for part of his forces. The dispute was over Tukhachevsky's reliance upon bourgeois military theory, which ended in his overreaching himself and getting a lot of soldiers killed while failing to capture Warsaw. Stalin and the First Cavalry leaders had opposed Tukhachevsky's Warsaw "adventure" from the beginning. Tukhachevsky, by the way, said that he

3. A French officer, Pierre Fervacque, who was imprisoned in a German camp for a time with Tukhachevsky (and who later became a well known French journalist under the pseudonym "Rémy Roure"), published a book on him in 1928. Tukhachevsky is revealed therein as a fanatic Russian

imperialist, pan slavic nationalist, elitist aristocrat, and virulent anti-Semite. Tukhachevsky never repudiated this portrait and until his death remained close personal friends with its author (see Fervacque's article in *Le Temps*, July 24, 1937).

expected the Polish proletariat to rise up and greet the Soviet Army, unleashing a European revolution. In fact, given what we know about Tikhachevsky's sympathies for Tsarist imperialism,³ it seems evident that he wanted to recapture Poland for the Soviet government.

Trotsky and his supporters defended the authority of the *spetsy* and attacked all others as incompetent. Trotsky infuriated Party members by his practice of shooting commissars who disobeyed his *spetsy*. He and his supporter Ivar Smilga argued strongly from 1919 for abolishing commissars—for "Unitary Command" (UC).

At the 8th Party Congress in 1919 a "Military Opposition" led by Voroshilov and supported by Stalin, was formed to argue against Trotsky's policies. As we have seen in Lenin's resolutions, the idea of a militia was reemphasized at this Congress and upheld for the future. At the 9th Party Congress in 1920, Trotsky was forced to backtrack (though he never admitted it as such) and made the actual proposal for a Workers-Peasants Militia, which was to be the form of military organization after the Civil War had ended. That this apparent agreement just papered over fundamental differences is shown by succeeding events. First, by December of 1920 Trotsky's major military ally in the Party, Smilga, was arguing that a standing army should be the basic form of Soviet military organization. Smilga's economic determinist reasoning was (1) that the peasantry could not be counted on, and the workers were too few to spread around among so many peasant units; (2) that the Soviet Russia was too unindustrialized. Second, Trotsky soon revealed what he meant by "militia" by proposing the "militarization of labor"—the organizing of workers and peasants into labor armies, under strict discipline and hierarchical control. Tikhachevsky also came out firmly in support of the standing army concept, proposing an "International General Staff" which would plan aggressive foreign military intervention and impose socialism on capitalist states. Once again, Tikhachevsky's imperialist ambitions were only lightly covered by a veil of Socialist rhetoric.

The Tenth Party Congress.

The 10th Party Congress met during

the famous Kronshtadt naval rebellion of February and March, 1921 and the anti-Soviet peasant rebellion in Tambov of the same months. The peasantry were clearly protesting the policy of "War Communism," which in effect meant forced requisitioning of needed food-stuffs for the Soviet army and the cities. That there were few serious peasant uprisings before 1920 indicated to the Bolsheviks that the peasantry had supported the Soviets as long as they had felt the danger that the "Whites" and former landlords might be restored. The Antonov peasant rebellion later in the year, and the difficulty in stopping Nestor Makhno's anarchist, anti-Semitic peasant rebellion in the Ukraine showed Lenin that a new policy towards the peasantry was essential. The Kronshtadt sailors' rebellion was interpreted to mean essentially the same thing. The sailors and marines were not the same individuals that had been the backbone of the October Revolution, but newer recruits from the cities and villages. The fact that they were led by a Tsarist officer and a sailor who fled to the Mensheviks thereafter and that the rank-and-file of the sailors refused to execute Bolsheviks whom they imprisoned (thus showing they were not as anti-Communist as their leaders) did not blind the Bolsheviks to the seriousness of the situation.⁴

As a result of the Bolsheviks' sense of isolation from the countryside (and from some of the working class, too—strikes had broken out in Petrograd) the militia concept was again weakened at the Congress. The militia was planned for heavily working-class areas only, and a standing army would be retained elsewhere.

At the same time, Trotsky's military ideas were rebuffed. Frunze, Voroshilov, Ordzhonikidze, Molotov, and Petrovskii, all political commissars and commanders associated with opposition to *spetsy*, were elected to the Central Committee of the Party, and others like them, including Gusev, Kuibyshev, Kirov, and Chubar, were elected Candidate members. Secondly, a debate over the question of the proper military strategy for a workers' state was engaged. Trotsky defended against all comers the notion that "military technique is universal," an argument for the kind of

4. These facts are taken from Paul Averich, *Kronshtadt, 1921*. Averich is a violent anti-communist

and Anarchist sympathizer; his analysis must be separated from the facts he reveals.

organization he had championed during the Civil War. Frunze as spokesman for the political and worker-commanders led the attack for a special "proletarian military science."

Frunze's and Gusev's concept drew from the experience of the Civil War as seen by these men. The essential points of "proletarian military strategy" were: (1) concentration upon maneuverability, as opposed to positional warfare (remember the static fronts and trench warfare of World War I); (2) planning for "small wars" against potential opponents having a higher technical level than the Red Army; (3) planning for partisan warfare, but with this warfare definitely subordinated to a regular army.

We should view this position dialectically. In a positive sense, it was the left position. It stressed politics and reliance on the working class much more than did Trotsky's, and acknowledged that this implied a lesser development of technique. However, this lower level of technique was seen as a result of Russia's backwardness, not as a necessity of relying on the masses. In a negative sense, it envisaged a permanent standing army. Thus this conception broke with the ideal of a militia which would replace the standing army altogether at some future time, as had still been outlined at the 9th Party Congress.

From this point on, no more was to be heard of the Paris Commune ideal. This should be seen as part of a whole system of planned incorporation of bourgeois ideas, NEP. The dominant force in the Soviet army, the worker-commanders, stood behind the Frunze reforms.

Frunze Reforms, 1924-5.

Under the Frunze reforms the Soviet army was to concentrate upon educating Communist military specialists to take the place of Tsarist military *spetsy* who still dominated the military hierarchy. The percentage of communists in the military administration was to be steadily increased. "Unitary command" (UC) was established. Commissars would no longer police the army commanders. The idea was that army commanders were to be communists, whose political reliability was therefore not in question.

A standing army was the center of military strategy. By December 1924

the "cadre army," as it was termed, comprised 47.6% of the entire infantry strength of the Red Army, and of course a much higher proportion of specialized units. 52.4% of the infantry was from the "territorial-militia" units. But even this militia plan was weakened by a relative neglect of the peasantry. Workers were to predominate in militia units. 16% of militia forces were to be from the "cadre" army. Peasants resented this policy, and demonstrations in which peasants protested discrimination against them in favor of workers, took place in 1924 in every military district.

Political training of the militia forces at the annual mobilization exercises was given special attention. This was good, but the militia plan, relying as it did on working-class predominance, was militarily as well as politically weak. Non-industrial areas had hardly any militia (since they had hardly any workers). For example, there were 13 territorial militia units in the Moscow Military District, but only one for the entire Siberian Military District. Only the infantry was really "militia-ized." Of the 11 cavalry divisions and 8 brigades, only one division was a territorial one.

The working class component of the army, both cadre and militia, was greatly strengthened over what it had been during the Civil War. Trotsky's Tsarist *spetsy* were largely pushed out of the Revolutionary Military Council (*Revvoensoviet*) and replaced by the worker-commanders, led by Voroshilov. By January 1925 Trotsky himself was removed from the *Revvoensoviet*. The Central Committee of the Party took over direct control of the Political Administration of the Army, which was now reduced in size and manned with Old Bolsheviks.

During the "Lenin Enrollment" of 1924 the Army admitted many officers to the Party. By 1924 as well a number of military academies had been set up. "Such institutions, although bearing Red Army names, were founded quite literally in the Imperial Russian Academies for the most part, and the staff showed the same discrepancies in social and political aspects." (Erickson) The future Red commanders were to be trained here.

The Frunze reforms therefore did not resolve the basic contradiction in the Red Army, but made it sharper. The militia system was retained, stress being laid on political loyalty of commanders

and men. The Tsarist **spetsy** were pushed out of the front ranks, though they continued to exercise great influence through the academies and military research and planning. The Party took over responsibility for political training in the army. All this was an improvement over Trotsky's administration.

But the principle of abandoning the standing army for the "armed people" was given up. Henceforth reliance upon military "expertise" and a standing army organized in a bourgeois fashion was not to be questioned. Although UC was established, this was done because the bourgeois ideas of military organization now had a foothold **within the Party itself**, quite apart from Trotsky and his supporters. As Erickson put it, "if anything, Frunze was being very gradually but finally militarized out of his Communism" (p. 199).

Voroshilov replaced Frunze in November, 1925 (upon the latter's death) as Commissar for War. But a week later Tukhachevsky was made head of the Red Army Staff. It was the "red commanders" who had given ground to the advocates of military expertise.

Nonetheless the contradiction still existed. UC was not full, since the Central Committee still directly supervised political work in the army. The idea of a Cadet Corps to train a military elite from a relatively early age (as done in Germany or Imperial Russia) was still rejected.

The 1924 Provisional Field Service Regulations set forth the military strategy of the army. According to Western writers who have examined this document (and who are sympathetic to it, thus likely to report it accurately), reliance upon military expertise and elitism, as advocated principally by Tukhachevsky, dominate over politics in it. Frunze and the red commanders in general had obviously been won over considerably to this approach. "There was a new emphasis upon the significance of the technical factor in modern war. Trotsky had not minced his words about the Soviet military predicament, and the problems which were raised up for the Soviet command by the technical backwardness of the Red Army and the instability among those who were its chief source of manpower—the peasants."

It was at once ironical and inevitable that Frunze's reforms

were themselves the complete justification of Trotsky's inescapable arguments, and the surrender was made to orthodoxy and the expense of the "revolutionary phraseology" which Trotsky had so often derided.... The whole tenor of the re-organization of the Red Army was designed to place it in a position to compete with an orthodox bourgeois army, whatever the present technical deficiencies. It was a programme which was not as thoroughly understood as Frunze might have wished, and he spared few pains to hammer in, with repetitive phrase and recapitulation of argument, the need for training and technical advance. (Erickson, pp. 207-8)

Perhaps the most obvious sign (in hindsight at least), as well as a major

During the trial these men, along with Bukharin, admitted conspiratorial relations with the German staff.

cause, of this development towards reliance upon bourgeois politics and organization in military matters was the important but little known collaboration between the Red Army and the German General Staff. This body was the most elitist, hierarchically organized and technically perfectionist military caste in the world. It was headed in the early 1920's by General Hans von Seeckt. Seeckt advocated peaceful relations between Germany and Russia to secure Germany's "rear." He saw great affinities between his Staff and the "young professionals" among the Soviet military such as Tukhachevsky, Uborevich, and Yakir.

The Relations with Germany under the Treaty of Rapallo.

Relations with Weimar Germany and



In the late 20s, senior Soviet officers were trained by the German Army—in spying as well as fighting. Here, Field Marshal Hindenburg greets Generals Yakir (right) and Tukhachevsky (third left) who was executed for treason in 1938.

the German General Staff were initiated in 1920 and formalized in the Treaty of Rapallo of April 16, 1922. The rationale for this was that the U.S.S.R. was isolated by the Revolution. No industrialized nation was willing to trade with it. Germany was also isolated politically by the Treaty of Versailles, which limited German armed forces and forbade Germany to produce armaments. The Soviet state agreed to provide territory for Germany to build munitions and airplane factories and to hold secret troop exercises. In return the Soviets would get a percentage of the munitions and armaments, and Soviet workers and technicians would be trained to produce them. What proved to be the most significant aspect was at first not emphasized. A few Soviet and German officers observed and participated in military exercises. Eventually these Soviet officers received a good deal of training from the German General Staff facilities.

This collaboration began at Trotsky's initiative, aided by Soviet politicians who were closely associated with him such as Radek, Rosengol'ts, and Krestinsky. It is certainly possible that, in addition to the official relations established at this time, certain personal and clandestine

relations were also set up along the lines of the admissions made by these men at the 1938 trial of the "Anti-Soviet Bloc of Rights and Trotskyists." During the trial these men along with Bukharin (one of the Rights) admitted conspiratorial relations with the German General Staff, Trotsky in exile, and Tukhachevsky and his military group. Indeed, what Bukharin admitted there (as opposed to what prosecutor Vyshinsky charged, and what he was found guilty of) seems to guarantee that some such kind of understandings existed. There is very strong evidence that Tukhachevsky and the military group were in fact conspiring with the Germans. There is nothing implausible about the list of the accusations, however much most bourgeois historians reject the trial as a frame-up and the charges as fabrications.

There was also a clear distinction made by the Germans concerning the attitudes of the different groups within the Soviet military towards them. They were angered when Commissar of War Voroshilov published details about secret German military strength. Captured documents show that the Germans felt entirely differently about the "young professionals" around Tukhachevsky,

the later subjects of the Military Purge. In General von Blomberg's 1928 report about the Soviet Army Tukhachevsky was carefully noted as possible leader of a subversive movement within the U.S.S.R. Blomberg was interested in retaining Uborevich in Germany in order to further influence him in favor of German interests ("um ihn weiter in deutschen Sinne zu beeinflussen"). Uborevich spent almost 3 years (1926-9) in Germany being trained in the General Staff School. In 1927 he was accompanied by Eideman, another leader shot with Tukhachevsky and himself in 1937. After Uborevich, Kork (1928-9) and Putna (1929-30) were selected as Russian military attachés in Berlin, Uborevich was sent back in 1929-30 to obtain more expertise. In 1930 German General Hammerstein called Uborevich "very pro-German" ("sehr deutschfreundlich"). The Soviet officer had expressed to some German industrialists in Berlin the hope that the Soviet Union and Germany could "slaughter the Poles" and "partition Poland once again" within two years! All this indicates a close attachment between the Tukhachevsky group, and great interest in this group on the German part, with clear political motives in mind.

However we should recall that relations with the **Reichswehr** (German military)—although not the personal agreements—were **official Soviet policy**. Voroshilov was a proponent of these contacts, which were intended to raise the technical level of the Soviet army. The political intrigues and influence these contacts exercised upon the Soviet army leaders were simply a consequence of this policy, a sharper form of bourgeois influence.

As with NEP in general, the "compromise" with the bourgeoisie which the Bolshevik Party agreed to make they were unable to keep within the limits they wanted—as is inevitably the case. Allowing "a little bourgeois ideology" or "a little opportunism" is like being "a little pregnant."

Rapallo marks the beginning of the development of the Red Army officers into an elite military caste, the logical result of reliance upon technical expertise and a standing army rather than the workers and peasants—in other words, of capitalist relations in the military. However, this process was not completed

within the military until World War II. Much struggle between the left and the right would still occur.

But the struggle was within limits which guaranteed the eventual victory of the Right unless the limits were broken. The left—Stalin, Voroshilov, the "red commanders" of the Civil War—demanded some form of dual command and emphasized the importance (always within the above limits) of political training. They stressed the territorial militia-cum-cadre army or "mixed" system; the Frunze concepts of "proletarian warfare"; an important, though subordinate, role for partisans relying on rousing the masses.

As the first months of the Nazi invasion were to prove, however, this "mixed" system was not even militarily viable. The Nazi armies were technically superior, while the Soviets did not really have a concept of "people's war" which alone could have overcome the Nazis while preserving socialist politics.

As with NEP in general, bourgeois influences within the military were by the late 1920's too deeply entrenched to be uprooted by the great Left upsurge of the First Five-Year Plan, and finally overcame it.

Military Developments 1929-1937.

The developments within the Soviet armed forces are a reflection of those within Soviet society and the Bolshevik Party as a whole. At the same time, the contradictions within the military were sharper, stood out more clearly, and were resolved in a bourgeois way sooner and more completely, than in the rest of Soviet society. Due to the crucial nature of the question of armed force and defense, the logical conclusions of the Bolsheviks' incorrect attitude towards the peasantry, their determinist conception of socialism, and their reliance upon technique before politics, were reached earlier in military matters. By the mid-1930's revisionist developments which would take another 20 years to emerge full-blown in the rest of society were fully developed in the armed forces.

Even during the Soviet "great leap forward" of the First Five-Year Plan there was really no comparable leftward push within the military. Because the decision to place heavy reliance upon technical expertise had already been accepted even by the left forces, little attention was paid to the ideology of the military command. The "cultural revo-

lution" in education, history, literature, etc. was not really official Party policy, though it was tolerated for a number of years.⁵ With the military under Party control there was no parallel "cultural revolution" in it.

During 1929 to 1930, 1933-4, and again after the assassination of Kirov, from 1935 to 1936, there were serious purges in the Party. The purpose of these purges was, in the former cases, to check up on and expel non-proletarian elements, passive members, Right oppositionists and, in the latter case, to unmask hidden opposition circles as well. These purges were very light in the army. For example, in 1929 no more than 5% of Party members were purged (expelled, asked to resign, etc.) in the army, compared to 11% (later reduced to 8%) in the Party as a whole, and about 16% of rural party cells, where kulak influence was strong (Erickson, 315; Rigby, 178-81).

During the early 30s the shift to reliance on technique became more pronounced.

This is all the more significant since even before collectivization had been completed the military leaders were known to be in sympathy with the Right Opposition. In 1927, Yona Yakir and Vitovt Putna, "young professionals" associated with the Rapallo agreements and with Tukhachevsky, signed a pro-Opposition statement addressed to the Politburo. Reportedly it was very critical of Voroshilov's leadership. Thus the military command, a known center of right-wing opinion—the ex-Tsarist officers who were frankly non-Communist still dominated in military training, for example—was left relatively untouched. The Bolshevik leadership believed that the security of socialism lay primarily on technique—i.e. on weapons, and only

secondarily upon ideology—i.e. upon people.

The First Five-Year Plan did have its weaker counterpart within the military. Certain steps were taken which constituted a definite though feeble tendency to strengthen the armed forces politically. For example, Tukhachevsky was replaced as Chief of Staff in 1928 by Shaposhnikov. But Shaposhnikov was an advocate of developing military technique as well, and so not decisively different from Tukhachevsky. Although Tukhachevsky was certainly "demoted" by this move, especially since he was a Party member and Shaposhnikov was not, it did not amount to much. The army was still to be a mass army. In the context of the day, this was in contrast with "the small, mechanized armies of the type of the Fascist police" (as Tukhachevsky himself put it). The Central Committee did strengthen the Political Administration. The army was to be "the school of Socialism for millions of peasants and workers." The working-class component of the army was increased after 1929. In the same year Yan Gamarnik replaced Andrei Bubnov as head of the Political Administration. Gamarnik was staunchly anti-Oppositionist at the time; Bubnov had signed the "Declaration of the 46" in 1923, a pro-Trotsky statement.

Officers of the Red Army were encouraged to join the Communist Party **en masse**. They were led by Shaposhnikov who joined in 1930. By the end of 1932 over 25% of the armed forces were Communist Party members. However, the proportion was higher with higher rank, and was highest of all for the top officers. In 1929 (for which we have the breakdown of figures) almost 50% of all communists in the armed forces were officers and NCO's. A German officer expert in the Soviet army⁶ believed that this was actively pushed by the Party, and that most officers who joined the Party at this time were motivated by careerism, not by principle. This was certainly the case with many. For example, Andrei Vlasov, later the Nazi collaborator during World War II, joined the Party at this time in order to further his career.⁷

5. See the collection edited by Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Revolution in Russia, 1928-1931*.

6. Generalmajor B. Mudler-Hillebrand, in an unpublished report in the National Archives.

7. "Sven Steinberg" (a pseudonym), Valsov, p. 7, George Fischer, *Soviet Opposition During World War II*, p. 28.

In 1929 the official **Field Service Regulations** were issued. They reflected the fact that they had been written largely by the ex-Tsarist **spetsy** in the military academies. These bourgeois "experts" continued to dominate military theory in the U.S.S.R. They had only been removed from positions of command and political authority, never from positions of ideological influence over the Party and over other officers and officer students. While stressing the need for political training and reliability, Erickson states they argued strongly for UC and reflected the increasing reliance upon technical expertise now accepted by both left and right.

In retrospect we can see that the left had tried to push for a more political approach in the military as well. But this left advance was hamstrung because of the limits imposed upon it by reliance upon technique. The First Five-Year Plan concentrated heavily on building up defense industries and armaments. It was clear from the late 1920's to the Soviet leaders that a new imperialist war was in the making.

"Industrialization did not signify, however, a surrender to a technological view of war, which was paramount in bourgeois armies according to Soviet views. Both Shaposhnikov and Tukhachevsky had stressed not only the military-technical processes of war but also the fundamental place which the morale factor must take in the preparation of armed forces and population alike" (Erickson, 306). The Soviet Army was still the most politically motivated in the world. No bourgeois force stressed political training to anything like the same degree. Every imperialist army was far more of an elite, "cadre" army, relied far more on technical forces, than did the Soviet army. It is only with hindsight, and a revolutionary perspective that we can see that the roots of revisionism within the Soviet army were deeply seated even by the late 1920's.

The Military and the "Great Retreat."

Beginning even in 1931, before the Nazi seizure of power in Germany, the Soviet government began "inching (its) way out of Rapallo" by signing a non-aggression pact with France. Formal relations under the Rapallo Treaty ended in 1933, when Hitler took power. However the "Great

Retreat"⁸ from the leftward spring of the First Five-Year Plan was especially marked in the military. After 1934 the Frunze system established in 1924 was abolished. A technical revolution in the Soviet army made possible a more elite, "cadre" standing army force. Mechanized brigades, motorized troops, modern artillery, an expanding chemical warfare branch replaced the relatively much smaller cadre force backed up with the extensive territorial-militia system. The "**Oscaviakhim**," a mass para-military organization to promote military knowledge, skills, civil defense, and political training among the population, had been set up during the 1920's and consolidated in 1927; it was gradually de-emphasized. In 1934, at the same time as other sweeping changes were made in the government of the Soviet State, the Revvoensoviet (Revolutionary Military Council) was abolished and replaced by a People's Commissariat of Defense under Voroshilov. Since more and more high State officials were Party members, the 1934 changes reflected the belief that, with the industrialization of the country and the recruitment of masses of the intelligentsia to the Party, the contradictions between the Party and the State were becoming unimportant.

During the early 1930's the shift to reliance upon technique became more and more pronounced. At the 7th Congress of Soviets in January 1935 Tukhachevsky made a speech which dramatized the transformation of the Soviet army into a technically modern force organized along bourgeois lines. By 1935, according to Erickson, the 'revolution' in the Soviet army

involved both the position of the command staff and the further advance to a large standing army, resulting in the eclipse of the militia system. The real revolution was the progressive normalization of the Soviet military establishment, which resulted in the Red Army being brought into line with other European armies, conventionalized to a point where militarism seemed to be triumphant over Socialism.

Erickson continues, "this could not fail to have pronounced effects on the status and prestige of the command." In 1935 the quantitative developments towards

8. A term used by the bourgeois writer Nicholas Timashev to denote the relatively rapid develop-

ment of conservative tendencies within the USSR after the early 1930's.



Mass display of Soviet tanks in late 30s Red Square display symbolizes the Red Army's shift of emphasis from workers and politics to technique and machines.

reliance upon technique rather than politics led to a qualitative turn to the right. The most striking change was the formal introduction of officers' ranks as in any bourgeois army. This removed the last difference in principle between the hierarchy of the Soviet army and any bourgeois force. The first five Marshalls of the Soviet Union were created. They were: Voroshilov and Budyonny, red commanders of the Civil War noted for political devotion rather than technical expertise; Yegorov and Blyukher, of poor background (a peasant and a worker respectively), and Tukhachevsky, major representative of the "young professionals," most prominent among the military experts, and closely identified with the Rapallo relations with the German General Staff.

The roles of the Political Commissars were lessened in that they were now required to have the same formal military training as the commanders. In other

words they were "second-grade" commanders. It apparently became easier for commanders to have commissars removed whom they did not consider amicable enough—those who interfered too much with operational matters.

In the words of Mueller-Hillebrand the years 1934-6 witnessed a "gradual dismantling of the territorial system in favor of a reinforced standing army and a more tightly knit military leadership." In August 1936 the age limit of the draft was lowered from 21 to 19 years, which increased the size of the army. "It made possible the replacement of the territorial organization by the cadre army..." (p. 139).

These years which saw a qualitative shift towards bourgeois forms in the armed forces also saw the height of Tukhachevsky's power and status and

that of the "young professionals" associated with him. In January 1936 he was selected by the Soviet Government to represent it at the funeral of England's King George V. Tukhachevsky turned this assignment into a trip including stops in France and Germany. All reports of this trip make it clear that Tukhachevsky was acting almost as an independent political force himself.

The German General Staff meanwhile had by no means lost either interest or contact with Tukhachevsky and his ilk. In 1932 Tukhachevsky and Yegorov ("ex-Imperial colonel and vigorous partisan of the collaboration with the Reichswehr," according to Erickson, which we recall was now being de-emphasized by Stalin) attended maneuvers of the German Army at the German General Staff's invitation. Yegorov was now Chief of Staff replacing Shaposhnikov, and Uborevich—upon whom the Germans had lavished so much attention—replaced Yegorov as commander of the Belorussian Military District. This was the area adjacent to Poland, and so of special interest to the Germans as well, determined as both they and Uborevich were to eliminate the Poles. On September 18, 1932 Tukhachevsky himself had arrived in Berlin, apparently at the invitation of General Kurt von Schleicher. Schleicher was very influential in German politics, a close ally of von Papen's and therefore also of German industrial interests—the German ruling class, which also looked to Papen at this time. Tukhachevsky attended German army maneuvers in Frankfurt-am-Oder (in Eastern Germany close to Poland), visited German armaments firms and East Prussia as well. As Erickson—who does not believe in any Tukhachevsky conspiracy with the Germans—nonetheless admits, "What, if anything, in the nature of political discussions passed between Schleicher and Tukhachevsky remains quite impenetrably hidden." (342). Tukhachevsky and others were still very pro-German in 1935, as Erickson shows.

By 1936 the military commanders appear to have been asserting their independence by pushing for right-wing concessions all along the line. A number of academies were founded or re-organized to stress purely technical training, such

as the Stalin Motorization and Mechanization Academy, the Dzershinsky Artillery Academy, the Budyonnyy Electro-Technical Institute, etc. A General Staff Academy was founded in 1936 "for the express purpose of training very senior commanders" in traditional bourgeois strategy. The Civil War leaders of the red commander type were left behind. A strict military hierarchy was set up, in "an over-all system which stressed control of the mass by strict centralization and nothing less than automatism." The common soldier was reduced to a pawn; his initiative was to count for nothing.

Politics was de-emphasized in every way. Cossack formations were set up in April 1936. Under the Tsars, the elite Cossacks had been traditionally used against the workers when no other troops would have been reliable. Til now their own units had been forbidden by the

By 1936, the Civil War leaders of the Red Commander type like Budyonnyi were left behind

Soviets as politically suspect. Most of the famous Cossack leaders were in exile in Germany, where they were busy working with the Nazis; the émigré Cossacks set up an SS Brigade during World War II.⁹

Political developments were equally right-wing. Under Gamarnik the role of the commissars was being drastically reduced. As Erickson, who as anti-communist is favorable to this development, puts it;

Intensive training in the techniques of mobile war and concentration upon raising technical standards were seized upon (with no small degree of justification) as a pretext for crowding out

9. Two recent books—Nicholas Bethell's *The Last Secret* and Nikolai Tolstoy's *The Secret Betrayal* which attack the British and U.S. governments of 1945-46 for forcibly returning these Cossacks to

the USSR, document their atrocities. See "BBC Time, WNET and the 'Poor' Nazis," PL, Vol. 11., No. 1 (February-March, 1978), pp. 38 ff.

political indoctrination. (p. 423)
He sums up the results of the develop-
ments this way:

The very great significance of the 1935 decree on ranks implied that, socially, the Red Army was moving to a form not radically different from that of a 'capitalist' army. . . . Trotsky was indubitably correct in seeing 1935 as a revolution in the relation of the army to the state. From this initial consolidation of prestige and privilege, the officer corps was closing itself up, with its special immunities and benefits developing almost into a caste. Nor was the officer corps immune from the wider social effects, deriving basically from the increased technical requirements, in so far that influx to the officer corps was coming from the new intelligentsia. (Erickson, p. 446)

This independence of the "military caste" was taking more overt political forms, in addition to Tukhachevsky's trips abroad. According to rumors from a high officer in the NKVD who defected to the West in 1936, all the Red Army officers on the Central Committee except Voroshilov and Budyonnyy—that is, Yakir, Gamarnik, Yegorov, Ubovich, Blyukher, Tukhachevsky, and Bulin (Gamarnik's deputy) voted against bringing Bukharin, chief spokesman for the right, to trial. Bukharin had been restored to a relatively prominent position—he was editor of *Izvestia*—and was outspoken in his hatred of Stalin and the policies associated with him. From February to April 1936 Bukharin had gone to Western Europe, to negotiate with the exiled German Social-Democratic Party and others for the Marx-Engels papers. While there he met and talked with the major leaders of the Menshevik Party in exile, Fyodor Dan and Boris Nikolaevsky. These men were the senior, most vociferous and most knowledgeable anti-Communists in the bourgeois world; Nikolaevsky personally trained most "first-generation" American Sovietologists. To them, and to the revisionist

writer Andre Malraux (whose novel *Man's Fate* is a disgustingly elitist and defeatist view of the Chinese Communist revolt of 1927; the "hero" is an intellectual terrorist) that Stalin was "a small, malicious man, no, not a man, a devil." It is impossible to believe that Bukharin did not engage in some organizing against the Soviet government while abroad.¹⁰ When he returned, the Central Committee discussed prosecuting him; it was then that the Red Army men named above were said to have voted in his favor.

Tukhachevsky's last "contribution" to Soviet military thought was his commentary on the 1936 Field Service Regulations just adopted. These regulations embodied Tukhachevsky's and the specialists' ideas, stressing the importance of political training or morale. Voroshilov was criticized by name in

Stalin did not repudiate the primacy of technique over politics.

the latter context, a striking example of the unparalleled independence given Tukhachevsky and the military staff in general. For Voroshilov was Tukhachevsky's immediate superior, while his article was published in *Bolshevik* (now *Kommunist*), the theoretical organ of the C.P.S.U.

1937 to World War II—Soviet military developments.

At the February-March 1937 Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., Stalin presented a lengthy report "On Shortcomings of Party Work and Methods of Liquidating Trotskyists and Other

10. Bukharin's conversations with these men are recorded in Nikolaevsky, "Letter of an Old Bolshevik," in *Power and The Soviet Elite*; and Lydia Dan, "Bukharin o Staline," *Novy Zhurnal*, 75 (March, 1964). Nikolaevsky was a famous liar (see Alexander Werth's comments on his book *Forced*

Labor in Russia in Russia Under Khrushchev; Russia: Hopes and Fears; and Russia; The Post-War Years) who once wrote that Hitler's own rise to power was part of Stalin's plot to rule the world! (in *Narodnaya Pravda*, No. 5, 1949). Dan led the exiled Mensheviks.

Double-dealers." This report is, within the limits of its time, very left.¹¹ It notes the fact that a preoccupation with economic work has left the C.P. cadre very weak politically, and recommends setting up new political training courses (this theme was reiterated by Zhdanov at the 18th Party Congress in 1939). It calls for relying upon the masses, especially those not in the Communist Party. It correctly recognizes that the right-wing forces are to be found mainly within the Party and reaffirms the sharpening of class struggle during the building of socialism. Unfortunately Stalin did not recognize to what extent the saboteurs and oppositionists had been a logical consequence of the policies followed by the C.P.S.U. He does not repudiate the notion of the primacy of technique over politics, though more stress is laid on the latter. Finally, Stalin criticizes the tendency to let mainly intellectuals and trained people into the C.P.S.U. But this practice did not stop, but rather accelerated after 1937.

During this speech Stalin said the following:

It is, of course, true that only individuals support the Trotskyite wreckers and tens of millions support the Bolsheviks. But it does not follow from this at all that wreckers can not cause serious harm to our undertakings. It does not require a large number of people in order to ruin and wreck.... To win a battle during wartime perhaps several corps of Red Army men are needed. But in order to throw away this victory at the front, for this a few spies are enough, somewhere in the Army Staff or even at the Divisional Staff who can steal the operational plan and give it up to the enemy. (ed. McNeal, I, 219).

On April 28 *Pravda* had published an article on the necessity for the Red Army man to master politics as well as techniques, that the Red Army existed to fight the internal as well as the external enemy. The implications of that article were clearly directed to preparing the way for a drastic political drive in the army,

and suggested that Stalin had lost all confidence in the Political Administration. (Erickson, p. 459).

On May 10, 1937 UC was abolished in the Red Army. Military councils were set up which had to countersign all orders of commanders, and commissars were to take up their old functions in the units. Between May 10 and June 11, when the arrest for treason of Tukhachevsky and the others was announced on the front page of *Pravda*, a large number of the highest ranking military men were relieved of their posts and either arrested or reassigned. On June 1 the suicide of Yan Gamarnik, head of the Political Administration of the Army, was announced. According to Svetlanin, Gamarnik was the linchpin for the whole military conspiracy. Even Erickson, who denies in the face of his own evidence any conspiracy with the Germans, recognizes the political reasons behind the purge:

... the Tukhachevsky-Gamarnik policy was taking such a course—dictated by the interests of military efficiency—that it would have led the army out from under strict political control. (Erickson, p. 465).

The evidence tends to show that those proven or suspected to have had connections with the Tukhachevsky and Co. plot with the Germans were removed first. Those command officers who were associated with Tukhachevsky's bourgeois reliance upon technique and with downgrading the importance of political training were purged later, in 1938 (Erickson, p. 470). By the end of 1938 the purge in the Army had reached very great proportions, all in the officer ranks. The higher the rank, the greater the proportion purged. According to Erickson 25% to 50% of the officers in the armed forces were involved, although many were later reinstated. They were replaced by men whose experience as officers dated in general from since the Civil War period. This meant that the new commanders were largely trained during the Frunze reform period (1924-34), when political training was relatively highly stressed, rather than during the Tsarist period. Those higher officers directly related to the First Cavalry

11. It should be studied by all those interested in the history of the U.S.S.R. and the Purges. It is not easily available in English, unfortunately. It is included in the later editions of *Problems of*

Leninism, and in a London edition, *The Moscow Trial*, ed. W.P. and Zelda Coates, 1937. The Russian edition, in Robert McNeal, ed. *J.V. Stalin: Sochineniya, I (XIV)*, (1933-40).

Army (Voroshilov's and Budyonniv's force) of the Civil War were largely either retained or, in a few cases (such as the later Marshal Rokossovsky), rehabilitated.¹²

Much has been written on the "great harm" which the purge of so many high-ranking and technically expert officers supposedly caused the Soviet army. It should be noted therefore that the most scholarly bourgeois sources agree with the Nazis (who knew from experience) and with some military observers at the time that the opposite was the case, and that the Soviet Army was, if anything, strengthened by these purges. According to Erickson

For an army which had just undergone a drastic purging, the Soviet performance was surprisingly good (at Khalkin Gol).

To date the beginning of the decline in the efficiency of Soviet military aviation from the purge may be somewhat misleading. (pp. 498; 501)

Col. Robert Faymonville, American military attaché in Moscow, insisted that the Soviet army had not been harmed by the purges and would withstand Nazi attack,¹³ as did Joseph E. Davies, member of the U.S. ruling class, personal friend of Roosevelt and Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. Both Himmler and Goebbels in his diaries report that Stalin had been correct in purging politically unreliable men from the command. They seem to be echoing Hitler's own judgment made on May 7, 1943. According to Toland (Adolf Hitler, II, p. 847)

He praised Stalin for purging the Red Army of defeatists and installing political commissars with the fighting forces.

Even Erickson admits that

In the event of the Soviet Union being involved in war and suffering serious initial reverses, the purge ensured that no military command group existed which might be of a mind to seize upon this opportunity to undo Stalin's dictatorship... in general the previous high command had shown

a notable independence of outlook, a singular homogeneity and internal loyalties. The present command exhibited no such characteristics. (p. 509)

Interesting remarks from one who discounts any active opposition on the commanders' part!

The point here is that the damage done to the Soviet military had been done before the purge. Bourgeois practices were deeply rooted, not in the military reliance upon the standing army alone, but in the very basic conceptions held by the Bolsheviks like Stalin concerning how to construct socialism. As a result, the leftward turn in policy stemming from the discovery of treason and political unreliability of the command staff was very limited in extent, and was relatively swiftly reversed.

In May 1940 the rank of "general" (replacing that of Komandarm) was reintroduced. Although this appeared to involve only a change of name, in reality it was more significant. "General" was a Tsarist term. The soldiers and communists denounced it as a symbol of the brutal discipline and elitism of the Imperial Army. The officers, on the other hand, wanted it, since it emphasized the traditional privileges and rights of the elite command staff. When the rank of "general" was reintroduced it was accompanied with a number of regulations strengthening discipline and setting officers apart from men.

This was the Disciplinary Code of 1940. "In this further round between socialism and militarism, the former now lost a great deal of ground" (Erickson, p. 555):

In 1935 the tendency to transform the officer corps into a caste had been plainly discernible. Although the 1940 Code still shrank from the term "officer" ("commander" remaining in use), the differentiation of rank and demands for respect for rank were more sharply emphasized. The salute was re-introduced. Courts

12. Many of the real oppositionists were *not* killed, or even purged. Grigory Tokaev, a military oppositionist were *not* killed, or even purged. Grigory Tokaev, a military oppositionist who claims to have been involved in a high-level conspiracy (which never acted) against Stalin, survived the period, as did many of the co-conspirators he discusses. See *Comrade X*. Svetlanin was cashiered

from the service but not arrested *The Far Eastern Conspiracy*

13. Faymonville's insistence on this point probably ruined his career. His superiors, viscerally anti-communist, did not "want to hear" that the Soviet Army remained strong. See the article on him by Herdon and Baylen in *Slavic Review*, March 1975.



PREPARATION FOR WAR: Teachers' college students learn to fire machine guns. Students and workers like these, trained in the period before Hitler's invasion, fought as partisans against the Nazis.

of Honor for officers (a device of the Imperial Russian Army) came back. Unconditional obedience was stipulated by Article 6; Article 8 required execution of orders "without reservation, precisely and promptly." Soviet military discipline was to be "higher, firmer and marked with severer and harsher requirements than discipline in other armies based upon class subjugation." "Fraternization" between officers and men was over and done with; the "liberal commander" who courted popularity was a danger to military efficiency, he was "not a commander but a rag."

Thus upon the outbreak of the Nazi invasion the Soviet Army was back on the revisionist road advocated by Tukhachevsky.

The Nazi Invasion and Victory of Revisionism in the Military.

There has been a lot of nonsense written by Soviet "dissidents" such as Medvedev, Nekrich, and Pyotr Yakir (son of the Yakir executed with Tukhachevsky) about Stalin's supposedly "trusting" Hitler not to invade the

U.S.S.R. Many of the military memoirs published between the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1961 and Khrushchev's fall in October, 1964, take this line, as did Khrushchev himself. This story is just part of the anti-Stalin crusade pushed by the right-wing forces within the U.S.S.R. to justify their abandonment of all the positive aspects of Soviet policy under Stalin.

In fact Stalin and the Soviet leadership were feverishly trying to prepare for the war with Nazi Germany they knew would come soon. Soviet military expenditures were hugely increased every year after 1935. The U.S.S.R. had sought in vain for mutual defense pacts with France and Britain, only signing the Pact with Hitler when the Allies had rebuffed the Soviet's final attempts and the Nazi invasion of Poland was two weeks away. On May 5, 1941 Stalin warned of an impending Nazi invasion in a secret speech in the Kremlin before young officer-graduates of the military academies. True, the U.S.S.R. was fulfilling its deliveries to Germany under the economic agreements concluded at the same time as the German-Soviet Pact until the very day of the invasion. But Stalin told Lord Beaverbrook (the

Canadian-British newspaper tycoon) in October, 1941, that he was doing this merely in order to try to get "another six months or so," to buy Hitler off for a time, in order better to prepare for the inevitable attack. Erickson who despises Stalin and worships bourgeois military technique (and therefore Tukhachevsky and Co.) believes that the U.S.S.R. would in fact have been ready for war by the summer of 1942 (p. 575). Alexander Werth agrees (Russia at War, pp. 142-3). This is exactly what Stalin had told the young graduates on May 5.

At any rate—insofar as it is an important point—the Nazi invasion was expected. Erickson agrees too that Stalin cannot be held personally responsible for the entire failure, as the "dissidents" falsely state. Erickson correctly describes the Khrushchev-type attacks on Stalin:

To attribute to Stalin's final, almost fatal blunders the full responsibility for the weakening at the Soviet frontiers is a distortion deliberate enough to serve present Soviet political purposes and touched with a melodramatic tint to conceal the basic crisis of the system. (p. 583; see also pp. 616-7; 625-7).

The real reason for Soviet defeats was that the U.S.S.R. was caught midway in transition between two very different schools or lines on the nature of defense and organization of the Army, as we have seen. After the leftward swing in policy resulting from rejection of the policies represented by Tukhachevsky, Soviet military doctrine had reverted to something closer to the Frunze position. This meant: less authority for the commanders, more for the commissars; reliance on the strategy of maneuver rather than upon positional defense; a greater role for partisans (in co-ordination with the standing army); greater stress on politics, less on expertise in general. This may be illustrated by a quotation from an article in *Pravda* of February 6, 1939:

Military thought in the capitalist world has got into a blind alley. The dashing "theories" about a lightning war (Blitzkrieg), or about small select armies of technicians, or about the air war which can replace all other military operation—all these theories arise from the bourgeoisie's deathly fear of the proletarian

revolution. In its mechanical way, the imperialist bourgeoisie over-rates equipment and underrates man. (Werth, p. 35).

These principles were embodied in the 1939 Draft Field Regulations (replacing the Tukhachevskyite 1936 Field Regulations). They were in the process of being reversed after the Finnish War. But this process was not complete. Defenses were half-constructed; airfields uncamouflaged, half-built, many near the frontier; ammunition dumps for partisans not completed.

In this sense it is true that the Soviet aversion for Tukhachevsky's ideas about reliance upon technique rather than politics had left the U.S.S.R. more poorly prepared. Probably the thorough adoption of any definite military plan would have meant a better initial defense than that which did occur. And it became obvious, as the war proceeded, that the U.S.S.R. was capable of beating the Nazi forces with a fundamentally bourgeois form of military organization, buoyed up by the tremendous political dedication of the Communist forces' high morale and revolutionary heroism, which enabled Soviet commanders to perform miracles.

Immediately upon the invasion (June 22, 1941 the anniversary of Napoleon's invasion of Russia in 1812), Stalin and the political leadership of the C.P.S.U. took close charge of military affairs. GOKO (State Defense Committee) was set up in June, and soon after that the *Stavka*, General Staff of the High Command (after July, of the Supreme Command), an even smaller group led by Stalin took charge of all military operations. On July 16, 1941, as it became increasingly clear that the Soviet Army was being defeated all along the front, UC was again abolished and the commissar system reintroduced. Stalin and the political leadership of the C.P.S.U. had never really trusted the military leaders politically, at least after 1937. Yet now, during the invasion, they were forced to rely upon these leaders.

The result was: (1) close supervision by the political leadership (*Stavka*) of all military decisions, with Commissars and special envoys being sent out from Moscow to check up on all field commanders; (2) very severe discipline for commanders who failed to carry out commands to the letter, or who survived their men in the event of a severe de-

feat. General Pavlov, commander of the Western Military District, was recalled to Moscow and shot in late 1941, as was his staff and that of the North-Western (Leningrad) front, after their armies had been largely taken prisoner. As the Nazi troops approached Leningrad, Moscow, and (in 1942) Stalingrad, this political leadership appeared to work and the tide of battle turned.

The privileges and ranks removed after the initial defeats were then returned to the officer corps. UC was re-established for good on October 9, 1942.

A little later, in 1943 (January 6), in addition to new uniforms, a whole code of manners was introduced for officers; above a certain rank, for instance, they could not travel by public transport, and were not allowed to carry paper parcels. Altogether a number of points from the etiquette of the old Tsarist Army were revived. (Werth, p. 401).

The decree of 24 July 1943 classified the members of the armed forces as enlisted men, sergeants, officers and generals. This was a decisive step on the road to creating the privileged class of the Soviet officers. (Mueller-Hillebrand, p. 149)

It was not until the height of the Stalingrad battle that epaulettes and a lot of gold braid were added to officers' uniforms—epaulettes like those which angry soldiers had torn off their officers' shoulders back in 1917. Out of the fire and smoke of Stalingrad the gold-braided officers emerged;... Their introduction was like a collective reward to the whole officer class of the Soviet Union. The gold braid also emphasized the professionalism of the Red Army. It was no longer a revolutionary army of *sans-culottes* (the word for proletarians in the French Revolution). (Werth, 389-90)

As the war was coming to an end the Party took steps to see that the military did not gain too much independence because of the popularity of its commanders, especially of Marshal Zhukov. In June 1945 Stalin assumed the title of "Generalissimo." A campaign of propaganda publicized the truth that the Communist Party and the political dedication

of its members bore the major responsibility for the fact that the Soviet Army had succeeded against the elite Nazi army where no bourgeois army did or could have. Indeed, the Soviet performance against the Nazis made the collapse of the French Army, the British Expeditionary Force (ending in Dunkirk evacuation), the Polish Army, and (in the Far East) the American and British Armies, look sick. This was certainly not due to the likes of Zhukov who, however "talented," was only a commander. It was due to the **people**. From 1946 to 1952 Zhukov, most popular of military leaders, was given relatively minor commands in Odessa and then the Urals in order to remove him from the limelight. Khrushchev brought him back as Minister of Defense in 1955 to ally with him against the remaining supporters of Stalin on the Presidium (Molotov, Bulganin, Kaganovich) in 1957, but had him

At the height of the Battle of Stalingrad officers' gold braid and epaulettes were introduced.

dismissed later in the same year for trying to alienate the army from its political leaders.

During the War developments towards the right within the U.S.S.R. generally, and within the military specifically, moved decisively ahead. This was not basically reversed by the leftward turn led by Stalin and his supporters after the war (often called "Zhdanovshchina" with respect to culture), a final attempt to restore Leninist ideas, set up a new type of Comintern (the Cominform), and attack bourgeois ideology.¹⁴ All this was done incompletely; without arousing much mass participation (though there was some); and within very narrow limits. It was dropped upon Stalin's death.

14. See, for example, R. Nordahl, in *Soviet Studies*, April 1974.

The article on the following pages, analyzing the development of capitalism in Iran, was written by a member of the Iranian Students Association. It was originally published, in English and Farsi, as part of a PLP pamphlet *The Struggle for Socialism and the Development of Capitalism in Iran*. The primary value of the paper to the revolutionary movement is that it clarifies the class character of Iran, which has a class structure similar to most countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Many members of the ISA differ with Progressive Labor Party regarding this question. Some follow a Maoist line and believe Iran is "semi-feudal, semi-colonial." We believe the facts in this article put this anti-Marxist theory to rest by showing the growth and consolidation of capitalism in Iran.

There are also those in the ISA, especially supporters of the Fedayeen guerillas (a leftist group in Iran who believe in, and have led, armed struggle) who consider Iran to be "dependent capitalist." A dependent capitalist nation is said to be one dominated by an imperialist, or monopoly capitalist nation, such as the U.S. Those who follow this theory believe, as do the Maoists, that the national bourgeoisie (i.e., those capitalists who wish to kick the imperialists out of Iran and put their local brand of capitalism into power) is a progressive force. Because of this, both the "dependent capitalist" theorists and the Maoists call for two-stage revolution: first, a revolution led by the national bourgeoisie to clear away the feudal remnants and the comprador bourgeoisie (i.e., those capitalists in direct alliance with the imperialists) and only then a proletarian revolution for socialism.


When this article was first published four months ago, we wrote the following, an analysis which has been borne out by recent events in Iran.

PLP rejected this two-stage nationalist theory many years ago (see *Road to Revolution III*, 1971). Based on historical experience, our party concluded that all nationalist movements end up in a capitalist society, and that the "second stage" of the revolution is never carried through by the nationalist revolutionaries. Today, it is crystal clear that the only path to liberation throughout the world is socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. We feel that this paper reflects this general outlook. However, this paper also has

some serious weaknesses. For example, it implies that the national bourgeoisie are sometimes an anti-imperialist force. The program of the national bourgeoisie has been to make a better deal for themselves with the imperialists, not to eliminate imperialism or the capitalist system which causes imperialism. The national bourgeoisie want to become the big bourgeoisie. Alliance with any sector of the capitalist class is suicide for the working-class movement, for each group of capitalists seeks to crush the workers' movement as soon as the opposing group of capitalists has been vanquished.

This paper does not expose the dangers of alliance with capitalists. It fails to deal with the fact that the current mass upheaval in Iran is under the leadership of religious forces, rather than revolutionary communists. These religious forces—specifically Khomeini—must be exposed sharply as forces who will do no more than maintain capitalism under a slightly different, probably even more fascist veneer. For the revolutionary movement to succeed in establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in Iran, all such misleaders must be mercilessly exposed and defeated within the mass movement. The failure of leftist forces to do that in the U.S. or in Iran reflects continuous opportunism. The author's failure to deal with this issue reflects a similar weakness.

In addition, this article is not placed in the context of the sharpening drive towards world war between U.S. and Soviet imperialism. Iran occupies a key central point of conflict between these two imperialisms. To neglect the role of modern Soviet imperialism and discuss only British and U.S. imperialism is to fall into the revisionist trap of seeing Soviet anti-Shah propaganda as a positive gesture of solidarity, rather than as a prelude to consolidating rising Soviet imperialist power. Thus, the author's call for the formation of a revolutionary communist party to lead a socialist revolution remains unclear, since the author makes no break with Soviet revisionism and imperialism in the article.



Despite the backward character of some agricultural production, Iran is a fully capitalist country.

Recently, the Khomeini-Bazargan-Yazdi-Antezemen-led government has begun a serious crackdown on the leftist Fedayeen guerrillas. Dozens of Fedayeen were arrested in the oil city of Abadan and shipped to Teheran for imprisonment. Because of large support for the Fedayeen, many have been released. Sellers of revolutionary literature in Teheran have been harassed by Khomeini's supporters, with the backing of the government. Newspapers which have criticized government officials or the Revolutionary Council (made up of Khomeini, Yazdi and other leading Muslims) have been shut down. Recently, the Fedayeen have again gone underground to avoid being repressed by the Revolutionary Council.

According to supporters in the U.S., the Fedayeen have begun the "second stage" of the revolution. However, there is still widespread hesitancy to criticize the Revolutionary Council and the government (including Khomeini) as a group. Instead, only a few leaders, like Yazdi and Antezemen, are singled out as reactionaries.

Our view is that all capitalists, small or big, "comprador" or "nationalist," are reactionary. Only by waging an ideological and militantly activist campaign against capitalism as a system—not solely against a few "bad apples"—can workers, students and professionals learn the lessons necessary to carry out socialist revolution. Nationalist struggles—no matter how militant and well-meaning—do not lead towards socialism. They only play to the strength of the national bourgeoisie. The role of communists is two-fold: base-building with in-

dividuals to win them to communist ideas and waging a mass propaganda campaign against the evils of the capitalist system and the need for socialist revolution. The obvious reactionaries—the Shah, Khomeini, Yazdi, etc.—are easy to attack, but instead of injecting new and revolutionary ideas into the working class this just confirms what most people already know. In other words, the communists are tailing behind the masses.

The main job of communists was stated 131 years ago by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*: win workers to "the theory of the Communists (which) may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property." The Shahs and the Carters, the Ayatollah Khomeinis and the Andy Youngs all stand for private property and capitalism. We stand opposed to them as a class. Despite the many differences between the U.S. and Iran, we believe the only way to achieve socialism is to mercilessly attack all forms of capitalism. The differences between various groups of capitalists are overwhelmed by the similarities of the capitalists as a class.

The PLP has learned many great lessons and drawn inspiration from the magnificent battle against the Shah. However, we believe the fight for socialism supercedes all else. We ask all revolutionaries to join with us in changing the face of the earth. If this article helps us to near that goal, it will have served a useful purpose.

We encourage reader response to the article which follows. Additional copies of the original pamphlet may be ordered by using the coupon on Page 80.

Fascism, Not Feudalism

The Growth of Capitalism in Iran

Iran was a feudal society at the beginning of the 19th Century. The ruling class attempted to expand through the conquest of land and making serfs out of working people. A good example of this trend was the efforts of the Iranian ruling class to conquer neighboring Afghanistan. However, the Iranian ruling class was confronted by both British imperialism and Russian expansionism in this period.

Russian expansionism led to a serious war in the North, which was lost by the feudal rulers of Iran. In the area which is now Soviet Central Asia, much territory and many people were officially brought under Russian dominance.

During the same period, British relations with Iran had been primarily commercial. However, the British imperialists wished to capture Afghanistan to secure their position in India, the Russians also wished to expand their territory to include Afghanistan. Iran was used as a tool by the Russian expansionists to fight against the British, with the result that the Russian-Iranian force was defeated. This defeat was ratified by the Treaty of Paris in 1857, which marked the rise of British imperial influence in Iran and the decline of the Russian interests.

The feudal lords of Iran were indifferent as to both British and Russian imperialism. They were mainly interested in maintaining their control over land and over the surplus created by the people on the land. As long as the rising imperialists did not tamper with these two things, the Iranian feudalists were content to do business with them and even



A rally of Fedayeen, whose refusal to attack Iran's new reactionary rulers as a group weakens workers' struggles.

allow them to maintain a measure of political control. The feudal lords did profit from commercial relations, through widespread bribery and customs duties paid by the British.

Under the influence of deepening commercial relations with Britain, however, small commercial Iranian middlemen emerged. They primarily sold goods which they obtained from British merchants to the royal family and the feudal lords. In return, the British merchants encouraged the export of Iranian handicraft products for sale in England. This exchange process, developing out of the impact of British imperialism on a feudal system, led to the development of a petit-bourgeois stratum, producing for the market and no longer constrained to household production or to production simply for the feudal lords. This stratum was the precursor of the national and comprador bourgeoisie of Iran.

The growth of British merchant-capital in Iran paved the way for direct productive investment by the British capitalists. The emerging national bourgeoisie also

wanted to dominate productive activity in Iran, and hence a contradiction emerged between the national bourgeoisie of Iran and the British imperialists.

The British approach to establishing direct investment in productive activity was to obtain a concession from the royal family, a kind of license to set up operations and extract surplus-value from the Iranian people. The national bourgeoisie opposed such concessions, wanting them for itself, and fearing British capitalist domination of production. The main kind of manufacturing the British were establishing was tobacco processing.

The feudal lords who ruled Iran were indifferent to the interests of the national bourgeoisie. They enjoyed a symbiotic relationship with the British imperialists. Hence, the tobacco movement, which emerged in opposition to the manufacturing concessions the royal family had handed out was led by the national bourgeoisie in opposition not only to British imperialism but also in some measure in opposition to the feudal lords of Iran.

* In 1886, the Shah granted a British merchant a monopoly on the purchase of tobacco and sale of cigarettes. A mass popular rebellion, led by Iranian

merchants and religious leaders, forced the cancellation of the monopoly. This was the first major anti-imperialist movement in Iran.

The feudal lords, who still reigned in the superstructure despite the rise of an infant capitalist market system, had placed many barriers to the full development of the market system. For example, the lords periodically confiscated the possessions of the national bourgeoisie, and imposed arbitrary (and changing) regulations on bourgeois development. Hence, the contradiction between the emerging economic base (essentially capitalist) and the superstructure (pre-capitalist or feudalist) was reflected in sharpening class struggle between the national bourgeoisie and the feudal class's government. The tobacco movement, which arose in opposition to concessions to British capitalists, was also necessarily a movement in opposition to the feudal superstructure. The tobacco movement was therefore led by the national bourgeoisie against British

Peasants were driven into the cities (or) became either rural proletarians or capitalist farmers.

imperialism and against the feudal superstructure. Because of the small size of the national bourgeois class, the struggle they led was generally unsuccessful in bringing about social change.

British imperialism stimulated the development of another stratum of bourgeois forces besides the national bourgeoisie. This was the comprador bourgeoisie, who made their profits from the exporting process, and who were tied to the British imperialists. Because of the close ties between the British imperialists and the feudal lords, this comprador bourgeoisie did not attempt to invest their profits in productive activity, and did not participate in the tobacco movement. Instead, they accom-

modated themselves to the maze of feudal restrictions, and invested heavily in land.

In the final analysis, there was no significant struggle in this period between the national bourgeoisie and the feudal lords because of the small size of the former, and their relatively small demands for workers and resources. They posed little threat to the feudal mode of production in this period.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTION

Unlike the simmering struggles mentioned above, a full scale revolt broke out in opposition to continual Russian seizures of Iranian territory.* The revolt was of limited success because the bourgeoisie was still small and disorganized, and the peasants and soldiers did not rise to join the revolt en masse. Further, the revolution was not aimed at the feudal system itself, but rather against Russian imperialism and against certain anti-capitalist regulations promulgated by the feudal system. Hence the results were limited. They did include the following reforms:

(1) A representative congress was established, through which the bourgeoisie could for the first time get a small foothold in the superstructure of the society;

(2) Capital investments were made more secure. Taxation and regulation policy moved in favor of the capitalist class.

The ruling class following the Constitutional Revolution was an alliance of the feudal lords and the comprador bourgeoisie. The split between the national bourgeoisie and the comprador bourgeoisie sharpened following this shift in the class structure of the government, since the national bourgeoisie desired the abolition of the feudal system, not just the reforms of the Constitutional Revolt. The comprador bourgeoisie, with their large landholdings, strong political ties to the feudal lords, and their alliance with foreign capitalists, naturally opposed the national bourgeoisie's aspirations.

The Constitutional Revolt marked the clear beginnings of the sharp division within the Iranian bourgeoisie. The importance of the division grew over time.

* The "Constitutional Revolution," during the first decade of the 1900's, brought many changes on paper but few changes in practice. Iran's present constitu-

tion, which religious leaders want enforced, dates from this period. The Constitutional Revolution's reforms were wiped out before World War I.

In 1905, the Russian ruling class defeated the uprisings of workers throughout Russia, and then was able to move to take back the reforms of the Constitutional Revolution in Iran. They closed the 2nd Congress, giving an ultimatum to the Iranian bourgeoisie. Resistance meant death. The national bourgeoisie were suppressed, and the revolutionaries were hounded throughout the country.

With World War I, however, the Russian imperialists could no longer devote sufficient forces to suppress the Iranian people. The national bourgeoisie led the masses of people in uprisings against both British and Russian imperialism, taking advantage of the conditions of world war. The masses had entered a new phase of struggle, in essence a continuation of the struggle begun with the Constitutional Revolt. The program of the uprising was to expel the imperialists. The ideology was nationalism, as would be expected in a movement led by the national bourgeoisie.

The October Revolution in Russia had a major impact on the struggle in Iran. All Russian imperialist forces were immediately removed. Hence, the main struggle turned to one of opposition to British imperialism by the Iranian masses, still under the ideology of nationalism and the leadership of the national bourgeoisie. Because of the strength of the rising nationalist movement, the British imperialists decided that they needed to impose a strong central government to control the masses by force when necessary, and to attempt to co-opt the people by a few reforms. In this way the British imperialists hoped to head off any radical change, and maintain their position.

The kings of the Qajar Dynasty were incapable of fulfilling these requirements of British imperialism.* So Reza Shah, the father of the current Shah, was brought to power by the British. The comprador bourgeoisie united with the national bourgeoisie to support the new regime, and the feudalists decided to accept the new central government in order to maintain some power within it. They understood that in a battle against the British plans, they would lose. The *coup d'état* which brought Reza Shah to power brought with it the destruction of

the nationalist democratic movement and of the local power which various feudal lords had held over their territories. All power was centralized in the hands of the British-backed Reza Shah, to guarantee British imperialism's position in Iran. The government organized a large army and a strong, renewed bureaucracy to strengthen and defend the new centralized government. The new government represented the comprador bourgeoisie, the feudal lords, and the British imperialists united in a political program which included destroying any progressive movement in Iran, and helping the British to exploit Iran's oil and to sell British products throughout a national Iranian market.

During the initial decade of the Reza regime, there was a rapid growth of foreign investment, reflecting the pro-colonial character of the new government. However, with the Great Depression, investment sagged, and the national bourgeoisie saw this as an opportunity to seize for itself the internal market of Iran from the British.

Despite the gradual increase in the power of the bourgeoisie in government, the mode of production was still primarily feudal. There was a low level of development of the market and of the capitalist mode of production. Furthermore, the comprador capitalists who played a major role in the government did little to develop capitalism in Iran. The government did confiscate the estates of those feudal lords who had backed the previous prince, but the revenues from the sales were not re-invested in any cycle of accumulation of capital. Rather, the comprador bourgeoisie continued to invest in land and lived in a high style from taxes, oil revenues, and customs duties. There were a few industrial development projects that the government undertook at this time, but government officials and army officers generally ran these enterprises with a view towards using the revenues for their own consumption, and generally managed the state enterprises (which were very few in the first place) in a corrupt fashion, with no view towards accumulation of capital.

With World War II, Reza made an effort to ally with the Nazis, so the British

* The Qajar dynasty ruled Iran from the 1700's. The Qajar rulers essentially lost control from about 1900 on, especially after a Cossack captain seized power in 1921. The last Qajar Shah was formally deposed by

the Cossack captain in 1926; the captain then proclaimed himself Reza Shah, founder of the Pahlavi dynasty.

quickly moved to replace him with his son, the current Shah. Iran's central government was overturned with this ouster, and the local lords and the feudalists seized the opportunity to re-establish their regional authority. During the war, Iran was occupied by Soviet, U.S. and British armies, which by the end of the war had led to a further entrenchment of U.S. and British imperialism in Iran.

The unstable internal situation in Iran, characterized by falling governments, economic crisis, and foreign occupation, provided an objective situation in which a mass movement was quickly organized and restored. Unfortunately, there was a vacuum of leadership to this mass upheaval, which prevented the revolutionary masses from taking advantage of the dislocations of world war to carry out a social revolution.

The economic effect of the war was to impoverish most people and to stimulate the growth of the local bourgeoisie. Production had almost come to a halt in Europe, and U.S. capitalists were mainly producing armaments and military equipment. The foreign capitalists in Iran were producing raw materials, intermediate goods, and consumption goods in this period, but relative to their earlier position, they were weak. Hence, the national bourgeoisie of Iran, like the national bourgeoisies of most less developed countries, could thrive in the domestic market during this period.

Foreign capitalists in Iran mainly confined their activities to oil refining, so the rest of the economic field was left open to the national bourgeoisie. The nationalist movement continued to flourish under the leadership of Dr. Mossadegh,* a representative of the national bourgeoisie, who came to power in 1951. Iran was not dependent on oil revenues during Mossadegh's regime, and in fact, imperialist countries boycotted Iranian oil in an effort to paralyze Mossadegh's regime, which had already nationalized oil production in Iran. During this boycott, Iran had to depend on its own capacity to produce manufactures. The comprador bourgeoisie, which had tied itself to foreign capital, was eclipsed in this period as the national capitalists grew and expanded, and the imperialist

sector waned.

But in 1953, Mossadegh was overthrown by a **coup** organized by the C.I.A. The **coup** brought radical social and economic reversals to Iran. The relative economic independence of Iran under Mossadegh was neutralized by massive intervention of foreign capital. Day by day, Iran became more dependent on imperialist countries. American "aid" to Iran increased substantially. Oil revenues flowed again to the imperialists. Balance of payments shifted in favor of imports from the imperialist countries, which meant that the comprador bourgeoisie was flourishing again. The national bourgeoisie was routed from power, and was faced with the choice of economic (and often personal) destruction, or joining the comprador bourgeoisie. Most of them joined.


The export of crude and refined oil, combined with the open door to industrial imports and the millions of dollars of U.S. aid, had a powerful effect on strengthening the comprador bourgeoisie. Thousands of petit-bourgeois became rich capitalists through engaging in the import trade. In order to develop their wealth, they had to become more and more dependent on foreign monopolies. The profit gained from the import trade was invested in other economic activities. Thus, in the early 1960s, we begin to have Montage manufacturing (assembly in Iran of goods produced abroad; e.g. auto assembly-Ed.). Other portions of the profit were invested in land and construction.

With this rapid capitalist expansion and accumulation of capital, it became abundantly clear that the remaining feudal remnants in the superstructure of the Iranian society constituted barriers to expansion of capitalism which could no longer be tolerated. The joint comprador bourgeoisie feudal rule had to be shattered.

As long as the comprador class was weak it made sense for the imperialists to use the feudal lords to their advantage. However, with the strengthening of the comprador bourgeoisie in the post-coup period, it was to the advantage of the imperialists to work with them. The reason is that the feudal class had no desire to institute methods of stimu-

* Dr. Mossadegh was an anti-communist liberal Iranian intellectual who was Premier from 1951 to 1953. Under his rule, the Shah's power was greatly curbed and the oil industry was nationalized (it had

been owned by British Petroleum, which is 51% owned by the British government). Mossadegh refused to co-operate with the fake-communist Tudeh Party.



The Shah and Khomeini: Both mean profits for capitalism and death for Iranian workers.

lating capitalist expansion, since their class interests rested in conspicuous consumption and land proprietorship. The feudalists tended to place their revenues in foreign banks rather than re-invest them. The foreign capitalists could tolerate this as long as they did not need a large market. However with the increasing oil revenues there was a need on the part of the imperialists to generate a larger market for more complex goods within the domestic Iranian market. Also, the imperialists needed to increase the supply of labor power, which was still at this period rooted in the countryside in pre-capitalist relations of production. It was necessary to replace the feudal system in production the way the feudal superstructure was being replaced politically.

New policies were instituted to ensure the freedom of movement of capital within Iran. But the U.S. imperialists, who had replaced the British imperialists by this period, wanted to "free" the labor force so that it could be more effectively exploited through the expansion of capital within Iran. To carry out this policy the U.S. backed measures to bring about "land reform" in Iran, beginning in 1960.

The capitalist mode of production was introduced many decades before land reform in a very modest form. Although

it was in contradiction to the feudal mode of production, the latter mode of production was clearly dominant. Nevertheless, through a variety of political twists and turns, the capitalist mode of production grew and developed in Iran until, by the time of land reform in 1960, only bits and pieces of the feudal mode of production were still existent. At the time of land reform, then, Iran can be characterized as a growing capitalist society, with significant pre-capitalist remnants. However, it was a capitalist society which grew only on increasing political and economic dependency on imperialist powers. The bourgeoisie in Iran had begun attacking the feudal superstructure during the Constitutional Revolt. When Reza came to power in 1921, the comprador bourgeoisie gained considerable power. When the temporary disruption of their power brought by Mossadegh was abruptly terminated in 1953 by the CIA coup, the comprador bourgeoisie gained in power enormously.

At the same time, the comprador bourgeois (which following Mossadegh's fall came to include almost all of the national bourgeoisie as well) was not an oppressed class which would fight against the remnants of feudalism along with the masses. After all, the comprador bourgeoisie shared power with the feudalists. The contradiction between the feudalists

and the comprador bourgeoisie was resolved quietly with the help of the imperialists through the land reform program. Although the feudalists offered open resistance in a few areas to the process of land reform, they no longer had the backing of any imperialist, and soon realized that such resistance was useless. The best they could do was to accommodate themselves opportunistically to the comprador bourgeois class, merge with it, and maintain their position of high status in Iran's political economy—but now as capitalists, not as feudal lords. In essence, to survive, the feudal lords committed suicide as a class.

The transition from feudalism to capitalism in Iran and in other less developed countries today follows a different pattern from the classical pattern outlined by Marx. Rather than a progressive, revolutionary bourgeoisie overthrowing the old feudal class, as in the French Revolution, we observe the spectacle of foreign imperialists imposing systemic transformations on feudal societies to make them more acceptable to the needs of the imperialists. In the process, the imperialists cultivate the class(es) which conform to these transformations, and work against reactionary classes (such as the feudal lords) and the revolutionary class, the proletariat.

Land reform does have a major impact on the mode of production, but it is a transformation imposed from outside the immediate national political economy, rather than primarily being a product of internal class struggle.

LAND REFORM IN IRAN: Its history and progress

The pre-land reform structure of land possession in Iran follows a familiar pre-capitalist pattern. 56% of the cultivated land was owned by 1% of the people in the rural areas. The big landowners were those who owned the land of 5 villages or more, and there were middle landowners, who owned the land of 1-5 villages. In addition, 6% of the land was owned by the government, which sold the land to the landowners before land reform began. There were substantial landholdings by religious organizations, who used the revenues from the land for the totally unproductive purpose of furthering religious activities. Finally, there was a substantial peasantry, who owned and worked small pieces of land. 93% of the peasants owned

no land, or a small piece not large enough to sustain a household. Only 7% of the peasants owned more than 3 hectares (7-1/2 acres) of land.

There were a variety of forms through which land was rented to peasants in the pre-land reform era. One system was called the "five factors" system. 20% of the product was awarded each to land, seed, water, animals, and labor. If the peasant worked with his own labor and owned his animals, and the feudal lords provided seed, water, and land, the peasant would receive 40% of the lands' output, while the landlord would receive 60%. In areas where water was particularly scarce, 2 shares would be awarded to the water ownership.

Another land rental system was a straight bargaining arrangement, in which a rent (in cash or in kind) would be agreed upon by the two parties. Under

The imperialists needed to replace the feudal system in production.

this system, the peasant generally lacked some factor such as water or seed, so he would have to borrow from the landlord in order to carry out production. Thus, at the end of the production period, he would have to (1) pay the agreed-upon rent and (2) pay the price of the factors which he had borrowed, plus interest.

The peasants were also required by tradition to provide certain services for the landlord. These included waiting on the landlord in his home, building roads and paths for him, repairing water sources such as springs, and similar activities quite similar to feudal dues in medieval Europe.

Land reform went through 3 stages. The first stage was simply that the landlords were given the opportunity to sell their land to the government at a good price, and use this money to invest in capitalist activity. The incentive for the

landlords to do this was that confiscation and re-division of the land was planned to follow. The main emphasis in the first stage was to reduce the big landlords, those with more than 5 villages. These landlords often avoided the reform by simply putting the villages in the names of their relatives and children. The whole process was filled with corruption, since the first lands bought by the government were the worst lands owned by the landlords, and then these lands were sold by the government to the peasants. The peasants were given 15 years to pay off the principal, and in addition the interest which accumulated on the unpaid balance. Generally, the plots of land were not large enough to sustain a household, and generally these plots were of inferior fertility, which meant that many peasants simply could not maintain the annual payments and feed their families. Hence, the familiar trek into the city to find industrial employment began for thousands of Iranian peasants.

This movement of the labor force from the country into the industrial towns was in fact one of the true motivations of the land reform process. The subsequent stages of land reform had a similar impact. More and more peasants were driven into the cities to find work as proletarians. Agriculture became more and more mechanized, and on a capitalist basis, as the banking system began to establish local branches in many villages. Thus, peasants who wished to continue in agriculture either became rural proletarians or capitalist farmers. The capitalist market began to penetrate into the villages, as the commodities produced by modern capitalism began to be marketed in the remote corners of Iran. The cities increased in size, strengthening the market relations and increasing the familiarity of the rural peasant with the capitalist city. Thus, as the money relationship became more typical of labor relations in the countryside, rural workers began demanding more commodities produced by capitalism, and the market for the industrial sector grew and stimulated further investment in the Iranian capitalist sector.

The consequence of land reform, then, has been the penetration of the capitalist market throughout urban and rural Iran. It has completed the destruction of any significant pre-capitalist economic formations in Iran. Capitalism now char-

acterizes the Iranian political economy, and the land reform pushed by the U.S. imperialists was a major factor in hastening this process.

One major political consequence of land reform is that it has awakened many rural Iranians to the rampant exploitation and corruption of the system they live in. Where before it was the landlords who exploited them through such forms as the "five factors" system, now it is the capitalists and the government which exploits them through the wage-slavery of capitalism. The hopes of the masses that land reform would open a new era for them have been brutally smashed. Field workers who have interviewed peasants and rural proletarians have shown this to be the general trend among the rural population, for the peasants understood that the government and the rich families were tied closely together. They begin to understand that Iran suffers under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The development of a detailed political strategy for the revolutionary movement in Iran goes beyond the scope of this paper. However, there are several basic political conclusions which can be drawn from this analysis. (1) Iran is a capitalist society, dominated by western imperialism. Any strategy must be based on this understanding. Certain forces within the revolutionary movement feel that Iran is "semi-feudal, semi-colonial." We have shown through our analysis that this is incorrect. Hence, any political strategy based upon the erroneous "semi-feudal, semi-colonial" analyses will be doomed to fail. (2) To end the exploitation of capitalism, only a socialist revolution, installing a worker's government (the dictatorship of the proletariat) can succeed. Other reforms, such as freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, free elections, and so on can never fundamentally alter the exploitation of capitalism without this fundamental change, however desirable these reforms may appear. (3) A socialist revolution can occur only through the leadership of a revolutionary vanguard communist party, dedicated to an uncompromising fight for socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Spontaneous mass upheavals may force concessions from the capitalists for a period of time, but only socialist revolution can permanently achieve liberation for the Iranian working class.

M



BANNERS WAVING, VOICES RAISED: *Thousands of workers and students, led by the Progressive Labor Party and the International Committee Against Racism, marched on May Day. Above, Chicago; right, Boston. For more pictures from around the world, see following pages.*

ay Day '79






France



Canada



Los Angeles

May Day is the holiday of workers all over the world and a day for workers to unite to voice their demands—and to put the ruling classes of all countries on notice: **WE WILL MAKE A REVOLUTION! SOCIALISM IS OUR FUTURE!**

May Day 1979 saw the working class and its allies fight for their rights and in many cases show their contempt for capitalism. Unfortunately, in many countries, reformists and outright agents of the bosses (like the revisionist “communist” parties of Europe and the various trade union confederations, still control the May Day demonstrations. The only way the working class can bring back the spirit of revolution that belongs to May Day is to struggle against these traitors and build their own revolutionary organizations.

In the U.S., the Progressive Labor Party, joined by the International Committee Against Racism, led thousands of workers and students in marches in Los Angeles, Boston, Chicago and Houston. The march in Chicago broke the Nazi claim that Marquette Park was their turf, and became the first multi-racial group to march into Marquette Park. The chants of the day, in all four cities, were for socialism and an end to racism, and for death to all fascists.

Marches and rallies were also held in hundreds of other cities around the world:

IRAN: Over 100,000 workers and students marched in Teheran in a demonstration called by left-wing groups and trade unions. The Khomeini forces tried to organize a counter demonstration, but were less than successful—only 30,000 showed up.

FRANCE: Steelworkers in Longwy who

are fighting to save their jobs from government-ordered layoffs of 20,000 steelworkers, battled police in Paris.

CHILE: Several hundred workers were arrested as they celebrated May Day in spite of the prohibition declared by the fascist Pinochet regime. The marches showed that the mass movement is regaining power there.

EL SALVADOR: Many workers were arrested on May Day. Immediately following May Day, dozens of members of the the left-wing People’s Revolutionary Bloc battled the police and occupied the French and Costa Rican embassies to demand the release of some of their leaders by the military rulers. Fifteen unions called a strike in support of the action.

TURKEY: The government banned all demonstrations and imposed a military curfew on May Day. Trade union leaders were arrested to prevent May Day demonstrations.

GUATEMALA: Over a dozen people were killed during a May Day demonstration in Guatemala. In Huehuetenango province, on the border with Mexico, workers and students battled police. In Guatemala City, despite the fascist repression of the government, thousands of workers and students, their faces covered to protect their identity, marched for five hours on May Day.

The pictures on these pages are only a small sample of the working class in action. United, the international working class holds in its hands the power to destroy capitalism and the racism it breeds, the power to rule the world.

**WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE!
YOU HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE
BUT YOUR CHAINS!**



Canada



Chicago



Iran



Dominican Republic



Colombia



Venezuela

The Sunday Chicago Southtown Economist

Vol. 2 No. 10

Sunday, April 29, 1979

SPORTS FIN/L

Chicago-South
Home Delivered
\$4.25 per month
Newsstand Copy 25¢

Call 586-8800 for Want Ads
Call 586-8790 for Home Delivery

May day march peaceful



Security marshalls, dressed in red t-shirts and stocking caps and carrying wooden canes for protection, lead protest marchers to a May day rally in Marquette park Saturday afternoon. The march was sponsored by the Progressive Labor party and the International committee Against Racism. (Staff photo by Larry Ruehl)

The following story was compiled from reports filed by Daily Economist reporters Raymond Hanania, Margaret McGurk and David Roeder.

The Progressive Labor party and the International Committee Against Racism staged a protest rally against Nazism, racism and fascism at Marquette Park Saturday afternoon, attended by more than 400 Chicago police officers, about a dozen reporters and photographers, and a handful of youthful hecklers.

No incidents of violence were reported during the May day rally, scheduled in honor of the international socialist workers' holiday, or during the march from Ogden park at 67th st. and Loomis ave.

An estimated 450 members communist organizations, including contingents from as far away as Tupelo, Miss. and Kansas City, Mo., followed the parade route down 67th st. with a police escort headed by First Deputy Police Supt. Samuel Nolan.

Squads of helmeted police joined the march as it neared Marquette park, where Chicago Lawn Cmdr. John Corless waited with additional reinforcements, including a dozen mounted officers and scores of plainclothes tactical police.

Local police had begun to mass at a temporary command post in the Marquette Park fieldhouse at 9 a.m. All insisted that no serious trouble was expected, and no counter-demonstration was anticipated.

Joggers, cyclists and tennis players expressed surprise and curiosity when they heard the march was scheduled. A few people brought pocket cameras to snap photos of the mounted police who smiled, waved and struck poses.

At the command post, Sgt. James Stepanek said six companies, totaling 400 officers, were marshalled for the demonstration.

Nolan denied that many officers were involved, but declined to provide an exact count of police present.

Observers agreed that Stepanek's report of nearly 500 officers seemed accurate.

In downplaying the number of police present, Nolan said, "The marchers are people exercising their rights. (The police) don't want to be the cause of any disturbances our-

Additional photos on pages 3 and 5

elves."

Small groups of residents gathered in front of shops and houses on Marquette rd. to watch a large, yellow rental truck equipped with loudspeakers lead marchers bearing dozens of red banners printed with socialist slogans into the park.

More than one observer was heard to inquire, "Isn't it a little early for this stuff?" as the marchers passed, chanting "Asian, latin, black, red, white; workers of the world, unite."

The city granted a permit for the march along 67th st. under orders from U.S. District court Judge Frank McGarr after Progressive Labor party requests to use 71st, 69th and 68th sts. were denied by the Chicago streets department.

Two police tactical unit cars were assigned to watch Nazi leader Frank Collin's 71st st. headquarters during the march.

Collins emerged from the two-story brown brick building only once during the afternoon, when he sold Nazi party t-shirts and gave some party literature to two young teenagers passing on bicycles.

When the marchers arrived at the rally site near 71st st. and Sacramento ave. inside the park, about two dozen hecklers, mostly teenagers, grouped on a low grassy knoll directly in front of the speakers standing on the sound truck, and were immediately joined by another dozen plainclothes police.

Three boys raised their arms in Nazi salutes and others hurled obscene epithets at the hundreds of demonstrators who surrounded them.

White speakers blasted "Nazis, fascists and liberals, like Jane Byrne," and called for "a world where workers will run things," the police threw a line of wooden horses around the hecklers on the knoll and positioned a dozen officers between the youths and the demonstrators.

After two speeches, the demonstrators turned back to 67th st. to return to Ogden park for a picnic lunch.

About twice as many local residents waited to see the marchers leave as had witnessed their arrival.

(Continued on page 5)

No violence during march

(Continued from page 1)

although the heavy police presence discouraged any who were tempted to attack the group.


Three or four middle-aged women shouted "Go back to Russia" as the marchers passed, and a few youths followed the group yelling insults and racial slurs.

Most bystanders simply watched with curiosity, amusement or con-

tempt as the marchers kept up a steady stream of chants, such as "Death, death, death to the Nazis, power, power, power to the workers," and "Nazis mean fight back, bosses mean fight back, cops mean fight back."

The group cheered loudly once it had crossed Western ave. into the West Englewood neighborhood, and speakers claimed the march as a victory over racism and oppression.

The protesters headed back to Ogden park, while squads of police dropped off the parade route to return home as the last chant echoed through the nearby streets. "We held May day in Marquette park."



The rock star
rising
the hard way,
from an auto workers'
neighborhood in Detroit,
playing the beer halls
the grass and acid alleys
of the Great Lakes,
the Ohio Valley,
singing
the grungy
neighborhood of Detroit

got a smash hit

a gold record

turned this
disc
into a Corvette,
a river cruiser,
a platinum record,
invested this
in shares
of GM,
cashing in
again
on the 1st 2nd 3rd shift
the office drudges
kitchens and kids
of that
neighborhood in Detroit
where his fame
persists,
clings to the street
like confetti
after a wedding,
after the wedding
party has driven off.

By J.S.

A militant
unarmed march
to the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

The usual signs,
banners.
Usual chants.
Wave after wave the same

Suddenly
held up: at
the tinkle of glass.
Distant, tiny, shocking
like the death of a toy

Frosted panes
broken
a fist emerged, a forearm
a face, another...
In gloom 5 stories deep
a hand started
waving
from the bottom
of its life,
as a sea fan
rust streaming
ships have passed over

**The
Workers
United
Will
Never
Be
Defeated!**

Now
short thick leggy
fingers
hook through the window grates:
undocumented workers, illegal
aliens
from South America
Africa
the Caribbean:
shouting
French, Spanish,
tilted and musical English

It is the human rainbow
arrested:
detained.

It had been Bolivian
with Indian cheekbones

It had saved, waited
to cross the Rio Grande
packed in vans
and car trunks
to be shot at,
raped
in the moonless dust

It was Haitians
on rafts
pushing out to sea

landing in these
marine gray
block buildings,
crosshatch fences
raked with barbed wire,

**¡Obreros,
Unidos,
Jamás
Serán
Vencidos!**

and around these
a field of black
Brooklyn ghetto,

a prison
in a vast
crumbling prison,

becoming this
protest
against this.

Above all it would be
the voice
from a broken window, trailing
down at the end
Thank yo-o-o-u
Thank yo-o-o-u

wrapping this march up
putting a small
victory ribbon on it

Smash Racism in Education

Students Must Ally With Workers

During Fall, 1978, 11.5 million people in the U.S. were enrolled in colleges and universities. There are nearly one million teachers in these institutions. Of the official 95 million workers in the U.S. more than 25 million require at least a bachelor's diploma.

Capitalism depends upon surplus value for its survival; that is the difference between the workers' labor value (wages) and the actual value produced by work. In other words, capitalism depends for its existence upon the exploitation of workers. It is within this context that the usefulness of colleges and universities to the capitalist class becomes clear. On the one hand the universities produce technological know-how, train technologists and a vast army of professionals indispensable to the capitalist superstructure, and on the other hand the universities and colleges produce and dispense the ideology necessary to maintain ruling class advantages over the working class. This ideology includes anti-worker, anti-communist, racist, sexist and professional schisms designed to keep the working class weak, divided, and willing to work for peanuts.

In short, capitalism violates the deepest aspirations and class interests of the great majority of students, intellectuals, and teachers. Racism, sexism, unemployment, speedup, inflation, rotten housing, schools and services are the daily bill of fare under this system. In addition, these "ordinary" forms of oppression are further exaggerated by the imperialistic plans inherent to capitalism, war, for profits being the most important imperialist practice. Today the primary

imperialist rival of U.S. capitalism is the USSR, and as the PLP has analyzed, the U.S. is in decline and the USSR has gained supremacy (the bourgeois "analysts" now openly agree).

History shows that world wars are inseparable from fascism, the most extreme form of mass terror and ruling class rule. The next war and its inevitable side-kick, fascism, will, if something isn't done about it, take millions upon millions of working class lives in this country. Something must be done about it, and students today, high school, college and university, have a vital stake in preventing or limiting, and finally reversing this development. Students can go one of two ways: into the ruling class-holocaust and against the tide of history and the working class, or into the working class, against racism, war and fascism, and onto the road to revolution, socialism and a decent society.

The Progressive Labor Party believes that most students will choose the working class and revolution; it is in their class interests to do so. The following brief pamphlet presents a communist viewpoint on students, the working class, and our party's program for revolutionary activity on campus.

UNIVERSITIES ARE CAPITALIST INSTITUTIONS

One of the capitalists' favorite cliches about schools is that they are "neutral" and "value-free." This lie serves to mask the class character of schools, universities, and even knowledge itself. No institution in a class society can be value-free: everything in the society must serve the interests of one of the two major classes.

Since, under capitalism, the bosses hold political power, they wield it to ensure that the educational process meets their needs at every level.

Capitalists run the university system, very often directly. A glance at the boards of directors and trustees of any major university reveals a complex web of interlocking relationships between the campus and finance or industrial capital. As a university's importance to the ruling class increases, so does the presence of ruling class figures on its leadership committees. Whether the big bosses play a direct role in administering these institutions (as the Rockefellers do at Harvard) or whether they entrust the job to agents (as is the case with "second-

dary" private universities or the state and city university systems), the fact is that the university system must serve the profit making capability of the ruling class.

The myth of the "ivory tower" was shattered once and for all a decade ago by the Vietnam war. As campus rebellion against this imperialist butchery became a mass phenomenon, panicky administrators and politicians shed crocodile tears about the violation of the university's supposed "neutrality." The anti-war movement proved that not only were universities not neutral with respect to the war but in fact the bosses could not conduct it without them:

• The Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) was campus-based. The militancy of hundreds of thousands of students succeeded temporarily in kicking ROTC off many campuses. As the countdown for world war approaches, it is now making a comeback.

• The infamous Staley-Taylor "strategic hamlet" plan was developed by two midwestern professors. Under this plan, hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese peasants were herded into brutal concentration camps in an unsuccessful attempt to cut the Vietnamese nationalist guerrilla army off from its base.

• Key graduate schools like Harvard's Center for International Affairs, Columbia's School for International Affairs, etc. supplied indispensable military, political, and economic advice to the imperialist war machine. Zbigniew Brzezinski, now Peanut Carter's National Security Adviser, first gained recognition as the leading academic apologist for the Johnson administration's mass terror bombing of South Vietnam, when he was a Soviet affairs "expert" at the Columbia SIA. Dr. Strangelove Kissinger walked into the State Department straight from the Harvard campus.

• The weaponry of genocide used at a level unparalleled in the history of warfare could not have been developed without the overt connivance of campus science departments. The napalm sold to the Pentagon in enormous quantities by the Dow Chemical Company (which became a major corporate target for the anti-war movement) was invented by a Harvard chemistry professor named Louis Fieser.

The examples above merely serve to prove the rule. Small and large, private and public, every U.S. college and university played a role in aiding the im-



South African students and workers in black ghetto of Soweto join in a rebellion against the fascist apartheid system. Unity of students and workers is needed to smash racism in education as well.

perialist war machine. **The most significant victories won by the student movement against the war came when the students attacked the concrete manifestations of this class relationship.**

Since the great South African rebellions of 1976, a growing campus movement in the U.S. has focused on the issue of university relations to firms with direct business links to the apartheid regime. Thousands of students and professors have demonstrated to demand that universities withdraw investments from companies with capital in South Africa.

Racist profits and therefore the racist superexploitation of the South African working class are nearly the highest rate in the world. The anti-racist consciousness that impels this demand is a positive thing. However, the class needs of U.S. imperialism - and therefore its dependence upon its universities to support its interests in South Africa - go far beyond the potential rearrangement of the universities' relatively insignificant investment portfolios. A good case in point is the relation between the South African SASOL II coal gasification project and the Raytheon-owned and MIT-staffed U.S. Badger Corporation, which is helping the South African Reich find a wartime alternative to petroleum.

During the 1960s, the U.S. ruling class was rocked by the thunderous rebellions of black workers in hundreds of cities.

These rebellions gave birth to a new dimension of racist police terror: the Tactical Patrol Forces, which implemented techniques of murder developed on campuses in departments of "Police Science" and schools of "counter-insurgency."

The lawyers, businessmen, bankers, and politicians who run all of capitalism's other institutions are indoctrinated and trained in colleges and universities. The course of capitalist industry is charted with the help of business schools. The mayhem known as medical care under capitalism is developed at the medical schools and hospitals connected to them. The miseducation of working class youth begins in the "think-tanks" of teachers' colleges. Even the poison that goes into our foodstuffs is perfected in the laboratories of agriculture departments.

As we have hinted above, however, all of the services rendered to capitalism by the university depend upon the university's major contribution to the bosses' system; capitalist ideology.

The essence of this ideology is the propagation of anti-working class filth.

In our country and in the capitalist world today, the clearest and most dangerous expression of anti-working class ideas is racism.

It is no wonder then that for the past decade, U.S. universities have become factories and conveyors for the production and distribution of racist poison.

RACISM AND FASCISM BEGIN ON CAMPUS

The Klansmen, Nazis, and other racists who since the anti-busing movement was launched in Boston in 1974 have advocated and carried out atrocities against black and Latin people and the working class in general throughout the U.S. did not fall from the sky. As the PLP has pointed out repeatedly, these storm-troopers are bosses' agents whose job is to foreshadow fascism and world war by creating a favorable climate for the most vicious expressions of capitalism.

However, the way first had to be paved for these fascist groupings. Before the first rock was thrown at black students in South Boston, before the Nazis set up an office in Marquette Park, before the KKK organized border patrols against Mexican farmworkers, the racism that would lead to these and other actions first had to be codified into a theoretic "system."

The campuses were the commando-posts for this initial task. Harvard, which boasts David Rockefeller on its Board of Overseers, logically became the flagship university for the new onslaught of racist ideology.

• In 1969, a Berkeley professor of Psychology named Arthur Jensen published an article entitled "How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement," in the Harvard *Education Review*. His updated version of Nazi eugenics contended that there were such things as "intelligence genes," and that the black population had a significantly lower proportion of them than the white population. The New York *Times* then dignified this garbage with extensive publicity—a signal for the vulgarization of Jensen's master race theory in the mass media. Daniel Moynihan, a former Harvard professor and advisor to Nixon, who developed the racist concept of "benign neglect," and who was rewarded for this yeoman service to the bosses with a New York State seat in the U.S. Senate, said at the time that "the winds of Jensenism (were) gusting through the Capital with gale force."

• In September 1971—the same week that Nixon announced a wage freeze—another Harvard professor, Richard Herrnstein, published a major racist article in the *Atlantic Monthly*. This masterpiece asserted that the U.S. was a "meritocracy" where wealth and power were based on

inherited intelligence. The implication was clear: the class structure of U.S. society and therefore the status quo were genetically determined. Herrnstein was quickly put on the same conveyor belt that Jensen had traveled before him; from the *Times* to *Time* and *Newsweek* to local papers and talk shows to strategically-placed references in textbooks used for elementary psychology courses.

• In the same period, another Nixon advisor/Harvard professor, Edward Banfield, published a tome entitled *The Unheavenly City*. This was an undisguised dose of vitriol against the most oppressed workers in the U.S. Banfield contended that ghetto rebellions were organized for "fun" and that the rebels were no better than animals, that poor people liked slum life and remained poor only because they lacked a vision of the future, and that more rigorous police and government surveillance (i.e. fascism) was the only solution to the problems caused by capitalism in the cities.

• Shortly afterwards racist pseudoscience reached a new level of ludicrousness when Christopher Jencks' *Inequality* attempted to explain differences in income and social position as a matter of "luck" and "personality."

• More recently, Harvard's E.O. Wilson (who made his reputation as an entomologist) has produced a series of volumes purporting to found the "new" discipline of "Sociobiology." The bugman of Cambridge says that not merely wealth and power but in fact ALL of social life are genetically programmed. You name it, Wilson's got a gene for it: altruism, spite, Xenophobia (i.e. racism), territoriality (i.e. imperialist war), entrepreneurship (i.e. making money as an exploiter), selfishness (i.e. the capitalist Golden Rule—hooray for me, the hell with you). Since the initial publication of *Sociobiology* in 1975, Buggsy Wilson has become a superstar in the bosses' press. His "discipline" has also become the new rage in many college and high school courses.

• Finally, to round out this brief survey of U.S. imperialism's intellectual Gestapo, we come to Nathan Glazer. As Moynihan's former collaborator, this eminent scholar has been well versed in racism. His latest opus, *Affirmative Discrimination*, provided a major service to the bosses. Capitalism, particularly when it approaches a period of fascism, always requires a scapegoat theory. As Hitler pointed out, the best

lie is usually the most outrageous. Who, asks Glazer, should be blamed for the horrors of racism? His answer: none other than racism's greatest victims. So Glazer offers us the Hitlerite Big Lie that black people in America, whose unemployment rate has never been higher and who are being exploited at a greater rate today than at any time in history, are at fault for the current economic devastation of the working class as a whole.

This pattern of racist academic activity is not new. As far back as the 1890s, Prescott Hall, a Harvard "genius" who was later to play a role in the U.S. eugenics movement—a movement that directly inspired the Nazis—was writing letters on the stationery of the Brooklyn-based American Anti-Semitic Association.

A professor from a prestigious university writes a book to say in five-dollar words that there "seem" to be genes for intelligence and that the most oppressed section of the working class "appears" to have less of them than everybody else. Another "expert" swears he can prove scientifically that poor people act like animals. A third wizard drones on for 600 pages about slime moulds and then uses his "findings"—to conclude that everything in life and society reduces itself to a question of Genes Uber Alles. This hackneyed filth has been around in one form or another since Malthus wrote diatribes against the social reformers who tried to improve the lot of the working class in 19th century England and who, according to him, therefore violated the "sacred" laws of both property and nature. Those who spew it become instant celebrities. Their "work" is portrayed in the ruling class media as groundbreaking research, and their "findings" filter down from the graduate schools to freshman undergraduate courses, all the way to elementary school.

But the ravings of the academic racists reverberate far beyond schools and colleges. No one is a born racist: racist ideas, like all others, have to be acquired through a training process. And like any other course of capitalist study, racism needs its authorities and gurus. Thus, the thugs who attack black schoolchildren in Boston, the policeman who shoots a latin youth in the South Bronx,

the Frank Collins who preach genocide in Chicago, the KKKers who shoot at black workers in Mississippi, and even Alan Bakke have all, knowingly or not, sat at the feet of Messrs. Jensen, Herrnstein, Banfield, Wilson, Glazer and Co.

A similar pattern preceded the development of full-blown fascism in Germany. Before the Kristallnacht, before the invasion of Poland, before the opening of the death camps, anti-Semitism had been a respected intellectual tradition in Germany for decades, and the racist pseudo-science of genetics had replaced biology in the laboratories of most German universities.

The parallel between modern U.S. universities and the universities in Germany immediately before the German ruling class decided to give power to Hitler is too blatant to deny. Hitler's intellectual sycophants ranted about "biotic communities" and tried to distinguish "German race science" from "Jewish race science." Today, fraudulent IQ tests are used to separate "gifted" from "ungifted" children at the very same time that the sociobiologists explain unemployment, racist terror, war, and fascism as the products of a grand genetic design.

Since the "new" scientific racists began preparing the ideological groundwork for fascism in 1969, thousands of college students and teachers have organized actions against them.

Spearheaded by the Committee Against Racism (CAR) and by our party, these actions and campaigns have had a telling effect on some of the leading academic racists. The ruling class press now admits that the data used by Jensen and his mentor, the British racist Cyril Burt, were fraudulent. Jensen's shill William Shockley can no longer show his face in public for fear of being shouted down or physically attacked. Herrnstein has been taken out of circulation.

While these victories are significant, the war against the academic Nazis and the consequences of their ideas is far from over. As long as capitalism exists, racist superexploitation, racist terror, and the ideas that justify them will proliferate. The mass movement got rid of Jensen, but the bosses had socio-biology and Wilson waiting in the wings to replace him. Neither racism nor the racists can be fought on a piecemeal basis.

What is needed is an all-embracing class outlook.

At every step of the way, the fight against racism, war, fascism, and the simplest everyday campus grievances must be organized from a pro-working class perspective. Students can realize their immediate and long-range aspirations only by uniting with workers.

THE WORKER-STUDENT ALLIANCE

The uneven development of the profit system creates a false antagonism between "mental" and "manual" labor. The big bosses never have to push anything heavier than a ball-point pen. Their philosophy - idealism - teaches that thought is primary over matter. Their ideology teaches that "intellectual" work is superior to physical work. Their system of miseducation - from grade school

students go on themselves to become members of the working class. Whether or not they wear neckties to work, they will eventually look for jobs as wage-earners and will never own capital or means of production.

Even many of those who become "professionals"—doctors, lawyers, etc.—will find themselves proletarianized in large institutions, because of U.S. imperialism's decline.

The racist, anti-working class ideas taught on campus are the bosses' means of vying for the class allegiance of students, intellectuals, and professionals. It is essential to the capitalists' needs that future doctors not unite with their patients, future teachers not unite with their students, future social workers not unite with their clients, and, above all, that future white-collar workers not unite with industrial workers.

It is just as essential - in fact, it is literally a matter of survival - for today's students that they initiate and solidify a revolutionary, anti-racist alliance with the working class.

Students have shown in the past that they are capable of launching important battles against the rulers and against the system's worst forms of oppression.

The movement against the Vietnam war first erupted on Campus.

The Civil Rights movement of the 1960s began with sit-ins against segregation by students.

The current movement against South African apartheid and U.S. business interests that profit from it started at the colleges. These movements were fueled by student uprisings in South Africa.

But as broad and as militant as these movements become, they can never hope to accomplish their goals unless the working class becomes involved in them and assumes leadership of them.

An important development that forced the U.S. government out of Vietnam was the refusal of the workers in the army to fight for the bosses' interests. The key thing that got the U.S. out of Vietnam was the fight waged by students, workers and peasants against U.S. bosses.

The very foundations of the capitalist system began to shake with the massive ghetto rebellions led by black workers in the 1960s and early 1970s.

The strike wave of the 1970s—particularly the week-long postal strike of 1970 that paralyzed capitalism's financial machinery—gave the bosses nightmares.

Students can realize their aspirations only by uniting with workers.

through grad school - is organized against the working class.

College, therefore, is traditionally viewed as the place to "get ahead," or, to put it more accurately, to achieve individual success at the expense of the working class.

At the turn of the century, most colleges were elite institutions exclusively for children of the ruling class and the system's top-level cadre. With the development of the capitalist economy, however, the big bosses found a need to train large numbers of people beyond the high-school level. As a result, the campus population has become more broadly-based than in the past. A B.A. or B.S. degree is now the minimum requirement for hundreds of different job categories.

What this means is that the overwhelming majority of today's college

A clear example in recent history of workers finishing what students start was the great French worker-student rebellion of 1968. What began as a series of demonstrations against dorm and classroom conditions on a suburban Paris campus quickly became pitched battles between thousands of students and police in the streets of the Latin Quarter. Within a matter of weeks ten million workers were on strike, and French President DeGaulle was making desperate deals with the West German bourgeoisie for help from their army if all else failed. France in 1968 proved that the conditions in a modern capitalist country were ripe for revolution, that students could and would unite with workers, and that workers and students together would rise to any demands made of them by the class struggle. The one missing ingredient—and it was decisive—was the necessary presence of a revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist party with a mass base and an outlook of organizing armed struggle for workers' power.

More recently, events in Nicaragua and the battles against the fascist Shah initiated by Iranian students and taken to a higher level by oil workers have demonstrated the power of the worker-student alliance.

The bosses' press wastes a lot of ink trying to prove that U.S. students today aren't interested in political struggle and that their only concern is academic success and getting ahead. Even if this has a tinge of truth to it, campus struggles are bound to break out before long. On a purely economic level, the system cannot deliver what it promises. Millions of college-trained people are unemployed or, if they find work at all, are forced into jobs that do not match their training.

The ruling class strategy for defusing potential militancy against itself in this situation is to push racism on white students and graduates, so that they will believe Glazer's Big Lie that the rotten economic conditions faced by white people are directly attributable to "gains" made at their expense by black people. The Supreme Court's Bakke decision institutionalized this Big Lie and paved the way for similar decisions both on campus and in industry.

White college students and others who are taken in by this bosses' alternative to the anti-racist worker-student alliance are falling for a sucker pitch. They are cutting off their noses to spite

their faces.

Every time the wage gap widens between black and white workers, the wages of white workers go down correspondingly. In addition, far from making economic progress, black workers and students are trapped in a vortex of steadily worsening conditions.

In a report entitled "The Illusion of Progress" (August 1978), the National Urban League published the following information:

- From 1975 to 1976, the black-white family income ratio fell from 62 percent to 59 percent.

- In 1975, the black-white unemployment ratio was 1.7-1. In 1978 it was 2.3-1.

The jobless rate of white high school dropouts is 22.3%. For black college graduates, it is 27.2%.

Clearly, a college education cannot change the economic laws of capitalism. Nor can all the Big Lies in the world change the fact that the ultimate class interests of working people and students—black and white, of all nationalities—are identical.

If we fight each other for crumbs from the bosses' steadily shrinking pie, we will gain nothing. Class unity and class struggle for socialism is our only hope for survival and a better life.

In the 1960s, as the anti-war movement and the ghetto rebellions were gaining strength, the ruling class made serious efforts to isolate students from workers ideologically, politically, and organizationally. Anti-working class drive was raised to the level of "science," just as racism is today. The bosses' favorite pseudo-revolutionary guru was a fake radical professor named Marcuse, who wrote books to prove that the working class was politically "reactionary" and about to be replaced as an economic force by advanced technology. For this brilliance, the bosses put Marcuse on the cover of the N.Y. Times Sunday magazine and made him a member of the jet set. After the French rebellion of 1968, which exposed Marcuse as a charlatan, his direct influence waned.

However, the anti-war movement never succeeded in cementing a massive worker-student alliance. Partly, this was the result of objective conditions. Partly it was caused by the weaknesses and limi-

tations of our own party, which was, then as now, the only organization with a revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist, pro-working class outlook on the U.S. political scene.

Today, the alliance is more necessary than ever, and time is of the essence. The war clouds are on the horizon! Already the bosses are threatening to restore compulsory military service. Masses of workers and students are slated to become cannon-fodder for the profit-greed of Rockefeller and Co. Here, too, racism plays a key role. Over forty percent of the front line casualties in Vietnam were black and latin working class youth whom unemployment had forced into the military. Unemployed black and latin workers and black and latin students who are in a revolving-door treadmill on the campuses will be the first called when the draft is restored for World War III.

Life and history show that the capitalist system cannot be reformed. Millions fought unemployment in the 1930s, yet unemployment continues to zoom. Millions battled fascism during the struggle against the Nazi beasts, yet fascism is the form of bosses' rule in many countries today and is on the agenda for the U.S. Millions organized against racism during the civil rights movement, yet the theories and practices of racism are more widespread and devastating than ever. Millions participated in the anti-war movement, yet the next imperialist war promises to be the bloodiest of all.

The capitalist system, which "educates" students to help it oppress workers and then murders them both, must be overthrown. Revolution and socialism—the dictatorship of the proletariat must be the constant goals of the worker-student alliance.

We need a society based on the aspirations of the working class, not on the profit lust of billionaires. We need a system of education in which students are taught to serve the working class, not to aid in its exploitation. We need knowledge that will help advance the material and cultural development of the masses—not racket pollution that paves the way for global genocide. Only socialism can realize these goals.

The actions of students in the U.S. during the Vietnam period, in France in 1968, in China during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, in Nicaragua and Iran today, and in countless of other

past, present, and future examples prove that in the final analysis, most students can be won to identify their interests with those of the working class.

Never have the stakes been higher. Never has the urgency been greater.

HOW TO BEGIN

1. Join the Progressive Labor Party.

The experience of every revolutionary movement in history proves the need for a communist party. The campuses, which are centers of anti-communism, must be turned into their opposite. This process, as well as the cementing of the worker-student alliance, requires a force of trained professional revolutionaries. In the past, students and intellectuals have made invaluable contributions to revolutionary struggle and to the working class. Membership in the party—the ultimate rejection of the bosses' system and the placement of all that one has learned of any usefulness at the service of the working class—is the best "career choice" a student or professional can make.

Read, subscribe to, and help circulate the PLP's publications, CHALLENGE-DESAFIO and PL Magazine.

2. Join and build the Committee Against Racism.

Racism, along with anti-communism, is the greatest internal obstacle to the revolutionary process and the worker-student alliance. On the other hand, as Marx pointed out, racism is also the capitalist system's Achilles' Heel. The International Committee Against Racism (InCAR) is the only organization in the U.S. today other than PLP capable of organizing mass anti-racist struggle in a pro-working class direction, because it is the only organization that views anti-racism as a matter of survival in the class self-interest of most workers and students. InCAR is also the organization that took the offensive against the bosses' intellectual stormtroop (Jensen and Co.), the anti-busing fascists in Boston, and the KKK, Nazis, and other sleazy forerunners of fullblown U.S. fascism.

3. Build the Worker-Student Alliance by helping turn the campuses into battlegrounds against racism and fascism.

a) Organize to help drive the academic racists off campus.

b) Expose and organize to serve all campus connections to South African apartheid. Kick corporate recruiters for apartheid off campus.



Anti-racist forces, with communists in the lead, will deal a death blow to racists and their ideology. International Committee Against Racism and PLP stopped the Klan from rallying in this Jamesburg, N. J. park last summer.

c) Oppose and defeat the special oppression of black, latin, chicano, and native American students on campus with regard to scholarships, grades, jobs, and general conditions. The standards and conditions for everybody are determined by the worst standards and conditions the bosses can succeed in imposing.

d) Oppose and defeat national chauvinism and the special oppression of foreign-born students.

e) Stop all fascist organizing on campus. NO "rights" for KKKers and Nazis!

f) Smash campus tie-ins to U.S. imperialism's plans for World War III and fascism:

—ROTC off campus.

—Stop war research.

—Expose and ban campus link-ups to imperialist think-tanks for butchery like the Trilateral Commission, the Brookings Institution, the Institute for Defense Analyses, the Rand Corporation, etc.

4. Build the worker-student Alliance by developing unity around common de-

mands with specific groups of workers.

a) On Campus: Develop a **Campus Worker-Student Alliance**. The place to begin is right at home. Colleges and universities employ millions of workers throughout the U.S. Some of the largest universities are also among the most important bosses in their areas, often with a payroll numbering in the tens of thousands. Campus workers are among the most exploited because the universities use their "non-profit" status to enforce specially low wages and rotten conditions. This is particularly the case in the many huge university-affiliated hospitals and schools of public health.

Not only are the campuses the producers of racist ideology. Not only do they oppress students by lining them up to march into oblivion for imperialist war or exploit them with astronomical tuition and fees. In the strict sense of the word, universities are also racist bosses that underpay, overwork, and murder workers as does any other capitalist enterprise.

Unity with campus workers is essential to launching an all-encompassing worker-soldier-student-alliance that can eventually seize state power. Here are suggestions for initial steps:

- Expose specific examples of racist attacks against campus workers. Organize a mass campaign among students and faculty around these issues.

- Organize students and faculty to support the demands of campus workers at contract time and to back their actions at any time.

- Help politicize the struggle of campus workers by winning them to join PLP and InCAR campaigns against racist professors, university tie-ins to South Africa, Israel, Iran and other bastions of U.S. imperialism, war research, etc. These issues are of crucial interest to the workers.

- Build unity between part-time student campus workers and fulltimers.

- Oppose and defeat university bosses' frequent union-busting attempts.

The power and potential of the campus worker-student became magnificently clear in 1970, when Nixon ordered the Cambodia invasion for U.S. Imperialism. During that May, when liberal campus administrators were desperately attempting to funnel anti-imperialist militancy into a pacifist dead-end of all-class unity, several hundred campus workers at Columbia University demonstrated inside the administration headquarters around their own grievances but mainly to kick the U.S. out of Cambodia. This action was followed hotly by a PLP-led march of 1000 students and campus workers that covered five miles from the Columbia campus to the heart of the New York City garment center.

The image of hundreds of campus workers and students, black, latin, asian, and white, marching arm in arm, chanting anti-imperialist slogans on their way to unite with workers off-campus in a crucial industry must stand as a beacon of hope for a near future when hundreds such actions, co-ordinated and led by the party, will play a pivotal role in the fight for socialism.

b) Unite at all times with the struggles of workers off campus.

- Expose and smash the interlocking relationships between university bosses and the local or national ruling class. More often than not, top university administrators will serve as directors or

officers of major banks or corporations in a given area. Making these ties public and confronting the bosses in question helps sharpen the pro-working class approach that must guide the conduct of individual campus struggle.

- Support strikes by workers in the general area of the university. Win the verbal and political backing of large numbers of students, faculty and campus workers. Recruit delegations of students to march on workers' picket lines. If the workers are willing, offer to help them smash scabs.

- Organize long-range agitational campaigns at key off-campus industrial sites like auto plants, steel mills, mines, shipyards, aerospace factories, etc. to promote the worker-student alliance against racism, war fascism, and the capitalist system.

- Develop militant support for anti-racist militancy by workers on the job or in their communities. Alliances with ghetto rebels and with actions against the KKK and Nazis (particularly, of late, in Mississippi) are important cases in point.

- Support and participate in the struggle for the shorter work week: **30 Hours' Work for 40 Hours' Pay**. The battle for shorter hours and higher pay is a bulwark of the fight for socialism and against unemployment, racism, and the bosses' confiscation of our labor power. Historically, it has been an essential ingredient of the movement to unite the entire working class. Students, as actual and potential workers, have a major stake in winning this demand, which, as Marx pointed out, is revolutionary in its implications.

c) Ally with anti-imperialist soldiers and sailors. Turning the guns around and transforming the looming imperialist carnage into a civil war for workers' power is a key feature of the worker-student alliance. The time to begin this process is now.

- Back rebellions by soldiers and sailors at nearby bases and naval yards. Carry news of these rebellions onto the campus and organize classroom insurgency to support them.

- Conduct revolutionary, anti-imperialist agitation at these bases as part of the worker-student alliance.

- If you go into the military, join a PLP fraction or CAR chapter or nucleus. **Don't fight for the bosses' greed but for the working class, socialism and the red flag of revolution!**



“It has become the ‘in’ thing in the U. S. to be able to shoot down Klansmen.”—Bill Wilkinson, Grand Wizard of Mississippi Klan

In the following pages, it becomes clear why smashing the Klan is indeed becoming the “in” thing in America, as millions of workers and students come to understand why the Klan and its Nazi allies, and the ruling class which sponsors them, are the enemy of every worker, black, white or Latin. In recent weeks and months there have been militant, armed fightbacks against these scum in cities all across the U.S. most recently in Decatur, Alabama, where the worm above got a taste of his future. More and more Klansmen will soon find out what it means to stand in the path of the working class on the road to revolution.

Part I of this article, tracing the history of the Klan from its earliest days and showing how, from the very beginning, it served the interests of the ruling class against workers, appeared in the Spring '79 issue of *PL Magazine*. To order, please use coupon on page 80.

By K.S.

Part 2-The Working Class Fights Back

Racist History of the KKK

Hooded Klansmen knew they could escape punishment for their crimes, since politicians, judges, and cops sympathetic to the KKK participated themselves or looked the other way.

It was not solely the local authorities who were either in or sympathetic to the KKK. There were national politicians as well. Hugo Black of Alabama, appointed to the Supreme Court by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937, and a former U.S. Senator, was a Klansman. So was Harry S Truman, who joined the Klan in Missouri in 1924. Edward White, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, had worn more than just his justice's robes (he, you will recall, helped Thomas Dixon publicize **Birth of a Nation**). The first Klan member in the U.S. Senate, Earl Mayfield of Texas, was elected in 1922. Governor Walker of Georgia was in the Klan. The governors of Maine and Colorado were also hooded politicians.

Several high ranking officials were never in the KKK, but had acknowledged support for it. The most prominent of these was President Calvin Coolidge, who appointed many Klansmen to official posts.

The help of local officials was essential for the Klan to carry out its activities. Throughout Texas the leaders of the Klan were sheriffs, mayors, and other local officials. The KKK organized their first nighttime parade in Houston in 1920. The police cleared the streets to allow the march to proceed unhindered. They also blacked out all the city's lights so that the Klan's burning crosses could be better seen. Knowing the cops and courts were behind them, the

Texas Klan carried out a reign of terror. In one small town, in the Spring of 1922, the KKK was accredited with over 500 "tar-and-feather parties" and "whipping bees." In Waco, for example, the cops arrested three masked and hooded Klansmen, with the melted, feathered tar still warm on the victim, and the grand jury presented no indictments. In Denton, the Klan took two black people from jail and flogged them. A black bellhop in Dallas was flogged and the letters "KKK" branded on his forehead with acid. A black dentist in Houston was kidnapped and whipped. The racist violence continued till about 1926, when politicians began feeling the pressure of working-class anti-Klan sentiment and started to arrest KKKers. The Texas Klan declined sharply without the full support of the local ruling class. By 1926, state membership dropped from a few hundred thousand to 18,000 and Klan activities all but ceased.

A similar situation existed in Georgia. In Atlanta in the 1920s, most of the City Council and School Board were Klan members, as were other city politicians and local businessmen. The 1920s saw a rash of floggings and whippings throughout the state, aided by friendly officials.

The Georgia Klan was not without opposition, though. When Klan Governor Walker appointed the pro-Klan Chief Justice of the Georgia Supreme Court, Richard Russell, as Chancellor of the University of Georgia, students demonstrated in opposition. Only one newspaper in the state would even print the story of the demonstration. By 1928, following a build-up of rank-and-file opposition to the KKK, the hooded order seriously declined.

In New York City local meetings were held in the Brooklyn Traffic Court, where the Klan leader was a magistrate. In Oklahoma, the state's Grand Dragon was the Vice President of the University of Oklahoma. In Kern and Los Angeles counties, where the Klan was most active in California, the KKK leaders were sheriffs, judges, city trustees, county supervisors, and Protestant ministers. The Los Angeles chief of police was a Klansman, as were most of the cops in San Francisco. In Kansas, where the Klan had 100,000 members in 1924, most cops were Klansmen. In Rhode Island the Klan had only 900 members in 1928, but Klansmen were in charge of three com-

panies of the State Militia. In Long Island, New York, the Klan controlled the Suffolk County Republican Committee and Klansmen won local elections in Islip, Babylon, Oyster Bay and Brookhaven townships. The Klan flourished throughout Long Island, with especially large chapters in Bayshore, Lynbrook, and Freeport. In 1924, one out of every seven residents of Suffolk County, then an affluent area, was a member of the KKK. In Washington State the King Kleagle was former Major Luther Ivan Powell, who was given a free hand to organize 100 Klansmen aboard the U.S.S. Tennessee anchored in Puget Sound. In Newport News, Virginia, the KKK controlled the chief of police, police court judge, most city council members, the managing editor of the leading newspaper and many prominent businessmen. In 1922, within six months of the Klan's existence in Mer Rouge, Louisiana, the postmaster, judge, sheriff, deputy sheriff, prosecuting attorney, and almost all the cops joined the Klan. In nearly all areas, politicians, cops, judges, etc. played a prominent role in allowing the Klan freedom to grow and to attack black people.

The existence of the Klan provided the impetus for the most heinous crimes against black people. For example, in one year (1919), as 25 race riots swept through the U.S., 70 black people were lynched, 14 blacks were burned alive, and 10 black soldiers—still wearing their World War I uniforms—were lynched (Franklin).

The list of crimes committed against black people by the 1920s Klan are too numerous to mention.

The universities were far from immune to "Klan fever." In 1921, Klan chapters were organized at Harvard and Princeton. In 1924, a cross was burned at Columbia University against a black student living in the dorms.

KLAN ATTACKS WHITE WORKERS

The Klan's brutality was never limited to black people. As we have seen (see Part I), the old Klan of Reconstruction days had aimed to destroy multi-racial unity as a necessary political step towards their economic goals, of (a) keeping the black ex-slaves as cheap labor through terrorizing them; and (b) dividing poor whites from poor blacks, in order to keep the poor whites politically

and economically powerless. This meant that any white worker or farmer who united with blacks in any way had to be viciously punished. Contrary to the lies of racist historians, multi-racial unity has always been a natural tendency among the poor and working-class of all races, in the U.S. as elsewhere. This is because working people know that class unity is necessary for them. Their conditions of life and the class nature of their exploitation teach this lesson daily. Multi-racial unity is essential to all workers and oppressed people generally, white as well as minority. So the Klan has always attacked working-class whites who acted in their class interest and attempted some form of unity with blacks, immigrants, etc.

The Klan of the 1920s was no different. It spent much of its time attempting to destroy the union movement

**The Klan
has always been,
and still is,
stage-managed by...
the ruling class.**

in the U.S.A. and in trying to terrorize anti-racist white workers. The "Mer Rouge" incident was a famous example of KKK terror against white workers.

In Mer Rouge, Louisiana, in September 1922, masked Klansmen seized five white men: Watt Daniels, a planter's son; Tom Richards, a garage mechanic; their fathers; and one other man, blind-folded and hog-tied them and threw them into the back of a waiting Ford truck. Daniels and Richards were leaders of anti-Klan sentiment in Northern Louisiana. Since this sentiment went unorganized, they became prime targets for Klan revenge.

The captives were taken to a clearing in the woods. The elder Daniels, a man of seventy, was tied to a tree and lashed with a leather strap. Watt Daniels managed to get loose and fought to save his father. In doing so he ripped off the mask

of one of his assailants, a move which was to cost Daniels and Richards their lives.

A few weeks after the incident, two hideously mangled corpses were found floating in Lake Lafourche. The victims had been flogged and run over with the "torture machine" which crushed and splintered the bones in the still-living bodies. The pulped corpses were then mutilated and dismembered. Only the torsos were found in the lake. The "Mer Rouge affair," as it was to be known, received national attention for its unbelievable brutality.

The Klan usually tries to pass itself off as a movement based in the masses.

This is the way it is portrayed by liberal bourgeois historians, whose hatred for workers and love of the bosses blinds them to reality when they are not simply lying. But the Klan has always been, and still is, supported and stage-managed by the bosses: employers, politicians, petty-bourgeois types and the ruling class itself. This is shown clearly in the KKK's concentration upon attacking the union movement in the U.S. During the 1920s the Klan centered its opposition particularly on activities of the Communist Party. At the same time the ruling class was orchestrating the "Red Scare," deporting thousands of European immigrant workers who had joined unions, and had set up the American Legion as an anti-socialist, anti-union goon squad. In the 1930s the KKK, like the ruling class itself, concentrated on attacking unions, especially those of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (C.I.O.).

During World War I hooded and masked Klansmen whipped, tarred, and feathered union organizers, strikers, and draft dodgers. They attacked striking shipyard workers in Mobile, Alabama and tarred and feathered organizers from the Industrial Workers of the World in Tulsa, Oklahoma. In the early 1930s, they flogged two members of the Communist Party in Dallas for speaking out against lynching.

During the 1920s the Klan centered much of its anti-union attack on the mine-workers, especially in West Virginia and Kentucky. Battles raged within the United Mine Workers (UMW) between Klansmen and anti-Klan unionists. In the mines of West Virginia, the KKK attacked black and immigrant workers. Whenever workers elected a black worker to a mine

Klan

committee, Klansmen would harass him and try to force his resignation. They would claim that "the West Virginia native white miners dislike serving on committees with 'ignorant n-----s who just came from the South.'" (Spero and Harris) Many black miners were forced to quit the UMW because "in many instances Negroes could not get jobs by which to earn union wages" owing to the "Ku Klux Klan spirit" in the union. (Foner, p. 170)

The Klan did not go unopposed within the UMW. In Kentucky, multi-racial groups of miners not only threw Klansmen out of the union, they chased them out of various towns as well. Additionally, the 1924 UMW constitution outlawed Klansmen from joining the union.

The Klan did not limit itself to the UMW however, but tried to organize in others unions in many U.S. cities. Throughout Oklahoma (where 5% of the state—90,000 people—were Klan members) for instance, Klansmen attacked union organizers, especially black organizers. In Michigan, the Klan tried organizing in mainly auto building towns—Detroit, Flint, and Saginaw. In Detroit, they tried to mobilize their 35,000 members to oppose integrated housing. In 1924 a boss-backed Klan candidate got 100,000 votes, and barely lost the election for mayor.

Industrial workers constituted only a small part of Klan membership. In Chicago, in a 1923 study, for instance, blue-collar workers made up 26.1% of Klan membership, while businessmen, managers, cops, firemen, and white-collar workers made up 73.9%. (Jackson) Throughout the 1920s and 1930s the KKK was never able to gain a real foothold in any union or industry—the mining industry coming the closest. Generally, multi-racial groups of workers fought the existence of the Klan and threw them out.

In the 1930s, the Klan took on a new crusade—the CIO and the Communist Party. As one 1937 poster in Atlanta claimed:

"CIO is Communism.
Communism
Will Not Be Tolerated.
Ku Klux Klan
Rides Again" (A.S. Rice, p. 102)

Attacks on CIO organizers, especially from the Steel Workers Organizing Committee and Textile Workers Organizing

Committee, became common occurrences. In the early 1930s, in Greenville, South Carolina, for example, the Klan broke up a meeting of the TWOC, beating up both black and white workers present. The police looked the other way, feeling that the KKK could put a stop to communist organizing in the Greenville area.


In Tampa, Florida, in 1936, CIO organizers were attacked by an unholy alliance of Klansmen, Catholic followers of the budding fascist Father Coughlin, leading state officials of the anti-communist American Federation of Labor (AFL), and local criminals and police. (Foner, p. 280)

The Klan was so enamored of the A.F. of L.'s anti-communism that Imperial Lizard Hiram Evans was constantly singing its praises. Klansmen distributed hoods at A.F. of L. meetings so that A.F. of L. members could go out and beat up CIO organizers "incognito." In 1940, A.F. of L. officials allowed the Klan to shower the national convention with leaflets urging delegates to join the Klan to rid the country of "CIO communists and n-----r lovers." At that time George Meany, today's AFL-CIO President, was a high official of the New York State AFL and tied to their AFL-President William Green.

The Klan labor program of the 1930s looked very much like the current A.F. of L-CIO program is today. First, they believed that immigrant workers should be denied work, so as not to "take jobs" from U.S.-born workers. Second, workers should avoid "unpatriotic actions," especially strikes, unemployment demonstrations, etc. Thus, the Klan particularly attacked communist organizers in the CIO, just as present-day union officials attack communists in the Progressive Labor Party, for calling for the working class to take the offensive against the bosses and do-nothing labor officials.

A typical Klan leaflet of the 1930s was found in Birmingham, Alabama in 1932. It was distributed in the black section of town.

"Negroes of Birmingham, the Klan is watching you. Tell the Communists to get out of town. They mean only trouble for you, for Alabama is a good place for good Negroes and a bad place for Negroes who believe in racial equality. Report Communist activities to the Ku Klux Klan, Box 661, Birmingham." (A.S. Rice, p. 101-102)



Member of Progressive Labor Party rips off hood of Mississippi Grand Dragon Bill Wilkinson in October '78 as PL and InCAR prevented a major Klan gathering. For further developments see photo, page 68.

At the time in Birmingham, the Communist Party had been fairly active in organizing both black and white workers around the defense of the Scottsboro Boys (see PL, Vol. 10, No. 5, April 1977). However, although the CP was pretty successful in organizing support for the Scottsboro Boys, they never militantly took the offensive against KKK violence. This *laissez-faire* approach undoubtedly allowed the Klan to grow and get away with much more than they could have had the CP fought fire with fire. In fact, there are few, if any, reports of CP-led workers doing anything more than simply defending themselves from KKK attack. What they should have done was attack Klan meetings, destroy Klan offices and literature, and beat up and kill Klan members. This approach would have cut down the number of lynchings, cross burnings, etc. carried out by an emboldened Klan. It should be pointed out that in the 1930s, the CP and the CIO **did** take the offensive against the "German-type" fascists—the Silver Shirts, Khaki Shirts, etc.—oftentimes physically demolishing their rallies. There is little evidence this was ever done against the KKK, however.

There was widespread opposition to the Klan nearly every place they tried to organize. In many cases the opposition was militant and multi-racial. Klansmen were beaten and thrown out of town. Klan meetings and rallies were broken up, and Klan equipment destroyed. **There are many examples of how groups of workers stopped the Klan.** The following are some of them:

- In 1922, a Colonel Camp wanted to revive the KKK in Greenville, Mississippi. He called a public meeting. It was a packed house. However, nearly everyone there was anti-Klan. Camp was shouted down and forced to leave town by a combination of whites, blacks, Jews, Italians, Irish, Chinese, and Syrians, who lived together comfortably in Greenville. The Klan was forced to go underground in Greenville, where it never caught fire and died by 1924.

- In 1921, Klan headquarters in Condon, Oregon was **shot up by armed workers** who made sure the Klan didn't become a force in the area. Though Klan membership in Oregon was 14,000 in 1922 (2% of the state), with 7000 members

in Portland, they skidded into decline by 1923.

- In a small Iowa town named Goodall, high school students struck against a substitute teacher whose husband was a Klansman. In Corning, Iowa, a small farming town about 75 miles from Des Moines, a KKK meeting touched off an anti-Klan riot. When the Klan called their first public meeting in Des Moines in July 1926, a large and angry crowd armed with pitchforks, hammers, and crowbars beat up and turned back Klansmen coming to attend the meeting.

- In 1922, in New Castle, Delaware, an angry crowd beat up Klansmen gathered for a cross burning.

- In Worcester, Massachusetts, a Klan rally of 10,000 in 1925 was attacked by a multi-racial crowd. An airplane the Klan had rented for the occasion was shot down by rifle fire and Klansmen on the ground were stoned and forced to leave town. Throughout Massachusetts attacks by anti-Klan workers were commonplace.

- In 1923, in Carnegie, Pennsylvania, a Klan march of 10,000 was attacked by an even larger crowd. One Klansman was shot and killed, and many others severely beaten. The next week in Scottsdale, hooded Klansmen were forced to unmask by an angry crowd. In the mining town of Lilly, four KKKers were killed and others injured when a large crowd armed with guns, fire hoses, and more attacked a cross burning.

NEW JERSEY WORKERS SMASH KLAN

In New Jersey, the Klan was large and fairly active. Their strongholds were in Passaic, Bergen, Essex, Union, and Morris Counties and in Camden and Trenton. Their main focus was to attack the Communist Party and school desegregation. They met with continued opposition.

In 1928, in Atlantic City, a call went out for an anti-Klan vigilance committee. Four thousand people, both black and white, showed up. There were many attacks on the Klan throughout the state, including the following account of a Klan meeting in Perth Amboy in 1923:

In August of 1923, several hundred Klansmen meeting in Perth Amboy's Odd Fellows' Hall were assailed by thousands of rioting townsmen. (Perth Amboy was inhabited almost entirely by Slavic

and Italian factory and port workers. Chalmers, a liberal bourgeois historian, omits this fact). Even when reinforced by firemen and state troopers, the police could not control the raging mob. When the crowd first started getting out of control, two carloads of Klansmen made a dash for it. One of them got away, but the other car was overturned and its occupants were beaten. There was little the police could do other than try to keep the mob out of the meeting hall. The streets belonged to the mob. Rioters brushed the police away from a patrol wagon and beat the Klansmen inside. A state trooper was lifted off his motorcycle and pinned in a nearby doorway. Helmeted police clubbed their way through to the hydrants so the firemen could connect their hoses, but the mob reformed, broke through, and cut the hoses. A Klansman who attempted to slip into the mob was beaten unconscious and his assailants only reluctantly abandoned their attempt to drop his body down the sewer when a policeman rushed by crying "My God, don't do that! That's murder!" As the crowd grew in the early hours of the morning, the shower of bricks and stones continued to rain on the Odd Fellows' Hall and the embattled policemen. The police finally turned to tear gas but their supply was small and it seemed wise to try to get the Klansmen to safety before the effect wore off. However, as the besieged knights dashed out of the doors and down the fire escapes they were met by the mob which again was coming forward to assault the building. When one Klansman tried to draw a pistol, the police just barely managed to hide him in an adjacent stable while the pursuing townsmen searched the police station. When the state troopers arrived, an attempt was made to lead the remaining Klansmen over the roofs to waiting cars. The mob realized what was happening and caught two of the cars, wrecking them and beating the Klansmen to the ground. A patrol wagon, which had made it out of town with its cargo

of Klansmen, was met on the road by incoming crowds. The terrified Klansmen were punched and mauled until they managed to escape to the woods, while their exultant punishers overturned the van. (Chalmers, p. 251-252)

Although historian Chalmers seemed outraged at "mob violence," this short tale of working class power in Perth Amboy, New Jersey stands as a conspicuous example of what armed, angry, and determined workers will do when provoked. The very existence of the Ku Klux Klan is provocation enough, both in the 1920s and today.

During the early years of the Klan's revival (late 1910s and early 1920s), two examples stand out as what not to do about the Klan. These cases show the bankruptcy of certain "leftist" ideologies.

BLACK NATIONALIST GARVEY HAD KLAN'S LINE

In the early 1920s, the United Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) and its leader, Marcus Garvey, found itself with a political line very similar to that of the KKK. Both the UNIA and KKK agreed that the U.S. should be a "white man's country." Both agreed that black people should "go back to Africa." Both agreed that white people and black people had nothing in common, could never work or live together in harmony, and needed to be physically separated. So the UNIA never attacked the Klan, while the KKK hoped and encouraged blacks to follow the mis-direction of Garvey, whose movement combined the worst aspects of the black capitalism of Andrew Young, the black nationalism of Stokely Carmichael, the mysticism and profit-making schemes of Elijah Muhammed, and the profiting off your "roots" of Alex Haley.

Garvey's "back to Africa" movement didn't go over very big with black workers, who had to contend with the KKK and other forms of racism in their daily lives. The bankruptcy of black nationalism and black separatism was never more apparent than here, as Grand Lizard Simmons and "Roots" Garvey found themselves on the same side of the fence of racism. Garvey carried forth the mis-guided logic of nationalism—and showed by negative example how

black nationalism is the scourge, and not the salvation, of black workers.

SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS ALLY WITH KLAN

The second sad specimen of what not to do when you're attacked with the disease of Klanitosis is the case of the Socialist Party of Wisconsin. By the early 1920s, the Socialist Party had become a completely reactionary force. With the formation of the U.S. Communist Party under the inspiration of the Soviet Bolsheviks and the success of the socialist revolution in Russia, the revolutionary days of the Socialist Party had ended. By the early 1920s, they were a nationalist chauvinist organization. Thus, it should not seem surprising that in 1921, members of the Socialist Party in Milwaukee ran for


In 1921, members of the Socialist Party ran under dual banners of the Socialist Party and the Ku Klux Klan.

elected office under the dual banners of the Socialist Party and the Ku Klux Klan! One candidate, John Kleist, ran for State Supreme Court as both a Klansman and a Socialist and ran better than anyone on a straight Socialist Party ticket. Kleist claimed the Klan had more "socialists" on its rolls than the Socialist Party. As both the KKK and Socialist Party were patriotic, national chauvinist organizations, this claim is quite possible. Thus, nationalism—in this case in the form of patriotism—combined with "socialism" equals National Socialism—Nazism, Fascism (KKK-style).

True revolutionaries are communists, and communists believe in internationalism—the smashing of all national borders and the growth of a world-wide communist movement to overthrow the capitalists of all lands. Black nationalism and "socialist" nationalism always lead



68 *Klan hood and regalia of Grand Lizard Bill Wilkinson are burned by PL and InCAR members at a rally in Boston in November '78, just weeks after they were ripped off the Imperial Worm in a militant anti-Klan rally.*



Lumbee Indians in North Carolina put a swift end to Klan cross-burning plans with an armed attack.

back into the arms of the ruling class and their agents, such as the KKK.

Speaking of fascism, the KKK in the 1930s was openly in favor of Hitler and Mussolini, although they "criticized" Mussolini for patching up differences between the Italian Fascisti and the Vatican in 1929. Klan rallies praised Hitler to the skies, especially for the Nazis' views on anti-Semitism and anti-communism. Joint KKK-Silver Shirt (a fascist organization led by budding fuhrer William Dudley Pelly) rallies were common throughout the '30s.

By 1928, the KKK was in serious decline. Whereas they had upwards of three million members in the mid-1920s, by 1928 they had a few hundred thousand and were dropping rapidly. What were the reasons for the Klan's decline despite their large membership?

(1) The Klan was too loosely structured and too anarchistic organizationally for it to become a long-term national movement. Though all 48 states


(and the District of Columbia) had Klan chapters, each state, and often each chapter within a city or state, "did its own thing." The Klan was very decentralized—too much so for it to become a national fascist danger. For a fascist movement to become a real threat it must be highly centralized with sizeable numbers of people willing to march into hell at the leader's whim. Most Klansmen were not prepared to follow the leadership of Simmons, and later Evans. There were constant quarrels over leadership, leaving the organization in a state of flux for months at a time. Which leads to the second point -

(2) The ruling class was not in a position to institute fascism in the United States on a grand scale. Thus, the backing that groups like the KKK received was usually limited to the local authorities (low-level politicians, local businessmen, judges, cops). **This backing was essential for the Klan to grow—without the support given by the local**

Klan

leaders the KKK was stopped by working class opposition. However, this decentralization of support was not enough to sustain a large national fascist movement.

There are a number of reasons why fascism was not yet on the U.S. ruling class' agenda:



(a) One reason has already been stated: there was still too much local autonomy by state and city governments, local police units, and fascist groupings. For fascism to succeed there has to be a definite centralization of power at the national level.

(b) The economic crisis that struck all nations (except the then-socialist Soviet Union) in the late 1920s and early 1930s was very severe in the U.S. However, the U.S. bosses were able to recover somewhat more rapidly than the nations of Europe, as U.S. imperialism could still live off much of the spoils gained from World War I. The U.S. ruling class did not feel the same level of urgency to opt for fascism, as the German, Italian, and Japanese bosses, for instance, as the U.S. bosses had slightly more economic leeway.

(c) Not that the U.S. rulers wouldn't have "accepted" fascism as an alternative to bourgeois democracy. Probably the key reason for the decline of the KKK and the halting of any drive for fascism in the U.S. was the multi-racial, and often communist-led, movement against the growing fascist malignancy. The growth of the leftist Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) was a crucial factor in this movement, as the CIO was instrumental in preventing the KKK and other fascist movements from

gaining a foothold in the industrial working class. The mood of industrial workers often is the decisive element in how far the bourgeoisie can go in instituting its nationwide designs. That a large part of the multi-racial working class often rose up against the KKK and Co. was probably the main reason why no serious fascist threat developed in the U.S. (or Canada, either).

By the time a Terre Haute, Indiana veterinarian who had headed the Klan's anti-CIO division, James Colescott, became Imperial Lizard in 1939, the Ku Klux Klan was in serious decline. By this time, there was a glut of fascist organizations around to tap any right-wing sentiments. Many of the Hitler-loving groups had their origins in the KKK. Many of the up-and-going nowhere fuhrers of the day had deep ties with the Klan. William Dudley Pelly, Mrs. Leslie Fry, James Edward Smythe, Col. E.N. Sanctuary, Gen. George Van Horn Mosley, Court Asher, White Shirt leader George W. Christians. A founder of the Knights of the White Camelia, George Deatherage, claimed that the German Nazis had gotten their anti-Jewish policy and salute (arms extended, palms downward) from the KKK.

Leaders of the German-American Bund, the leading Nazi organization in the U.S., were in constant touch with Klan leaders and many klaverns were pro-Hitler.

Things had certainly reached a far cry from the early 1920s when Klansmen in Paterson, New Jersey had protested against the Steuben Society and the teaching of German in the schools. On August 18, 1940, several hundred robed Klansmen shared the grounds of the Bund's Camp Nordlund, near Andover, New Jersey, with a similar contingent of uniformed Bundmen. Clad in yellow robes, Arthur H. Bell, the Bloomfield (N.J.) lawyer, who had led the New Jersey Klansmen in the 1920s, attacked the singing of "God Bless America" which he described as a Semitic song fit only for Bowery taverns and brothels. Edward James Smythe, Protestant War Veteran head, who had organized the meeting, lauded Bund leader (Fritz) Kuhn. Then the Camp Director and Deputy

Bundesfuhrer stepped to the front of the platform. "When Arthur Bell, your Grand Giant, and Mr. Smythe asked us about using Camp Nordland for this patriotic meeting, we decided to let them have it because of the common bond between us. The principles of the Bund and the principles of the Klan are the same," he proclaimed. At this point, Klan leader Bell grasped the hand of the Bundsman. After the speeches were over and a message from Imperial Wizard Colescott had been read, a Klan wedding was performed beneath a fiery cross. When the neighboring residents gathered outside a fence chanting "put Hitler on the cross" and singing the "Star Spangled Banner" the Bund band struck up and drowned them out. (Chalmers, p. 322-323)

In 1944, the U.S. Bureau of Internal Revenue filed a lien for back taxes on the Klan. By this time, the first Klan revival was at an end, and Colescott and Co. packed up and hid under a rock for the next few years.

THE SECOND KLAN REVIVAL— POST WORLD WAR II

Despite the official "demise" of the KKK, burning crosses appeared throughout the South, as well as in West Virginia and Michigan, throughout 1945 and 1946. In Texas, racial clashes increased 900% in 1945 from 1944. Just as happened after World War I, black soldiers returning from the war were harassed and attacked. There was resentment over the black vets "getting out of place." On June 22, 1945, Elroy Fletcher, a black World War II veteran was flogged with a heavy wire cable for trying to register as a student at Jackson College in Jackson, Mississippi. Most of the attacks and the harassment were attributed to the Ku Klux Klan.

In October of 1946, the KKK was officially revitalized by a 55-year old Atlanta obstetrician named Samuel Green. Green became the post-World War II Imperial Lizard of the new Klan—the Association of Georgia Klans.

The Klan grew outside of Georgia as well during this period. Evangelists praised the joint doctrines of Jesus and the Ku Klux Klan at rallies in East Ten-

nessee and in Knoxville. In Chattanooga, cross burnings forced a Jewish woman to close her store, as J.B. Stoner, an up-and-coming fascist, was pushing the anti-semitic pamphlet "The Protocols of Zion." A member of the Chattanooga Board of Education brought a Klansman to a discussion on pupil absenteeism and the Klan launched a campaign of threats and beatings to urge parents to rectify this situation.

The Klan was back! To certify the situation, a huge picture story appeared in Life magazine of a major Klan initiation ceremony on Stone Mountain, outside Atlanta. In Virginia Robert Byrd, now Majority Leader of the United States Senate, helped lead a Klan revival in that state.

Almost immediately the KKK came under widespread attack as popular resistance to the hooded empire mounted. Nearly everywhere major Klan spokesmen such as Dr. Green went, there was rank-and-file (not government) opposition. When Green addressed an audience in Columbia, South Carolina students from the University of South Carolina, disrupted the talk with stink bombs. This sort of thing became commonplace.

The Klan needed a new public-relations image, felt the hooded Dr. Green. In 1948, the Klan realized they had to bide their time, as millions of U.S. workers were better able to see the relationship between the KKK and the international fascist movement they had just fought to crush.

This public relations image went from the ridiculous to the ludicrous. For instance: at Christmastime, hooded Klansmen dressed up as Santa Claus (a trick taken from the Nazis, as Storm Troopers played Kris Kringle and saluted the children with a curt "Heil Hitler!"). A Klan group presented a radio to a 107-year old black man. Food was distributed to the hungry. Even 20 suits of underwear, stamped KKK, were handed out at an old folks home in Atlanta.

Despite the polished-hood image, violence was still the Klan trademark. The KKK had its own Klavalier Klub whipping squad, and a Klan group called "the Black Raiders" had to be banned by Green himself for going beyond the limits of acceptable Klan violence.

There was so much opposition to the Klan, however, most state and local governments were forced to institute anti-Klan laws. Without the undivided support of the local authorities, the Klan



Multi-racial unity is the key to winning the battle against the Klan. Here students led by Progressive Labor Party demonstrate against racist murders of blacks in the South.

floundered quickly. By the time Green died suddenly in 1949, the second—and disorganized—Klan revival was nearly at an end, with the last remains of Klan activity dying out by 1951.

THE THIRD KLAN REVIVAL— THE MID AND LATE 1950s

The third Klan revival was a particularly bloody one. It was spurred on by the Brown vs. Board of Education decision on public school integration on May 17, 1954. It coincided with the early stages of the Civil Rights movement, with which it clashed constantly. Its leader was to be a spray painter at Atlanta's General Motors Fisher Body plant, Eldon Edwards. In competition with at least seven other Klan organizations, Edwards' U.S. Klans, Knights of the KKK, was the largest—with approximately 20,000 members in Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Louisiana.

Other Klan groups competing for the pre-eminent position in Klandom and for the dollars of its members were: the Florida KKK, the second largest groupings; the Association of South Carolina Klans; the Original KKK of the Confederacy, the most violent of the new Klan groups, led by Asa Carter, a radio announcer from Birmingham; the Gulf KKK of South Alabama; the Knights of the KKK in Louisiana; the Association of Arkansas Klans; and the Original KKK in Arkansas. In addition to the "official" Klan groups, there was a glut of others without the Klan title.

The Citizens' Councils were the largest of this type. The Citizens' Councils were also organized in 1954 in response to school integration. The Coun-

cils only differed from the Klan in appearance as popular accounts called them the "new sinister KKK," "current version of the KKK," "scrubbed-up cousin of the Klan," "white-collar Klan," "uptown Klan," "button-down Klan," and "country club Klan." (McKillen)

The Councils were in fact the result of a new tactic by the South's ruling class. The Klan itself could preserve its appearance of being a mass, "nativist" group of white workers. This meant that: (1) the Klan, which was trying to recruit white workers and poor whites, could appear to be "independent" of the local bosses and politicians. These were usually disliked by working-class whites, few of whom would join boss-led groups. So the Citizens Councils were essential if the Klan was ever to involve masses of white workers; (2) through the Councils the local bourgeoisie and ruling class, together with their political servants, could openly push for the same racist policies as the Klan, while formally maintaining a separation from the Klan. So, for example, Klan violence could be "disowned" while the same racism could be pushed. This was necessary to get many petty-bourgeois forces organized behind the Klan. In fact, of course, the "White Citizens Councils" led the Klan and its violence.

There were individual racist rivals also. J.B. Stoner, an ex-Klansman, filled the mails with flyers about exterminating the Jews. By the 1960s, he wound up as leader of the anti-Semitic National States Rights Party, which found its inspiration in Adolph Hitler and even uses the SS as its symbol. This is the organization that Fred Cowen belonged to. Cowen, you may recall, was the fascist who re-

cently entered a factory in Mount Vernon, New York and opened fire on black and immigrant workers, killing five before being killed himself.

Another Klan protege, Horace Miller, sent a racist newsletter around the globe with mail-order applications to join his personal Klan. Neofascists internationally received Miller's rag.


The head of the Original KKK of the Confederacy, Asa Carter, led the most violent Klan faction of all. As a radio announcer in Birmingham he made a name for himself by banning rock and roll music. A big sign which read "Be-Bop Promotes Communism" hung on his office wall. Carter's followers were widely racist. They made headlines when six Klansmen jumped on the stage of the Birmingham Municipal Auditorium in April 1957 and assaulted singer Nat King Cole. Four of Carter's boys got 20 years in jail for the turpentine-soaked castration of a black man kidnapped for a sacrificial initiation ceremony. Carter's Klan days ended when he shot and wounded two other Klansmen in a dispute. Charges against him were dropped, but his Klan days were over.

Frederick John Kasper, a Columbia University graduate, added an "intellectual" note to the KKK. Kasper idolized the fascist poet Ezra Pound (who was a propagandist for Mussolini) and ran a bookstore stocked with racist and anti-Semitic literature as well as the works of Pound. Kasper was jailed for leading a racist mob in Clinton, Tennessee in activities that took the National Guard to quell. The Klan "disowned" Kasper using the excuse that he had committed a cardinal Klan "sin"—he had attended a few integrated parties in New York City. In fact the Klan probably just wanted to disassociate itself publicly from the violence. The Klan and Nazis seek to maintain a "clean" image as super-patriots. Therefore they are usually very careful about fighting the army or any force which may make them appear "subversive."

The 1950s Klan became more overtly and explicitly fascist than its predecessors. Klan literature had become the mouthpiece for the would-be fuhrers of the 1930s and 1940s, such as Conde McGinley and Gerald L.K. Smith. The leaders of Nazi groups and Klan organizations became more intertwined. A Nazi-like salute was officially used at

Klan rallies in South Carolina. The Original KKK of the Confederacy dressed in pseudo-storm trooper uniforms instead of the traditional white sheets. The Klan sponsored poorly-attended lectures by another over-the-hill fascist, George Deatherage.

Racist violence in this period was stepped up. Historian David Chalmers reports a partial list of Klan violence during the period 1954-1958. Listed are 530 cases of "overt racial violence, reprisal, and intimidation."



The 1950s Klan also attacked the labor movement. On July 25, 1955 the Chattanooga Central Labor Union adopted a resolution supporting school integration. The KKK and White Citizens' Council attacked the CCLU, saying it was headed by "alien Communist lovers" and was partly responsible "for the disgusting integration of Negro and White workers in the labor movement in Tennessee." (Foner, p. 317)

An interesting analysis of the Klan at the time by James Vandezo Zanden found that the typical Klan member was a blue-collar worker, but the typical Klan leader was a small businessman or a cop. Under this leadership, the un-class conscious worker found himself siding with white bosses and bosses' agents against black workers, instead of uniting with black workers to fight the class enemy.

Because of the fight for power between the different Klan groupings, and the death of Eldon Edwards in 1960, the Klan found itself in decline, despite an

increase in activities spurred by the lunch-counter sit-ins by civil rights workers in 1960. It was left to Robert Shelton, head of the Alabama Klan, to lead the KKK into the fray against the multi-racial civil rights movement of the 1960s.

THE FOURTH KLAN REVIVAL— THE 1960s

The 1960s Klan appeared almost exclusively in the Southern states. It was built by opposition to the Civil Rights Movement. The segregationist tactics of Alabama Governor George Wallace and Birmingham chief of police "Bull" Connors helped the Klan immensely.

Robert Shelton's United Klans of America grew to about 5000 members throughout Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida, Tennessee, Alabama, South Carolina, and North Carolina. The Original Knights of the KKK grew to about 1000 members, including, for the first time, Catholics. The White Knights of the KKK, an extremely violent version of the Klan, had about 2000 members at its height in the mid-sixties. The North Florida Klan, based mainly in Jacksonville, grew to about 1000 members; while the Association of South Carolina Klans had about 500 members. Eldon Edwards' U.S. Klans (now headed by Robert Lee "Wild Bill" Davidson), which was the main Klan group in the 1950s, Atlanta lawyer James Venable's Federation of Klans, the Dixie Klans, the Improved Order of Klans, and the Association of Georgia Klans were also on the scene.

As in the 1920s the ruling class media was ready to build the Klan with another of their potential "exposes." Thus, a New York Times article on April 20, 1965 claimed that masses of people were flocking to join the Klan (which they weren't) and that the Klan was much stronger than they really were. "The Klan and allied organizations are now more active and possibly stronger in numbers and influence than at any time since the Klan's heyday in the 1920s." (Keesing, p. 7-8) Similarly, a congressional hearing in the 1960s estimated Klan membership at 40,000 nationally, though these figures seem inflated as compared with other accounts.

With Imperial Lizard Robert Shelton at the helm, the 1960s Klan focused entirely on the Civil Rights movement. The

extraneous issues of the past, from handing out KKK underwear to senior citizens to opposition to flouridated water as a communist conspiracy were laid to rest. Racism, combined with heavy doses of anti-communism, was now the sole issue of the Klan. Integration, school busing, the lunch-counter sit-ins—all were attacked.

Interestingly, just as Klan leader Simmons and Marcus Garvey found it more than possible to work together, so did the 1960s version of the Klan and the Black Muslims. In a rally in Atlanta's Hurd Park in the Spring of 1964, Imperial Lizard Shelton singled out local Black Muslim leader Jeremiah X (who was at the rally) for praise in opposing integration.

As always, the cornerstone of Klandom was racist violence. With the help of local and state officials, the Klan used terror to push for segregation. In an Alabama state report on October 17, 1965, the KKK was implicated in at least 12 of 17 racial murders since 1963. There were no convictions in any of the 12 cases.

One Klan leader, Daniel Burros, who was Grand Dragon of the United Klans of New York State as well as former National Secretary of the American Nazi Party and editor of *The Free American*, advocated genocide as the best means to solving the black and Jewish "problems." Ironically, when a *New York Times* article on October 31, 1965 revealed that Burros was Jewish, he committed suicide the following day.

Throughout the sixties the Klan kept trying to destroy the Civil Rights movement and to intimidate Civil Rights workers. More often than not, they did not have the support of most white workers and had to rely solely on the local authorities for their power. The activities of the KKK during the 1960s were simply a reflection of how the ruling class itself would and does respond to the fight against racism when the thin veneer of "democracy" is removed.

• St. Augustine, Florida became a racial battleground in the 1960s. With the help of the police, the KKK built one of its largest chapters. At one rally here in the fall of 1963, four black men, including dentist R.N. Hayling, a local civil rights leader, were abducted and beaten viciously by a Klan-inspired mob. Four Klansmen were arrested, but a

local jury found them innocent of assault and battery. Instead, the four black men were convicted of assaulting the crowd.

1964 saw much fighting between civil rights workers and the KKK in St. Augustine. Though the mayor claimed St. Augustine had no "racial problems," the U.S. Civil Rights Commission reported that racial conditions in this city were "considerably worse than in most, if not all, other cities in the state." (Chalmers, p. 378)

During 1964, Dr. Hayling's home was shot up by Klansmen. Following this a member of the Ancient City Hunting Club (a KKK front organization) was shot and killed as he rode with friends, shotguns in hand, through the black district. Sheriff L.O. Davis then went through the black neighborhoods to announce a campaign of terror against black people.

Despite repeated attacks by Klansmen and police, the Civil Rights workers, under orders from Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) never fought back. They were constantly beaten and carted off to jail. When the Klan marched through the black area of town, SCLCers stood on the sidewalks and sang "I love everybody."

Apparently King and his followers did not study history. Only an all-out violent offensive against the Klan had stopped them before. **King's pacifism had the effect of allowing the Klan and the police to run roughshod over the people of St. Augustine.** In fact, Klan leaders Connie Lynch, J.B. Stoner, and Hoss Kanucy appeared on national TV and exclaimed happily that in St. Augustine "there is going to be trouble for a l-o-n-g time!" **The KKK knew that as long as their "nemesis" was the SCLC, they could get away with murder...literally.** About one month after the Klan leaders appeared on TV, a black army colonel, Lemuel Penn, was murdered by four Klansmen as he rode through town in his car.

Throughout the South, the pacifism of the Civil Rights movement's leadership allowed the Klan to get away with violent attacks unhindered. Usually King and his followers appealed to the same police and the same judicial system that was enforcing the racist laws. Thus, Klansmen knew they not only had immunity from prosecution for their racist crimes,

but they had immunity from any counter-attack by the pacifist Civil Rights movement.

As the Civil Rights movement died down, so did the KKK. Why was this? Didn't the ruling class, who backed the Klan, have the strength to make "Jim Crowism" and the Klan's racist violence prevail?

The Klan declined in the 1960s because it was opposed by the dominant section of the U.S. ruling class, the Rockefeller-Morgan wing. After World War II the U.S. ruling class recognized that Communism had won millions of adherents all over the world. So the U.S. with its stooges in the British, French, etc. ruling classes, launched the "Cold War" and attempted to begin a preventive war with the then-socialist Soviet Union. Though it never won the support to carry this out, the U.S. ruling class did launch the Korean War.

Internationally the U.S. ruling class tried to mask its anti-communism—really the desire to defend fascism, exploitation, and capitalism—as a "fight for freedom." The Jim Crow system of racism in the South was in blatant contradiction with this line. Millions of workers throughout the world knew that the U.S. ruling class enforced fascist terror on a large part of its population. This made the U.S. rulers' claim to be dedicated to anti-communist "freedom" very weak. During the Korean War particularly, newspapers like the *New York Times* remarked over and over how Southern racist terror weakened U.S. propaganda (especially in Asia the U.S. invasion of Korea was correctly regarded as just another imperialist intervention).

To bolster their image the main section of the U.S. ruling class decided to pay some lip service to "racial equality." They engineered the "Brown vs. Board of Education" decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954. Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren had been a famous racist. He had ordered the imprisonment in concentration camps of all Japanese Americans in California in 1942. But Warren got his marching orders from his ruling class bosses and became a "liberal" overnight. The U.S. ruling class trumpeted the "landmark" Supreme Court decision, supposedly outlawing segregation, throughout the world. Meanwhile nothing at all was done to enforce it or get rid of Jim Crow.



The Southern ruling class was firmly opposed to this policy of doing away with Jim Crowism. But the Southern ruling class was far too narrow, too regional and parochial in its political outlook and interest. It was concerned only with maintaining its political hold in the South, not with the U.S.'s image internationally. The chief section of the ruling class, however, recognized that this attitude was destroying U.S. credibility, and thus aiding socialism. So the Rockefeller wing of the ruling class set about undermining its Southern partners.

This process did not really get underway until the Civil Rights movement had begun. The sit-ins were begun by the masses of black workers and students. The black "bourgeoisie" under such mis-leaders as Martin Luther King only hopped on the bandwagon later, to take charge and mis-lead the Civil Rights movement into "safe" (for the U.S. bosses) channels. Malcolm X, a militant nationalist, attacked King's betrayal of the 1963 march on Washington, calling it the "Farce on Washington." He shows how President Kennedy, frightened at the prospect of tens of thousands of rank-and-file black workers, protesting in Washington, called on "the big six" civil rights mis-leaders to control, which

they did. The result was a government sponsored pacifist cake-walk.

During the 1960s the U.S. ruling class basically moved to support Civil Rights "legislation," though it did not pay any attention to implementing the legislation until pushed by masses of white and black Civil Rights workers. When the Southern ruling class stubbornly opposed this, the dominant section of the ruling class moved to defeat them. The F.B.I. (led by arch-racist J. Edgar Hoover) was forced to harass the Klan somewhat, to show who was boss. Civil Rights Acts were passed; a few racist terrorists were convicted under them after the local ruling class had let them off, as in Mississippi. Political opponents were sponsored to defeat or undermine diehard racist politicians, such as Orville Faubus (Arkansas), George Wallace (Alabama) or Lester Maddox (Georgia). Jimmy Carter got into big-time politics by betraying, and then politically destroying, Maddox in Georgia. As is well known, this ability of Carter to "see which way the wind was blowing" (i.e. to correctly gauge the desires of the real ruling class) brought him to the attention of the Rockefellers, onto

the Trilateral Commission, and eventually got him the Democratic presidential nomination. More farsighted racist politicians (like Wallace, Robert Byrd, Russell Long, and famous Dixiecrat Strom Thurmond) shifted with the times and began paying lip-service to the ruling class's new line. To say nothing of ex-Klansman Lyndon Johnson, who became a great "civil rights" proponent overnight while murdering millions in Vietnam.

The Klan revivals since World War II, therefore, have never been fully backed by the national ruling class, but only by local ruling classes. Only in the 1960s, however, were these fascists forcibly brought to heel by the ruling classes. Earlier, as now, they were permitted to grow under "local" ruling class control, if they could.

Today the situation is entirely different from that of the 1920s or the 1960s. The U.S. ruling class is in decline, in retreat around the world. They are increasingly pushing racism, nationalism, and other anti-worker ideas in order to divide the working class, so as to be able to cut back on essential services and lower wages to raise the profit rate of U.S. corporations, so these can compete economically with Japanese, Russian, or German capitalists. This is already happening. However, the rapid decline of U.S. rulers' influence (e.g. Iran) will mean much harsher cutbacks in the future. In addition, they must push super-patriotism and anti-communism to prepare the working class for a war against the Soviet Union and to keep them away from all class-conscious, communist ideas.

This is why the main section of the U.S. ruling class is defending the new Klan, the Nazis, and other such scum like the R.O.A.R. racists who work directly in the liberal Kennedy Democratic machine in Massachusetts. **THE CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE DOMINANT SECTION OF THE RULING CLASS AND THE KLAN, NAZIS, ETC. IS NO LONGER THE SAME KIND AS IT WAS IN THE 1960s.** Unlike the 1920s or 1960s, the ruling class cannot opt for "liberalism" to control the mass movement. Liberalism costs too much; some reforms must be given in order to build illusions in the system. The U.S. rulers can afford liberalism less and less. Increasingly they must rely on pitting different sec-

tions of the working class against each other. Today the ruling class's Supreme Court pushes exactly the same kind of racism as the Klan does—the age-old lie of "reverse racism." The ruling class itself is nationally promoting the idea that "white workers cannot get ahead unless minority workers are held back, and vice versa." This is precisely what the Klan and Nazis say. The contradiction between the U.S. ruling class and these fascists is only over the best means of carrying out this line. Therefore the fascists are not repressed, simply kept within certain bounds, but built up within those limits. There is no contradiction between the fascists' and the ruling class's ideology.

What are the lessons we must learn from the racist, anti-worker history of the Ku Klux Klan—a history which is not over by any means? The first lesson is the way in which the Klan, and racist, fascist, anti-worker groups like the Klan, must be fought. During the 1960s the Klan, though opposed by a large Civil Rights movement, was really curbed by the ruling class alone. The pacifism of the Martin Luther King mis-leadership allowed the Klan to get away with much more than they would have had the anti-racist movement been more militant. **The first lesson for anti-racists to learn from the history of the KKK is that the only language understood by hard-core racists and their capitalist protectors are the "three M's."**

(1) **Mass**—Only a mass movement against racism, and against the KKK, can succeed.

(2) **Multi-racial**—The movement against racism must also oppose all forms of nationalism and be thoroughly integrated. The Klan and their ilk attack whites as well as blacks and must be fought by both in a unified movement (such as the Committee Against Racism).

(3) **Militant**—Pacifism must be discarded! The violence of the racists can only be countered with mass, multi-racial, working-class violence. The Klan can be destroyed, not by relying on the "justice" of the cops and courts, but by taking matters into our own hands and beating them into dust ourselves.

The second lesson is that the Klan can never be opposed by allying with bourgeois forces. All the major "Civil Rights" groups like the NAACP, the Urban League, CORE, etc.; all poli-

ticians in both Republican and Democratic Parties; cops, judges, the national and most local leaderships of the union movement—all these forces masquerade as being “anti-racist.” But the opposite is true. Historically and today these forces are composed of, or are directly subservient to, the ruling class. They have created the racism and the Klan, and they perpetuate them. Their pretended “opposition” to the Klan’s racism is a lie.

The same is true of the revisionist movement, the so-called “socialist,” “communist,” etc. parties and groups. Some of them are: The Communist Party U.S.A.; The Socialist Party (Social-Democrat U.S.A.); the trotskyite Socialist Workers Party; the ‘Revolutionary’ Communist Party; and all pro-Mao, pro-China, pro-Soviet, pro-Albania, or “democratic socialist” groups. The reason is that ALL OF THESE GROUPS

ARE IDEOLOGICALLY TIED TO THE RULING CLASS. All of them believe in, and practice, uniting with some segment of the ruling class. Usually this is the most dangerous racist part—the liberal, the minority nationalist mis-leaders, etc. These groups are much more tied to the ruling class and its ideas than they are committed to fighting racism. NONE of them believes in multi-racial unity.

Only the Progressive Labor Party and its friends and members in the International Committee Against Racism (I.N.C.A.R.) stand for multi-racial unity, with no unity with the bosses or any segment of the “liberal” ruling class. From Boston to San Diego, from Chicago to the Rio Grande Valley, and most recently in Tupelo, Mississippi, the heart of the South, P.L.P.’s and Incar’s ideas are being seized by workers who know the bosses are losers.

REFERENCES

1. Alexander, Charles C. *The Ku Klux Klan in the Southwest*. Lexington, Kentucky; Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1966.
2. Bennett, Lerefe, Jr. *Before the Mayflower*. Baltimore; Penguin Books, 1966.
3. Bohn, Frank. “The KKK Interpreted” *American Journal of Sociology*, Jan. 1925, 30, 4, 385-407.
4. Bontemps, Arna and Conroy, Jack. *Anyplace But Here*. N.Y.; Hill and Wang, 1967.
5. Broun, Heywood. “Up Pops the Wizard” *New Republic*, June 21, 1939, 99, 186-187.
6. Buni, Andrew. *The Negro in Virginia Politics*. Charlottesville, Va.; Univ. of Virginia Press, 1967.
7. Burger, Nash K. and Betterworth, John K. *South of Appomattox*. N.Y.; Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1969.
8. Chalmers, David M. *Hooded Americanism*. Garden City, N.Y.; Doubleday and Co., 1965.
9. Crowell, Evelyn M. “My Father and the Klan” *New Republic*, July 1, 1946, 114, 930.
10. DuBois, W.E.B. *Black Reconstruction in America*. N.Y.; Russell and Russell, 1935.
11. Foner, Philip S. *Organized Labor and the Black Worker*. N.Y.: Praeger Publishers, 1974.
12. Franklin, John Hope. *From Slavery to Freedom*. N.Y.: Vintage Books, 1969.
13. Gossett, Thomas F. *Race: The History of an Idea in America*. Dallas: SMU Press, 1963.
14. Green, Constance M. *The Secret City*. Princeton, N.J.; Princeton Univ. Press, 1967.
15. Horn, Stanley F. *Invisible Empire*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1939.
16. Hovland, Carl I. and Sears, Robert R. “Minor Studies of Aggression VI. Correlation of Lynchings with Economic Indices” *Journal of Psychology*, 1940, 9, 301-310.
17. International Committee Against Racism. *Free the Pendleton Fourteen*. 1977 pamphlet.
18. Jackson, Kenneth T. *The Ku Klux Klan in the City*. N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1967.
19. Keesings’s Research Report. *Race Relations in the USA, 1954-1968*. N.Y.: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1970.
20. Kennedy, Stetson. “The KKK: what to do about it” *New Republic*, July 1, 1946, 114, 928-930.
21. Lester, J.C. and Wilson, D.C. *Ku Klux Klan*. N.Y.: AMS Press, 1905.
22. McMillen, Neil R. *The Citizens’ Councils*. Urbana, Ill.: Univ. of Ill. Press, 1971.
23. McWilliams, Carey. “The Klan: Post-War Model” *Nation*, Dec. 14, 1946, 163, 691-694.
24. Mecklin, John M. *The Ku Klux Klan: A Study of the American Mind*. N.Y.: Russell and Russell, 1924.
25. Osofsky, Gilbert. *The Burden of Race*. N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1967.
26. Price, H.D. *The Negro and Southern Politics*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1957.
27. Progressive Labor Party. *Racism, Intelligence and the Working Class*. 1973 pamphlet.
28. Rice, Arnold S. *The Ku Klux Klan in American Politics*. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1962.
29. Rice, Lawrence D. *The Negro in Texas, 1874-1900*. Baton Rouge, La.: LSU Press, 1971.
30. Rules Committee, House of Representatives. *The Ku Klux Klan*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921.
31. Spangler, Earl. *The Negro in Minnesota*. Minneapolis: T.S. Denison and Co., 1961.
32. Spero, Sterling D. and Harris, Abram L. *The Black Worker*. N.Y.: Atheneum, 1972.
33. Tindall, George B. *South Carolina Negroes, 1877-1900*. Baton Rouge, La.: LSU Press, 1952.
34. Vanden Zanden, James. “The Klan Revival” *American Journal of Sociology*, 1960, 65, 456-462.

The New PLP Album

Songs of struggle and revolution from
THE PLP SINGERS

To order, send \$5.00 to:


PROGRESSIVE LABOR PARTY
GPO Box 808
Brooklyn, New York 11201



Posters from PLP

Authentic ad from Scot Paper Co. from the 30's.
On heavy paper, in blue and yellow. \$2.00 in-
cludes postage.

In black or red on white background. \$1.50,
including postage. Order from PLP, Box 808,
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201.



*Employees lose respect
for a company that
fails to provide
decent facilities for
their comfort*

TRY wiping your hands six days a
week on harsh, cheap paper towels—
and maybe you, too, would grumble.

Towel service is just one of those small,
but important courtesies—such as proper
air and lighting—that help build up the
goodwill of your employees.

That's why you'll find clothlike Scot-
Tissue Towels in the washrooms of large,
well-run organizations such as R.C.A.,
Victor Co., Inc., National Lead Co. and
Campbell Soup Co.

ScotTissue Towels are made of "strong
fibre"—an amazing cellulose product
that drinks up moisture 12 times as fast
as ordinary paper towels. They feel soft
and pleasant as a linen towel. Yet they're
so strong and tough in texture they won't
crumble or go to pieces . . . even when
they're wet.

And they cost less, too—because one
is enough to dry the hands—instead of
three or four.

Write for free trial coupon. Scot Paper
Company, Chester, Pennsylvania.



ScotTissue Towels - really dry!



Send for PLP Publications

CHALLENGE-DESAFIO

Weekly newspaper in English and Spanish reporting and analyzing struggles from the shops, campuses and communities. 1 year \$5.00

PL MAGAZINE

Magazine of political analysis, including major statements of PLP. Now appears quarterly.

6 issues--\$3.50 Single copy--75c

POSTERS

Scot Paper Co. ad (Bolsheviks) \$2.00

The World Above/The World Below. \$1.50

1. ROAD TO REVOLUTION III 50c
The general line of the Progressive Labor Party. Also available in Spanish.
2. RACISM, INTELLIGENCE AND THE WORKING CLASS 25c
An incisive critique of IQ theories and how they are used to build racism and fascism.
3. 30 FOR 40. 10c
The historic struggle for the shorter workday and why we need it—and how we can win it!
4. IRAN: THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM & THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM . . . 50c
How capitalism grew in Iran, and why Iranian workers must fight for socialist revolution. (In English and Farsi)
5. STUDENTS: TO ARMS AND WORKERS' REVOLUTION 15c
The role of the universities under capitalism and why students must join workers in revolution.
6. REVERSAL OF SOCIALISM IN CHINA. . . 25c
PL analysis of events in China after the cultural revolution and how counter-revolution won out.
7. THUNDER IN THE MINES 10c
The Miller-UMW Machine: Blueprint for fascism.
8. A WORLD TO WIN. \$5.00
The PLP Singers' latest album of revolutionary and working class songs.
9. THE PLP LP. \$2.80
Songs of workers' struggles and revolution, sung in folk and Motown styles. (8-track tape only)
10. TURN THE GUNS AROUND 25c
Camp Pendleton Case and why communists must organize inside the bosses' armed forces.
11. SMASH APARTHEID!. 25c
The anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa and why U.S. workers are supporting it here.
12. SIT DOWN!—The Great Flint Sit-Down Strike At General Motors 1936-37. 25c
How auto workers occupied GM for 44 days and won industrial unionism in the CIO.
13. END SLAVE LABOR WELFARE WITH SOCIALIST REVOLUTION. 25c
Trends in the welfare system and how to build a worker-client alliance for revolutionary change.
14. WIN WITH MARXISM-LENINISM. 25c
A PLP cartoon book in English and Spanish.
15. PITTSBURGH REBELLION OF 1877 25c
Story of the great railworkers' strike and how it spread through the working class of Pennsylvania
16. PHILADELPHIA TEACHERS STRIKE. . . . 10c
Lessons of the '73 strike and fight for 30 for 40.
17. REVOLUTION TODAY, U.S.A. \$2.00
Strategic ideas for revolutionary struggles in the U.S. from Progressive Labor Party (366-p. book)

PROGRESSIVE LABOR PARTY

Box 808, G.P.O.
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201

Please send me the PL literature indicated below.

CHALLENGE-DESAFIO (1 year--\$5.00)
PL Magazine (6 issues--\$3.50, single copies--75c)
POSTERS: Scot ad. World Above.
PAMPHLETS, BOOKS AND RECORDS
(please indicate quantity of each)

5/2/79

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE ZIP

UNION LOCAL OR SCHOOL
or UNEMPLOYED

AMOUNT ENCLOSED

. . . 1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . . 4 . . . 5 . . . 6 . . . 7 . . . 8 . . . 9

. . . 10 . . . 11 . . . 12 . . . 13 . . . 14 . . . 15 . . . 16 . . . 17

Fall 1979

John Brown's Raid - Multi-Racial Unity

Can History Be a Science?

On The Anti-Nuclear Movement

The Bolsheviks and the Peasants

Racism in Medicine

...and later

How the Ruling Class Financed Hitler

The New Orleans General Strike

The New Anti-Draft Movement

The Capitalist Economy of the USSR

Subscribe to PL[★]

Use the subscription coupon on the facing page

COMING ISSUES

Demonstrate



at



HARPER'S FERRY



Join with the International Committee Against Racism and Progressive Labor Party to commemorate the 120th Anniversary of John Brown's anti-slavery raid on the federal arsenal at Harper's Ferry, West Virginia. This stirring multi-racial, armed attack on racism helped set the stage for the Civil War. For more details, write or call PL (addresses on page 3) or contact InCar at:

P.O. Box 904 Brooklyn, N. Y. 11202 (212) 989-5499

Sat., Oct. 27, 1979