

Spring 1963

**INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALIST
REVIEW**

1863-1963:

**EMANCIPATION
PROCLAMATION**

by William F. Warde

Struggle for Negro Equality

(A Symposium)

Phases of the Cuban Revolution

by Luis Vitale

Crisis in the Common Market

by E. Germain

***"Arab Socialism" and the
Nasserite National Movement***

by A. Sadi

**35
CENTS**

Correspondence

EDITOR'S CORNER

Editor:

In the winter issue of International Socialist Review, in a lengthy and thoughtful article, Mr. Art Preis takes me to task at some length for saying in a piece entitled "Labor's Ebbing Strength," published in The Nation of September 1, that both the membership and the prestige of American unions were declining.

Mr. Preis suggests that one possible source of my information might have been *The Nation's* office boy who confirmed my view while the rest of the editorial staff was out drinking beer.

I should like to assure readers of your excellent publication that this was not my source: I was privileged to see advance proofs of Mr. Milton Alvin's piece which follows Mr. Preis's essay in the same issue of your magazine.

Near the lead of this piece, Mr. Alvin says, "It is no secret that labor's influence and strength has been waning for the past fifteen years. The union movement has not only diminished in size but its membership has failed to keep pace with the general increase in population. Even more serious than this absolute and relative decline in numbers has been the erosion of its morale, its militancy and social idealism."

It is easy to understand how some confusion might arise when successive articles in the same publication take such varied positions.

George G. Kirstein
 Publisher, *The Nation*
 New York City

* * *

(The following reply was addressed to Mr. Kirstein by Milton Alvin, with a copy sent to the International Socialist Review.)

Editor:

The International Socialist Review has sent me a copy of your letter

commenting on the contradiction in Art Preis's article and mine.

I think the point Preis was trying to make is that it is premature to "hang a wreath" on the American labor movement, which is still numerically very sizeable. In re-reading your article, my own and Preis', I have come to the conclusion that perhaps you and I over-emphasized the decline in the unions on this point while we seem to be in general agreement on the fact that there has been a real decline in other respects.

At any rate, I want you to know that I appreciate your contribution to a discussion on the union movement that is both desirable and necessary. I hope our efforts will succeed in stimulating some thinking, especially among unionists themselves, on the whole problem of how to lift the movement to the place it should occupy in American life.

I am encouraged by the fact that all three articles we are discussing are now being circulated among some union leaders in this area.

Milton Alvin
 Los Angeles

* * *

(Editors Note: Art Preis has been critically ill for quite some time and is, unfortunately, unable to participate in the exchange of views over the articles mentioned above.)

The pressure of increasing printing costs and a rise in postage has reluctantly compelled us to make a modest upward adjustment in our rates. Beginning with the next issue, the rate will be fifty cents for individual copies and \$1.50 for a yearly subscription.

Existing subscriptions will continue at the old rate until their expiration. All subscriptions received prior to the publication of the next issue will be honored at the old rate.

* * *

We have exciting news for our readers in the form of outstanding material already on hand and promised for our subsequent issues. Among the articles scheduled for publication are: An interview with Peng Shu-tse, one of the founders of the Chinese Communist Party who, with Chen Tu-hsiu, split from Stalinism after the 1927 revolution.

Also: Kennedy's War in South Vietnam by Theodore Edwards, an outstanding Marxist lecturer, writer and scholar. Plus: Union Problems in South California by our regular contributor, Milton Alvin; New Light on the Origins of Man by Evelyn Reed, an eyewitness report of the Trotskyists at Vorkuta, etc., etc., etc. Be sure your sub is in so that you won't miss our coming issues.

READ THE YOUNG SOCIALIST

I want to subscribe to the YOUNG SOCIALIST (1 year, \$1.00).

.....
 (Name—please print)

.....
 (Address)

YS. P. O. Box 471, Cooper Sta., N. Y. C. 3

SOME THOUGHTS ON

The Emancipation Proclamation

By William F. Warde

LINCOLN'S Emancipation Proclamation went into effect a century ago on January 1, 1863. The freedom heralded by that decree is far from won; slavery was buried but Jim Crow is very much alive.

Despite this excessive "gradualism," the Emancipation Proclamation stands as a monumental landmark in the advancement of liberty, not only for the colored people, but for all Americans. Even though Lincoln resisted Senator Sumner's plea to issue the proclamation on the Fourth of July, this charter of freedom ranks with the Declaration of Independence in our revolutionary heritage.

However, the vast discrepancy between the promise held out by the 1863 pronouncement and the performance of the possessors of power in the hundred years since presents problems for historians as well as for the political defenders of the existing order. What caused this failure and where should the responsibility for the perpetuation of Negro inequality be placed?

* * *

THE Civil War ushered in the Second American Revolution. This was the most momentous event in the entire nineteenth century for out of it came the capitalist colossus of our own day. The Emancipation Proclamation was the greatest event in that conflict. Its significance — and shortcomings — cannot be understood except in the context of the Civil War and the divergent interest and aims of the social forces on the winning side.

The Civil War erupted as the climax to a prolonged contest for command over the country between the Northern businessmen and the Southern planters. Ever since the Missouri Compromise of 1820, the moving force in American history and the pivot of its political affairs had been the now muffled, now acute struggle for supremacy between the beneficiaries of slave labor and the upholders of free soil and free labor. Just as the rulership of Big Business is central to the problems of our generation, so throughout the first half of the nineteenth century the major social issue before the

American people was: what is to be done about the slave power?

In the decades before the Civil War the cotton nobility became dominant not only in the South but over the nation. Its representatives and accomplices controlled the White House, the Senate, the Supreme Court, the armed forces and charted the main lines of foreign and domestic policy.

THIS sovereignty of the slaveholders was first seriously challenged by the Republican party organized in 1854. This was a coalition composed of the rising industrialists, the small farmers of the Northwest, the urban middle classes and part of the wage-workers. All these elements opposed to the slave power rallied around the young party.

When Lincoln was elected President in 1860, the long-established balance of power in national politics was profoundly upset. Until that point the slaveholders could count on a pliant and even servile administration to do their bidding at Washington. The Republican assumption of command meant that the authority and resources of the federal government had slipped from their grasp and were being taken over by their foremost rivals, the Northern manufacturers and their associates.

Because of the grave difficulties besetting their antiquated system of production, the Southern planters and slave-dealers could ill-afford to lose possession of the heights of power they had so long and profitably occupied. Like other ruling classes on the skids, they placed defense of their privileges before the democratic decision of the electorate. Up to 1860 the wealthier and more conservative planters had rejected the arguments of the Southern "fire-eaters" that departure from the Union was the cure for their ills. Now they swallowed the desperate remedy of secession, formed the Confederacy and fired on Fort Sumter.

The immediate cause of the Civil War was therefore political: the shift of supremacy from the cotton barons to the industrial bourgeoisie and their allies. The seces-

sionist *coup d'etat* confronted Lincoln's government with the choices of resubmission to the dictates of the slavocracy or taking the field of battle to clinch by bloody warfare its constitutional triumph in the 1860 elections. The loyal states mobilized to beat down the defiance of the "lords of the lash."

THE statesmen on both sides brought forward legalistic and constitutional arguments. But these covered up a far deeper issue. Behind the embattled governments and armies were two antagonistic forms of property and wealth production. The Confederacy was conceived in chattel slavery, property in human beings; the Union rested upon wage-labor and freehold farming. The planters had plunged into secession in order to safeguard their "peculiar institution" at all hazards;

its preservation was bound up with their victory. The fate of the slave system hung on the outcome of the Civil War.

The founders of the Confederacy were far more cognizant of this fundamental feature of the conflict than were their Northern adversaries. In a grandiloquent defense of the Confederate Constitution on March 16, 1861, Vice-President Alexander Stephens declared: "The new Constitution has put to rest forever all the agitating questions relating to our peculiar institution — African slavery as it exists among us — the proper status of the Negro in our form of civilization. This was the immediate cause of the late rupture and the present revolution. Jefferson, in his forecast, had anticipated this, as 'the rock upon which the Old Union would split' . . . The prevailing ideas entertained by him and most of the leading statesmen at the time of the formation of the Old Constitution were, that the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature; that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally, and politically . . . These ideas, however, were fundamentally wrong. They rested upon the assumption of the equality of races. This was an error . . .

"Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite ideas; its foundations are laid, its cornerstone rests upon, the great truth that the Negro is not equal to the white man; that Slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition. (Applause.) This, our new Government, is the first in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth."

STEPHENS was all wrong in his assertion that the Confederate Constitution had "put to rest forever" agitation about slavery. Actually, secession had given crucial importance and extreme urgency to the issue. The United States could not be reunited until slavery itself had been "put to rest forever."

But in the opening stages of the Civil War the Republican high command did not view or approach the situation in this light. In the immense upheaval convulsing the country they believed it possible and desirable to leave standing the underlying cause of it all!

They had held this position from the birth of the Republican organization which was not designed to be a party of social revolution but of political reform.

The manufacturing and business interests at its head sought protective tariffs, transcontinental rail lines, lucrative government contracts, favorable immigration and banking policies; the representatives of the small farmers and middle classes in its ranks wanted homesteads, better transportation facilities, educational grants, etc. The Republican leaders were resolved to wrest political predominance from the planters, bridle the aggressive ambitions of the slave power on the foreign field, and fence in their domain. But they were willing to leave slavery alone if the Southern cotton magnates would accommodate themselves to the changed relationship of forces. Again and again they declared: we have no intention of disturbing or destroying slavery and are ready to give firm guarantees of its continuance wherever it legally exists.

**INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALIST
REVIEW**

Published quarterly by the International Socialist Review Publishing Association, 116 University Pl., New York 3, N. Y. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

Contents

CORRESPONDENCE 34

THOUGHTS ON THE EMANCIPATION
PROCLAMATIONby William F. Warde 35

PHASES OF THE CUBAN
REVOLUTIONby Luis Vitale 41

CRISIS IN THE COMMON
MARKETby E. Germain 46

"ARAB SOCIALISM" AND THE NASSERITE
NATIONAL MOVEMENTby A. Sadi 48

THE FUTURE OF THE NEGRO
STRUGGLE — A SYMPOSIUM 52

IN REVIEW

The Political Testament of
Patrice Lumumbaby Karolyn Kerry 62

Life in Stalin's Prison
Campsby Ellen Grey 63

Self-Defense Doctrineby Jack Arnold 63

Vol. 24 — No. 2 — Whole No. 163

Editor, Tom Kerry; Business Manager, Karolyn Kerry; Editorial Board: Joseph Hansen, Shane Mage, Art Preis, Myra Tanner Weiss, Tim Wohlforth.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: U.S.A. and Latin America, \$1.25 a year (four issues); single copies, 35 cents; bundles, 25 cents a copy for five copies or more. Foreign and Canada, \$1.50 a year (four issues); single copies, 35 cents; bundles, 26 cents a copy for five copies or more.



JUST as the upper crust among the planters had resisted secessionism in the 1850's so the most influential Republicans indignantly and sincerely repudiated Abolitionism as subversive of the established order and the devilish fomenter of slave insurrection. Seward, Lincoln and others approved the hanging of John Brown. It took the bourgeois heads of the North several more years to come abreast of the requirements of their revolution than it did their slaveholding counterparts in the South to recognize and act upon the imperatives of their counter-revolution.

The Republican leadership followed this course of conciliation with slavery for over a year after the Civil War broke out. In his Inaugural address Lincoln reassured the slaveholders in these words: "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists; I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." As late as July 26, 1861, after the rout at Bull Run, the Senate, by a vote of 30 to 5, resolved that the war "was not being prosecuted for the purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights and established institutions" of the seceding states.

Since the slaveholders would not accept second-rank in a Northern-dominated Union, and the Republican coalition would not forfeit its legally acquired supremacy, decision could only be rendered by an armed fight to the death — and this portended the death of slavery.

THE Abolitionists and other consistent opponents of the slave power saw this clearly and urged Lincoln to conduct the war in a revolutionary manner by manumitting the slaves. On Nov. 7, 1861, Marx and Engels wrote from London in a dispatch to *Die Presse* of Vienna: "The present struggle between the South and North is, therefore, nothing but a struggle between two social systems, between the system of slavery and the system of free labor. The struggle has broken out because the two systems can no longer live peacefully side by side on the North American continent. It can only be ended by the victory of one system or the other."

If, as Secretary of State Seward later remarked, "The Emancipation Proclamation was uttered in the first gun fired at Fort Sumter," he and his colleagues took a long time to get the message. For the Republican directorate the question of slavery was subordinate to the preservation of the Union under their own hegemony and so they started to wage a hesitating, purely military campaign against the rebels, which was highly ineffective. Even after losing hope of compromise with the secessionists, they feared to antagonize the upper classes in the border slave states by tampering with their accumulated wealth and labor supply.

The government feared to arm the free Negroes and enroll them in the Union forces. It was even more indisposed to encourage the slaves to rise up against their masters, sabotage production, and escape from the plantations. In 1861 Lincoln overruled General Fremont's order freeing the slaves of all Missourians

supporting the Confederacy and as late as May 1862 he voided General Hunter's action emancipating the slaves in Georgia, Florida and South Carolina.

THE Administration's refusal to strike any blows at slavery provoked angry protests throughout the North and chilled the enthusiasm of its foreign friends for the Union cause. Almost from the day that armed conflict began, the Republican regime was subjected to a tremendous tug of war between the conservative faction led by Secretary of State Seward, which wanted to maintain the status quo, and the Radicals headed by Secretary of the Treasury Chase, Senator Sumner and Rep. Thaddeus Stevens, who pressed for political and military action aimed at crushing the Confederacy and demolishing the slave power. To Stevens, "the vile ingredient called conservatism" appeared "worse than secessionism."

Lincoln vacillated between these opposing tendencies. As a private person, he detested slavery. As a moderate Republican, he proposed to solve the problem by gradual and compensated emancipation followed by colonization abroad of the former chattels. He offered this scheme to the border states whose officials rejected it.

The Radical and Abolitionist leaders deeply distrusted the President for his caution and compromise on this all-important issue. Frederick Douglass denounced "the slow-coach at Washington." Wendell Phillips, speaking at a Republican rally in Boston, was applauded when he accused Lincoln of treason and urged his impeachment for nullifying General Hunter's proclamation.

The emancipationists were not all of one breed. The big bourgeois Radicals in high posts like Chase, Stanton and Wade insisted on ruthless measures to combat the slavocracy in order to clear the field for the unhampered expansion of industrial capitalism. Their upper class motivation was to emerge more clearly during Reconstruction. The Abolitionist agitators like Douglass and Phillips were bent on destroying the slave power in order to get justice and equality for the Negroes and fulfill the democratic ideals of the Republic.

Subscribe

International Socialist Review
116 University Place, N. Y. 3, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$2.50 for my subscription for the next eight issues.

Name

Street Apt. No.....

City Zone..... State.....

DURING the first half of 1862 the anti-slavery forces conducted a relentless campaign to compel the President to change his course. The difficulties in handling the large numbers of slaves who ran away and sought refuge behind the Union lines and in the army camps, the need for more men and money to carry on the war, the desire to placate European liberal opinion made the old conciliatory policy less and less tenable. The mounting impatience of the most energetic supporters of the Administration with its temporizing attitude toward the rebels was expressed in the open letter that the editor of the *New York Tribune*, Horace Greeley, known as the Tom Paine of the Radicals, addressed to Lincoln on August 20, 1862. Headed "The Prayer of Twenty Millions," it demanded that the President liberate the slaves in both the secession and border states at once and turn to the Negroes for aid against the South.

To this Lincoln replied: "My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

Despite the restraint in this restatement of his guiding line, Lincoln had reached the point where he could no longer withstand the fierce pressure of emancipationist sentiment. He was losing popularity in the North and risking leadership of his own party. The powerful Congressional Committee on the Conduct of the War controlled by the Radicals was insisting that the military deadlock could not be broken without the suppression of slavery.

Lincoln had made up his mind to take action by June 13, 1862, when he informed Seward and Welles, that the Union would be subdued if he did not free the slaves. The legal basis for his exercise of executive power had been laid by the Confiscation Act passed by Congress on July 6, 1862, for the unshackling of slaves belonging to the secessionists. On September 23, after Lee had been driven back at Antietam, Lincoln made a preliminary public announcement of emancipation. One hundred days later his definitive proclamation was issued. January 1, 1863, was the great Day of Jubilee for all friends of freedom.

* * *

FEW nowadays have read the Emancipation Proclamation. Compared to the fiery Declaration of Independence, it is a pallid document. According to Professor Richard Hofstadter, "it has all the moral grandeur of a bill of lading." Lincoln did not present the edict as an affirmation of democratic principle but as "a fit and necessary war-measure." It did not outlaw slavery as such or free any slaves. It applied only to areas over which the Federal government exercised no control and specifically exempted all regions under Federal military occupation. In the scornful words of British Lord Russell: "It does no more than profess to emancipate slaves where the United States authorities cannot make

emancipation a reality, and emancipates no one where the decree can be carried into effect." In the text Lincoln took care to enjoin orderly behavior upon the Negroes and "recommend to them that, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages."

But these defects of the document turned out to be far less significant than its issuance. Governor Andrew of Massachusetts rightly observed that the Emancipation Proclamation was "a poor document but a mighty act." It signalized the decisive turning point when the Civil War was transfigured into a social revolution against the last of the pre-capitalist formations in the United States. The further course of the conflict was powered by the irresistible dynamism of its attack upon the structure of slavery. The proclamation gave official sanction to the Negro's efforts to free themselves; it opened the Union armies to them. From that time on every advance of the Union troops into the South became a step toward full emancipation. The sentence of death which the Emancipation Proclamation in effect passed upon the slave power was carried out in the subsequent stages of the Second American Revolution.

* * *

REFERRING to the problem of slavery, Lincoln truthfully remarked that circumstances controlled him more than he controlled circumstances. The Republican switch from the path of reform to the highroad of revolution, from the expectation of negotiating a deal with the deposed slaveholders to their extirpation, from the shielding of slavery to its suppression is a remarkable example from our history of how the exigencies of a life-and-death struggle can transform people, policies and parties. The necessities of waging a war to the hilt against the Confederacy compelled the Republicans to depart from the restricted perspectives of their original platform and enforce the most far-reaching anti-slavery measures which they previously opposed. The ascending revolution propelled the people of the North to ideas and positions advocated until then only by a tiny, isolated minority. The Abolitionists, who had made emancipation their war-cry long before secession, anticipated the march of events and the needs of national progress far better than the "realistic" and opportunistic professional bourgeois politicians.

In retrospect, it can be seen how emancipation advanced step by step as the Civil War developed, overcoming one obstacle after another. The Republicans abolished slavery in the District of Columbia in April, 1862; they fulfilled their campaign pledge to forbid slavery forever in the territories the following June; Lincoln opened the flood gates with his Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863. When the Radical machine went into high gear, it put over the most revolutionary solution of confiscating slave property without compensation and enacting the 13th Amendment. So a mighty revolutionary shakeup revolutionizes the mentality and politics of its participants and leaders.

TODAY Kennedy occupies the White House tenanted by Lincoln a century ago. The President has condemned the Fidelistas because they did not confine their actions to the pronouncements of the original national-democratic, humanistic platform, but went on to take socialist measures. He refuses to see that, in order to realize their democratic objectives and carry out their pledges to the poor, the honest and courageous Cuban revolutionaries had to go far beyond their initial intentions.

The leaders of the Cuban Revolution had good precedent for this in American history. They acted no differently than the heads of the Second American Revolution who discovered that they could not preserve the Union, defend democracy, and clear the way for national progress without dispossessing the counter-revolutionary slaveholders. The Republicans who started out as reformers became converted by force of circumstances and much to their surprise into bourgeois-democratic revolutionists. The Fidelistas, who began as bourgeois-democratic rebels, have ended up as socialist revolutionists. The Cubans of the 1960's took up where the American revolutionists of the 1860's left off. After all, the Castro regime which Kennedy is so intent on destroying, has uprooted racial discrimination in Cuba.

This is well worth noting on the centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation. Instead of blaming Castro for transgressing the limited aims of the July 26th Movement in its infancy, Kennedy's propagandists and historians like Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., might better direct attention to the following questions closer to home: Why didn't the President's predecessors of Civil War days succeed in eliminating Jim Crow and why must Negroes still be fighting today to acquire the status of full citizenship?

Enlightenment on these points can be obtained through understanding the motives and aims of the ruling capitalist class in its progressive and in its reactionary phases of development. It took four years of civil war and twelve years of military occupation of the South before the Northern statesmen felt securely entrenched at the summits of power. So long as they feared a political comeback by their traditional adversary, the Republican bourgeoisie had to make substantial concessions to keep the allegiance of the farmers and Negroes.

AT EACH turn of events from 1861 to 1876 their conduct was primarily shaped, not by consideration for the needs of the common people and still less for the claims of the four million Negroes, but by the shifting requirements of their drive for unchallenged supremacy. After the Confederacy had surrendered and the slaves were freed, the problem of remolding the cotton kingdom came to the fore. Was the South to be democratized by transferring control to the emancipated black and the poorer whites — or would a new oligarchy take the place of the subjugated slavocracy?

This issue was fought out during the Reconstruction period. In the first years after 1865 two contending programs were put forward for handling the South.

Lincoln's successor, President Johnson, sought to restore order as quickly as possible and keep the Negroes subjected by enforcing the Black Codes, denying them the vote, and restricting changes in social relations to the minimum. The Radicals, backed by the Abolitionists and Negroes, set out to complete the demolition of the planting aristocracy.

To forestall any resurgence of the unregenerate rebels, the aggressive agents of Northern business and banking found it expedient to give the Negroes the vote and sustain by military force the reconstructed state governments established and administered by opponents of the old order. These introduced many worthwhile innovations in education, taxation, the criminal codes and other domains.

As in all modern revolutions in backward areas, agrarian reform was the most burning need of Southern society. Here the Republican administration defaulted. In some places the ex-slaves seized the plantations, worked them for their own account, defended them arms in hand. Generally, they expected that a generous Federal government would give them "forty acres and a mule." They waited in vain.

"Confiscation is mere naked justice to the former slave," declared Wendell Phillips. "Who brought the land into cultivation? Whose sweat and toil are mixed with it forever? Who cleared the forests? Who made the roads? Whose hands raised those houses? Whose wages are invested in those warehouses and towns? Of course, the Negro's . . . Why should he not have a share of his inheritance?"

BUT the representatives of the rich in Washington refused to hand over this rightful inheritance by providing the masses of freedmen with the material means for economic independence: land, livestock, seeds, cheap credit and other essentials for raising crops. Consequently, the four million landless, helpless agrarian laborers, fell back into servitude in new forms to the merchants, money-lenders and landowners. In a few years this economic dependence led to the loss of their civil rights and political power as well.

In the showdown the Republican bourgeoisie had confiscated four billion dollars worth of slave property since that kind of investment was unsuited to their own mode of exploitation. They were happy to transfer title to the Western territories belonging to the Federal government to homesteaders, railroad, mining and lumbering corporations, because this brought profit to their enterprises. But it was pushing social revolution too far for these moneyed men to expropriate landed property in the settled South. That would not only set too dangerous an example of confiscation but might endow the small cultivators of the soil with too much potential political weight.

After using the freedmen and the poorer whites to hold the ex-Confederates down, the Northern capitalists left them in the lurch. They turned away while the Ku Klux bands instituted a reign of terror, deprived the Negroes of their gains, and drove them back into oppression. Finally, in the disputed presidential

election of 1876, the Republican and Democratic chiefs sealed a bargain by which white supremacy was re-legalized in the South in return for a continuance of Republican rulership in Washington. The Robber Barons of industry and finance, assured of a divided and destitute working population and a plentiful supply of cheap agricultural labor in the South, then proceeded to harvest and enjoy the golden fruits of their victory.*

THE Reconstruction period was the final chapter in the Second American Revolution. Its tragic outcome is pertinent to the Negro struggle today. It demonstrated that the capitalist rulers at the peak of their revolutionary vigor would not accord full and enduring equality to the Negroes nor even permit the freedmen to keep the rights they had won in bloody combat. Will their present-day descendants be more inclined to grant genuine integration a century later when they have become the mainstay of the anti-democratic, pro-colonialist, and anti-socialist forces in the world?

The experience of the Civil War is instructive on both the positive and the negative sides of the problem of alliances in the fight for freedom. The coalition between the Republican bourgeoisie and the small farmers with the Negroes took time to cement and become effective. But it pulverized the slave system, struck off the shackles of chattel slavery, and protected the most democratic and progressive regimes the Southern Negroes have known to this day. With the relationship of forces in the country at that time, these accomplishments could not have been made in any other way.

After advancing the cause of Negro liberation, the upper-class Republicans broke the alliance and conspired to thrust the freedmen back into bondage. They became anti-Negro, anti-democratic, anti-labor, not because they were white, but because they were capitalist profiteers bent on their own aggrandizement.

It would be wrong to conclude from this betrayal — and those which have occurred since — that the Negroes are predestined to travel the rest of freedom's road alone. They remain a minority in this country which they have helped create and make great. To attain the objectives they seek and overcome the enemies of equality, they can use reliable and strong allies. Where are these to be found within our borders?

It is becoming widely recognized that the "liberals" in both the white and the colored communities, who deprecate direct action and pin their hopes on the powers-that-be, are untrustworthy allies and even worse leaders. This is all to the good, since those who look to the beneficiaries of discrimination to end it serve to weaken and derail the struggle against the Jim Crow system.

At the same time many of the best fighters for Negro emancipation have lost all faith in the capacity of the white workers to aid their struggle and have totally cancelled them out as possible allies. It cannot be

* See Two Lessons of Reconstruction by William F. Warde, Fourth International, May-June, 1950, for a fuller exposition of the three main stages of Reconstruction and the clash between the opposing methods of dealing with the subjugated South.

denied that organized labor, and especially its leaders, have given ample grounds for this mistrust. The Negro militants are completely justified in going ahead, as they are doing, to direct their independent actions against discrimination. This same spirit of self-reliance was evidenced by the slave insurrectionists, the runaway slaves, the Negro Abolitionists, the delegates to the Colored People's Conventions, the freedmen who seized their master's plantations and armed themselves against the resurgent white supremacists.

WILL the mutual estrangement between the privileged white workers and the Negro movement, fostered by the divisive strategy of the rich, be everlasting? The Civil War showed what radical reversals and realignments can come about in the course of a life-and-death struggle. We are far from such a situation in the United States now. But the increasingly militant temper of the movement for racial equality does mark the beginning of a deep-going change in American life and politics which has revolutionary implications.

Even at this stage the government has trouble coping with the Negro problem. It will become still more disturbed as the anti-discrimination struggle batters at other parts of the Jim Crow system, North and South.

At some point along the way the reactionary anti-labor policies of Big Business will also shake up the mass of workers and bring them into opposition to the administration. Both segments of the American people would then find themselves arrayed against a common foe. It is an old adage that "the enemy of my enemy is my friend."

However hesitatingly and slowly, these converging anti-monopolist forces will have to seek points of contact and mutual support. In the course of practical collaboration, each will have to readjust their relations and revise their opinions of the qualities of the other. As has happened in many union battles — and in the battle for the Union — prejudices will be burned away and new alliances forged in the fires of joint combat.

JUST as the Republicans of 1860 underwent a profound transformation and decreed the liberation of the slaves in 1863, despite their earlier indifference, so the participants in a new revolutionary movement would have to recognize even sooner the necessity of achieving solidarity through complete equality. This time, forewarned and forearmed, the Negroes will not be satisfied until that is won.

It would be unrealistic to underestimate the vigilant, unremitting efforts it will take, to purge the poison of racial prejudice which capitalism has injected into the bloodstream of American life. Yet the day will dawn when the white workers must come to understand that discrimination is not only a crime against their colored brothers and unworthy of a democratic society but injurious and costly to their own welfare. The emancipation proclaimed in the Second American Revolution will be realized for black and white alike in the "new birth of freedom" which a socialist America will bring.

Phases of the Cuban Revolution

By Luis Vitale

(Author's Introductory Comments)

THESE comments are inspired by the extraordinary enthusiasm with which we revolutionists have received the fresh breeze coming — once again — from Martí's marvellous island. Fidel Castro's speech against sectarianism and bureaucratism has awakened new hope in the revolutionists of Latin America who aspire to forge a society like Cuba's. Powerful energies have been freed by the life-giving experience of a country which is constructing socialism, following the pristine tradition of the theoreticians and strategists of the modern concept of the world: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg and Trotsky.

Cuba is a country which is building a new socialism — the socialism dreamt of by millions of human beings for more than a century — in its social-economic foundations as well as on the level of proletarian democracy, in the very complicated sphere of customs and political-cultural traditions. The struggle against sectarianism and bureaucratism goes beyond the confining limits of economics to concern itself with the basic problem of humanity: the end to the alienation of man, the final liberation of the human species, ultimate goal of dialectical materialism.

Once again we find ourselves beside the true leaders of the Cuban people. The political organization to which I belong, the *Partido Obrero Revolucionario* (Workers Revolutionary Party), which is attached to the *Movimiento de Fuerzas Revolucionarias* (Movement of Revolutionary Forces), supported the Cuban revolution and its worker-campesino government from the beginning, not with words only and through its newspaper *Frente Obrero*, but rather it did so principally in the field of action. We were in the front ranks together with Clotario Blest, Julio Benítez and other labor leaders holding high Fidel's picture in our hands and enthusiastically distributing leaflets in support of Cuba, at the very moment when Eisenhower and his retinue of colonizers passed by the old offices of the CUT (*Confederación Unica de Trabajadores* — United Confederation of Workers), an activity for which we were brought to trial.

Not only have we participated in meetings in support of Cuba but also in those organized by the "imperialist worms," where we engaged in hand-to-hand fights with the mercenaries in the *Italia* and *Victoria* theatres and also in that famous open air "mass" held in 1961. I was the author of the motion approved at the Third National Conference of the CUT in December of 1960, by which the Chilean workers

bound themselves to declare a general strike in case of an imperialist attack on Cuba, a measure which was put into effect in April of 1962 when Clotario Blest was president of the CUT.

At the last congress of the CUT, held in August of 1962, we proposed concrete measures to reaffirm that agreement and to develop massive rank-and-file Committees in Defense of the Cuban Revolution. We have belonged, since its organization, to the *Instituto Chileno-Cubano de Cultura* and to the *Movimiento de Solidaridad y Defensa de la Revolución Cubana* (Movement of Solidarity and Defense of the Cuban Revolution), which until recently was presided over by that fighting leader of the Chilean workers, Clotario Blest.

We have known how to preserve the unity of both organizations together with other revolutionary tendencies, in spite of the sectarian attitudes of those who would assume the role of "Escalantes." We have known how to preserve that unity especially in those cases in which certain organizations have been denied the right to speak and in spite of the attitudes assumed by the "Chilean Escalantes" who imposed the bureaucratic removal from office of those holding the most important posts in the above mentioned organizations.

As do the other Trotskyist fighters and comrades on the continent — in Peru, Colombia, Venezuela, Bolivia, Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Paraguay and the Dominican Republic — we carry out these actions convinced that the most effective way of defending the Cuban revolution is by making the revolution in each one of the countries which form part of this "backyard of Yankee imperialism."

NOW, we are publishing Fidel's historic speech of March 26 and that delivered before the Provincial Committee of Matanzas — speeches which are unknown to the Chilean workers because of the systematic suppression which our native Pompas and Garruchos have practiced against these documents — because it is our belief that their contents reflect added prestige on the Marxist-Leninist leadership of Cuba and that they serve as political models for all the workers' parties of Chile. At the same time, we take the liberty of making some comments, inspired always by the noble aim of disseminating and helping — with deeds — the Cuban and Latin American revolutions.

Castro Attack on Bureaucratism Opens New Phase

FIDEL Castro's speech against sectarianism and bureaucratism opened a new phase in the ever ascendant curve of the heroic Cuban Revolution.

It seems to us that up to the present the Cuban Revolution exhibits five fundamental phases:

The first was the phase of armed insurrection which, at the same time, was made up of several stages. In these are

included the attack on the Moncada Barracks in 1953; the landing from the *Granma* in 1956; the guerrilla warfare in the Sierra Maestra led by the 26th of July movement; the participation of the *campesino* and rural proletarian masses in the guerrilla war — a decisive class factor which influenced the course of the revolution; the activities of the Revolutionary Directorate, which carried out the attack on

the Presidential Palace in 1957, and which conducted sabotage in the cities; the opening of new fronts in the Escambray Mountains; the war of positions and, of major importance, the liquidation of the bourgeois army, until it culminated in the conquest of Havana and the incorporation of the urban proletariat in the active struggle with the general revolutionary strikes of January 1, 1959.

The second was the dual power phase which evolved from the fall of Batista to the removal of Urrutia, which was characterized essentially by the duality of powers which arose between Urrutia's bourgeois-democratic government and the masses which supported the true revolutionary leadership made up of Fidel, Raúl, Ché and Camilo. Peoples' Tribunals which applied the direct justice of the workers to the counter-revolutionaries, workers' and *campesinos'* militias, Committees for the Defense of the Revolution, together with the Rebel Army, constituted the real power. They were the organs of proletarian power which quickly displaced the formal power, exercised by the pro-capitalist government of Urrutia. During the course of this phase the Cuban Revolution took great steps forward.

The third phase runs from the installation of the worker-*campesino* government, directed by Fidel, to the nationalizations of October, 1960. A series of basic laws changed the capitalist structure of semi-colonial Cuba. Agrarian reform was planned and consolidated. Urban reform, a bold measure, won the fervent support of social segments which had been cool to the revolution. The army barracks were converted into schools. The campaign of expropriations without compensation of the large foreign monopolies, which culminated in the historic Nationalization Decree of October, 1960, began.

From this moment forward, Cuba became a workers state. Definite signs characterize it as such: more than 80 per cent of the means of production and of the basic processes came under the control of the new state which, in a very real way, represented the historical interests of the workers; the democratic-bourgeois tasks were accomplished (the expulsion of imperialism, agrarian reform, and the liquidation of the semi-feudal remnants); at the same time, the accomplishment of socialist tasks got into full swing (the collective operation of part of the agricultural lands, the socialization of the factories, the control of foreign and domestic commerce); the planning of the economy along socialist norms began; the bourgeois apparatus was completely destroyed; the army and police of a capitalist stripe ceased to exist; the bourgeois law courts were replaced by peoples' tribunals; the bourgeois congress was buried forever in the cemetery of its corruption.

THIS process took place in accordance with the laws of the Permanent Revolution, a theory elaborated by Marx, developed by Trotsky in 1905 and applied by him and Lenin in the Russia of 1917. Nowadays some call it the *Uninterrupted* or *Dynamic* Revolution.

The phenomenon of action and reaction manifested to the full its many facets in the Cuban Revolution. Each reaction — generally violent — of Yankee imperialism, was answered with bold retaliatory blows by the Revolutionary Government and the octopus, wounded in its vital parts, was forced to retreat behind its black protective cloud.

The fourth phase developed from the appearance of the workers' state up to March 26, 1962. It was a very contradictory phase. On the one hand, notable advances took place, such as the almost complete expropriation of the national bourgeoisie and the creation of the *Consolidados*, wherein all industries in the same type of activity were concentrated; the economy was planned; an unprecedented literacy campaign was carried out; the mercenary invaders — the "worms" — were crushed at Playa Girón.

This attack had an importance comparable to the United States invasion of Korea because of the results which that invasion had on the Chinese Revolution. During this phase the revolutionary cadres were strengthened, the militias

were supplied with modern weapons, and socialist tasks were deepened. Of fundamental importance was the proclamation of a Socialist Cuba and of Fidel and his government as Marxist-Leninist.

Yet, in spite of these advances, there began a concealed process of sectarianism and bureaucratism. The old Communist Party (since 1944 it was called the *Partido Socialista Popular*) — the great slacker of the fighting in the Sierra Maestra — began to climb onto the backs of the guerrilla fighters. Beginning in 1960, they occupied key posts in the political and administrative apparatus of the state, which they consolidated in March and April of 1960, as part of a larger plan: to control the apparatus of the ORI (*Organizaciones Revolucionarias Integradas* — Integrated Revolutionary Organizations), which is to form nothing less than the foundation of the United Party of the Socialist Revolution.

The true revolutionists, with Fidel at their head, dedicated to the great tasks of transforming Cuban society, and without any free time at their disposal to be concerned with the progress of the ORI, were forced to leave that task in the hands of Aníbal Escalante, Secretary in Charge of Organization of the *Partido Socialista Popular*. Escalante and company, conscious of the fact that the decisive instrument which could lead him and his faction to power had fallen into his hands, prepared the conditions for Thermidor.

THE fifth phase has just begun. Not only is it important because during this phase the first manifestations of bureaucratism were liquidated, but that perhaps in it will be initiated the greatest period of proletarian democracy which history has ever known.

What Were the Causes Which Gave Rise to Escalante and Company's Bureaucratism?

Without a doubt Escalante, Garrucho, Pompa and company constituted a group which proposed to control the government of Cuba. Their motives were unbridled ambition and the thirst for power. Nevertheless, it is logical to ask, were they moved solely by these subjective factors, or by an anti-Marxist policy and methods, resulting from deep social-economic causes? Lenin said that every faction which arises in a party reflects, in the last instance, pressures from a class sector or sectors. Escalante's case is not that of one person but of many — of 500 little Escalantes and Aníbal, as the Cuban leaders have so correctly pointed out. It is important, therefore, to determine what social-economic basis permitted the appearance of Escalante and company.

Among the essential causes we can point out the following: the backwardness of the country; the contradictions between the countryside and the city, between the collectivist and the individualist tendencies and the underdevelopment of industry; the shortages; the differences between those who do manual work and the intellectuals.

Before proceeding it should be clearly understood that the Escalante group had not yet come to form an extreme bureaucratic caste, but that rather it was merely an outbreak, a germ, an embryo of bureaucratism. At the same time, it will be useful to state once more the distinction made by Fidel between sectarianism and bureaucratism. These political categories do not always manifest themselves together. Sectarianism may exist without bureaucratism, as may be seen in the case of the "sectarianism of the lowlands" which Fidel criticized in his speech, although generally bureaucratism is accompanied by sectarianism.

The Backwardness of the Country

In order that we may be able to understand the process of bureaucratization in its germinal state, it is necessary to begin with the characterization of what Cuba was and what it is. Before the revolution of 1959, Cuba was a semi-colonial country with a backward capitalist economy subject to the laws of unequal and combined development. After

the revolution triumphed and, most especially, after the establishment of the workers' state in October of 1960, it ceased being a semi-colonial country. But it had inherited a backward economy, a limited industrial development which was the product of imperialist colonization.

Contradictions Between Country and City

The workers' states which are established in the backward nations — the transitional state between capitalism and socialism (We shall return to this theme later) — face very grave problems, problems which are derived from the enormous social-economic contradictions which exist. In the first place there are the abysmal differences between the city and the countryside, differences which become immense during the stage of the workers' state.

In those countries, where the majority of the population is made up of peasants, one of the basic tasks — aside from the liquidation of imperialism — is the implementing of agrarian reform, a bourgeois-democratic task which the national oligarchies have not discharged. Every revolutionary leadership is faced with problem of how to carry this task forward. Should there be immediate collectivization of all the land or should the land be given to the peasants so that they may farm the individual plots? A not too well informed revolutionist would choose the first course. The Cuban leaders, aware of the experiences of other workers' states, saw that the first course could not be applied in a country where the backwardness of industrial development does not permit supplying the needs of a socialized agriculture.

The Cuban government realized that the best temporary measure was to distribute the nationalized lands to the *campesinos*, combining this democratic task with the establishment of peoples' farms and co-operatives. In this way, more than 70 per cent of the agricultural lands were kept under private ownership. This was the only way to assure a satisfactory level of agricultural production. Forced collectivization would have resulted in disaster, as it did in Russia in the 1930's.

NEVERTHELESS, this way out — which is the best — is a difficult one. It makes possible the interplay of the contradictions between the individualistic tendencies of the countryside and the collectivistic tendencies. The *campesino*, like every small property owner, is a conservative. Once a revolution is unleashed, the *campesinos* may be drawn in and they may even initiate the insurrectionary process if the revolutionary leadership has known how to interpret their aspirations, as did the guerrillas of the Sierra Maestra. But, after the revolution has triumphed, the following problem always presents itself: How can the *campesinos* be prevented from openly opposing the interests of the proletariat? How can the reactionary sectors be prevented from obtaining the support of the *campesinos*? The *campesino* class — we are not referring to the rural proletariat — is not a revolutionary class in and of itself. It does not have

its own view of history. It is a petty-bourgeois class inherited from the capitalist system.

The small and middle land owners who live on the Cuban countryside aspire — as they do everywhere else — to individual ownership. They do not sow nor do they carry their products to market unless they are completely convinced that they will receive an immediate profit. They will even kill and butcher animals if the products derived from them (milk, cheese, butter, etc.) do not bring good prices. In order to prevent the killing of animals the Cuban government was forced in 1961 to impose five year jail sentences.

These tendencies are aggravated by the backwardness of industry. The ideal solution will be found in giving the *campesinos* agricultural machinery and manufactured products at low prices. But the backwardness of Cuban industry, inherited from the past, does not permit this at the present time. Since they cannot buy at low prices nor get enough goods, owing to the low level of industrial production, the *campesinos* tend to supply their own needs alone; they tend to sow, to reap and to sell what suits them alone.

When industry is not well developed, one temporary solution is to import manufactured products and to sell them at low prices to the *campesinos*. But this too cannot be done in Cuba because of the imperialist economic blockade and the lack of foreign exchange. The help which the workers' states give is effective but in comparison to their rocket and heavy industries, their light industry is backward. This is why they are not in a position to export great quantities of manufactured goods at competitive prices.

Role of Cuban Communist Party

What role did the Cuban *Partido Socialista Popular* play in this problem which is so basic? Since the revolution triumphed they emphasized democratic-bourgeois tasks exclusively, the subdivision of the land and the formation of co-operatives. This was the first error which was pointed out by the true leaders of the revolution and which was recognized, *a posteriori*, by the PSP, when the failure of the sugar cane co-operatives was demonstrated. This is certified by the latest decree of the Cuban government, that of August, 1962, which converts the 622 sugar cane co-operatives into state collective farms. "With this step," said Fidel, "the agricultural proletariat grows once more; it becomes the largest sector of workers in our country."

The unilateral policy favored by the PSP, of the subdivision of the land and the creation of co-operatives, without collectivization, was conducive to the strengthening of the individualistic tendencies of the *campesino* class. Who was behind that policy? Escalante and company? Was he seeking for a base of support among the small and middle property owners? Is it not suggestive that this same policy was the one put into practice by the Stalinist bureaucracy upon the death of Lenin in 1924, with the slogan: "Kulaks, enrich yourselves!"?

In addition, the Cuban PSP did not favor the general nationalization of business enterprises. From the first days of the revolution its policy consisted solely in the awarding of credits to industry and in the increasing of salaries. This was the second error. On the very day that the plenum of the PSP was discussing moderate reforms for capitalist industry, Fidel was proclaiming the expropriation without indemnification, of national and foreign industries.

It has been fully demonstrated that the national bourgeoisie are incapable of achieving a decisive industrial development. There is only one road: the expropriation and the administration of the factories by the workers' state. In this way a sensible industrial progress is guaranteed, following socialist norms, to mitigate the differences between the countryside and the city.

Why was it then that the PSP was so reticent about nationalizations? Why did it demand that the Trotskyists, who attended the First Congress of Latin American Youth held in Havana in 1960, be expelled for having proposed the expropriation, without indemnification of national and for-

Fidel Castro Denounces Bureaucracy

The complete text of Castro's sensational March 26 speech in which Castro assailed Communist leader Anibal Escalante, and others, for converting the Cuban Integrated Revolutionary Organizations into "a yoke, a straitjacket."

35 cents a copy

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

eign firms, a line proposed at the same Congress by Fidel? Was that policy perhaps inspired by Escalante? Is it not strange that the same line of the underestimation of industrial development was applied by Stalin during the period of 1924 to 1929, the period during which bureaucratism and sectarianism surged forward in Russia? From this the essential question is derived: Which social sectors benefited from such an orientation? Did not the errors of the PSP or of Escalante and company regarding agrarian and industrial problems lead, perhaps, as part of the Thermidorian plan of the bureaucracy in embryo, to a weakening of the proletarian wing headed by Fidel?

Shortages Spur Bureaucratic Tendency

The backwardness of the country, the imperialist blockade, the lack of raw materials and of replacement parts for machinery, problems which still have not been overcome in spite of the efforts of the planned economy and of the help of the non-capitalist countries, resulted in a marked shortage of products, especially of consumer products. In the light of this, the growth of a limited black market and the strengthening of a tendency towards speculation, was inevitable. The Cuban government found itself forced to ration certain articles, guided always by the worthy purpose of achieving an equitable and just distribution. Nevertheless, the new conditions brought about by the distribution created a new situation which certain groups, acting in the shadows, would use to their own advantage. These were those groups which were in a position to dispense favors in the distribution of the scarce goods.

Did Escalante and company try to take advantage of the shortages and of rationing? Did he make use of the ORI apparatus, that apparatus which meddled in everything, in order to favor certain sectors with a larger quota of more and better things in exchange for unconditional support? Why was it that hundreds of store owners and small property owners went knocking at the doors of the PSP?

Differences Between Workers and Intellectuals

In backward countries there are great differences between those who do manual labor and those who are engaged in intellectual pursuits. The majority of the workers and *campesinos* are illiterate; their very low technical and cultural level is the cause for a shortage of specialized workers, a phenomenon which does not occur in the highly industrialized countries. Once the social revolution takes place, the technicians and scientists, who because of their social position are attached to the bourgeois ideology, leave the country in large numbers. The result of this is that there remains a very small group of people with a satisfactory cultural level. In the first phases of the workers' state there are many difficulties because the workers, lacking specialized training and experience in the conduct of businesses, produce at a very low level. At the same time, the working class encounters grave problems in the running of the basic units of the workers' state — the ministries, factories and collective farms.

The stratum of the intelligentsia which has stayed in the country, is not always willing to contribute unstintingly to the revolution. Fidel's, Che's, Raúl's and Chomon's cases are exceptional ones. There is added, therefore, a series of privileges for those educated persons who carry out intellectual tasks in administration. These people generally come from the petty bourgeoisie. In Cuba in 1961, in order to be able to occupy one of these posts, it was necessary to receive the prior approval of the ORI, which was controlled by Escalante. It is in order to ask: Did Escalante try to find a basis of support in this stratum of managers, technicians and secretaries? Why was it that the larger part of the sectarian nuclei of the ORI, created by Escalante, was made up by this type of person? Why had Escalante included so few workers in the apparatus of the ORI?

A Bureaucratic Formation in Embryo

These social-economic factors conditioned the birth of a bureaucracy in embryo; of an embryo — we insist — not of a privileged and settled caste, let alone of a new social class.

The high watermark of bureaucratism and sectarianism — 1961 — was reached during the period of greatest difficulties for the Cuban Revolution. It took place during the time of the greatest shortages, when there was the most acute shortage of raw materials, when there was a tight imperialist blockade, when difficulties were being experienced with the co-operatives and with the small and middle land-owners.

The means employed by Escalante to remove from power the men of the 26th of July Movement and the Revolutionary Directorate, was the ORI, the creature of an apparatus in which there was to be no worker participation. He was conscious of the fact that a mass Marxist-Leninist party, one that was alive, dynamic, made up of the best workers, was going to demand a clear accounting, was going to make democratic decisions and to eliminate the potential bureaucrats. That is why the primary objective of *Escalantismo* was to forge "a yoke, a strait jacket."

THE *Escalantista* faction was able to control key posts in the administration of the government and to acquire an ever-growing autonomy and to play an incipient Bonapartist role. Its interference in all matters of state was leading to the exercise of a concealed duality of powers; it was still very hidden. At the same time, the *Escalantistas* began an insidious campaign against the true leaders of the revolution. They began to broach the problem of the "cult of personality"; to say that Fidel's *History Will Absolve Me* was not a Marxist-Leninist document; that the attack on the Moncada Barracks and the *Granma* landing were the product of petty bourgeois attitudes which were removed from the masses, etc., etc.

Escalantismo began to grow in strength in some mass organizations, like in the *Confederación de Trabajadores Cubanos* (Cuban Confederation of Workers) and the *Asociación de Jóvenes Rebeldes* (Association of Rebel Youth), from which E. Figueroa of the 26th of July and M. Payán of the Revolutionary Directorate, organizers of the Congress of Latin American Youth held in Havana in 1960, were removed. *But there was one decisive sector in which it could not make headway, in which it was not able to establish the sectarian nuclei of the ORI. And that was: the Rebel Army, the Militias and the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution. We can say that the Thermidorian Plan shattered against this bulwark.*

Escalante and company tried to carry out their own policy; it was erroneous, but at any rate it was a political line. They attempted to carry out their line in the countryside, in industry, in government administration and in foreign policy. For example, it is probable that Escalante and his team may have attempted to isolate the Cuban Revolution from the Latin American masses. It is significant that the delegates sent from Cuba by the Cuban Confederation of Labor during 1961, spoke a much more moderate language than that used by the young revolutionists who visited us in 1960. It was significant that in workers' meetings — we recall one held by the CUT in 1961 on the occasion of a preparatory meeting of the Latin American Trade Union Conference — that they should suggest that Cuba's experience was unique, that it was dangerous to copy the line of armed revolution because in Cuba there existed special conditions which were not present in the majority of the countries of the continent.

Fortunately, this policy has changed in 1962, and not by coincidence, either, since the removal of Escalante and company. The last delegates to come to Chile — those who participated in the National Congress of the CUT in August of 1962 and one railroad worker with whom we had the privilege of exchanging ideas, at the National Leaders Coun-

cil of the CUT, held in July of 1962 — were complete revolutionists who, like those of 1960, constantly appealed to the masses and to the Latin American Revolution as the only effective way of defending the Cuban people.

To what extent was the moderate line of the delegates who visited us in 1961 influenced by Escalante and company? What relation was there between this policy and the theory of the “peaceful road” which the Communist parties of Latin America pursue? Was the incipient tendency to isolate the Cuban Revolution from the Latin American masses the result of an embryonic policy of “Socialism in one country?”

It is most likely that the Escalante faction not only reflected petty bourgeois sectors, but that its policy was the product of old sins committed by the *Partido Socialista Popular* many years before the revolution.

Not the First Case in History

The germination of a bureaucracy in embryo in Cuba is not the first case in history. The history of revolutions demonstrates that this problem has presented itself in every backward country, owing to their peculiar social-economic conditions. Although the phenomenon is not inevitable, it should be taken very much into account.

In Russia, for example, a similar situation presented itself three years after the revolution had been unleashed. Lenin became aware of the problem and in 1921 he decided to begin a campaign against bureaucratism. Trotsky, writing of this concern on Lenin’s part, said the following:

At the Eleventh Congress of the Party, in March 1922, Lenin gave warning of the danger of a degeneration of the ruling stratum. It has occurred more than once in history, he said, that the conqueror took over the culture of the conquered, when the latter stood on a higher level. The culture of the Russian bourgeoisie and the old ruling bureaucracy was, to be sure, miserable, but alas the new ruling stratum must often take off its hat to that culture. “Four thousand seven hundred responsible communists” in Moscow administer the state machine. “Who is leading whom? I doubt very much whether you can say that the communists are in the lead . . . (Trotsky. *La Revolución Traicionada*. Buenos Aires: Claridad, 1938. English-language edition: *The Revolution Betrayed*. New York; Pioneer Publishers, pp. 100-101)

Trotsky relates that:

Early in 1923 it became apparent to the principal leaders who were aware of the political situation, that Stalin was packing the forthcoming Twelfth Congress, the highest Party authority, with delegates who were unconditionally loyal to him. Lenin became so alarmed at the gravity of the situation that he summoned me to his rooms in the Kremlin, spoke of the shocking increase in bureaucratism in our Soviet apparatus and of the need to find a solution to the problem. He suggested the advisability of naming a special commission of the Central Committee and he asked me to intervene actively in the matter.

“Vladimir Ilyich, I am convinced that in the present fight against bureaucratism in the Soviet apparatus we should not lose sight of what is happening; a very special selection of functionaries is being made, of members and non-members, on the basis of loyalty to certain dominant personalities and of leading groups of the Party within the very Central Committee. Every time that a lower functionary is attacked, one runs up against a prominent leader of the Party . . . I cannot take charge of the work under the present circumstances.”

Lenin was thoughtful for a moment, and — I am quoting him literally — said: “In other words, what I am proposing is a campaign against the bureaucratism in the Soviet apparatus and what you are proposing is to ex-

pand the fight directing it against the bureaucratism of the Orgburo of the Party? Isn’t that so?”

I laughed at the unexpected nature of his answer, for at that time such an exact and complete formulation of the idea had not occurred to me. And I answered: “I suppose that’s it.”

“Very well then,” answered Lenin. “I propose we form a bloc.” (Trotsky. *Stalin, Barcelona*: Janés, 1947, p. 379 English-language edition: New York, Harper and Bros. 1941, p. 365.)

Lenin’s incurable disease, did not permit him to continue the open fight against the bureaucracy. Nevertheless, in his *Testament* (written between December 25, 1922 and January 4, 1923), he inscribed his verdict:

Stalin, having become General Secretary, has concentrated an enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he will always know how to use that power with sufficient caution . . . Postscript: . . . I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin from that position and appoint to it another man who in all respects differs from Stalin only in superiority — namely, more patient, more loyal, and more polite and more attentive to comrades, less capricious . . . (Trotsky. *The Suppressed Testament of Lenin*. New York: Pioneer Publishers, 1946, pp. 6-7 Translator)

Before his death, Lenin had broken with Stalin because of a disrespectful and bureaucratic attitude on Stalin’s part towards Lenin’s wife, Krupskaya.

Trotsky has written some pages about this period of the rise of the bureaucracy in Russia which are so accurate that what has happened in Cuba with Escalante and company seems to be a carbon copy of what he recorded then. Trotsky wrote:

It was then [1923] that Stalin began to emerge with increasing prominence as the organizer, dispenser of credentials, tasks and jobs, the trainer and overlord of the bureaucracy. (Trotsky. *Stalin, Barcelona*: Janés, 1947, p. 400 — English language edition: op. cit., p. 385).

The great majority of the older generation of the present bureaucracy, were on the other side of the barricades during the October Revolution. Take, for example, the case of the Soviet diplomats . . . Or at best, they were far removed from the struggle. The bureaucrats of today, who during the October days were on the side of the Bolsheviks, in the majority of cases played no significant roles. As for the young bureaucrats, they have been trained by their elders and frequently selected from among their own offspring. These men would not have been capable of making the October Revolution, but they have been the best suited to exploit it . . . (Trotsky. *La revolución traicionada*. Buenos Aires: Claridad, 1938, p. 85 — English language edition: *The Revolution Betrayed*. New York: Pioneer Publishers, 1945, p. 93).

Under the guise of a struggle against the Opposition, the revolutionists were replaced with government functionaries. (Trotsky, op. cit., p. 88 — English edition: op. cit., p. 98).

The Thermidor conspiracy of the end of the eighteenth century, prepared for by the preceding course of the revolution, broke out with a single blow and assumed the shape of a sanguinary finale. Our Thermidor was long drawn out. The guillotine found its substitute — at least for a while — in intrigue. The falsifying of the past . . . Trotsky. *My vida*. México, 1946, Vol. 2, p. 326. English-language edition, New York: Scribner, 1930, p. 505)

Is there not a certain amount of agreement between what Fidel said about Escalante and company and the writings and attitudes of the great leaders of the Russian Revolution, Lenin and Trotsky, in their fight against Stalin’s bureaucratism?

Crisis in the Common Market

By E. Germain

TEN years of uninterrupted "boom" in Europe and Japan have culminated in fundamental changes in the relationships of forces within the imperialist camp. American imperialism has lost the absolute economic and financial superiority which it attained at the end of the second world war. British imperialism has lost its position as the second ranking capitalist power in the world. The vigor of the Common Market threatens to deal a serious blow to British economy and it could even become a threat to Yankee imperialism. In the last analysis, the crisis which has suddenly burst forth in the heart of the imperialist alliance — following the refusal of General de Gaulle to sanction the entry of Great Britain into the Common Market — is a consequence of these changes in the relations of inter-imperialist forces.

This crisis is two-fold in character, being at the same time politico-military and economic. On the political and military level, de Gaulle, since his return to power in 1958, is tenaciously pursuing the idea of a reorganization of the Atlantic Alliance which would rest on an equal partnership between European capitalism under French hegemony on the one hand and capitalist America on the other.

He first tried to set up a "directorship" of three (USA, Great Britain, France) at the head of NATO. He afterwards sought to create a "political secretariat" of the Common Market, located in Paris, which would lead the six capitalist powers of the Common Market to act in agreement toward the United States inside the Atlantic Alliance. He is today concentrating his efforts on the construction of a "French atomic striking force," under the exclusive control of the French government, which could tomorrow become an "independent Franco-German striking force," and circumvent the Bonn-Paris agreements which ban the equipping of the *Bundeswehr* with atomic weapons. The purpose of all these efforts is the same: to be able to discuss, negotiate and make pacts on equal terms with Washington; to end the predominant position which American imperialism has occupied since the end of the second world war in Western Europe.

ON THE economic level, de Gaulle's policy seeks to maintain the Common Market within its present limits, until the interpenetration of its capital funds permits the construction of capitalist enterprises of sufficient power to compete against American enterprises with chances of success. It must be pointed out that the Common Market actually has two aspects: to abolish the customs barriers between the six member countries — France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands — by the year 1970, and at the same time to maintain a sufficiently high schedule of tariff duties between the six countries of the Common Market on the one hand and the rest of the world on the other. (At present the customs duties between the Six have been reduced by an average of fifty percent.) Controlling a market considerably larger than before and protected from American, British and Japanese competition by the "common external tariff," the

great French, German and Italian trusts could undergo an exceptional growth, linking themselves to one another and forming new groups which would then be of such dimensions that they could contend with the giant American monopolies.

At first American imperialism favored the growth of the Common Market and the entire process of "European economic integration." Closer collaboration between the European powers was even one of the conditions attached to the granting of "Marshall Plan aid." The U.S. did so especially for political and military purposes: to create a counter-weight to the power of the Soviet Union and the other workers' states on the European continent and to put the Atlantic Pact on a more solid financial and industrial footing.

But for some years now, the American imperialists have with increasing anxiety begun to take account of the economic threat to Washington's predominant position in the capitalist world posed by a restored and strengthened capitalist Europe. The permanent U.S. balance of payments deficit impelled the American capitalists to insist that their now financially "solid" European partners take more responsibility for a larger share of the military expenditures of the Atlantic Alliance and for "aid" to the underdeveloped countries. Washington's reply to the purely economic challenge to American imperialism posed by the Common Market consists in advocating the dilution, as quickly as possible, of the Common Market into an "Atlantic Zone of free exchange," embracing the United States and Canada, in addition to Western Europe.

LIKE the Common Market, customs duties would be abolished *within* this "Atlantic Zone." But, unlike the Common Market, there would no longer be protective tariffs between the Six, on the one hand, and the United States and Great Britain, on the other. That is to say, American agricultural and industrial products and British industrial products, would have free access to European markets. This would enable the American trusts to make the most of their present superiority over the European trusts so they would be more of a match for their French, German and Italian competitors.

Great Britain's entry into the Common Market, followed by that of a series of small European countries — Denmark, Norway, Portugal and perhaps Austria and Switzerland — would have been the first step in the realization of this American plan. General de Gaulle's veto of Great Britain's entry into the Common Market, has provoked consternation in Washington and deals a harsh blow to the cohesion of the imperialist alliance. At the same time, it strikes at the economic future of capitalist powers like Great Britain, which, cut off from the markets of the Six, risk being more and more outdistanced by them.

De Gaulle is convinced that his gamble will succeed thanks to a three-fold blackmail. He knows that the only effective European counter to his veto — the breaking up of the Common Market — is impossible because the Com-

mon Market members have too much of a stake in maintaining it, despite their resentment against the special position of Paris. He knows that the only effective American retaliation — a threat to withdraw its troops from Europe — is also ruled out. For this would, paradoxically enough, result in reinforcing the Gaullist concept of the creation of a second imperialist bloc in Europe, independent of the United States. He also knows that Washington will not even be able to utilize such a traditional "solution" as promoting the overthrow of de Gaulle. For, in the present political situation in France, de Gaulle is "irreplaceable" from the viewpoint of the bourgeoisie and his precipitate removal would provoke an exceptionally profound social and political crisis.

It thus seems that de Gaulle will be able to realize his objectives in the short run. However, it is more than unlikely that he can realize them in the long run.

In the first place, the capitalist forces which he represents, constitute only a minority current in European capitalism, and do not even represent the whole of French capitalism. These forces are sufficiently expansionist to want to exploit to the bottom the possibilities inherent in the Common Market but are still too weak to face competition on a larger market. Thus these forces need the protection of a "common external tariff." De Gaulle's policy is tailored for French agriculture, the European textile industry, or perhaps the coal industry. It is not a policy suited for the most dynamic and powerful German, Italian and Dutch trusts. This is especially true for the German trusts for whom the Common Market has already become too narrow a straitjacket since they already export twice as much merchandise to countries outside the Common Market as they sell to member countries. That is why so many German capitalists, following the lead of Minister of Economics Erhard, have declared themselves in favor of an "open" Europe and the admission of Great Britain into the Common Market.

Moreover, there will be other strategems since de Gaulle has no monopoly on initiative in this situation. Great Britain has already reacted by inducing its partners in the "European Free Trade Association" — Portugal, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Austria and Switzerland — to agree on the complete elimination among the "outer Seven" of all tariff duties by the year 1966, four years before the Common Market tariff elimination date of 1970. There are thus being created additional elements of a tariff war which would especially make the German capitalists stop and think.

At the same time, American imperialism, while itself erecting protective tariff duties, is pressing for a general lowering of tariffs and simultaneously increasing its investments inside the Common Market, thereby to some extent "getting around" the "common external tariff." This policy of accelerating the export of capital to competing imperialist countries — rather than to colonial and semi-colonial countries which are considered "bad risks" — has the double advantage of fighting the competitor on his own ground and of maintaining a certain degree of unemployment in the U.S. which exercises a pressure on American wage levels. The basic purpose of these exports of capital is to take advantage of the wage differentials — several sectors of American industry even have separate pieces of equipment made abroad to be assembled later in the United States — with the long-range hope that they would thus obtain an "equalization" of American and European wages.¹ But meanwhile this policy of exporting

¹ The American trade union bureaucracy, trapped by its position of "pure and simple trade unionism," cannot conceive of doing anything else except go begging in international conferences for the . . . increase of Japanese, French, Italian, etc., wages! See, notably, the attitude of the American delegates at the last conference of the FIOM (International Organization of the Metal Workers.)

capital aggravates the balance of payments deficit and, from the viewpoint of American imperialism, constitutes a double-edged weapon.

FINALLY, even if the policy of de Gaulle is able to achieve a certain success, it will eventually end in the political and military reinforcement of West German imperialism in proportion to its economic superiority. By exaggerating the economic and military power of France, de Gaulle will, in the last analysis, have been working "for the King of Prussia." On the day after the Brussels crisis, Germany already seems to have become the arbiter of the situation. After all, it is Germany and not France which is alternately threatened and courted by Washington and London.

It is probable that, a few years hence, the "fusion" of the Common Market with the greater part of the members of the European Free Trade Association will take place and de Gaulle's plan will run aground. But not without heavy cost in the meantime to the American and British bourgeoisie and not without having also increased the bargaining power of Paris which will undoubtedly bring it some advantages in the field of nuclear secrets.

For revolutionary Marxists, this conflict is a typical inter-imperialist competitive struggle in which the working class has no reason for supporting one side against the other.² To the policies of both sides, they must counterpose the struggle for a Socialist United States of Europe, for a really unified Europe which could effectively surmount the antagonisms bred by capitalist competition; that could only be a Europe which has abolished both capitalist property and the bourgeois state. It is not by accident, moreover, that the present crisis in the Common Market coincides with a slackening of economic expansion which could be the preliminary signal of an opening recession in all capitalist Europe.

Before the advent of this recession, and still more harshly during it, the employers would unleash an offensive to improve its competitive conditions at the expense of their own working class. It would be pure suicide for the working class to solidarize itself, either with its own bourgeoisie or with that of the opposing camp. Its only effective reply can be to affirm its basic class solidarity: "Workers of all European countries unite against the Europe of the monopolies, whether it raises the slogans of the Europe of 'fatherlands,' the 'open' Europe, or the European 'community.'" This should be the line of action for the working class movement of Europe.

ABOVE all, this means unity in defending the common interests of the workers. For a number of years the Fourth International has spread the idea of a European

(Continued on Page 51)

THE MILITANT

Special Offer to New Readers

To get the facts and read the truth, take advantage of a four-month trial subscription for only one dollar. Send this coupon with payment to: The Militant, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

Name

Street

City Zone..... State.....

The Nasserite National Movement

By A. Sadi

"Arab socialism" is a new ideological creature born only several years ago in the minds of some Arab petty-bourgeois intellectuals, especially in Syria. It has recently been elaborated and adopted as an official ideology by the Arab national movement led by Abd el Nasser as an "alternative" to communism.

Right from the end of the second world war, an uninterrupted series of mass national liberation movements has drawn the colonies and semicolonies, one after another, into a process of permanent revolution. The great successes achieved by the Soviet Union and the other workers states, together with the victory of the Chinese Revolution, have awakened the masses of the colonial countries to consciousness of their wretched material, moral and cultural condition. It has been proved to them that the only way to overcome their misery, low standard of living and low cultural level is the way of socialism.

Socialism, therefore, has become the slogan of the masses and the catchword of every party or movement trying to win the masses in every underdeveloped country. But the policy of the Stalinist parties in the Arab world, which has always been to zigzag in accordance with the diplomatic interests of the ruling bureaucracy in the Soviet Union; and especially the attitude adopted by these parties — in the wake of the Soviet government — in such situations as the Palestinian war has antagonized the Arab masses, particularly the socialist-minded intellectuals who used to rally around these parties. Disappointed over the Stalinist parties and over the Soviet Union, these intellectuals began a search for a "new god" — for a kind of socialism independent of the policies and influence of the Soviet Union. The result was a hash of ideas which came to be known as "Arab socialism."

The Nasser Coup

Nasser's coup d'état in 1952 came at the climax of a great revolutionary upsurge in the Arab world, especially in Egypt. A mighty wave of workers strikes and peasant revolts and upheavals, together with the intensification of guerrilla war against the British occupation forces in the Suez Canal zone, shook Farouk's rule to its very foundations. The monarchy could no longer maintain its hold on the people. Egypt stood on the verge of social revolution. The Palace's last attempt at self-defense was the burning of Cairo on January 24, 1952. But this attempt, intended to demoralize the mass movement and discredit the Wafd government which was responding to the mass pressure, did not save the situation for the throne and its feudal allies. The burning of Cairo was used, indeed, as a pretext to dismiss the Wafd government and to form in its stead a new government which "would not submit to national

feelings" and mass pressure. But this new government was born paralyzed. Instead of restoring "law and order," it stood impotent in the face of the mounting revolutionary wave. The crisis was aggravated. In these circumstances, Nasser and his colleagues launched their coup. Without a single shot, Farouk's rule crumbled like a house of cards.

Nasser's military coup was in fact a desperate attempt to prevent a real people's revolution, which could have developed into a proletarian revolution, and to curb the masses and prevent them from influencing the development of events.

The leaders of the coup, by virtue of their military education and military mentality, never believed in the masses. Indeed, from the beginning they have suspected the people and have always been afraid of them. Their first act after seizing power was to prohibit strikes and demonstrations. When, immediately after the coup, the textile workers in Alexandria declared a strike, it was broken by police and military force and two of the leaders were put to death.

Faith in Militarism

In his book *The Philosophy of Revolution* Abd el Nasser says, "Throughout my life I have had faith in militarism" — and so have his colleagues. They want "discipline" and submission to orders, and were shocked by the activity of the masses. They crushed it by the ruthless measures of military dictatorship. In the same book, Abd el Nasser says, "We needed discipline but found chaos behind our lines. We needed unity but found dissensions."

It is true that Abd el Nasser and his colleagues, when launching their coup, had an aim. But it was very vague. They felt the need for political and social reform but had no program. Having seized power, they were faced by a mass of complicated political and social problems to which they had never given thought and before which they stood confused and completely impotent. They even began to regret their "rashness" and "folly" in seizing power. Abd el Nasser had to "confess that after July 23 I suffered fits in which I accused myself, my colleagues and the rest of the army of the rashness and folly we committed on July 23." He admits that "the situation caused me a depressing psychological crisis. But later experience and reflection, and the true significance I derived from them, lightened the reaction of the crisis upon me." Only then did he come to the conclusion "that we are at present in the throes of two revolutions and not one . . . One political in which [every nation] recovers its right to self-government from an imposed despot or an aggressive army occupying its territory without its consent. The second revolution is social, in which the classes of society would struggle against each other until justice for all countrymen has been gained and conditions have become stable."

Rulers Fear Masses

Accordingly the monarchy was abolished and an agrarian reform was decreed. But abolishing the monarchy did not bring the masses "self-government." Even bourgeois democratic rights and liberties were not granted. On the contrary, a firm military dictatorship was established. Political

A. Sadi, who appears in our columns for the first time, is an Arab socialist with many decades experience in the revolutionary movement. Although we do not necessarily agree with all that he says, we think that our readers will find his article to be an instructive study of one of the most puzzling features of politics in a strife-torn area that is now much in the news.

parties were outlawed and strikes and demonstrations were strictly forbidden. The new rulers' fear of the masses never waned. The agrarian reform was limited and on a very narrow scale, but it did improve somewhat the lot of a considerable portion of the peasantry and helped win them to the new regime. The compensation paid to the landowners was expected by the new rulers to be invested in industry, thus helping to industrialize the country. But the landowners, by force of tradition and lack of experience and hope of big profits in industry, invested their new capital in real estate instead. The agrarian reform, however, has broken the backbone of the feudal class and put an end to their influence on the political and economic life of the country.

Having failed in drawing private capital into industry, the new regime began to depend on state funds to build new industrial enterprises, and a kind of state control and planning was established.

In foreign policy the new rulers tried at the beginning to reach an understanding and *modus vivendi* with Britain and the United States, relying on their aid. But the United States refusal to supply arms with which to meet Israel's continual raids forced Abd el Nasser to turn to the workers states for arms. These new friendly relations aroused the rage of American and British imperialism. In insulting terms, both the United States and Great Britain withdrew their offer to help Egypt build the High Dam at Aswan. Abd el Nasser responded immediately by nationalizing the Suez Canal Company. This touched off the Suez crisis which ended with the Anglo-French attack on Egypt with the help of Israel. The help given by the Soviet Union to Egypt during the crisis raised the prestige of the Soviet Union and the Communist parties in the whole Arab world.

Arab Unity Slogan

At the same time the imperialist attack on Egypt aroused Arab national feelings and the solidarity of the masses in all Arab countries. "Arab Unity" became the general slogan.

In Syria the Communists were gathering strength and influence. This aroused the fear of the weak Syrian bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeois Ba'athists, who were virtually in power in Syria at the time. They hastened to unite with Egypt in order to win the help of the strong Egyptian bourgeoisie against the Communists. The Communists stood against the current and opposed unity.

Then came the revolution in Iraq at a time when the prestige of Abd el Nasser was at its highest. He was recognized as the leader of the whole Arab national movement against imperialism and for national unity and social reform. The Ba'athists in Iraq led the movement for unity with Egypt. But the Communists, who were the strongest party in Iraq and who controlled the trade unions, the peasant committees, the organizations of the intellectuals, and the militia, helped Kassem crush the Ba'athists and the movement for national unity.

This attitude of the Communists against national unity in Syria and Iraq turned the feelings of the masses against them and they began to lose ground. In Iraq, after crushing the Ba'athists, Kassem turned against the Communists and drove them underground. In Syria they lost much of their influence in the working class, and many of their intellectuals left the party to begin co-operating with Nasser. When Nasser's social reforms antagonized the landowners and a section of the bourgeoisie in Syria, the Communists made a front with the most reactionary elements there. Nasser utilized the occasion to launch a witch-hunt against them, including all means of propaganda and police terror. At the same time he compromised with the reactionary elements, even well-known imperialist agents, to win them against the Communists.

The union between Egypt and Syria was, naturally, to the advantage of the Egyptian bourgeoisie, who were the stronger. Their profits expanded and increased relative to those of the Syrian national bourgeoisie. This antagonized

the latter, while Nasser's compromises and cooperation with the most reactionary elements and his dictatorial methods in monopolizing power brought a rift between him and the Ba'athists.

The economic and social measures taken by Nasser in Egypt and Syria proved to be insufficient. Private initiative did not contribute to the development of the national economy. The new reforms helped to enrich many of the Egyptian bourgeoisie. Capital began to concentrate in the hands of a few millionaires. The division of the national income in favor of the capitalists rose from sixty-eight per cent before industrialization to seventy-two per cent in 1961. But still they did not invest in industry. They all turned to trade and real estate where big profits are sure. The big landowners used every means to evade the agrarian reform laws.

All this forced Nasser to take new and more drastic measures. On July 20, 1961, he issued decrees nationalizing the banks and insurance companies. He also decreed the participation of the state in a number of private industrial enterprises. The maximum property allowed in land was decreased from 200 to 100 acres.

The Syrian bourgeoisie, whose domestic position had been bolstered through the co-operation of the Communists and a section of the Ba'athists and through Nasser's compromises with the extreme right, were shocked by these measures. They used the influence they had won in the army to launch a coup against the Nasserite rule, separating Syria from Egypt.

* * *

THE separation of Syria from Egypt came like a bolt from the blue to Nasser. It drove him to review his whole past policies. It opened his eyes to the intrigues and conspiracies of the landowners, the big comprador bourgeoisie and imperialist agents, against his rule. He felt the danger in Egypt itself and began to look for support among the people. He realized, he said, that "ages of suffering and hope finally gave shape to the objectives of the Arab struggle. These objectives which are a true expression of Arab national conscience are freedom, socialism, unity." He admitted that a revolution "is not the work of one individual" and that the "value of a revolution lies in its degree of popularity, in the extent to which it is an expression of the vast masses, in the extent to which it mobilizes their forces to rebuild the future, and also in the extent to which it enables these masses to impose their will on life." He also recognized that "work aimed at expanding the base of national wealth can never be left to the haphazard ways of exploitive private capital" and that "the socialist solution is the only way out to economic and social progress."

Nasser's National Charter

On these bases he intensified his measures of nationalization and called for a "National Congress of Popular Powers" which was held May 21, 1962. At the inaugural session, Abd el Nasser presented a "National Charter" which was meant to be a "scientific" program for "Arab socialism" and which declared that "the major economic and social problems confronting our people at present must be resolved on a scientific basis" and "revolutionary action should be scientific." The charter also states:

"Our immediate aim is to do away with exploitation, and to make possible the exercise of the natural right to have an equal opportunity, to dissolve class distinctions and to end the domination of one class and hence remove the clash between classes which constitutes a threat to the freedom of the individual citizen, and even to the freedom of the whole of the country, by violating the rights of the people which creates the chance of exposing the country to the lurking dangers of foreign forces vigilantly on the lookout to drag it into the arena of cold war and make of it its battlefield and of its people fodder for their guns. The removal of the clash between classes which arises out of interests that can never be reconciled,

between those who exercise exploitation and those crushed by exploitation in the past society, cannot overnight lead to the dissolution of all class distinctions or lead to social freedom and true democracy.

“Yet, the removal of the clash between classes makes it possible, by eliminating the exploiting class, to dissolve peacefully class distinctions, and to open the gates for democratic exchange which brings the whole society near the age of true freedom.”

Let us see now how this aim of “doing away with exploitation” and the “ending of the domination of one class” can be achieved on a “scientific basis,” as conceived by the authors of the Charter.

Some Cogent Questions

While they admit the necessity of “eliminating the exploiting class,” they speak of “dissolving peacefully class distinctions,” and state that the “Egyptian people refused the dictatorship of any class.” But how can this exploiting class be eliminated? Do the authors of the Charter believe that this class will renounce exploitation voluntarily for the benefit of that utopian free society which they envisage? And if, in the name of the Egyptian people, they reject the dictatorship of any class, for what purpose, then, is their state? Is it necessary to prove now what history itself has demonstrated that every state has been the product of class struggle and that its role always is to defend the interests of the exploiting class against the exploited classes? Every state has been the instrument of the dictatorship of a class. Without the class dictatorship of the proletariat, the exploiting class cannot be eliminated.

However, in an article “Arab Socialism and Communism” in a special issue of the Egyptian review *The Scribe*, an expounder of the Charter rejects class struggle altogether. “We do not believe in the necessity of class struggle,” he says, “or in the supremacy of one class over the others.” He believes that “this class struggle can actually be checked even in the capitalist regimes of the Western world” and that “the American worker or that of Western Europe has succeeded in acquiring a multitude of rights by more or less peaceful means and has attained a constantly improved standard of living.” From this he draws the conclusion that “the class struggle has ceased to be a necessity in order for the proletariat to gain its rights and to attain a decent standard of living which constantly improves.”

But how did the proletariat of these highly developed capitalist countries attain their “decent standard of living” if not by class struggle? And has class struggle really ceased to be a necessity in these countries? Then what are the strikes declared so frequently by the working class in the USA and the European countries if not an expression of class struggle? Moreover, has class exploitation ended in the West? Does the attainment of a “decent standard of living” constitute socialism? Does it end class exploitation? According to the author of the article, the answer is, “Yes.” He says, “It is socialism which is predominant in these countries.” From this one must draw the conclusion that the “Arab socialism” in the minds of the authors and exponents of the Charter is nothing but modern capitalism.

Some Obvious Contradictions

This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the Charter recognizes the “existence of a private sector that would, without exploitation, participate in the development within the framework of the over-all plan.” Nationalization, according to the Charter, “is not a blow to the individual initiative” but “rather a guarantee to an expansion of the range of general interest.”

“The great importance attached to the role of the public sector,” the Charter states, “cannot do away with the existence of the private sector. The private sector has its effective role in the development plan. It must be protected to fulfill that part.” All that is “now required” from that private sector is “to renovate itself and strike a new path

of creative effort, not dependent, as in the past, on parasitic exploitation.”

The wolf is told to feed on grass! Private capital is asked not to exploit!

The experience of the last ten years seems to have proved to the leaders of “Arab socialism” that capitalists cannot produce but for profit. Therefore they are ready to provide them with “reasonable profit without exploitation.” But where does profit come from if not from exploitation?

In the field of agrarian reform, the Charter states that “The Arab application of socialism in the domain of agriculture does not believe in nationalizing the land and transforming it into the domain of public ownership. But from experience and study it believes in individual ownership of land, within limits that would not allow for feudalism.” “The revolutionary solution to the problem of land in Egypt is,” according to the authors of the Charter, “by increasing the number of land owners.”

We are told furthermore that the “socialist framework carefully set up by the July laws wiped out the vestiges of exploitation and left the door open to individual investment that would serve the general interest in the field of development. It would equally serve its owners by providing them with a reasonable profit without exploitation.”

One cannot deny that the reforms and nationalization measures passed by the new regime in Egypt and envisaged by the Charter are of great importance for the development of the country. But they are not yet socialism. Socialism is not merely nationalization. Socialism cannot be achieved without, first of all, the proletariat seizing power and crushing the old state machine. Nationalization as an economic basis for socialist planning should be without compensation. It is impossible to overthrow the rule of the capitalist class by paying them compensation for their nationalized property and leaving the door open for individual investment and “reasonable” profit.

But what, then, is the class nature of the new Egyptian state? What class is in power there?

The new Egyptian state is a capitalist state and the class in power there is the national bourgeoisie. It could be objected that the new state is nationalizing capitalist property and even persecutes individual capitalists. This is all true. But such measures are taken in the interests of the class as a whole. By “exploiting” capitalists, Nasser means individuals who put their interests above those of the class and who cannot be integrated into his plan of developing industry and the capitalist economy to advance the national bourgeoisie as a ruling class. Egypt is ruled by a bureaucracy which represents the interests of the national bourgeoisie. A bureaucracy in power is always the representative and servant of a class. This servant may sometimes sit on the shoulders of his master and spit in his face but he remains always a servant. Hitler, in spite of his drastic measures against individual German capitalists and in spite of his firm state control over the German economy, remained until the end a servant of German finance capital.

Nasser is not a new Hitler and the new regime in Egypt is not fascism. Hitler, representing highly developed finance capital in its decay, played a reactionary role. Nasser plays a progressive role as the representative of a semi-colonial national bourgeois class fighting against imperialism and for the realization of a bourgeois democratic revolution. In fact, Nasserism is not something altogether original. It is a mixture of Kemalism and Peronism in new and different circumstances.

At the time of Kemal Ataturk, imperialism was at its peak of strength while the Russian Revolution was inspiring the proletariat everywhere. The Turkish ruler could not stand the pressure on two fronts. Fear of the proletarian revolution forced him to compromise with imperialism and put an end to his reforms. Peron fell victim to an economic crisis. But Nasserism exists in an era of the weakening of imperialism and the strengthening of the workers states and the rise of the colonial revolution. Imperialism cannot

show to the colonial and semi-colonial bourgeoisie its teeth and claws. The fear of a proletarian revolution in the colonies and the needs of the cold war with the workers states force imperialism to make every effort to win the bourgeoisie of the underdeveloped countries. At the same time, the Soviet Union gives utmost help to the same bourgeoisie in hope of keeping them neutral in the cold war. Nasser, playing the role of neutralism, wins help from both sides and utilizes this help to strengthen his regime.

Yet there is no alternative at present to his leadership in the Arab world. The Arab proletariat have not yet built a competent leadership. The Communist parties, with their treacherous policies, have lost almost all influence in the liberation movement. In the beginning they supported Nasser without reservation. After the unification of Egypt and Syria, especially after the Iraqi revolution, they made Nasser the main enemy, going so far as to join imperialist agents in a front against him. While Nasser raises the two main slogans cherished by the masses — socialism and national unity — they oppose both. While declaring that “Arab unity must be built upon complete liberation from imperialism,” they do not see the struggle for national unity as part and parcel of the struggle for the bourgeois democratic revolution. They advise the masses to wait for completion of liberation from imperialism before beginning the struggle for unity. As for socialist revolution, they think that the time and objective conditions are not yet ripe. Instead of socialism, they call for a national democratic state “which does not represent one certain class, but relies on the support of patriotic democratic groups, and which opens the way for a peaceful transition to socialism according to the conditions and national characteristics of our country.”

In this way the Communist parties in the Arab world

have withdrawn from the liberation movement and are now struggling against Nasserism from outside. But revolutionary Marxists should not stand aside from this movement. They should be integrated in it, struggling from within for their own slogans of socialism and national unity. Their main struggle against its bourgeois leadership and for hegemony of the proletariat should be ideological in character. They should explain to the masses what real socialism is and what the role of the working class should be in the movement for socialism. They should make every effort to win the working class to their side and help it to win its independence.

Nasserism, in its present form, cannot live long. It is full of contradictions. It is trying to rely on both the national bourgeoisie and the working people. But the interests of opposing classes cannot be reconciled. Moreover the old ruling classes of landowners and comprador bourgeoisie are not altogether crushed. They are only waiting for an opportunity to launch an attack. A sharp economic crisis in the West would force imperialism to show its teeth and claws. The stoppage of foreign aid would push Egypt into a sharp economic crisis. The working masses would intensify their struggle. The Nasserist leadership would be forced to choose between relying on the working people inside and the workers states outside, and relying on the bourgeoisie inside and imperialism outside. It is not difficult to foresee what path it will choose. Only hegemony of the working class over the movement would save the conquests of the bourgeois revolution and push it forward into a proletarian revolution. This can be done only if the revolutionary Marxists succeed in penetrating the movement and conquering it from within.

February 4, 1963.

The Common Market Crisis

(Continued from Page 47)

trade union conference, bringing together all the confederations without excluding any political or philosophical tendency. This trade union united front should elaborate a two-point policy: Joint resistance to all reductions in real wages, to any deterioration in the social security system and to any financial policy aimed against the workers; joint struggle for the forty-hour week, for three (or four) weeks vacation, for socialized medicine and for the nationalization under workers control of the monopolized sectors of industry — especially those monopolies which are already spread over several countries and which the working class of a single country can no longer completely get hold of.

But the European working class cannot limit itself to a strictly defensive posture before European big business. It should counterpose its plans for a socialist Europe to the imperialist plans. The Soviet Union and the other workers' states would be able to play a very positive role in this respect. They could take the Gaullist prattle about a “Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals” at its face value, and, recalling that capitalist Europe is only a fragment of Europe as a whole, they could convoke a congress of all the unions and parties of Western Europe. They could place at its disposal the experience, technical personnel and offices of their planning commissions, charge them with drafting the outline of a plan for the economic, social and cultural development of a Europe unified on a socialist basis. The brilliant perspectives of such a plan would exert a growing force of attraction on the European masses, especially to the extent that capitalist expansion abates and unemployment increases, as it already has in Great Britain and Norway.

Instead of following such an orientation, the Soviet government, which continues to represent not the interests of the working class but those of the vast bureaucracy, oscillates between denouncing the Common Market with idiotic

arguments (“an attempt to put Europe under the bondage of the United States and impoverish the workers”) and a recognition of its spurious “benefits” (which is the present line of the Italian CP). The initiative is constantly left to the class enemy so that the masses cannot be mobilized and aroused in effective opposition.

It is thus incumbent upon revolutionary Marxists and the currents they seek to influence and direct in the mass movement to redouble their boldness and spirit of initiative in order to substitute themselves for the old defaulting leadership, to rekindle today, in the face of the contradictions which are again rending capitalist Europe, the flame of the socialist Europe of tomorrow, the Europe of the working class.

February 23, 1963

² Over the years, the Soviet bureaucracy has supported different European imperialist powers in their desires to “oppose” Washington, American imperialism being considered as the number one enemy. This was even the justification for the counter-revolutionary policy on the colonial question carried out during this entire period by the various Communist parties under the pretext that it was preferable for French imperialism to control the Mers-el Kebir Algerian naval base rather than Yankee imperialism.

Today, for the first time since the beginning of the “cold war,” the Kremlin has changed its position. In the conflict between Paris and Washington, it adopts a position of benevolent neutrality towards Kennedy while redoubling its accusations against the de Gaulle-Adenauer coalition. The Kremlin’s fears of the nuclear rearmament of the Bundeswehr and of the constitution of a unified inter-imperialist bloc in Europe, disposing of its own nuclear arms, explains this turn. We must also take into account its hopes for a “global settlement” with Kennedy which they are again strenuously pursuing.

The Future of the Negro Struggle

A symposium on this subject, celebrating the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation, was held at the Eugene V. Debs Hall in Detroit on Jan. 4, 1963. The speakers, in the order of their presentations, were George Breitman, writer for *The Militant*; Reginald Wilson, managing editor of *Correspondence*; and Rev. Albert B. Cleage, Jr., Contributing editor of *The Illustrative News*. Melissa Singler was chairman. The symposium was sponsored and transcribed by the Friday Night Socialist Forum.

GEORGE BREITMAN: Tonight we are commemorating the 100th anniversary — 100 years and three days — of the Emancipation Proclamation, a convenient date to mark the approximate end of chattel slavery and the approximate beginning of second-class citizenship for the Negro people of the United States. We commemorate that occasion, in line with the subject of tonight's symposium, not by discussing the events of the past, which certainly deserve to be examined in detail, but by turning our attention to the future of the Negro struggle, whose aim is to abolish second-class citizenship and achieve complete equality.

NOTICE none of us three speakers has brought a crystal ball along with him. That's good — it means we'll have to rely on whatever powers of analysis, methods of analysis or theories we possess. The theory that I shall try to apply to tonight's subject is Marxism, the theory of scientific, revolutionary socialism, which we think is the best instrument of analysis yet devised for understanding the world of today and tomorrow, even if some people mishandle it.

In trying to determine the probable future of the Negro struggle in this country, it is best to begin by considering the future of the world and of the country within which the Negro struggle will unfold. What we see there is a great and irrepressible conflict, headed for a showdown during the remaining years of this century. It is a conflict that will decide whether the world will continue to be dominated by capitalist and imperialist exploiters of labor, or whether the working people of all nations and colors will be able to free themselves from such domination, take their destiny into their own hands, and make the transition to a society where the exploitation of man by man will be abolished and replaced by a system

capable of satisfying the needs of mankind, which include equality and peace as well as material abundance.

This irrepressible conflict is the world background and framework for the future of the American Negro struggle, and it is crucial for at least two reasons. One is that it will produce, already has produced, powerful allies of the American Negro all over the world, allies because they have similar objectives and because the enemies of the American Negro are their enemies too. The second reason why the world conflict is relevant to tonight's subject is that no country is immune or will remain immune from the struggle for or against capitalism, not even the United States, the last stronghold of this dying system. Which means that here at home, as the world crisis of capitalism penetrates and deepens here, as the class struggle between the American capitalist and the American worker sharpens and explodes, here too the Negro will be able to find strong and numerous allies and reinforcements to fight together with him against their common enemy and exploiter. It's unfortunate that lack of time permits tonight's speakers only to state points rather than to develop them. But I think I've said enough about the world conflict to show that you cannot avoid thinking and talking about its direct and indirect impact on the Negro struggle here.

Turning now to the Negro struggle itself, I think we should start by noting the important developments in the Negro community during the last few years. I want to list some of these and try to explain what they mean, because I think their continuation and deepening are inevitable during the next period.

TAKE just the last three years: The sit-ins that began Feb. 1, 1960, and quickly spread all over the South, brought a new force onto the scene, the Southern Negro youth, displaying

impatience with the old-style moderate Negro leadership and building their own organizations, like the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, because they are dissatisfied with the old ones. **May, 1960** — organization by Negro trade unionists of the Negro American Labor Council, dedicated to fighting discrimination in industry and unions. **September, 1960** — the big pro-Castro demonstration in Harlem after the government had launched a massive campaign of propaganda against the Cuban revolution. **1960** — the year that the Muslims were transformed from a sect to an important movement because its spokesmen dared say things about racial oppression that most Negroes wanted voiced. The year that small groups around the country began to form in sympathy with Robert F. Williams' call for Negroes to defend themselves. The year that the press began to complain openly all over the North about Negroes rallying to the defense of victims of police brutality, sometimes disarming the cops and putting them to flight.

Then 1961 — the small but symptomatic demonstration at the UN against the murder of Lumumba, in February; the freedom rides in the spring; the filling of Southern jails in the summer; the independent mobilization of the Negro community in the Detroit mayoralty election — I could go on with this list all night, but time is limited, so I cut it off, because even a partial list makes the point that something new is happening.

These new events have produced new organizations and have compelled old ones to act and talk more militantly. Along with them have emerged new moods, new feelings, new demands — if not altogether new, at least they are expressed in new ways, more sharply and unequivocally. And if these new feelings and ideas are not already shared by a majority of the Negro people, they surely are, as Loren Miller said in *The*

Nation, rapidly gaining support and respect among the majority.

What are these sentiments, or the most obvious ones? Anger at anyone who tells the Negro he must go slow, take it easy, or wait for the proper time, which is always in the future and never today. Resentment at any kind of paternalism. Suspicion and mistrust of whites, particularly liberals. Rejection of the liberal perspective of very gradual reform, whoever offers it, white liberals or Negro liberals. Contempt for tokenism and those who are satisfied or deceived by it. Mixed feelings about integration and where it will lead, if anywhere. Impatience with progress through gradual change over an indefinite period, and insistence on Freedom Now. A strong desire for racial solidarity and unity. Determination that the Negro should control his own struggles, that these struggles should be led by Negroes, that their tactics and strategy should be determined by Negroes — all resulting in a pronounced preference for all-Negro organizations. Growing support for bloc voting, that is, voting to elect Negroes to represent Negroes, whether in public office or union posts.

NOW what do these new events and feelings represent, what do they signify for the future? We have given an answer in *The Militant* — that this marks the beginning of the radicalization of the Negro people. I still think that estimate is correct, but tonight I would like to approach the question, and if possible to throw light on it, from another angle.

What it signifies is that the Negro struggle is becoming more — independent. More independent — is that all and what's so remarkable about that? My answer is: It's the key to the whole future; when the labor movement starts out on the road to independence, as the Negroes are doing, *everything* will begin to change. What does Negro independence, complete independence, mean? Maybe you can grasp it better by considering what dependence means, the condition that has prevailed to a greater or lesser degree until now.

Dependence means that the Negroes must wait, wait until they get permission, the green signal, the OK, from other forces — from the employers, from the White House, from the Democratic Party, from Solidarity House, from City Hall. Dependence means that Negroes cannot act freely and in accord with their own interests as they see them; that they must wait for the go-sign before they can seriously launch their own demands, candidates and campaigns; that the Negro movement is and can only be the adjunct and appendage of other movements. In short, dependence has been the curse,

the fatal weakness, the main source of defeats for the Negro struggle.

Dawn of New Day

And now at last, not slowly but rapidly, not tentatively but decisively and irreversibly, this state of dependence is being overcome, to use the Southern movement's wonderfully expressive word. Dependence is being overcome, mental and psychological shackles are being broken and cast aside, and independence is becoming the goal, the hallmark, the method of decisive change all up and down the line. It is the dawn of a new day, so bright that not everyone has been able to adjust his eyes to it yet, a change every bit as momentous as the Emancipation Proclamation. I cannot think of any more favorable development in this country since the start of the cold war, nor one that holds greater promise for the future.

Conservatives are disturbed by this new tendency, and liberals recoil from it in horror with epithets about "racism" and "Jim Crow in reverse." But revolutionary socialists support it and welcome it and hail it because it represents a transformation that spells nothing but good for the Negro people, nothing but good for the real interests of the working class, and nothing but good for the fight for socialism.

And here I cannot help using part of my precious time to inform or remind you that it was only the Socialist Workers Party, out of all political tendencies in this country, that foresaw this new development as long as 15 years ago — not in all of its concrete and complex detail, but in its essential characteristics; not only theoretically foresaw and predicted it, but even then, while it was still in an embryonic stage, even then advocated it and defended it as thoroughly legitimate, progressive and desirable. You will find the evidence for this claim, which is also a test of the relevance and validity of Marxism for radical-minded Negroes, in the new Pioneer Publishers publication which is on sale here tonight. It is entitled "Documents on the Negro Struggle," covering the years 1933 to 1950, and the last two parts, dealing with the Socialist Workers Party's 1948 convention resolution, are the ones dealing with the prospects and potential of the kind of independent Negro movement that is being built today.

NOW whenever the point is made that the immediate future will see the continuation and strengthening of the independent tendency that is already in motion, then certain questions and misgivings arise. I don't mean the objections of conservatives and liberals, which I will disregard at this time. I mean questions that come up in the minds of Negro and white militants, which are pertinent and proper, ques-

tions like these: "Granting that a truly independent Negro movement is necessary, is it enough to insure victory? How far can such a movement go alone?"

In the first place, the independent Negro movement does not have to go it alone. I said earlier it already has allies abroad; even now it has some allies at home. But how far could it go alone, if it had to? I don't think anybody can answer that question exactly, can say that this movement will be able to go just so far, and no farther. This is one of those questions that can be answered only in action, in practice, through the testing of the relation of forces. But it can be said with certainty that an independent Negro movement can go much farther, can achieve much more, can force much greater concessions from the rulers of this country than dependent and semi-dependent movements have won up to now. Our rulers know this just as well as we do; that's why they've employed so much brainwash, bribery and brutality to keep the movement in a dependent status.

Another part of the question was: Can an independent Negro movement, by itself, achieve its goal of complete and unconditional equality? Our answer must be that this is very unlikely. Saying this does not contradict what we have said about the many positive features and the presently underrated potential of an independent movement. It is a conclusion imposed on us by a fact, a cold hard numerical fact, that the Negroes are a small numerical minority of the population — between one-ninth and one-tenth. This creates strategic and tactical problems quite different from those existing in countries like South Africa, where dark-skinned people are an overwhelming majority and where racial oppression can be uprooted through majority rule. In our country Negroes can win equality only if the white population is divided, only if a substantial part of the white population is won to the side of the Negro people as an ally.

THE indicated major ally of the Negro people is the working class, the labor movement. For many reasons: Most Negroes are workers themselves. Negroes and white workers have common needs — decent jobs, housing, schooling, peace, etc. In addition, the white workers, even if most of them don't understand it yet, are themselves injured by the Jim Crow system, and are weakened in the pursuit of their own main objectives by racial divisions and antagonisms. Nobody has to preach to the Negroes about the need and advantages of a labor-Negro alliance. They have been in favor of it for a long time; in fact, no section of the population has been more pro-labor during the last quarter-century than the Negro people.

If a labor-Negro alliance does not exist, or if it exists only in a partial and distorted way, it is not their fault, but the fault of the labor bureaucracy.

The real point is that there is no contradiction whatever, either in logic or in practice, between organizing or reorganizing the Negro movement along independent lines and achieving alliances with other sections of the population, starting with the working class. In fact, many militant Negroes view doing the first job as an indispensable condition for successfully doing the second. They believe — correctly, in my opinion — that first they must unite and shape and orient their own movement, and that only then will they be able to bring about an alliance that will have results — that is, an alliance of equals, where they can be reasonably sure their demands and needs cannot be subordinated by their allies. (When I say they must create their own movement first, I do not mean that they cannot also simultaneously begin the forging of alliances, but that if any temporary conflicts should arise between these two tasks, then priority should be given to the needs of creating the independent Negro movement.)

No Easy Road

So what revolutionary socialists foresee is this: The Negro people, drawn together by their common experiences as an oppressed minority, will build an increasingly independent movement, fighting militantly for equality under their own banner, with their own program and behind their own leaders. They will not build this movement easily, smoothly, without setbacks and defeats, without mistakes — but at least they will be the Negroes' own mistakes, not those foisted on them by their enemies and false friends, and so they will be able to learn from such mistakes and correct them.

One effect of their independent struggles will be to shake up and divide the white population, which will simultaneously be shaken and divided by the many social and political conflicts flowing out of the international crisis and the domestic class struggles that I referred to in the beginning. Thus new alliances will emerge, particularly because the labor movement will not always remain as it is today, dominated and controlled by a narrow-minded and conservative bureaucracy; new oppositional and left-wing formations inside the unions will challenge the Meanys and Reuthers too.

A new alliance will be forged between the independent Negro movement and the leftward moving sections of the labor movement. We cannot supply any exact dates, or predict all the complicated forms this development will take, or foresee all the twists, turns, re-formations and realignments this will entail. But this alliance, we predict, will

assume an advanced political character, breaking with the Democratic Party and building a new party whose goal will be to depose the present ruling class, and it will be the instrument through which the Negro people will win their second emancipation and the white workers their deliverance from capitalism. We place major stress on such a labor-Negro alliance because until it is created the next American revolution cannot take place, and because as soon as it is created basic social change will become a serious point at the very top of the American agenda. All this we socialists not only predict, but advocate and fight for

THINK I have time within my 30-minute limit to squeeze in just one more point, and it is this: It's common knowledge here that revolutionary socialists say the capitalist ruling class will never grant genuine equality to the Negro people. I haven't the time to repeat our reasons for this belief, which would require us to discuss the basic cause of racial oppression, and the ways in which racial oppression is inextricably intertwined with the roots of the profit system in the United States; perhaps these things will come up in the discussion period. Anyhow, that's what we think, and whether you agree or disagree with us, you will have to admit that the position you take on this question necessarily plays a big part in any forecasts you make about the future of the Negro struggle.

We not only think that American capitalism won't grant equality to the Negroes, but we also think that the Negro people, by fighting for equality under this system, will inevitably, through their own experience and not out of some socialist pamphlet, come to the most far-reaching revolutionary conclusions — including the conclusion that capitalism must go if racism is to be eliminated.

The correctness or incorrectness of our analysis of American capitalism will not be settled by debate tonight. It will be proved or disproved through action, action in the streets and in the ballot booths, through struggle, through the struggle of the Negroes and their allies for equality — equality within the capitalist system if it can be won there, or equality outside this system if it can't be won here. We are quite willing to put our analysis to that test, and to join the Negro people in fighting for as much equality as can be achieved under this system. We are confident that the outcome of such a test will be enlightening and beneficial for both the Negro and socialist movements.

* * *

REGINALD WILSON: Thanks, Melissa. I think George has placed our talk tonight in an excellent context. To a certain extent I feel somewhat like

a sandwich where I have two excellent people on each side of me and I'm only going to provide a little bit of filling in the middle. What I intend to do is something quite modest. I only hope to bring out a few points which seem very important to me as they affect the future of the Negro struggle and to elaborate on some points which have already been touched on.

MYSELF am very happy to be speaking here tonight. As you all know, there are many conferences going on all over the country on the very thing we are dealing with now since this is the Emancipation year, I've been told, and we are celebrating, I've also been told. I understand Wayne State University got an endowment of \$10,000 to set up a conference on the centennial and they're inviting Ralph Bunche and Gunnar Myrdal and other outstanding liberals to speak and I don't doubt Marian Anderson will be singing someplace. The *Progressive* magazine for one has dedicated its last month's issue entirely to this question, and except for a few pages it was a complete waste of time. I don't doubt that many other publications are also devoting special issues to the Emancipation.

Some Liberal Views

You are acquainted with all these people, I'm sure, Gunnar Myrdal and Ralph Bunche. Ralph Bunche, you know, is the person who asked Floyd Patterson not to fight Sonny Liston because he'd give a poor image. Gunnar Myrdal, in spite of his excellent contribution to sociology, was the keynote speaker at Howard University commencement last year in which he gave one of the most patronizing talks that I've ever read about, in which he told "you Negroes" what you had to do in order to make it. I don't think it set too well with his audience. There has been a recent social event here in Detroit, which some of you may have attended, given by one of the Negro sororities — a big swinging deal, so I understand. Judge Parsons, the new Negro federal judge, was the keynote speaker and he used his time to denounce the Muslims. Ralph Bunche also used some of his valuable time to denounce the Muslims at the recent NAACP conference in Atlanta, Georgia, last year.

So you can see these meetings are not very important. There is a lot of money going to be spent on them, there is a lot of publicity that's going to result from them, but they're not very important. I think the kind of thing that is being done tonight by what I'd like to call "disreputable people" is what is going to be important. It is the kind of thing where people who are not committed to this society, who are not committed to this ideology, can feel free to think and to criticize and to come to some important conclusions. Let

me read you a couple of sentences that Eric Lincoln wrote. He is the author of an important book on the Muslims and he was speaking of the Muslims when he wrote them, but I think they are important for all of us to consider. He says:

"The Muslims have abandoned the fundamental principles of the American creed as having no practical relevance to them or their conditions of existence. They have substituted in its place a new system of values perceived as more consistent with the realities of their peculiar circumstances. This is a unique departure by an organized group in American history. No other racial or ethnic group has so deliberately and so completely rejected the fundamental premises or values implicit in the American creed. The Black Muslims quite properly identify these values with white Christian culture and they reject not only the symbols of subordination and their subordinated status in a white oriented society but the very principles which, though imperfectly expressed in practice, provide the ideal goals which order our social behavior."

Now I think this kind of thinking and this kind of approach is important for any serious radical group or any serious person who intends to work for fundamental social change. They must reject an ideological commitment to official society and this frees them and gives their analysis of society an air of reality and a sense of purpose.

I WAS struck recently, in the *Michigan Chronicle*, by a number of articles celebrating the election of the various officers of the Booker T. Washington Business Association, which some of you may be familiar with. An entire page of the *Michigan Chronicle* was devoted to articles by Negro business leaders here in Detroit. These were some of the headings which I thought were very interesting: W. A. Lewis says: "1963 looks exciting to me." One of the sentences in his article says: "The probability of a nation-wide crippling strike is greatly minimized by the surprising demonstrated willingness of President Kennedy to invoke the Taft-Hartley act." He also says: "The billions spent in the race for space and other defense mechanisms will cushion our maximum economy." R. Conrad Vaughn, the recently elected president of this group, said: "A banner year is coming up in 1963." He said: "Michigan's economic climate while not perfect is sound . . . Business optimism and public confidence in Michigan is at the highest possible peak."

Crises Loom Ahead

Now serious people can't be bothered with this kind of thinking; nevertheless, this is the kind of thinking which per-

vades to a great extent many of our so-called spokesmen, and by "our," I mean Negroes. And, to go a step further with the analysis that George made, there will not only be crises in society as a whole, but there will be crises among Negroes themselves. Because what is necessary is not just a new leadership, what is necessary is a new vision of what the Negroes' goals are. And before this leadership can be viable they must discuss their goals, they must interact, they must disagree with each other. They must have a new concept of where they are going and they must re-evaluate where they have been, not in the terms of the past, but in the terms of the future, of what they want American society to be.

One of the things that they must recognize is that it is not one class, or one element in society that is going to bring about any revolutionary change. There are going to be clashes and there are going to be battles between segments of society, between classes and elements and groups within the Negro society. The Negroes will find it necessary to take pages from the books of other organizations and use them. They will also find it necessary to reject pages from the books of other organizations and parties as not being a useful guideline for their future direction. They will find it necessary to use a multiplicity of techniques.

Many Negroes, for example, will find it necessary to reject the passive-resistance-non-violent philosophy of Martin Luther King. Not that it is not important in many circumstances or in many activities, but they will find that it is not the only tool, as Dr. King believes, as many people believe who are struggling seriously with the problems the Negro faces. It is only one of many techniques which will be necessary before the Negro wins his freedom. They must also have a vision of their goals. And their goal, as many are beginning to realize who are fighting in this struggle, is not just voter registration and it is not just sitting at a lunch counter, it is not just riding on a bus. These are peripheral things. If all of the lunch counters and all of the buses were integrated and all of the voters were registered, this would still not bring freedom to the Negro in this country. But it is only in the crucible of their own experience that they learn these things. It is this experience which will make their goals meaningful to them. They must learn through their practical experiences in fighting against the society that they face here that they will form an ideology and a philosophy by which they can guide themselves.

THE Negroes will also find it necessary to internationalize their movement. They will recognize that the ties that they have with the African and Asian countries will be some of their

most valuable ties. Not only are they fighting against the corrupt elements of American society but they are also fighting against the influence of the West in the world, in its corrupt manifestation of its imperialistic subordination of the underdeveloped nations. Only by linking themselves with the underdeveloped countries and combining their vision with theirs can Negroes come to any realistic and useful philosophy.

They must recognize that in fighting for their rights and in supporting Negroes for public office, for example, what is important is *what* they are fighting for, not necessarily the people who are the instruments of their fight. To give a concrete example, I would certainly condemn any discriminatory action to remove Adam Clayton Powell from office, simply based on his color, despite the fact that he is a corrupt politician. By the same token, when we support Negroes for office, say, for example, in the recent campaign here in Detroit in which Rev. Cleage supported a number of Negroes for office, we must recognize that we support them for the principle that Negroes must represent their own people, not that these are necessarily the best representatives for the Negro. Certainly all of these candidates could be shaken up in a bag and I wouldn't take my pick of any of them.

A Crucial Point

What is important is the fight, not the instruments of the fight. It is also important that out of the experiences that the Negro will have in America, that he produce his own philosophers and theorists who can speak to him much more closely than an outsider can speak to him, despite the fact that many outsiders have valuable things to say. Now this is a crucial point, because many of us have wondered and asked ourselves what is the place of the white radical or the white sympathizer in the Negro struggle. At a recent meeting held at Rev. Cleage's church, Max Roach, the well-known jazz musician, gave the answer that, "he can give money." I'm sure he was only being partly facetious. Money is a valuable thing; it is also important, however, to recognize that there is more use for sympathizers than simply giving money. Nevertheless, it is also important to recognize that as the Negro movement develops, that the nationalistic aspects of it will cause the rejection of whites, in many respects even sympathetic ones.

This should be understood, it is very important to understand this, because many whites who are sympathetic to the movement and who do attempt to work with Negroes find themselves rejected and wonder why. But if you put this attitude within a historical context and recognize that after 400 years of oppression, you know, to put out your hand now in brotherhood — well,

it's a little late and many Negroes are aware of this and so they reject you on this ground. George mentioned, and very rightly so, the resentment of paternalism on the part of Negroes and it's also important to remember that paternalism takes on many aspects. There is the paternalism of ideology as well as the paternalism of suppression and patronizing and that sort of thing, so that, rejecting white paternalism, you reject it in all of its aspects, even some that may be valuable to you. But, you may incorporate these useful aspects as you grow and come to an awareness of how you can use these ideas as you develop, and as your movement develops.

THE Negroes today in America have real grievances, have real issues that they are fighting for, and this is what gives their movement purpose and this is what gives their struggle its radical and dynamic aspects. They are moving forward, they appear to know where they are going, but their goals will develop as they go along. There are some very important things happening in the world which are affecting the Negro struggle; it is important to recognize the effect of the national and international scene on the Negro struggle. It is important not to feel or to believe that it is an isolated phenomenon which does not have any connection to what the West is doing in the world and what the East is doing in the world, to the threat of the bomb.

It is important to recognize that all of these will have an effect on what happens in this country. It is very possible that the Negroes' pressing for their demands not only may bring about sympathy and understanding and growth in the number of people who will join him in his movement — it may also bring a rejection of his aims. We must recognize that this society has so many corrupt elements in it that it is very possible that the catalyst of the Negro movement in it may cause it to tend further in the direction of fascism. I think this is an important consideration, we must look at the dark side of things as well as the bright side of things. And by that I want you to understand that when we think that the Negro struggle is moving forward, that it is only going in a positive direction and not a negative direction, that it is also necessary to take into consideration the other elements of society which are fighting it — and fighting it very strongly.

I mentioned previously that the Negro has a very real cause that he is fighting for because he can sense and recognize and feel the oppression of this society against him. Many people in America feel this sense of urgency and this sense of purpose and many of them are attempting to join the Negro cause

in order to be in a vital movement. If they are to join with the Negroes they must meet Negroes on their own terms, and not propose terms for them. It is only out of the Negro's own experience that he will form his philosophy and ideology, and all those who will support him and who will help him must find where he is going and go there with him. Thank you.

* * *

REV. ALBERT B. CLEAGE, JR.: It's very difficult to know at just what point to touch "The Future of the Negro Struggle." After the brilliant introduction by the first speaker and the brilliant continuation by the second speaker, just what can you expect from the third speaker? I think we might say that you're moving from the rational and intellectual toward the irrational and non-intellectual in this symposium. The first speaker was almost pure brain, the second speaker had a little feeling about the whole thing, and some sense of identification, although he had an objectivity to which I do not pretend. And now you come to no brain and all feeling. I don't claim to be committed to any ideology, as was the first speaker. I don't have the detachment of the second speaker. I approach the Negro struggle purely upon the basis of an emotional identification.

I DON'T know exactly what the books say about it, nor all the steps that have led to the present. I'm not too sure where we're going nor where we're going to end up. I don't know how many allies we're going to have when we get through, nor even whether we have any allies now. So I suppose I'm closer to the Black Muslim position than to any position that's been enunciated here tonight. That is, I don't have any confidence in the white man at all — liberal, radical or conservative. As a matter of fact, I don't have too much confidence in a whole lot of Negroes. The reason I don't have much confidence in the white man is very simple. He's got a stake in the status quo, and every man I've ever seen fought hard to protect anything he had. I just can't see people voluntarily giving up a privileged position or any of his privileges. I don't say that there aren't such people, people who will just say, "I've been convinced, you've converted me, I believe now and therefore I'm willing to make certain changes."

We had this big conference in Detroit just a few days ago, you read it in the papers. All the religious leaders and everybody got together and they all made big statements. I didn't go. I wasn't busy or anything — those conferences just depress me. But I understand that they issued statements on open occupancy in housing, and that things are going to be a lot better in

the future. Just between us, I don't believe a word of it. I really don't. And I don't believe that all those leaders when they got all through sitting there really believe it either.

I saw the Archbishop was there, and Bishop Emrich and Gov. Romney and all of them. There were Negro leaders there too. One of the Negro leaders who made a big statement there was the man who issued a statement against "racism" last year when we were trying to elect three Negroes to Congress. They were all there, and they all stated that from here on in we have decided that all this race business in housing has got to go. They stated it. I don't believe it, that's all. I don't believe that anybody that's got a house in a white community is going to be more inclined to sell to a Negro now, since the conference, than he was before. I believe that any Negro can get a house in a white community if he really wants to. And any Negro who wants to get and doesn't know a white person to buy it for him, please see me after this meeting. If you've got the money, you can buy anything. But I don't believe that it's going to be done through any change of heart, or any reconditioning of attitudes.

Sense of Identity

I do not identify with these interracial groups that make big pronouncements and issue big statements. I do not identify with Negroes who are so much a part of the white community that they feel that if anything happened to it, they'd die. And that's a whole lot of middle-class, bourgeois Negroes — who are more white than the white community in which they live. They believe that everything about it is good. I can't identify with them. The Negro I can identify with is the Negro down South who'll get on a bus, knowing that at the end of the line he's going to get his head whipped and probably be killed. I can understand that Negro. When he got on the bus he didn't know which white man was going to kill him at the end of the line. *Every* white man he saw could have been the one. When a Negro goes in a store and engages in a sit-in demonstration, I know how *he* feels. When he walks in there and sits down at the counter, he sees white people coming into the store and he doesn't know *which* white man is going to strike him. He doesn't know, and when I see a crowd of white people, I know just how *he* feels.

We're talking about the future of the Negro struggle. I'm not really concerned with what the white man thinks of the struggle. I'm not trying to convince him of anything. I'm not trying to persuade him to believe in what we're struggling for because I don't care whether he believes in it or not. The struggle eventually is to be resolved through the use of power. And whether I can convince him or not is not going to amount to anything in the long run because if I

can't marshal any power, he isn't going to do anything anyway. But I am interested in convincing Negroes because we have a long way to go and we've got to go it together. We have a lot of divisions, we have a lot of misunderstanding. So I waste your time, those of you who aren't Negroes here, trying to convince those Negroes who are here to give an emotional commitment to the Negro struggle.

I AM NOT interested in an intellectual agreement. You can read all the books, but you must believe, believe that the Negro has a destiny, that the Negro has a past of which he need not be ashamed, and that he has a future that he alone can determine. The Negro must become convinced that he is equal beyond a shadow of a doubt. The moment he's convinced then his own self-image is changed. The moment that the Negro really believes, and nobody has to tell him, that he's equal, then he will also believe that he is actually entitled to everything that America has to offer — *everything*, that there is no area of American life where he cannot walk in and demand his rights. And when you start walking in and demanding your rights in Detroit, as well as Albany, Ga., you're just liable to end up back in the street with a very sore head. But we've got to get to that point where we really believe it, all of us. And that is the tremendous task that confronts the Negro militant. He can forget the white militant, forget the white liberal, forget all the whites, because his essential task is to get the mass of Negro people to the point where they really believe, where they are committed to a struggle, because they have a self-image which makes the struggle inevitable and inescapable.

Now, I say that there are certain facts or basic ideas which the Negro must agree upon for this next period of his struggle. First, the Negro must believe in the *fact* of struggle. That may sound like a pretty obvious kind of thing. Doesn't everybody believe in the fact of struggle? By struggle we really mean conflict. We must believe in the fact of conflict! And we must realize that to struggle we must struggle *against* something. Only an insane person struggles against himself. The masses of Negro people do not yet realize that we are struggling against a total white society, a total white civilization. So we've got to know who our enemy is. There's a word that the Negro in the street uses in the poolroom. He says "ofay" when a white man comes in. That means shut up, there's an enemy in our midst. "Ofay" is pig Latin for foe. The "ofay," that's the white man, is the foe. I think, that a recognition of the fact that in most areas of life this is true, has got to be the basis upon which the Negro proceeds to act.

Lot of Baloney

Most white people *are* his enemy. They are organized to prevent him from achieving justice, equality and integration. Many Negroes have not realized this, strange as it may seem. A lot of Negro people have always felt — what is it that the mother tells the little child?: "Give to the world the best you have and the best will come back to you." Now that's a lot of baloney. You can't solve a race problem on that kind of premise. A lot of Negroes have worked on the idea that if they could just make themselves good enough, they would be "accepted." You know by "good enough" what they meant: If they could make themselves "white enough" they would be accepted. And then there's the idea of education, if we could just get enough education, if we could just stop acting Negro, if we could just stop talking Negro, and all of the things identified with Negroes; if we could just stop eating fried chicken, if we could just stop eating watermelon, if we could just stop doing all the things that a Negro does, if we could act just like white people, then the white man would "accept" us! A lot of Negroes still pursue this will-o'-the-wisp through the valley of despair.

I WAS talking to a Negro the other day.

He went out near Seven Mile Road where he heard Negroes were moving. He asked a lady to see a house she had advertised in the paper. She wasn't showing her house to Negroes because she wasn't going to sell to Negroes. He was shocked and hurt. He said that he thought we had progressed beyond all that. He was really hurt by the whole thing. You know, in a way, it was a good thing, because I had tried to talk to him about a whole lot of things, but he just couldn't understand. But he understands now. That lady told him she didn't want no nigger looking at her house. She didn't ask him how long he'd been in school. She didn't ask him how much his suit cost, she didn't ask him who his friends are (he knows all the big Negroes). She didn't ask him who he knew, she just told him, "This house is not for sale to Negroes," that's all, and she slammed the door. That's all, she was through with him.

We've got to learn that we are engaged in a struggle and that we're struggling against something. This idea, "Give to the world the best that you have," and go to school and study hard — all those things are good. Negro children ought to go to school, if we could get some decent schools for them to go to. But I am saying that the race problem is not going to be solved that way, I don't care how much education you get. Ralph Bunche is still a Negro, isn't he? If he gets caught on the wrong street here tonight, he's liable to get beat to death before he can get back to the

ghetto. You do not escape being a Negro, there's not a thing you can do about it. Women can go to the beauty parlor and they can get all that stuff that they're putting on them now, and when they come out they are still Negro. Negro men can go get that, whatever it is they put on them in the barber shop, and come out looking real pretty, but they are *still* Negro!

We've got to understand this! We used to believe that if we acted right, if we got ourselves ready, the white man would give us jobs, decent jobs, promotion, advancement, apprenticeship training, all these things would be open to us, housing, schools, good schools, civil rights, political representation. For many years we really believed that the only reason these things were held back from us was the fact that we weren't ready. That's the kind of confidence we used to have in the great kind, benevolent white man. Many a Negro really felt that if he got to the place that he was ready, the white man would reach down and take his hand and say, "Come on up, brother, now you're ready."

YOU can laugh, you young people in here, but it was your fathers and grandfathers who believed that. That's what they believed, and it is of tremendous importance to the Negro that we are coming to the place where we no longer believe it. That is, the masses of Negroes are coming to the place where they no longer believe it. I'm not talking about Negroes running for political office, and Negroes heading up race organizations. I'm talking about the ordinary Negro up and down the street. He is coming to the place where he realizes that he's a Negro — for good or for evil. And with the changing situation in Africa and the emergence of the new African nations, the Negro is coming to the place where he is no longer ashamed of the fact that he is inescapably Negro.

More and more there are getting to be Negroes who are proud of the fact that they are Negro. They can walk up the street and look at a white man and think, "I'm as good as you are. I've got a history that's as long as yours and longer. In fact, I had a culture and a civilization when you were eating raw meat and living in caves." You can't get 10 Negroes together now but that one of them is on his way back to Africa. There must be four or five of you who are thinking about going back to Africa right here tonight. And this too is important. Negroes used to laugh when you mentioned Africa. They thought it was all jungle and savages running around naked. But today Negroes are thinking about Africa in terms of its possibilities. I've talked to Negroes who've been to Africa and come back, and they say: "For the first time in my life I took a deep breath and I was a free man."

That's the sense of release that a Negro who leaves this white man's civilization gets when he goes home.

New Self Image

This is the new self-image which is emerging from the Negro's growing recognition of the fact that he is engaged in a struggle as an oppressed people, and that his condition of oppression is not an indication of inferiority. For 100 years we have been systematically deprived of opportunity — 100 years of systematic discrimination. No other people anywhere in the world has been scientifically conditioned to accept inferiority as the Negro has for the past 100 years. And no other people anywhere in the world, no matter how long their systematic discrimination existed, has come out as triumphantly as the Negro in terms of his personality. The only healthy individual in America today is the Negro. Everyone else is sick. The Negro is not a victim of the sickness which is American culture and civilization. The Negro is still a whole personality, he can still love and he can still laugh. The average Negro doesn't even care about getting rich. The creativity that's in America, what little there is, is still coming out of the creativity of the Negro. A new Negro is coming into being — out of struggle. I certainly agree with the second speaker when he said that we don't come into this with any preconceived notions. We don't come into it with any philosophy or book. We don't have any idea where it's going or how we're going to develop it. But we have confidence in our ability to evolve a philosophy compatible with the realities of the world in which we live.

THE fact of struggle is one thing, then there is its nature. What kind of struggle are we engaged in? Is it a struggle for somebody to give us something? Is it a struggle to persuade people? We're just getting to the place where we're beginning to understand that it's a power struggle. The college kids down South understood it first, with the sit-in demonstrations, the kneel-ins, the stand-ins, the jam-ins, all of these were evidences of a growing awareness that this whole thing is a matter of power. The Negro for generations would walk by a store and never do anything about it because the man told him he couldn't go in. If he wanted something he'd go around to the back door. The Negro accepted that because he didn't realize that he was engaged in a power struggle. He didn't realize that he had any power, because he didn't have wealth, the courts were not honest and fair with him, the government was against him — *everything* was against him. He couldn't see any area in which he had power. But we have developed a new concept of power,

which is very difficult to deal with and impossible to defeat.

Now, I don't know whether the Negro is going to stick with Martin Luther King and non-violent direct action or not, but certainly it will continue to be one of the important weapons in his arsenal because it is a power against which there is no answer. When a Negro goes into a restaurant and sits in, there is nothing you can do except kill him. And killing him is no answer, it is defeat. There's only one thing you can do, you can frighten him and hope he won't come in. When a Negro gets on a bus and sits down where's he's not supposed to sit, there's no answer, you can ask him to get up, you can draw a gun, you can order him off the bus, but if he sits, there is nothing you can do but kill him. And if you kill him you've lost — your superiority has been destroyed. He has established a moral and spiritual superiority which is invincible.

Want Freedom Now!

And they realize this all through the South. The white man in the South is not just angry, he's confused. He has found no answer to non-violent direct action. What can he do? He doesn't want to talk. He doesn't want to meet. But he's got to stop this thing that's happening, he's got to stop it. How can he stop it? So he meets. But he doesn't want to arrive at any conclusions, so he stops meeting. And then Negroes are back, sitting in again, and kneeling in and wading in. So the white man comes back and talks again, but still there's no answer. There is no answer! We will not accept second-class citizenship in any form. We won't accept any promises of freedom tomorrow. Don't tell us that if we'll be patient, you'll work it out. We want freedom — all of it. Right now, tonight!

That's the nature of the struggle. It has taken on an altogether new character in the last few years. All the old handkerchief-head Negro leaders, who used to stand up and tell you about what they were doing and their organizations were doing, and how much progress they were making — they know they're washed up, they're just as confused as the white man down South because they don't know what to do. They've got to find a course of action that's compatible with the Negro's new conception of himself. They've got to evolve a new course of leadership, so you watch, every Negro organization in America is zig-zagging. It's trying to find out where the people are. The leaders are all tongue-tied, they can't talk any more, they say one sentence and take it back. They don't know where the people are. Martin Luther King can talk to Negroes *anywhere* in America. And another leader who can still talk with them is Malcolm X. You listen to Malcolm X and you go home and say: "I don't believe all that he said." You may not believe it, but all

the time he was talking you kept saying, "That's right, that's right." So the nature of the struggle has changed, we are aware of the fact that there is a struggle, and we are in the course of learning the strategy of struggle. And that's probably the most difficult thing of all, and will take up a good part of the coming century.

The strategy of struggle you can't learn from a book. Marx wrote some kind of strategy of struggle in a book. When they got ready to use it they had to write another book to explain the first one. Now they've got two books or three, or a hundred and three. The strategy of struggle the Negro will have to evolve for himself. And essentially he will evolve it so long as he's not afraid to die. The minute the Negro becomes afraid to die he can give up the whole struggle and go home, and accept second-class citizenship. The whole strength of the Negro position is the growing feeling everywhere that, "I don't care whether I die or not, I want freedom NOW; if I die, then I die trying to get it."

IN THE strategy of our struggle three things are going to be tremendously important in the coming years. To begin with, we must understand the areas of power, that a poor oppressed people have. We don't have all kinds of power. I am going to read that book the chairman mentioned, Robert Williams' book, "Negroes with Guns." I never thought about that kind of power, but I understand it's an interesting book, and I'd like to see what he's got to say. But I see power in terms of three realities. First is political power. Tremendous resources are being used in the South to register Negroes to vote. This is with an awareness of the importance of political power. In the North, periodically, Negroes have a big registration drive, but we are just copying the South. We do not understand or appreciate as yet the tremendous power that lies in our use of the ballot. We have a drive as though someone is going to put a gold star on our foreheads if we can get every Negro registered. The same people that go out to register Negroes to vote will stand up publicly and say, "I do not believe that the Negro ought to use his political power to elect Negroes to political office."

Now obviously, somebody's crazy. Why do you spend dollars, weeks and months, why do you send people from door to door registering Negroes to vote, if you don't want them to vote to put Negroes in office to secure equitable Negro representation? In the South they understand it, the whole movement in the South to register Negroes to vote is articulately defined by the kids who are doing the work, and who are getting beat up: "We are trying to register Negroes so they can vote, and elect Negroes to office and change the polit-

ical climate of the South." Political power! In 1964, the Negro will have an opportunity in the Northern cities to decide whether Kennedy stays in the White House or whether we take him out. That is political power.

Use Political Power

We should be having conferences everywhere, right now. Everywhere Negroes are they ought to be sitting down to decide, are we going to leave Kennedy in office or are we going to take him out? I know some of you say, "Well, he's better than Eisenhower." I don't really care whether he's better than Eisenhower. He's better than Nixon too, but he's still no good for our struggle. If we take him out of office, who do we put in? You say Rockefeller's worse than he is? I don't care if Rockefeller is worse than he is, it would be a tremendous thing to take Kennedy out of office because he refuses to take our struggle seriously. It would have a tremendous effect on Mr. Rockefeller. Yes sir, he would take the oath of office as no president ever took it, because he'd be looking back over his shoulder every minute because he'd know that we were back there watching him. There is a real possibility that we could take Mr. Kennedy out of office, and we ought to let him know with conferences everywhere, all over the country, that we are thinking of taking him out. I mean, let him know that we are really considering it. Everywhere, every time a little group of Negroes meets, we ought to send him a resolution. Let him know we're talking about taking him out of office in '64 unless he does more than he's been doing. He hasn't done anything. We could take him out, in the key cities which control the key states of the North. That's political power. We've got to learn how to use that kind of political power. I doubt that we'll learn how to use it effectively by '64, but we're going to make steps in that direction. Political power is one of the real powers we have that we can use, both North and South.

SECOND, there's economic power. That's our buying power. Rev. Martin Luther King has asked the Negro to be prepared for the use of national "selective patronage" campaigns. This was an inevitable, inescapable call. Negro ministers in every city in the North have been experimenting with the method. We've used it twice here in Detroit; Philadelphia has used it at least 14 times. Every time it has been used, in every city, it has worked. Do you know why? The white man never hates the Negro enough to lose a dollar for his hatred. He never hates quite that much. If the Negro will stop buying, any company will change its employment policies. That's economic power! We could use it on the automobile in-

dustry. If Negroes all over America stopped buying . . . Cadillacs, they wouldn't need that new plant they're talking about building. And the same thing is true in every other area. We are, as Mr. Breitman said, a small percentage of the total population. But, working together, we are a tremendously significant segment of the population.

Third, there is the moral and spiritual power of non-violent resistance to evil. The world has gotten very small, and we're engaged as a nation in a life-and-death struggle that involves all of the people of the world. Every time America finds it necessary to use violence to keep the Negro in "his place," it's flashed all over the world. We don't care if they beat us to death, so long as everybody in the world knows about it.

We have a disgraceful situation here in Detroit with the public schools. If the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People would call all of the Negro children out of the Detroit schools, until Superintendent Brownell and the Detroit Board of Education did something to equalize education, the first day there would be a little note about it in the Detroit papers — they'd hope that if they kept quiet it would go away; the second day there would be a big article in the *New York Times*; the third day it would be in every newspaper in America; and the fourth day it would be a front page story all over the world. And if we kept them out, what could they do? Put the parents in jail? Put the children in jail? What could they do? They would be forced to meet the problem — equalize education, cut out segregated education in Detroit, do something about overcrowding. In this way we can utilize a power for which there is no answer. We can dramatize the inequalities we suffer. We can let the world know.

Let the World Know

Kennedy doesn't want the world to know. That's why he was messing around down there in Mississippi with Barnett. There's some question about whether or not there wasn't some kind of illegal, criminal conspiracy between Kennedy and Barnett in Mississippi. Either that or the *Look* magazine editors ought to be put in jail. We have an opportunity to dramatize all of the inequalities we suffer, to let everybody in the world know. Then, when America goes to the United Nations and tries to stand on that self-righteous, free-world platform and talk about what we want for the free world, the other nations look at us and laugh, because they know what's happening to the Negro here. We can do that, we can do it right here in the city of Detroit. Any city, any town, any community. And that is one of the tremendous sources of power that we have and we must learn how to utilize it fully. It's getting so that the peoples of the world are closer and closer. It

used to take maybe two or three days for news to get out. By this time next year it may take a half hour to get news all over the world. That's a tremendous complex of powers, our political strength, our economic strength, and the moral and spiritual strength of dramatizing the inequalities and injustices that we suffer.

JUST in case you misunderstood me, all of this has got to be done under Negro leadership. Any white people who want to go along and help, good. But don't stand in the way, and don't try to give orders, like Walter Reuther. Just help. Like Max Roach said, give plenty of money, and let us know that you believe in what we're doing. But don't get in the way, and don't try to give orders. Don't try to tell us how to do it. And you're not going to like a lot of the things we have to do. When we embarrass America, seeking our rights, we will embarrass you, I don't care how radical you are. You'll say, "Aah, they shouldn't have done it that way." That way? We're going to do it that way, and every other way, and we're going to keep on doing it that way, and if you don't like it, just remember that we're going to do it again and again and again, until we're free and a black man can live in America with dignity and pride.

* * *

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

(One of the questions asked of Rev. Cleage by the first speaker from the floor concerned the attitude of the Negro movement toward the struggle for peace.)

REV. CLEAGE: Personally I am opposed to war, any kind of war. I am especially opposed to atomic war which threatens the very existence of civilization and mankind. I think that most Negro people are opposed to war. I think that Negro people are liberal in the sense that their oppression has led them to have an awareness of social problems and an identification with suffering people everywhere. The immediate problem that the Negro faces takes precedence over every other problem. The Negro is opposed to war, but I don't think that the Negro is going to subordinate his struggle for first class citizenship, for becoming what he hopes to become, to the war against war. I was in San Francisco during the second world war when all the radicals in California were yelling for the Negro to keep quiet and wait until the war was over, that it was no time to be talking about Negro rights during a war. I didn't believe it then and I don't believe it now. I think the time to talk about Negro rights is now, and if they drop the bomb while we're talking, my

last hope will be that we're integrated in the blast.

Our struggle is not a struggle which negates the struggle against war. I think, in a sense, you recognize the fact that your struggle against war puts you on the side of our struggle against oppression. And, in a sense, our struggle against oppression puts us on the side of those who struggle against war. But our struggle against oppression is paramount. If there is any world left, we want to be free in it.

(A speaker who identified himself as a Black Nationalist, opposing integration and favoring separation, asked what the small socialist movement had to offer black people, and why Debs Hall has pictures on the wall only of white men — Marx, Trotsky, Debs.)

GEORGE BREITMAN: The question was about the relation between the independent Negro movement and the revolutionary socialist movement. First, however, I'd like to comment on Rev. Cleage's remark that during the war all the radical groups he heard in San Francisco advised the Negroes to subordinate their struggle to the war effort. I want to say that Rev. Cleage evidently didn't hear what the Socialist Workers Party had to say during World War II. Because the Socialist Workers Party was that section of the radical movement which insisted that the Negro struggle should not be subordinated, and which fought against the Jim Crow system and made the fight against it a paramount issue from the beginning to the end of the war.

The question was about the relations between the two movements and what the socialist movement has to offer to the Negro people. Now, certainly in terms of numbers, which is the way the question was posed, the revolutionary socialist movement is much smaller today than the Negro movement. But what is involved is more than numbers, what's involved is a question of ideas, of program, of a program that is concerned with the relation of forces between Negroes and other sections of the population. Socialists are opposed to the Jim Crow system for the same reasons that Negro people are opposed to it and for other reasons, not only because it oppresses Negroes but also because it hurts white workers. We don't consider the development of an independent, militant, mass Negro organization as being in contradiction with that movement also working with whatever allies are available . . .

(Interruption by questioner, who asked why black people should ally themselves with white workers when the latter are prejudiced.)

There is no intention whatever on our part to deny that a majority of the white people in this country are prejudiced. If

the situation as it is now were to continue forever, then our program would have no application. But we believe that things change, and that the thinking of the white workers will change too. Not today, not tomorrow completely, but we think they will respond to certain needs of their own, to certain pressures, international and national pressures, including those that result from the action of an independent Negro movement. That is one of the things we are trying to do — to help educate white workers to understand that their real interests are similar to those of the Negro people.

Now there are two main reasons why white workers are prejudiced. One is that they do have certain advantages from the Jim Crow system; it gives them certain privileges. But these privileges and advantages are nowhere near as great as they think they are, and in addition the Jim Crow system affects them adversely too. It distracts them from the struggle for their real objectives, aims and interests; the divisions between white and Negro workers hurt them both as members of the working class. The other reason why white workers are prejudiced is that they too have been brainwashed for a long time. They too have been subjected to the racist propaganda of the ruling class. We don't think that this propaganda is always going to be effective. We think that the workers will be able to shake off its effects in the course of fighting for their own needs. The Negro people have been brainwashed for centuries, no group has been brainwashed for a longer time. Yet we see now that they have been able to throw off the effects of this brainwashing, declare their independence and start off on a new road. If Negroes can do it, if Negroes can overcome the pernicious effects of brainwashing, then we say it's also possible for white workers to do it.

Therefore, when we talk about the future, we are not talking about the working class as it is today, with the kind of leaders it has today; we expect that the working class will change, as a result of its own experience and the pressure of its own needs. And the kind of alliance we predict for the future, and advocate and fight for, is not an alliance between prejudiced white workers and Negroes, but of Negroes with those white workers who have shaken off the ideas of the ruling class, including the racist prejudices that the ruling class persistently fosters and inculcates, and who recognize the necessity of working together with the Negro people for their common aims.

The question was also asked about the hall here, why do we put up pictures of white people? We put up pictures of these working class leaders because of the program they represent, not because of their race, and we will put up the pictures of other leaders who represent the program which we are trying to convince the American people

will lead them to liberation, equality and peace.

(A question about the usefulness of electing non-radical Negroes to office was asked by a member of the audience who also pointed out that he had served in the armed forces under a Negro officer who was no better than white officers.)

REV. CLEAGE: I gather the question had to do with my supporting middle-class Negroes for office. And whether or not they are actually going to stand for any basic change, is that it? *(Interruption by questioner to explain.)* At this point I'm not really concerned about whether a Negro who runs for Congress is going to be more socialistic than Dingell in the 15th Congressional District. All I want is Negro representation in the 15th Congressional District that's going to fight for the things that the Negroes who live in the 15th Congressional District want. I want a Negro Congressman who is going to Congress and is going to fight for those things that the people in his district really want, and who's going to represent them. So I wouldn't expect that we were going to elect someone who was a revolutionary out of the 15th District to go to Congress. Because Negroes are not revolutionary in the traditional sense. We are merely concerned with oppression, and with doing away with oppression, and getting first-class citizenship. We want to send a man to Washington from the 15th Congressional District who's going to make that possible — as far as it is within his power. We want to increase the total number of Negroes in Congress, so that when issues come up we have representation. I realize from your point of view that this certainly is not an ideal situation . . . *(Interruption by questioner again.)*

Oh, I get your point, you mean there are some sick Negroes. Yes, that's true. I know any number of Negroes who are sick, who have middle class values of all kinds, who just do not identify with the Negro struggle, who are sick from top to bottom. If you had to serve under one in the Army, I sympathize with you. I sympathize, not because he was a Negro, because if you hadn't had a sick Negro, you'd have had a sick white man. So you were going to have somebody sick over you anyway. I am still glad that you had a Negro.

(A three-way discussion took place on the floor between a Negro liberal, a Black Nationalist and a white trade unionist on the relations between whites and Negroes.)

REGINALD WILSON: It's important to remember what the topic of the discussion was; it was the future of the Negro struggle. And in talking about the future of the Negro struggle, some of us projected the fact that nationalism among Negroes will rise, and rejection

of whites will increase. Now, you don't have to like this and you don't have to approve of it, it will be a necessary part of the Negro seeing himself as a united and solid people. This is one of those aspects that are coming out, it's coming out in the things that have been said from the floor, it's coming out in the things that all nationalist and radical Negroes are projecting. This is going to be part of it — as a projection of the future of the Negro struggle. This is what the discussion is about. And many times in talking about people like Walter Bergman, people who are fine, dedicated people, we begin to lose sight of the total picture.

James Baldwin had an interview with Elijah Muhammad a few weeks ago and he wrote it up in a long article in the *New Yorker* magazine and one of the things he said in this article, among many other things, was that, well, I love a very few white people who are my friends and I think they love me and I may have to lay down my life for them — and isn't love the most important thing? This is a very moving kind of a statement, this is a personal choice that he will have to make for himself, this is what he has to decide about his relationships to these people.

But in terms of what the Negro as a mass is doing, he has had 400 years of rejection and oppression. It is understandable that he will reject whites, even well-meaning and sympathetic whites. We must recognize this as part of the future of the Negro struggle. This is the thing you have to do, put it in its proper context. You don't have to accept it as being a nice or a good thing, or what nice people are going to do. This is what is happening and it is happening all over. You find the Muslims rejecting the totality of white society, and they are correct in their rejection. You know, Negroes were blamed for the defeat of the Populist movement, they were blamed for the fact that workers are not organized in the South now, that they do not have labor unions in many places in the South. And they have been blamed for many other things in American society that have caused a division of solidarity between white and black. And so they are tired of it. They don't want any of this any more. And they say: "We will make our own fight, our own movement, and if the whites want to help on the periphery, that is their own business."

* * *

REV. CLEAGE: I share your hope for a world in which there is neither black nor white. In religion we have two concepts. One is eschatology, which has to do with the end, or latter days. You read in the Old Testament that the time will come when the lion and the lamb will lie down together and everything will be beautiful and perfect. This idea was always prevalent in both Judaism and

Christianity, but it never did away with the prophetic utterance which had to do with the immediate moment. When Isaiah and Amos spoke, they spoke not of this latter day, when the lion and the lamb would lie together in peace and friendship, but of the immediate problems of the specific day.

I think we face here this kind of dilemma. Essentially I would feel sympathetic to both positions which have been enunciated here tonight. Certainly I accept the position of the gentleman who believes in everything black and woolly, and wants pictures of black men on the walls. We as Negroes need all the symbols. We should send to New York and get some of the pictures to put up here. We need them! But at the same time I understand the feeling that there are situations in which there are white people who are profoundly sympathetic, who make profound sacrifices for Negroes, and who seem to be completely out of the mainstream of the white man's course of action. Certainly there must eventually come a day when we can all put our arms around each other in one happy world, in which there is neither black nor white, yellow nor red. That's the kind of world we want.

But we can't, as Negroes, wait until this great gettin'-up mornin' when there is no black and no white, when there is no yellow and no red. We can't wait for that morning to fight for our freedom. We need the immediate goal of black men fighting together for black men's freedom, for all black men's freedom. We have to have that now. It is a

temporary state of affairs. We hope that it will not be the ultimate end, a world where there is black over here and white over here. But at this point it is inescapable because the Negro has been oppressed, subjected to all kinds of brainwashing and misuse. So if the Negro is to live with pride, he must stand up and fight and put aside the sentimental picture of a world which will some day come, and fight the problems which exist today.

Eschatology is good. We all want that kind of world. But it doesn't exist today and the dream only confuses us. It only confuses the Negro to try to draw a line and every time he sees a white man to say, "Is this a good one or is this a bad one?" And then think of the vast array of choices in between: "How good is he and how bad is he? Is he all bad or is he just a little bit bad? At what point would he not go all the way with the Negro?" The old parable that Negroes have always used is that every white man gets off the train at some point. It's just a question of what station. A whole lot of them get off when you ask if they would want their sister to marry a Negro. Some don't get off even there. But the Negro with a skeptical air says, "Well, even if he didn't get off that station, which is way down the line, there is a point at which he will get off." So we realize that we are fighting a struggle and that in this struggle there are certain immediate things that have to be accomplished — a new self-image, a strategy of struggle, a unity of purpose. In this we'll hurt some friends, and for this we apologize.

Bulletin of Marxist Studies

Documents

on the

NEGRO STRUGGLE

Including the texts of discussions with Leon Trotsky, 1933 and 1939, and Socialist Workers Party convention resolutions, 1939 and 1948.

(Price: 65 Cents)

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

The Political Testament of Patrice Lumumba



By Karolyn Kerry

CONGO, MY COUNTRY by Patrice Lumumba, with a foreword by Colin Legum, Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1962. 195 pp. \$5.95.

In his foreword, entitled: The Life and Death of Patrice Lumumba, Colin Legum is constrained to raise some pertinent questions regarding the circumstances under which this book was published some years after the manuscript had been submitted to the publishers.

He notes in his opening paragraph that: "Nothing that touches the name of Patrice Lumumba is entirely free from controversy. When this book, which was written in 1956-57, was published posthumously in Belgium last year, it raised a fresh outcry both from those who regarded him as a martyred hero and from those who regarded him as an evil incarnate. Was it authentic? With what motive did the publishers produce it four years after it had been sent to them? Why was publication held up in the first place? Had the manuscript been 'doctored' in any way?"

On the basis of the evidence Legum is convinced that it is authentic; that the manuscript represents a progressive development of Lumumba's views which underwent considerable change during and especially after it had been written. The internal evidence would seem to confirm Legum's conclusion.

Under the explosive impact of the revolutionary development in the Congo, Lumumba rapidly discarded the illusory phantom of "gradualism," in which the Congolese would "eventually" acquire their freedom and independence from Belgian colonial rule. In his 1956 program, Lumumba advocated the establishment of a Belgo-Congolese Community under Belgium "tutelage," with a limited form of democracy.

The Belgian colonialists refused to grant the most moderate proposals for a gradual reform until the mounting pressure of a surging mass movement compelled them to surrender far more than the Lumumba program had originally proposed. It is a tribute to his integrity that Lumumba's thinking kept pace with the dynamic of the revolu-

tionary development. More than any other, he best expressed the aspirations of the Congolese people, to throw off the shackles of colonial oppression.

"By the middle of 1960," Legum remarks, "Lumumba's strength was such that, try as they would, neither his Congolese opponents nor the Belgians could resist his claim to become the first Congolese Prime Minister." Lumumba earned the bitter enmity of the Belgian colonialists by his determination to resist the divisive tactics of the imperialist powers who sought to retain their control by conspiring to promote separatist movements in Kantanga and elsewhere.

On the basis of his experience in the struggle for national independence and national unity, Lumumba quickly realized that even the most elementary democratic reforms could not be achieved without going far beyond his original program. He did not hesitate to jettison the reformist views put forward in this book — which is all to his credit and testimony to the fact that history today has placed on the agenda tasks which cry out for revolutionary solutions.

Because he remained true to the interests of his people Lumumba was marked for destruction. Legum points out that "Lumumba has an electrifying effect on the Congolese; he was capable of arousing enthusiasm in a way that could not be matched by any other leader in the Congo. That was his strength. The strength of his opponents depended on their ability to neutralize him or, if necessary, to destroy him." Lumumba could not be silenced, so . . . he was murdered.

The treacherous role of the United Nations played no small part in facilitating this dastardly act, and to this day, although a UN resolution, Feb. 1961, specifically instructed the United Nations officials to apprehend and punish the murderers, nothing has been done.

The great distance traveled by Lumumba between the writing of this manuscript and his death can best be illustrated by his political testament,

written shortly before he was murdered, in the form of a letter to his wife: My Dear Wife:

I am writing these words not knowing whether they will reach you, when they will reach you, whether I shall still be alive when you read them. All through my struggle for the independence of my country, I have never doubted for a single instant the final triumph of the sacred cause to which my companions and I have devoted all our lives. But what we wished for our country, its right to an honourable life, to unstained dignity, to independence without restrictions, was never desired by the Belgian imperialists and their Western allies, who found direct and indirect support, both deliberate and unintentional, amongst certain high officials of the United Nations, that organisation in which we placed all our trust when we called on its assistance.

They have corrupted some of our compatriots and bribed others. They have helped to distort the truth and bring our independence to dishonour. How could I speak otherwise? Dead or alive, free or in prison by order of the imperialists, it is not I myself who count. It is the Congo, it is our poor people for whom independence has been transformed into a cage from beyond whose confines the outside world looks on us, sometimes with kindly sympathy, but at other times with joy and pleasure. But my faith will remain unshakable. I know and I feel in my heart that sooner or later my people will rid themselves of all their enemies, both internal and external, and that they will rise as one man to say No to the degradation and shame of colonialism, and regain their dignity in the clear light of the sun.

We are not alone. Africa, Asia and the free liberated people from all corners of the world will always be found at the side of the millions of Congolese who will not abandon the struggle until the day when there are no longer any colonialists and their mercenaries in our country. As to my children, whom I leave and whom I may never see again,

I should like them to be told that it is for them, as it is for every Congolese, to accomplish the sacred task of reconstructing our independence and our sovereignty: for without dignity there is no liberty, without justice there is no dignity, and without independence there are no free men.

Neither brutality, nor cruelty nor torture will ever bring me to ask for mercy, for I prefer to die with my head unbowed, my faith unshakable and with profound trust in the destiny of my country, rather than live under subjection and disregarding sacred principles.

Life in Stalin's Prison Camps

ONE DAY IN THE LIFE OF IVAN DENISOVICH by Alexander Solzhenitsyn. 160 pp., \$3.95. Published by E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1963.

This novel is the most recent literary and political sensation in Soviet literature. Completed almost two years ago, the manuscript was first rejected by several Soviet editors before the liberal wing of the Soviet writers took it up. They managed to get the Central Committee to review the question of its publication and finally Premier Khrushchev personally authorized it to be published without changes. The official favor is reflected by the government publicity campaign. *Moscow News* printed it in weekly installments and *Soviet Literature* for February, 1963 has also published it.

Solzhenitsyn himself spent the years 1945-1953 in a Stalinist concentration camp and although the book is in no sense a diary, it is obviously based on personal experience. In spite of the fact that it describes only one day in the three thousand six hundred and fifty-three days of Ivan Denisovich's prison term, it is an artistic, compressed, analytic commentary on Soviet life generally during Stalin's reign. In keeping with its subject matter it is terse and to the point.

Ivan Denisovich Stukhov is an ordinary Russian soldier who served in the Red Army, was captured by Germans, later escaped and made his way back to his own lines. Instead of being welcomed as a hero, Ivan is regarded with suspicion as a German agent and arrested for treason. Afraid of being shot if he protests his innocence, Ivan "confesses" to the charge and is sentenced to ten years in a political prison in the frozen wasteland of Siberia.

Since this is a camp for political prisoners (*z.e.k.'s*) here at least one can talk against the regime. However this is small recompense for the incredibly hard life the prisoners are

History will one day have its say, but it will not be the history taught in Brussels, Paris, Washington or in the United Nations, but the history which will be taught in the countries freed from imperialism and its puppets. Africa will write her own history, and to the north and south of the Sahara, it will be a glorious and dignified history.

Do not weep for me, my dear wife. I know that my country, which is suffering so much, will know how to defend its independence and its liberty. Long live the Congo! Long live Africa!

Patrice

Self-Defense Doctrine

By Jack Arnold

NEGROES WITH GUNS by Robert F. Williams, edited by Marc Schleifer with prologues by Martin Luther King and Truman Nelson. Marzani and Munsell, Inc. New York. 1962. 128 pp. \$1.95.

PEOPLE WITH STRENGTH — THE STORY OF MONROE, N. C. by Truman Nelson. Published by the Committee To Aid The Monroe Defendants, 168 West 23rd Street, NY. 37 pp. \$35.

Taken together, the book by Williams and the pamphlet by Truman Nelson, represent a thorough-going presentation of the history of Negro struggle against segregation in Monroe, N.C. The extensive distortion of Monroe events, as reported in the commercial press and by all too many proponents of pacifist approaches to the segregation problem, make the publishing of these two pieces of literature welcome. An even greater need is served because the book and the pamphlet present what must ultimately prove to be the most tenable approach to desegregation, the self defense program of Robert F. Williams.

The doctrine of self defense that Williams and Nelson so effectively defend is not at all a new doctrine. It is the self-same doctrine that appears in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. In the schools of this country, at least those I attended, we were taught that the right to bear arms was provided for such innocuous purposes as hunting. But the reality of the matter is that the left wing of the American Revolutionists, who forced this doctrine into the constitution, understood full well that when governments fail to protect the rights of the people, the people themselves must be prepared to defend their rights, through self defense if necessary, even carrying that defense as far as the overthrow of oppressive state powers.

People would buy these so-called carpets because real ones in state stores sold for thousands.

Inside the camp too there was a terrible shortage of tools and equipment at the construction site. A careful count was kept of every item. And more often than not the prisoners were forced to scrounge the materials they needed for their jobs.

Anyone interested in the complex and contradictory nature of the Soviet Union should read this novel. It is the perfect antidote to the Orwellian disease of Stalinophobia. This is not a "1984" horror tale but reality. And while the reality was hard and unpleasant, there was still a power and tenacity in the workers that the oppression could not crush.

Build Your Library

BOOKS — PAMPHLETS

by **Leon Trotsky**

Diary in Exile: 1935	4.00
The Third International After Lenin (cloth)	4.00
(paper)	2.50
First Five Years of the Communist International	
Vol. 1 (cloth)	3.50
Vol. 2 (paper)	3.00
Stalin's Frame-Up System and the Moscow Trials	1.00
The Living Thoughts of Karl Marx	.75
The New Course	.50
The Chinese Revolution — Problems and Perspectives (Bulletin of Marxist Studies No. 1)	.35
Marxism in the U.S.	.35
Their Morals and Ours	.25
Stalinism and Bolshevism	.20
The Russian Revolution (Copenhagen speech)	.15
My Life	2.45
Fascism — What It is — How to Fight It	.25
I Stake My Life (Speech on the Moscow Trials)	.15
Stalin (A biography) (cloth)	2.25
(paper)	1.95
The History of the Russian Revolution	12.50
Literature and Revolution	2.98
Permanent Revolution and Results and Prospects	2.50
Problems of the Chinese Revolution	7.50
Whither France	1.95
Where Is Britain Going	1.50
Trade Unions in Epoch of Imperialist Decay	.15
The Stalin School of Falsification	3.00
Terrorism & Communism: Reply to Karl Kautsky	1.95
In Defense of October	.20
The Only Road	.65

CUBAN REVOLUTION

By *Joseph Hansen*

Trotskyism and the Cuban Revolution	.15
In Defense of the Cuban Revolution	.25
Theory of the Cuban Revolution	.25
Truth About Cuba: An Answer to T. Draper	.25
* * *	
How Cuba Uprooted Race Discrimination by H. Ring	.15
The Second Declaration of Havana: Cuba's Answer to the OAS (Castro)	.25
The Revolution Must Be School of Unfettered Thought by Fidel Castro	.15
Guerilla Warfare by Che Guevar	3.50
At Puenta Del Este by Che Guevara	.25
Cuba's Agrarian Reform by Fidel Castro	.25
Speech to the Women by Fidel Castro	.35

NEGRO STRUGGLE

Anti-Negro Prejudice: When it Began, How it Will End. by George Breitman	.10
Negroes on the March by Daniel Guerin	.50
Socialist Workers Party Resolutions: Class Struggle Road to Negro Equality	.25
Negroes With Guns by Robert Williams	1.95
People With Strength: The Story of Monroe, N. C. by Truman Nelson	.35
Monroe, N. C. . . . Turning Point in American History: Speeches by Conrad J. Lynn	.25
Documents on Negro Struggle: Discussions with Trotsky, Reports and Resolutions — 1933-1950	.65

BOOKS — PAMPHLETS

by **James P. Cannon**

NEW

The First Ten Years of American Communism 6.00

The History of American Trotskyism (cloth)	2.75
(paper)	2.00
The Struggle for a Proletarian Party (cloth)	2.75
Socialism on Trial	.50
America's Road to Socialism	.35
The Road to Peace	.25
Defense Policy in the Minneapolis Trial	.25
Socialism and Democracy	.15
American Stalinism and Anti-Stalinism	.15
The End of the Comintern (The Manifesto of the Fourth International — 1943)	.15
The Russian Revolution (25th anniversary address — 1942)	.10
The Coming American Revolution	.10
To the Memory of the Old Man (Leon Trotsky Memorial Address)	.10
The Workers and the Second World War (1942)	.10
Notebook of an Agitator (cloth)	4.00
(paper)	2.50

PIONEER POCKET LIBRARY

The Death Agony of Capitalism (Transitional Program) by Leon Trotsky	.25
The Suppressed Testament of Lenin by Leon Trotsky	.25
The Kirov Assassination by Leon Trotsky	.25
The Chinese Communist Party and the Hungarian Revolution by Michael Banda	.25
The Long View of History by William F. Warde	.35

(For complete listing of Pioneer Publications send for free catalogue)

Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.