

SPARTACIST

NUMBER 3

JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1965

10 CENTS

HARLEM RIOT AND AFTER

For months last spring and early summer the New York press pounded away, day in and day out, in an unprecedented campaign of press terror against the Negro people and the Negro freedom movement. SPARTACIST viewed this campaign as the deliberate and conscious preparation of white opinion to accept an all-out police attack on the developing struggle for Negro freedom. Over the preceding months this struggle had risen to new heights in the North with the entry of thousands—and even hundreds of thousands in the case of the school boycotts—of the oppressed black people of the ghettos into militant actions to change the basic conditions of their lives: jobs, housing, and schools. The future development of the movement along such lines of militant mass struggle was intolerable for those who rule this country, for at this juncture stagnating American capitalism, even in a temporary spurt of prosperity, cannot raise 10 per cent of the total population of the country to even that standard of living of the rest of the working class. On the contrary, the ruling class faces the long-term necessity of cutting back the living standards of all workers. For this reason, any sustained mass struggle by the Negro people for fundamental reforms poses, at bottom, a threat to the capitalist system itself and must run headlong into the state apparatus.

Spartacist Predicted

On this basis SPARTACIST stated early in July "... the bourgeois state now prepares to fight openly in the streets through its police arm against the resurgence of the struggle." This prediction was strikingly confirmed on July 18 and the days that followed as wave after wave of armed, specially trained elite police—the Tactical Patrol Force—swept through Harlem indiscriminately beating and terrorizing all who crossed their paths, when the mood of the ghetto made it clear that the killing of 15-year-old James Powell by an off-duty police officer would not go unprotested.

Police Started It

While the shooting of Powell itself was probably a purely spontaneous trigger action on the part of a brutal racist cop, the following protest provided the opportunity the city powers had been waiting for to provoke a

(Continued on Page 4)

FREEDOM FOR CUBAN TROTSKYISTS!

[The author of this article was one of several supporters of the SPARTACIST who participated in the trip to Cuba last summer by eighty-four American students, in defiance of a State Department ban on travel to Cuba. The group spent two months making an extensive tour of the country, investigating the results of five years of the Cuban Revolution. During this time the author had lengthy interviews with Leon Ferrera, son of the imprisoned leader of the Cuban Trotskyists.]

New repressive acts have been undertaken by the Cuban government against the Cuban Trotskyists. These moves represent a qualitative change in the attitude of the Cuban leadership towards this working-class political tendency that unconditionally supports the Revolution, but is critical of certain fundamental policies and positions of the leadership.

Five members of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (POR), Cuban section of that wing of the Fourth International led by Juan Posadas, have been tried in secret and sentenced to prison with terms up to nine years. Among the five was the General Secretary and editor of their newspaper, Idalberto Ferrera.

Andres Alfonso

The arrests began in November, 1963, when Andrés Alfonso, a mechanic at the Interprovincial Bus Repair Shop, was arbitrarily ordered arrested by the administrator of the shop, Manuel Yero, after distributing copies of *Voz Proletaria* among his fellow workers. (The Trotskyists' newspaper consisted of several mimeographed pages, all they have been allowed to print since the seizure of their printing presses in May, 1961, and the smashing of the type of a Spanish edition of L. Trotsky's *Permanent Revolution*.) Comrade Andrés

(Continued on Page 12)

SPARTACIST

—published bimonthly by supporters of the Revolutionary Tendency expelled from the Socialist Workers Party.

EDITOR: James Robertson

West Coast EDITOR: Geoffrey White

Subscription: 50¢ yearly. Bundle rates for 10 or more copies. Main address: Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N. Y. 10001. Telephone: UN 6-3093. Western address: P.O. Box 852, Berkeley, Calif. 94071. Telephone: TH 8-7369. Midwest address: P.O. Box 9295, Chicago, Ill. 60690. Telephone: 772-8817.

Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent an editorial viewpoint.

Number 3



Jan.-Feb. 1965

YPSL Tendency Joins Spartacists:

Over Thanksgiving weekend the National Committee of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation, meeting in Chicago, called upon the suspended national Young Peoples Socialist League to recognize its subordination to the SP as the condition for lifting the suspension. In response the YPSL National Executive Committee voted to dissolve the YPSL organization. The following is a declaration by that tendency in YPSL which, over the past several years, has fought its way toward a revolutionary and internationalist perspective.

ON THE DISSOLUTION OF YPSL

Statement by the YPSL Revolutionary Tendency

The dissolution of the youth group of the American social-democracy can only be welcomed by all those who desire to make a socialist revolution in this country. At the same time, this move by itself is far from enough—it is only the first step along the long and difficult path of rebuilding a revolutionary party; rooting this party in the working class; relating this party to the day-to-day struggles of the class; and leading the working class, through the medium of a transitional program, to the overthrow of capitalism and the construction of the socialist order.

Where We Stand

Those of us who were drawn to the socialist movement through participation in the Young Peoples Socialist League have had to grapple with the numerous theoretical questions which face every serious socialist, questions which, while admitting of no easy answers, must be answered if we are to live and grow. In particular we have had to face those questions which were posed in their sharpest expression by the October Revolution, around which the various currents within the socialist movement define themselves to this day. The most outstanding of these questions, as is only natural, are those which are identified with the names of the makers of that revolution, Lenin and Trotsky. Specifically, we have considered and come to agree with

Lenin's and Trotsky's conception of the nature and role of the revolutionary party, and with their conception of the strategy and tactics which that party must follow in order to be successful. This, above everything else, was the question which differentiated us from every other current within the YPSL, and is the basic consideration in determining the course which our tendency has decided to take upon the dissolution of the YPSL.

Behind the YPSL Break-up

In coming to this position, which we did not do lightly nor without a thorough assessment of the other alternatives, we have had to break with a number of attitudes and political positions which, until recently, bound the entire YPSL together. We refer, for instance, to a deepgoing nationalism, which expressed itself in a lack of concern for building an international movement and a fear of domestic reaction which gave impetus to semi-pacifist and, finally, outright pro-imperialist politics; cynicism and skepticism about the possibility of making a revolution, and therefore skepticism about the necessity of ourselves—the revolutionary Marxists—having any vital role to play in immediate struggles, which led to a shameful deferment in the mass movements to the existing leaderships (which are now revealing themselves as increasingly reactionary and braking forces within those movements); a desire for respectability, which led us to try to build “revolutionary cadres” in a common political organization with Norman Thomas and Michael Harrington; and, finally, a corroding contempt for theory, which led us to pay lip-service to Marxism and purely literary homage to Lenin and Trotsky while ignoring the essential class content of the politics of Marxism, Leninism, and Trotskyism.

The resulting political structure, which did not even pretend to be a revolutionary organization, showed its instability even as a reformist organization, as domestic and international events rent apart not only the organization but even its internal factional groupings. “Only that which is constructed on intransigent revolutionary ideas neither crumbles nor falls into dust.” In the course of the disintegration of the YPSL, however, one positive development emerged: many questions of strategy and tactics facing the revolutionary movement were discussed, and anyone who was seriously interested in developing revolutionary politics had the opportunity to consider and reach a conclusion about them. We have tried to do this, and have developed the following positions.

Our Positions

The colonial revolution, even in its Stalinist manifestations, must be defended against imperialism, regardless of the consequences to the revolutionists carrying out this task within the imperialist countries.

The Shachtman analysis of the role of the Stalinist parties, at least in the advanced capitalist countries, has proven to be false, and Trotsky's conception correct: these parties are essentially working-class parties, with petty-bourgeois leaderships, seeking reconciliation with capitalism.

Both the perspective of pressuring the labor bureaucracies and the liberals, in America, to form a “liberal-Labor party,” and the position of rejecting any intermediate and transitional demand and calling only

for a "revolutionary party," are incorrect. Until the revolutionary party is large enough to be a practical alternative to the bourgeois parties, we call upon the workers to "form their own party which can take power and solve the problems facing the working class," and participate in those intermediate expressions of this movement, giving critical support to other socialist parties and such anti-capitalist formations as the Freedom Now Party.

We do not fear, and as Trotskyists seek to enter into, united actions with other radical groups, even if these groups lack respectability in American liberal circles.

We raise the demand of organized, armed self-defense by Negroes against racist violence, and call for the formation of block councils in the urban ghettos which can give protests a mass character.

Finally, we seek the unity of all genuinely anti-capitalist and anti-Stalinist radicals into a single revolutionary party, agreeing with Trotsky that the differences over the "Russian Question," as important as these are, should be no bar to organizational unity.

We Join the Spartacist Group

With the dissolution of the YPSL we faced the choice of joining the Spartacist group, with which we are in substantial programmatic agreement, or of remaining with the comrades of the American Socialist Organizing Committee, seeking to win them over to our views. After serious and extended consideration we have decided to join the Spartacists, in spite of differences on the nature of the Soviet Union, and function as a loyal and disciplined part of the Spartacist organization. We hope that the comrades of the ASOC, as they deal with the problems that we have raised, problems which will inevitably arise within their group as they seek to apply themselves to the task of rebuilding the revolutionary party in America, will follow us in our course. In any case, we and the Spartacist group as a whole look forward to continued fraternal relations and cooperation in united actions with the comrades of the ASOC.

Not the End, But the Beginning!

A small but important chapter in the history of American revolutionary socialism has come to a close. We hope that we can measure up to the tasks that face us, the bearers of the communist future of mankind, and that all socialists who are the irreconcilable enemies of capitalist and Stalinist oppression, in this short period of time we have remaining before the final struggles that determine the fate of our race take place, will make those decisions and take those actions which alone can guarantee the victory of humanity over the forces of annihilation and barbarism, will take the road marked out by Lenin and Trotsky during the first half of our century. There is no other way.

Fraternally,

For the REVOLUTIONARY TENDENCY, YPSL:
Douglas Hainline, New York, NEC member
Lyndon Henry, Texas, NEC alternate
David Rader, New York, NEC alternate

... PURGE

(Continued from Page 16)

ticularly busy weekend. The next day she had to rush down to Philadelphia to undergo the formality of a trial prior to expulsion from the SWP. The local branch acted on charges proposed by party National Secretary Farrell Dobbs. These were: (1) the main charge that she went on a "political junket" to Cuba as part of the travel-ban-breaking group without prior party approval; (2) that "co-thinkers" had informed the SWP that she had distributed copies of the SPARTACIST in Cuba; and (3) that on her return she stayed at the home of a leading Spartacist and had participated without prior SWP clearance in a *New York Times* group interview (see Aug. 19 issue), organized by the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba.

still available

SPARTACIST Special Election Supplement

Contents include:

- Critical Support for SWP Campaign
- Answer Goldwaterism with Class Politics
- PLM Errs in Opposing SWP Campaign

a copy free on request from: SPARTACIST,
Box 1377, G.P.O. — New York, N. Y. 10001

The third charge concerning her return is peculiar—in the *Times* she upheld the position of the SWP and was praised for her remarks by the party National Organizational Secretary, Ed Shaw. And to make an accusation out of staying with a Spartacist supporter is simply evidence of a contemptible, bureaucratic mentality. The second charge of distributing copies of the SPARTACIST in Cuba is flatly false. Examination of the main charge reveals a deep-going hypocrisy by the SWP-YSA Majority toward the whole series of Student Committee-sponsored trips. Comrade Stoute had asked permission to go. The party equivocated for several weeks without giving her an answer; the time came to go and she left "without permission"! In the *Militant*, the SWP has supported these Cuba trips in words, but meanwhile the YSA, without coming out openly, has done everything it could to keep young people from going. (And the YSA leadership had the gall to complain to the official Cuban Federation of University Students when at the last moment two YSA functionaries applied and were not allowed to go.)

Not Yet the End

The purge of oppositionists goes on apace in the SWP and YSA. On November 14, following the collective expulsion at the YSA plenum and the accompanying official proscription of the Spartacist group, a supporter of the Wohlforth committee was "suspended indefinitely" from the YSA for publicly selling his group's bulletin. And the end is not yet in sight as the party Majority tries to cinch up its departure from revolutionary Marxism by a campaign of expelling oppositionists and silencing dissidents. ■

... HARLEM

(Continued from Page 1)

"riot" and thereby "justify" a full-scale police offensive intended to smash every sign of struggle and intimidate the movement for a long time to come. Demonstrators at the 28th precinct house in Harlem were therefore pressed back, and back again, by the cops, who harangued them in racist terms, roughly dragged several of them into the station house, and finally charged into the main body. Then, the moment resistance flared, the Tactical Police, already on hand and waiting, surged through the main streets of Harlem attacking not only the demonstrators near the precinct but, for example, charging into Saturday night crowds as they left movie theaters, throwing up barricades in such a way as to prevent fleeing crowds from dispersing and running down and group-beating fleeing or defiant individuals. This then created the "riot" situation necessary to justify the all-out intervention.

Previously Prepared

Police Commissioner Murphy who directed the attack made no bones about acknowledging (*The New York Times*, July 20) that the city police had been "fully prepared" for several months and that his staff had long since brought their "riot-control" plans "up to date." Given the foregoing months of press preparation, it could be expected that not only would there be no outcry from the general public, but that, on the contrary, the "riots" themselves would be regarded by middle-class whites as conclusive evidence that Negroes are, by nature, uncontrollable and violent, and that further division of black and white workers and discredit to the Negro people's fight for freedom and equality would result. And just as the treatment of the July 18 demonstrators was a provocation to all Harlem, so the Harlem events were in turn a provocation to every other black ghetto in the North, evoking echoing outbreaks in seven others in the following weeks. It is unlikely that such a wide-scale strategic attack against the Negro people could have been carried through without the complicity of the highest political power in the land—the Johnson administration in Washington.

Test of Leaders

This clear and direct confrontation between the Negro masses and the police, agents of those who have created and maintain for their own profit the miserable conditions under which millions of black workers live and die, was a test of all who seek to lead the

Negroes' struggle. The teen-agers and young workers of the ghetto fought back valiantly, but the defiant shouts and coke bottles of *individuals*, no matter how numerically preponderant, were no match for the *organized, armed force* of the police, as the casualties show. Obviously the overriding need of the ghetto was—and is—its own *self-directed mass organization*.

Organization

Furthermore, the question of organization is no abstract one in this case. The people were in the streets, angry and ready to struggle, conscious of themselves not as mere individuals but as thousands with the same basic interests and needs, facing one enemy. Under such conditions there is a spontaneous urge toward organization—a handful of people walking with Bayard Rustin instantly became hundreds (he urged them to go home); on another occasion a few people with "Wanted For Murder—Gilligan the Cop" signs became in minutes a march a thousand strong. The masses were crying out for organization and leadership as at no other time. All who would be leaders must be judged foremost on their response to this transcendent need.

"Unity Council"

On Monday, July 20, almost all existing Harlem organizations formed a "Unity Council" which included both integrationists and nationalists, from the NAACP to the Muslims to Malcolm X's organization; the American Negro Labor Council, and Negro business associations; Jesse Grey, the rent strike leader, and Dunbar McLaurin, slumlord; Percy Sutton for the Democratic Party, and so on, through a list of 65 organizations. The Unity Council pledged itself to "restore peace in the community" and put forward several semi-reformist demands. But the only *action* vigorously pursued by this impressive alliance of "leaders" was directed *against* the one serious attempt that was made to give effective organization and direction to the people in the streets.

Harlem Defense Council

That effort was made by the Harlem Defense Council (HDC) which, by Tuesday, had issued a leaflet reading "**ORGANIZE YOUR BLOCKS.** *The events of the last two days have shown that if we are not organized we are just a mob and not in a position to properly deal with the enemy. ORGANIZE APARTMENT BY APARTMENT, HOUSE BY HOUSE!* *The Harlem Defense Council calls on all black people of Harlem to set up Block Committees with the purpose of defending each and every block in Harlem from the cops. MASS DEMON-*

STRATION. Each home and each block must be so organized that on Saturday, July 29th, we will be able to have an organized march. . . . As the march moves up Lenox Avenue each Block Captain will have his block ready to join as we pass his block." Though only a small group, the HDC did all it could to translate this call into reality.

United Front Against HDC

This beginning, however small, toward the creation of a counterforce to the institutionalized violence and oppression of the state, struck fear into the hearts of the ruling class and their "liberal" politicians, their cops, and their "Negro leaders." On its eve the March was banned by Commissioner Murphy in the interest of so-called law and order. The position taken by the Unity Council was that while the ban was bad, the march was worse (for the quaking petty-bourgeoisie view nothing with more alarm than the organization of the masses). Springing into action in probably the first grass-roots work most of its supporters had ever done, the Unity Council canvassed the blocks along the route of the proposed march, circulating leaflets and urging tenants not to participate. They devoted ceaseless efforts to attempting to persuade Epton, leader of the HDC and vice-chairman of the Progressive Labor Movement, to call off the march, and did succeed in convincing Jesse Grey to withdraw his backing at the last minute. (Grey, who had seemed a genuine militant up to this point, apparently was unable to withstand the pressure of a real showdown and not only withdrew his support to the march but later also revoked his sponsorship of the Harlem Solidarity Committee's garment center rally, pulled a number of buildings off rent strike, and appeared in court to voluntarily deny that he had any intention of organizing a force of "one hundred revolutionaries" in Harlem.) The efforts of the Unity Council were in concert with those of the police who were mobilized *27,000 strong* to crush the march. And if this wasn't sufficient, James Lawson, head of the United African Nationalist Movement and another indefatigable member of the Unity Council, offered his own black membership to fight alongside the police against the marchers! With much courage and dignity Epton, with his lawyer, Conrad Lynn, with the continued support of the Freedom Now Party, and others, stepped out to begin the march and was immediately arrested. Leaderless, the demonstration did not materialize.

Solidarity Committee

Those militant forces that were inside Harlem stood with the Harlem

Defense Council; those outside joined together to form the Harlem Solidarity Committee in an attempt to take the pressure off the ghettos—now including Bedford-Stuyvesant—by rallying working-class support for the besieged Negro people. Initiated by the Spartacist group, other participants in the HSC included Youth Against War and Fascism, Workers World, the Brooklyn Civil Rights Defense Committee, the Committee for Peace Organization, and the Progressive Labor Movement. (The Socialist Workers Party, which was also initially involved, withdrew, citing the pressure of election petition work—though saying privately that they felt the groups involved were “disreputable.”) Around the slogans “Remove the Rioting Cops from Harlem” and “Support the Right of the Citizens of the Ghetto to Defend Themselves,” the Harlem Solidarity Committee organized a mass rally in the center of the garment district, and, despite the fact that use of sound equipment was denied by the police, addressed nearly 1,000 workers who enthusiastically supported the speakers and make quick work of the one or two hecklers. James Robertson, SPARTACIST editor, described the role of the cops in creating the riots and, in reference to attempts being made to blame the riots on Communists, said that “unfortunately there aren’t many Reds in Harlem now—but there will be!”

Playing With Fire

Though the “riots” were needed by and provoked by the bourgeoisie as an excuse to crush a growing mass movement, nevertheless the development and outcome of such an undertaking cannot be fully foreseen. It is certain that resistance to the police attack far exceeded what they had anticipated, for the extent to which the youth and young workers of the ghetto fought back, even without organization, was an ominous portent for the ruling class. In Rochester, for example, the city police force was actually defeated and driven from the ghetto area in the initial hours of fighting; only with the intervention of the state police and national guard was the ghetto re-occupied.

All leaderships, during normal times, claim to be militant and independent of the power structure. It is times of crisis when pressures, but also needs and opportunities, are greatest that provide a real test, with lessons to be learned for both sides. Prior to the “riots” the bourgeoisie had been uncertain about the Black Nationalists. However, when forced to choose sides the usually militant-sounding Nationalists proved themselves to be thoroughly reliable allies of the (white) bourgeoisie, playing no role different



James Robertson, foreground, editor of SPARTACIST, addresses rally called by Harlem Solidarity Committee in the garment district.

from, or even independent of, the middle-class integrationists. It was class orientation, not color orientation, that provided the basis during those July days for an alternative leadership: i.e., the Harlem Defense Council.

The response by the ruling class to the threat of class rather than race struggle was two-fold. On a minor scale it experimented with encouraging the development of a respectable nationalist movement which could exploit the wide-spread pseudo-nationalist sentiment among Harlem youth and channel it against the “Reds.” Such a movement would also be useful in calling off or controlling future ghetto-sparked protest which might be embarrassing or threatening to the ruling class, since the old middle-class civil-rights leaders had been shown over the past period to no longer be effective in this regard. For this reason Black Nationalists were, for the first time, received by the Mayor and other City officials; and Lawson and Overton were enabled, with police support, to hold rallies in the center of Harlem which was forbidden to others. As could be expected, these figures threw themselves wholeheartedly behind the anti-Red witch hunt, which was the primary tactic of the ruling class.

Witch Hunt

To cover up their own role and to prepare for ridding themselves of those who proved the potential real opposition, the authorities immediately

launched a no-holds-barred witch hunt, and the gutter press appeared with such daily headlines as “Riot Leftists Urged Murders.” In this atmosphere sweeping injunctions were issued to all who were associated in even the most remote way with either the Epton March or the Harlem Solidarity Committee, forbidding them from “assembling, gathering together, convening, parading, marching, demonstrating or acting in concert, in the public streets, squares, sidewalks and other public areas” from 110th Street to 155th Street and from river to river. Epton was charged with “criminal anarchy,” on the basis of a paraphrase of Lenin’s *State and Revolution*, with urging the murder of cops and judges, and faces 10 years in prison and \$10,000 fine if convicted. (Apparently the Communist Party is hoping to get rid of its leftist-Maoist opposition since Gurley Flynn speaking from Moscow and *The Worker* did everything possible to lend credence to the phony charges.) A Grand Jury “investigation” was initiated against the Progressive Labor Movement in an attempt to place the blame on them for instigating the riots. In this context and the concomitant pull-back in struggle, practically all special reactionary interests have been encouraged. The combined forces of the *Daily News*, landlords, and police department circles went on to initiate their own successful witch hunt, against

(Continued Next Page)

... HARLEM

(Continued from Page 5)

Mobilization for Youth, a city social agency which had supported rent strikes. Those forces opposing school integration have been encouraged to mobilize and launch a counterattack against even the most minimal efforts toward school integration. Eventually, with the issuance of the FBI's report on September 27, it became apparent that, lacking a single shred of evidence, the FBI was not able to either sustain or create a "Red Conspiracy" underlying or linking together the various riots. They had to settle merely for exonerating the cops (whom they found to have been too soft in suppressing Negroes), labeling all who resisted police terror as the worst and most irresponsible elements of society, and toeing the line for Police Commissioner Murphy as regards his personal shibboleth, a civilian review board.

SWP Disoriented

The response of one other organization must be examined in relation to to Harlem events—that is the Socialist Workers Party, which still claims to be a Trotskyist organization and the vanguard of the American working class. Once again events left the SWP far behind—with the consent of the SWP! The political line of this group in recent years justifies their own abstention from struggle since they see themselves as unessential to the victorious outcome of these struggles. Having lost confidence in their ability to lead, they have revised revolutionary theory to eliminate the necessity for conscious, revolutionary leadership in the fight for socialism, and look to other, non-working-class forces to do the job for them. On this basis the SWP restrains its members from any active involvement in the Negro struggle, choosing instead to act as a cheering section for one or another "leader."

There is a revolutionary axiom concerning the interrelationship of action and theory: A line formulated apart from experience will undoubtedly err, while a correct line embodied in cadres deeply rooted in the class can be decisive in the outcome of a struggle. The SWP's lack of involvement and experience in the Negro arena is undoubtedly responsible for its incorrect analysis of the Harlem events as contained in the *Militant* of August 10 under the heading "Meaning of the Harlem Riots" by the party's official Intellectual, William F. Warde.

In this article Warde views the riots solely as "eruptions" and "spontaneous outbursts" stemming from frustration and bad conditions. He over-

looks the whole development of class forces over the preceding period culminating in the necessity for, and *decision of*, the bourgeoisie to bring a halt to a potentially threatening chain of militant actions. To him the riots are a "new, higher stage" of the struggle, and he speaks of "urban guerrilla warfare" and "revolutionary methods." But fighting back in a war started by one's enemy for his own interest while one's own side is unprepared is hardly in itself "revolutionary"—it's more like *instinct*. *Revolutionary* methods of struggle involve precisely *preparation* and *organization*, on a mass basis, so that there is at least a fighting chance to win something whether or not complete victory is gained in that particular struggle. And it is no "higher stage," no step forward, which results in all casualties on one's own side, the winning of not even the most minor concession, and in the aftermath a sweeping witch hunt, and demoralization and inactivity among one's own forces. The riots were in actuality a *set-back* to an upward motion, not a step forward—though with proper leadership and organization they could have led to a great step forward.

Ever Upward with William F. Warde

In the following key paragraph from the Warde article we can see the crux of the SWP's revisionism on all questions:

"The revolt of the black freedom fighters is moving forward under our eyes from one stage to another in obedience to the objective laws of every great national and social revolutionary process. Each new stage emerges with implacable necessity from the gains and deficiencies, the victories and setbacks, of its predecessor. The needs and demands that power its progress are too imperative and irrepressible to be arbitrarily halted. Both concessions and repressions feed it and stimulate its forces in different ways as the cumulative momentum of its onward march keeps lifting it to higher levels of struggle."

In the inexorable advance of History there can be no defeats, for, according to the above schema, even a setback is a step forward. And what role is there for a revolutionary vanguard in this chain of inevitable and automatic progression? The aging leadership of the SWP, tired and discouraged after 35 years of struggle in the heart of world imperialism, no longer believes it will play a role; therefore they revise revolutionary theory to eliminate themselves. Contrary to the whole force of Leon Trotsky's analysis and revolutionary struggle, they feel that the question of leadership is no longer

decisive and hence are not seriously concerned with it.

Accurate, careful analysis is not important if it is not made from the standpoint of determining one's own future orientation toward a struggle. Thus the Warde article omits mention of either the Unity Council or the HDC march, for to criticize the first would be, in effect, a criticism of the Nationalists upon whom the SWP banks all, and to give due credit to the HDC would be building a hated and envied competitor. And since the SWP can no longer admit errors it is forced to cast the Nationalists in the role of the militants in the struggle despite the fact that they were, at the time, in alliance with the liberal integrationists whom the SWP condemns. At another point Warde lumps together as "the most militant": Jesse Grey, Bill Epton, and the various Black Nationalists. But a class line was drawn between Epton and the Nationalists, with Grey vacillating and finally ending up on the wrong side.

In its search for non-class elements to cast in a leadership role, the SWP makes no mention of the formerly-vaunted "bold new leadership" which, as recently ago as April, the *Militant* hailed as "the dividing line in the civil rights struggle in this city." (The SPARTACIST had characterized the groups which had called the second school boycott and stall-in as a temporary, artificial alliance of militant and militant-sounding individuals.) Having found this force to cuddle up to in April, the SWP had necessarily to lose it in July, for by the time of the "riots" this "bold new leadership" no longer existed! The SWP, in putting forward uncritically one nonrevolutionary Negro leadership or another, praising their good points while omitting anything unfavorable in either record or program, is in fact encouraging the Negro people to place their trust in leaders who will only sell them out at some future, possibly more critical date.

Waiting for Malcolm X

Warde's *Militant* article ends by hopefully anticipating that Malcolm X and his new Organization of Afro-American Unity can fill the leadership vacancy. Malcolm X has been the SWP's top candidate for Black Leader for almost two years, and they are reluctant to give him up despite recent—and predictable statements by him which must be highly embarrassing to them. Malcolm X has now become the protege of Sheik Muhammad Sarur Al-Sabban, head of the World Muslim League and described by Mr. X as "the richest and most powerful figure in Saudi Arabia today. . . . Many very responsible Arabs refer to

him as the 'real king of the Hejaz' that is, Arabia—the last bastion of legal chattel slavery (of black Africans!) in the world today. From that land of oil-imperialism financed slavery Malcolm X, in his new position as official representative of the World Muslim League, has assured the American bourgeoisie that he is not anti-American, un-American, seditious, or subversive (*The New York Times*, Oct. 4). In proclaiming his new-found Brotherhood of all Mankind he has the effrontery to proclaim before the Negro people that some of his dearest friends are—Uncle Toms! He goes on to say "It takes all religious, political, economic, psychological and racial ingredients to make the Human Family and the Human Society complete. . . . We must forget politics and propaganda and approach this (the race problem) as a Human Problem" calling for "real meaningful actions, sincerely motivated by a deep sense of humanism and moral responsibility." It has now become the prime responsibility of Negro leaders to make "their own people see that with equal rights also go equal responsibilities." The *Militant* has devoted a lot of space to Malcolm X over the past couple of years, but these words never appeared in, nor were they commented on by that paper.

Defend Bill Epton

The roll-back and lull in the Northern freedom struggle resulting from demoralization following the "riots" will be only temporary despite the desire of existing organizations to permit only the most limited and "safe" activities. Such programs will only serve to widen the gap between the Negro masses and these middle-class organizations; it has been correctly said that the riots were the death knell of a militant CORE. Yet despite the widespread pseudo-nationalist sentiment, nationalist organizations, despite their militant-sounding rhetoric, have become increasingly exposed to those young militants prepared to commit themselves unreservedly to organized struggle. Only the Harlem Defense Council, of all existing black organizations, withstood the stringent tests of the past period. Yet HDC itself is at present only a tiny and by no means fully correctly oriented organization. Struggle must also continue within the existing civil rights organizations to win their best elements to a program of mass organization and militant struggle.

The vigorous defense of Bill Epton (and those other HDC members who have now been charged with "criminal contempt" for refusing to aid Epton's frameup) is directly and urgently tied to far broader needs. The authorities

are trying to make HDC into a "horrible example" and scapegoat in the campaign of suppression through fear and Red scare in Harlem and all the great black ghettos of the northern cities. To smash this attack and defend HDC is an immediate way to strike at this whole trend and widen or reopen fields of struggle being clamped shut. Such a defense requires many elements: a non-partisan, i.e., politically inclusive, national defense committee side-by-side with a principled refusal to empty the defense of its content by concealing or sidestepping the radical beliefs and aims of the



Bill Epton

defendants; an emphasis on mass organization—both of local defense committees in the cities, ghettos and campuses across the country and of actions and demonstrations rightly turning the Epton case into the *cause célèbre* of this country.

Revolutionary Program

Revolutionaries in the Negro freedom movement need to pose *transitional* demands which, at each point, tend to bring the Negro masses to the recognition in struggle that fundamental solutions to their problems are not possible within the framework of the capitalist system, a system which incorporates in its very being inequality, racism, and mass destruction. Depression-level unemployment within the ghetto will not be solved by fighting for a job here or a job there or by schemes which bring the black and white workers into conflict over a shrinking job pool. Rather, a revolutionary program attempts to *unite* black and white workers in a *common struggle to increase the number of jobs*. The best method of doing this is to fight for the shorter work week at no loss in pay ("30 for 40"). The fact that electricians in New York recently won a 25-hour workweek indicates that this struggle is definitely on the agen-

da. Ghetto organization can presently best be extended through the creation of block councils firmly based on building tenant councils. Through such councils ghetto dwellers gain experience in organized struggle and confidence in their abilities to fight. One of the most effective and militant weapons in this struggle is the *rent strike* which must be expanded, especially in view of the current attempt of the landlords and courts to put a stop to this once and for all. Moreover, such councils form a natural basis for the organization of defense patrols to protect the community against future police riots—and such patrols are the embryo of that workers militia which will defend the coming American Revolution. The challenge from Parents and Taxpayers must be met by plans for immediate integration of all schools backed up by the force of massive demonstrations and boycotts.

A revolutionary leadership will educate the Negro people to the understanding that the Democratic Party is merely the preferred political tool of the very classes responsible for oppression. The Democratic Party has been the most powerful political force in this country for three decades; the fact that it has done *nothing* of any substance to advance the position of the Negro people is because *it doesn't want to*: it is controlled by powerful financial interests who benefit from the oppression of Negroes. The cop on the corner, Murphy, and the judges are all part of the Democratic machine on the local level. The only alternative is the development of a mass Labor party based on an alliance of black and white workers committed to a socialist solution to the problems of the working class—unemployment, speed-up, low wages, slums, and racism. In the absence of such a party, support must be given to all independent political candidates who have programs based on the needs of the ghetto, such as the Freedom Now Party.

Black Workers Will Lead!

Out of the struggle for and implementation of such a program will come a new revolutionary organization capable of organizing the Negro masses and leading them in struggle. Such an organization, through fighting for the special needs of the Negro people, will form its link through the Revolutionary Party to broader struggles—ultimately the struggle for workers power and a socialist reorganization of society. The Negro people, the most exploited section of the working class, will, by virtue of their long experience in struggle for a better life, play a leading role in the emancipation of the entire American working class—and through them, of all humanity. ■

BUREAUCRACY AND REVOLUT

INTRODUCTION

The Sino-Soviet dispute has further stimulated a process that neither of the disputing parties can stop: the breaking up of the once monolithic International Communist movement into its component—national—parts. The Rumanian, Italian, and French Communist Parties' recent maneuvers toward maximizing their security and privileges within the context of a *national* political and economic structure are the most recent expressions of this universal process. The trend has reached its furthest development in the split between China and the Soviet Union—a split which flows from a profound divergence of *national* interests, and which, given the social character of the bureaucracies in question, cannot be healed. Khrushchev's ouster was undoubtedly due in large part to his intransigent opposition to the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), but the feeble attempts of Brezhnev and Kosygin to ameliorate the conflict can retard only slightly what is, at bottom, an irreversible process.

The depth of the split can be judged not only by the refusal of the Soviet Union to support China in the Sino-Indian border conflict, but by the fact that it instead supported—with arms—India! Under such circumstances China's development of the A-bomb must be greeted by all revolutionary Marxists as a welcome strengthening of Chinese defenses at a time when the Chinese Revolution is not only being aggressively threatened by U.S. imperialism but when it is also being systematically betrayed by the Soviet bureaucracy in the search for "peaceful coexistence." However, the main point is that every increase in the ability of the Chinese to hold the U.S. at bay militarily is an increase in time to prepare the proletarian revolution—above all in *America*—the only final safeguard to all gains thus far made by the international working class.

Toward a Revolutionary Answer

As the Stalinist monolith disintegrates, workers and youth within the Communist movement begin to genuinely seek a revolutionary alternative to the reformism of the old-line Stalinist parties and at first glance the Chinese position appears to offer this. Thus, the first steps toward class politics are often in the direction established by the Chinese CP. We see that the Sino-Soviet dispute not only accelerates *national* decomposition of the Communist movement, but also furthers polarization within the ranks of each party.

The Progressive Labor Movement, much smaller than the American CP, has found much needed moral support in the CCP's criticism of the Soviet leadership. But, since the Chinese have not gone beyond superficialities and formalism the responsibility now confronts PL to explain the development of class-collaborationist policies by the Soviet bureaucracy. In explaining the victory of October Lenin said, "Only the history of Bolshevism during the whole period of its existence can satisfactorily explain why it was able to build up and maintain, under the most difficult conditions, the iron discipline necessary for the victory of the proletariat." Similarly, only the history of the Comintern during the *whole* period of its existence can satisfactorily explain why it degenerated into today's stinking corpse. Present reality is not accidental or unrelated to the past but is, rather, the total realization of it. Nothing can be understood except in its historical development.

Stalin's Politics

It is this method that PL has thus far avoided. The entry of the Chinese CP into the Koumintang (ordered by Stalin) resulted in the tragic slaughter of thousands of Chinese workers in Shanghai and Wuhan at the hands of Chiang Kai-shek in 1927. During the "Third Period," under the false policy of "social fascism," the German CP refused to launch a United Front struggle against Fascism (as Remmele, one of the KPD's leading parliamentarians, said, "Let Hitler take office—he will soon go bankrupt, and then it will be our day.") In France in 1936, when the "People's Front" government faced a massive strike wave in which the French workers had *occupied the factories* and were the overwhelming force in the country. Thorez said, "One must learn how to end a strike!," and the French CP continued to support the bourgeois coalition government. In Spain the Spanish Revolution was headed by Stalinist "Peoples Front" policies under which the CP destroyed the workers' militia of Barcelona in May, 1937, reinstated the hated bourgeois police, and murdered workers' leaders. At the end of the Second World War, in France and Italy when the Communist-led working classes were the *major armed force* in the countries, the CP's of these countries entered bourgeois coalition governments and disarmed the workers.

Empiricism

All of the foregoing are not just isolated facts! To acknowledge some and ignore others, while *refusing to*

see or explain the organic interrelation of all these events is not Marxian dialectical materialism but *empiricism*—the very method which led to the above mistakes and crimes. The mistakes of the past cannot simply be forgotten, or laid aside in the interests of present-day "unity." The contradictions of the present epoch of imperialist decay continually create the objective conditions for proletarian revolution. As touched on above, too many of these opportunities have been destroyed or betrayed. As the conditions of our epoch continue to create similar opportunities, the policies of the past which led to defeats of revolutions must be understood *thoroughly* so as not to be repeated. An overall historical analysis must be made of the past decade despite conclusions which doubtlessly will be unpopular with some who call themselves socialists and communists. This is absolutely necessary for the creation of the Revolutionary Vanguard which must be forged in this country. Only if it is properly armed theoretically and programmatically will it be able to lead a *victorious struggle for the proletarian dictatorship* in the United States.

The following article thus takes as its point of departure the needs of the international proletarian revolution and derives from these the particular strategy toward the Sino-Soviet dispute. The substance of this article was presented as a resolution for the SWP National Convention in the Summer of 1963 by the Revolutionary Tendency. The present article has been very slightly abridged. The intervening time has served only to reinforce its viewpoint.

THE SINO-SOVIET DISPUTE

The open split between the ruling groups in the Peoples' Republic of China and the Soviet Union is a fact of world-historical significance. On the surface the split appears to be a dispute over ideological questions among self-proclaimed "Marxist-Leninists." In its underlying reality, however, the split has a vastly different meaning. It signifies the eruption of irreconcilable material antagonisms between national Stalinist bureaucracies. The context of this struggle is the mortal crisis of the Stalinist system squeezed between the pressures of unyielding world imperialism and of rising working classes internally.

The crisis of Stalinism is caused by the growing power of the new generation of industrial and intellectual workers in every country of the Soviet bloc.

ION IN MOSCOW AND PEKING

This generation, thanks to its own efforts and to its birthright—the structural and ideological heritage of the October revolution—has been able to achieve magnificent economic successes despite obstruction, incompetence, and misleadership by the Stalinist rulers. The new working class of the Soviet bloc has embarked on a struggle to cast off Stalinist repression and obscurantism and to establish proletarian democracy.

Political Revolution

The suppressed Hungarian and Polish revolutions showed that proletarian democracy can be won only through the smashing of the Stalinist bureaucratic and police apparatus by revolutionary mass action. These struggles, and their repression by the monolithically united counter-revolution, definitively verified Trotsky's program of *political revolution*. Political revolution—successful repetition of the Budapest commune in Moscow and Peking—will be the climax of the movement of the Soviet bloc proletariat.

Marxist politics and Marxist theory constitute a unified whole. Both are entirely based on the specific class interests of the proletariat, the only really revolutionary class of modern society. The developing political revolution in the Soviet bloc is comprehensible only in terms of this dialectical inter-relationship of theory and practice: the development of a revolutionary-Marxist vanguard party is indispensable to the victorious struggle of the workers, and no party can understand the political development of the Soviet bloc, manifested currently in the Peking-Moscow split, unless it consciously and directly analyzes from the point of view of the Soviet-bloc proletariat, *i.e., on the basis of the political revolution*.

Only confused centrists could try to explain the Sino-Soviet dispute in terms of the indigestible "ideological" apologia issued by the two sides and limit their conclusions to a judgment as to which of these positions is more or less "correct," is righter or lefter. The Marxist, proletarian, view starts with the recognition that the political groups symbolized by both Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung are mortal and irreconcilable enemies of proletarian democracy, of socialism, and of the working class. Only on *this* basis can the real issues in their conflict be grasped.

The opposition of the Peking and Moscow ruling groups is grounded in their identity. The fundamental fact is that both constitute privileged bureaucracies able to maintain their caste power only through a system of

authoritarian repression. Their specific caste interests, as the usurpers of power and privilege within a social structure historically deriving from the proletarian revolution, define them ultimately as anti-proletarian and pro-capitalist despite the fact that they are obliged *in extremis* to defend the organism upon which they are parasites against imperialist military onslaughts.

Repressive Bureaucracy

As a privileged caste formed and organized on a national basis, the Bonapartist bureaucracy of every deformed workers state always and inevitably seeks to maximize its own economic and political power. This takes place necessarily at the expense of the workers and peasants, and, if possible, at the expense of the imperialist sphere—but at the same time no Stalinist bureaucracy has shown hesitancy to defend or increase its own power at the expense of another deformed workers state and of its ruling caste. The "ideological" struggle between Peking and Moscow reflects the real incompatibility of the material interests of two counter-revolutionary national bureaucratic castes.

The real issues in the Peking-Moscow clash are posed in terms of conflicting power-political and economic needs. These needs reflect the different origins of the two national bureaucracies, and above all they reflect the different relationship of forces between each, imperialism, and the working class. The differential impact of American imperialism upon the Chinese and Russian states raises their antagonisms to the level of sharp struggles. The Maoist leadership must contend with an American policy quite unreconciled to the Peking regime and actively employing all available means to destroy it. The American imperialists even maintain a competing paper-regime in the form of the old tyrant, Chiang Kai-shek, on Formosa. The Russians are more free from an immediate restorationist threat from imperialism and are driven by other forces to seek a *detente* with the American government. But what Khrushchev is prepared to offer in the Kremlin's side of a co-existence deal is to go even further in acting as imperialism's indirect policeman not only among workers in the advanced countries, but over the colonial revolutions—of which the Chinese is one!

Unlike the Soviet bureaucracy, which developed in and through the degeneration of an authentic proletarian revolution, the Chinese Stalinist bureaucracy has its origins in a struggle

whose nature was petty bourgeois and whose direct historical mission was basically bourgeois. Its heroic epoch, the Chinese civil war, was a combination of an elemental peasant struggle for the land and a nationalist struggle against foreign domination and for national unification. The leadership forged in this vast revolutionary upheaval took shape as a military elite, selected on the basis of the qualities of combativity, devotion, and discipline. Basically alien to the urban proletariat, and cut off from its own petty-bourgeois roots by the very fact of its militarization, this bureaucratic caste was welded together through the structure and leadership of the Communist Party and the ideology of Stalinism.

China's change into a deformed workers state was initiated in a mass peasant-based revolutionary civil war which was followed by a military-bureaucratic process of transformation into a form of society modeled upon the Stalinized Soviet Union, economically and politically cut off from the capitalist world, and economically and politically integrated into the Soviet bloc. The bureaucratic caste completed this transformation in a forced response to the overwhelming objective requirements of military defense in the Korean War and the need for rapid economic recovery and growth. Though this was done in a pragmatic fashion, it was perfectly consistent with Mao's fundamental conception of the "Bloc of Four Classes," whose true meaning is the claim of the Communist Party leadership to state power as a supra-class "Peoples Democratic Dictatorship."

Chinese Nationalism

The success of Mao Tse-tung and his followers in channeling and distorting into the form of a national-bureaucratic straight-jacket the socialist drives of the Chinese revolution testifies only to the thoroughly and consistently counter-revolutionary nature of the Maoist bureaucracy. The petty-bourgeois nationalist nature of Chinese foreign policy is demonstrated most dramatically by the fact that Peking's border claims against New Delhi are supported by the Chiang Kai-shek regime occupying Formosa. The obligation of Marxists to give *unconditional* defense to the deformed Chinese workers state in order to prevent its military defeat by a capitalist power cannot be permitted to obscure the fact that the extremely sparse population of these wastelands is neither Chinese nor

(Continued Next Page)

... SINO-SOVIET

(Continued from Page 9)

Indian. Humiliation of Nehru's military pretensions in the border conflict is obviously a triumph for Chinese foreign policy, and has gained Peking much closer friendship with the military dictators of Pakistan and Burma. It is an equally obvious blow to Soviet foreign policy, which had made enormous and partially successful efforts to secure a relationship of special closeness with the Nehru regime. It is irrelevant to the Chinese and Russian Stalinists, but of absolute importance to Marxists, that the Chinese policy of posing the question in national-chauvinist rather than class-revolutionary terms has done serious damage to the chances of the proletarian revolution in India and elsewhere in Asia.

The Stalinist policy of Chinese hegemony over non-Chinese nationalities is as much a violation of the right of peoples to self-determination and contradiction of the basic interests of the international proletarian revolution as is the Great-Russian chauvinism of the Kremlin. This is shown most clearly in the cases of Tibet (where Chinese policy resulted in an uprising under reactionary leadership) and of Formosa. Though the Peking bureaucrats use the most violent language to denounce imperialist treaties at the expense of China, they completely endorse the imperialist Cairo agreement (among Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang) which gave Formosa to China. Using this imperialist treaty as a pretext, the Chinese Stalinists refuse to recognize the right of the Formosan workers and peasants to self-determination and reiterate their intention to seize Formosa by force of arms. The practical effects of this policy are to give political aid to Chiang in his oppression of the Formosan people and to help U.S. imperialism in its policy of isolation and containment of the Chinese revolution.

The extreme antagonism between Peking and Washington is rooted in the appetites of U.S. imperialism which still resents its loss of China, seeks by all means to hamper and frustrate Chinese development, and openly professes its desire to see the present Chinese government overthrown by counter-revolutionary forces. This continual pressure has led the Chinese Stalinists to formulate a bitterly anti-U.S. foreign policy, at profound variance to the Kremlin's basic line of a bi-lateral deal between the super-powers. The underlying nationalism of the Peking line, however, continually acts to upset all efforts to break through the *cordon sanitaire* imposed by Washington.

Chinese Economic Policy

The economic policy of the Chinese Stalinists has undergone the most staggering shifts. Until 1957 the CCP's general line attempted to balance rapid industrialization with gradual agricultural collectivization and slight improvements in living standards—a policy which permitted impressive, even spectacular, economic progress. This course culminated in the brief "Hundred Flowers" period when the momentary thaw allowed the general proletarian and intellectual revulsion against the Maoist-Stalinist bureaucracy to emerge into the open. The working-class opposition was immediately and brutally suppressed in the "Anti-Rightist" campaign. The warning of inevitable political revolution, however, led the bureaucracy to make a radical new departure in economic policy: the demands for workers' democracy were to be buried through transformation of the entire nation into a tightly disciplined economic unit under the slogan of an immediate transition to full communism through the medium of the "rural peoples' communes."

Bureaucratic Adventurism

The "great leap forward," viewed objectively, was an attempt to achieve rapid economic development through methods of total military mobilization. It was an act of criminal bureaucratic adventurism, and failed ignobly. The forced communization of the peasantry, the elimination of all restraints on the duration and intensity of labor, and the uprooting of technical specialists led to an economic collapse unprecedented in the history of the Soviet bloc. The decline in industrial and agricultural production, in industrial employment, and in living standards was too drastic to be concealed, despite the fact that the total breakdown in economic planning involved the non-existence of meaningful statistics (and, after 1959, of any statistics at all).

The Chinese economic collapse increased the tension between Peking and Moscow to the breaking point. China was not only unable to fulfill commitments under its trade treaty with the Soviet Union, but simultaneously demanded that the U.S.S.R. give it increased aid. To top it off, the Chinese Stalinists pressed Khrushchev to increase his military spending and to help them expend Chinese resources in the development of a Chinese atomic bomb. Khrushchev's reaction was the brutal withdrawal of Soviet technicians at the end of 1960, and the rapid reduction of Sino-Soviet trade to a level reflecting China's vastly reduced export capability.

The Chinese Stalinists claim that the abandonment of the "leap forward"

and the return of private agriculture on a significant scale are merely temporary retreats within an unchanging policy. The basic policy of the Chinese Stalinists is the construction of "communism in a single country" on a pauper technical basis using the unaided labor of hundreds of millions of peasants. The Maoists refuse to depart even slightly from this reactionary conception, despite the efforts now being made, for the first time since 1957, to increase trade with the capitalist powers.

The authoritarian attitude of the Chinese Stalinists toward the workers, peasants, and intellectuals has always been coupled with the preoccupation of maintaining close ties with the masses, and of winning genuine support for government policies, if possible. They have sought to gain mass support through a pretense of "Leninism" as well as through their familiar "thought-reform" tactics. Similarly, in the period of the first Soviet Five-Year Plan, Stalin sought to appeal to the idealism of the workers and the youth on the basis of a seemingly "revolutionary" line in foreign as well as domestic policy: forced collectivization and the "Third Period" were inseparable aspects of a single ultra-leftist line. In China, though real enthusiasm among certain sections of the population at the start of the "leap forward" is well attested, this had disappeared by 1962. Nevertheless the profession of a "leftist" foreign policy remains necessary for the Mao regime in order to hold together its cadres, to distract international attention from its catastrophic economic blunders, and, in addition, to face the intransigent hostility of imperialism.

Chinese Stalinism

The Chinese Stalinists, in their dogmatic reiteration of the Stalin-Zhdanov line on everything from Art to Yugoslavia, and in their continued practice of the Stalin cult, express clearly their real nature. Only people whose own political line has become hopelessly muddled can discover any inconsistency between the Chinese position on "de-stalinization" and their criticisms of Khrushchev's foreign policy. The Chinese Stalinists' ideological line is a consistent reflection of their international isolation, the insuperable economic difficulties confronting them, and their inability to make any real concessions to the demands of the Chinese people for greater freedom except at a deadly risk of political revolution. In contrast, the Soviet bureaucracy is in an almost diametrically opposite situation.

The very growth and successes of the Soviet economy have exploded Stalin's autarchic fantasy of the "two

world markets" (the final formulation of "Socialism in One Country" until Mao resurrected it with his communes) and have forced the Soviet Union to adopt a policy aiming at integrated economic planning within the Soviet bloc and steadily increasing interdependence with the capitalist states. The growth of the Soviet proletariat in size, skill, and cultural level has confronted the Soviet bureaucracy with a gigantic social force that can be temporarily averted from political revolution only at the price of real concessions, of which the liquidation of the Stalin cult was the most profound. The terrible economic drain involved in preparations for modern war give the Soviet bureaucracy powerful incentives to promise the people of the Soviet bloc an effective reduction in international tensions.

Consequences of Coexistence

The basic line of the Soviet bureaucracy is to preserve its power and privileges through a combination of repression with peripheral political concessions to and steady improvement in the living standards of the Soviet people. It therefore feels a profound need for an overall accord with U.S. imperialism which would permit recovery of economic resources now wasted on military purposes and would allow the Soviet Union much freer access to Western markets. Of course the price for this hoped-for accord between the U.S. and the Russian bureaucracy is to be at the expense of others.

The Soviet Union is becoming a steadily more important factor in the world economy and in international politics, as is shown in varying ways by the increasing Soviet oil exports to the West, the spectacular rapprochement between the Kremlin and Vatican, and the decisive military and economic support provided for the pro-Soviet regime in Cuba. This process of steady improvement in the bargaining position of the Soviet bureaucracy vis-a-vis U.S. imperialism has resulted in a general Soviet-U.S. entente on decisive political questions (against political revolution in the Soviet bloc, for neocolonialism under the aegis of the U.N. in the backward countries) dating at least from the Suez and Hungarian affairs.

U.S. - Soviet cooperation, nevertheless, has been limited drastically by the refusal of the U.S. government to make any concessions on what is, to the Soviet bureaucracy, the quintessential matter: disarmament. The Soviet Stalinists have sought to persuade U.S. capitalists that disarmament is in their immediate economic interest. The Khrushchev position is utopian, not because the economic argument is

fallacious, but because it conflicts with other, more fundamental, interests of U.S. imperialism. Imperialist power in the world can ultimately not be preserved without armed force. The U.S., therefore, cannot and will not disarm. The Soviet economy, freed from the burden of armaments, would develop so rapidly that the U.S. would soon find itself in an inferior political and economic situation, and this would be fatal for capitalism.

In the context of its coexistence strategy the Kremlin is willing to give material aid to petty-bourgeois-led colonial revolutionary movements, as in Algeria, while attempting to pre-

NEW PAMPHLET!

**What Is
Revolutionary
Leadership?**

Four articles from *Labour Review*

48 pages—25¢ a copy

Order from: **SPARTACIST**

Box 1377, G.P.O.

New York, N. Y. 10001

vent their development into proletarian revolutions. For example, while maintaining "correct" diplomatic relations with the French government, the Kremlin via the Czech government, gave great quantities of arms to the FLN to fight the French, and simultaneously, via the French CP, aided the FLN in its campaign to exterminate opponents within the movement. (After this, the Soviet protests against the outlawing of the Algerian CP sound singularly hollow.) Where such revolutions cannot be confined within capitalist limits, as in Cuba, Soviet aid is accompanied by pressures toward internal dictatorship and suppression of anti-Stalinist currents and of subordination to the general line of the Kremlin. Thus, even when seemingly aiding revolutions, the Khrushchev line is directly anti-working-class and counter-revolutionary.

The Deformed Workers States

The counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism in all its forms without exception cannot be permitted to obscure the fundamental thesis of the Trotskyist movement that the Stalinist bureaucracy is defined by its role as a parasite upon the economic structures of the kind established initially by the October Revolution. The regimes in the Soviet bloc, now including Cuba, are deformed workers states: i.e., they are based on property forms established,

directly or however indirectly, by the October Revolution, property forms which are the basis for the development of a socialist society. However, the working class in these countries does not wield political power, does not control production, and does not decide the international policy of these states. Thus we see the Soviet-bloc countries as workers states which have become degenerated or been born deformed. Their present form can only be temporary, and it is wrong to interpret these temporary distorted forms as a new or inevitable stage in the development of society. We stand for the defense of these states as of every conquest of the working class. The Fourth International's call for a political revolution to overthrow the bureaucracy in the workers states constitutes the most effective defense of these states and is part of the strategy of world revolution against imperialism.

Marxist Intervention

The Trotskyists totally reject a sectarian, abstentionist, "plague on both your houses" approach to a phenomenon of world-historical significance, the split between the Moscow and Peking wings of the counter-revolutionary Stalinist bureaucracy. Thus as in every clash within the labor bureaucracy the contending formations may be compelled to seek mass support through actions whose potential consequences transcend and contradict the real aims of the bureaucrats. We support all actions, however and by whom ever initiated, which are in the interest of the working class, since as Marxists we have no interests distinct from those of the working class as a whole. Our intervention tends always to transform actions initiated by the bureaucracy into struggles against the bureaucracy, whereby the working class can develop the alternative revolutionary leadership required for its self-liberation.

In their polemics against the Soviet leaders, the Chinese Stalinists have pointed out aspects of the counter-revolutionary Kremlin line, its conciliation to imperialism and open revision of basic Leninist concepts. In practice, of course, the Chinese have gone as far as the Soviets in supporting those anti-working-class national bourgeois regimes which are willing to take a pro-Chinese line in foreign policy (Algeria, Guinea, Ghana). Nevertheless, within the Communist parties outside the Soviet bloc, these Chinese criticisms help to disrupt the discipline of the parties, and stimulate the emergence of tendencies seeking a more militant struggle against their own ruling class.

(Continued Next Page)

... SINO-SOVIET

In response to the Chinese attacks the Kremlin leaders have found that their most potent weapon is the issue of *Stalin*. Every partial exposure of the reality of the Stalin era, every degree of latitude for the expression of variant views in politics, economics, and the arts, is a gain for the workers, and every attempt to maintain or increase repression under the pressure of "Stalin's Heirs" in Peking and Moscow is an attack upon the vital interests of the working class.

Revolutionary Solution

The basic orientation of the Marxists is always to the workers, never to bureaucratic leaderships. We side with the Communist workers of the western and colonial countries who, however confusedly, seek a revolutionary policy instead of the reformist coexistence line. We side with the workers of the Soviet bloc (and those young intellectuals seeking to be their spokesmen) who are striving to free themselves from bureaucratic oppression and thereby to restore the revolutionary and socialist democracy of the Lenin era. The tactical problem for the Marxists is to establish ideological and political contacts with these revolutionary tendencies in order to develop common actions against imperialist capitalism and its Stalinist bureaucratic labor lieutenants controlling the deformed workers states. The strategic goal of the world Trotskyist movement is the emergence of a new revolutionary leadership on the basis of the transitional program of the Fourth International.

The program of the Fourth International for the Soviet Union as set forth in 1938, which posed the central task of the Soviet workers as the *restoration of Soviet democracy*, is entirely valid today not merely for the U.S.S.R. but for the deformed and degenerated workers states generally. The key points of this program are:

—*freedom* of the trade unions and the factory committees;

—*legalization* of all parties recognized as soviet parties by the workers and peasants;

—*revision* of planned economy from top to bottom in the interests of producers and consumers. Factory committees should be returned the right to control production. A democratically organized "consumers' cooperative should control the quality and price of products;

—*reorganization* of the collective farms in accordance with the will and interests of the workers there engaged;

—*proletarian internationalism* should replace the reactionary international policy of the bureaucracy. No secret diplomacy—the complete diplomatic correspondence of the state should be published;

—*only the victorious revolutionary uprising* of the oppressed masses can revive the regime of Soviets and guarantee its further development toward socialism. There is but one party capable of leading the Soviet masses to insurrection—the party of the Fourth International.

The struggle of the masses in the Soviet bloc is today developing in accordance with this program of workers' democracy. The Trotskyists seek to intervene in support of every struggle, every demand, however limited or partial, in accordance with this program. ■

... CUBA

(Continued from Page 1)

had undergone harassment for several months prior to his arrest on November 9, because of his outspoken opposition to the authoritarian attitude and bureaucratic methods and errors of the administration and the union officials. He had been transferred from job to job and finally, in October, 1963, was transferred to a location two hours from his home in Havana—in effect fired from his job. He fought the transfer and had received the support of an Assembly of the Transport Workers union for his re-instatement and against the illegal transfer. Twice during this period he was held by the police for a short time and released. Following his final arrest, he was confined for several weeks by the Security Forces (G-2) without any charges and then transferred to "La Cabana" prison.

Loyal Participant

As is the case with all the other comrades arrested, Andrés was a full and loyal participant in all the activities of the Revolution, from *before* 1959, when the Stalinists were still waiting to see who would win. At the time of his arrest he was a sub-officer in a combat militia battalion and had been mobilized during the October, 1962, crisis. He was a voluntary worker and a member of the Committee for Defense of the Revolution (CDR). Before the victory of the Revolution in 1959 Andrés was a revolutionary union militant and fought in the underground against Batista, as well as during the final insurrection.

Florida Fraga

Florida Fraga, the companion of Andrés, was arrested without charges at her home the night of December 1,

1963, after returning from a meeting of her CDR where she had denounced the arrest of Andrés and asked the Committee to solicit his immediate release. As a result, after she left, and in the presence of bureaucrats from the District and Sectional CDR's, Florida and Andrés were expelled from the Committee and she was ordered arrested.

Florida, an employee of the Ministry of Transport, was a militia woman, a member of the Cuban Federation of Women (FMC), and had recently done voluntary labor cutting sugar cane. Her father, Gustave Fraga, lost his life as a member of the anti-Bastista underground in Guantanamo City. She too had been a fighter in the underground from very early in the struggle.

Ricardo Ferrara

The following day, December 2, 1963, when Ricardo Ferrara went to inquire about Florida at the Fifth Unit of the CDR, he himself was seized and illegally ordered arrested. Comrade Ricardo's outstanding revolutionary record started when he joined the Castro guerillas at the age of sixteen and fought in the Oriente Second Front, "Frank Pais." He was a member of the Militia, the CDR, and was a "Vanguard Worker" of Commerce. Shortly before his arrest he had just returned from volunteer labor, picking coffee, when Hurricane Flora struck. He immediately volunteered for the rescue work and spent many days, almost without any rest, rescuing and attending to victims of the floods.

All three were held *incommunicado* for five months without any accusations or charges being placed against them, despite many protests from trade unions, union leaders, prominent socialists, and revolutionists from all over Latin America, including the leadership of the fighting Bolivian tin miners.

Last spring they were taken from their prisons to a trial that was closed to the public. There they were charged with: (1) distributing an illegal paper, (2) advocating the overthrow of the Cuban government, and (3) being critical of Fidel Castro. Florida Fraga and Ricardo Ferrara were sentenced to two years each; Andrés Alfonso received a sentence of five years. Andrés and Ricardo are currently serving their time in the "El Principe" prison, while Florida is in the Woman's Prison of Guanajaz.

Roberto Tejera

That same month the purge continued with two more Trotskyists arrested in the same manner. Roberto Tejera was taken in custody when he went to inquire about his three comrades.

Idalberto Ferrera

Later, the police came to the apartment of Idalberto Ferrera, the General Secretary of the POR and editor of *Voz Proletería*, and arrested him, again with no explanation. Their office was broken into and copies of the paper and other documents were confiscated. Comrade Ferrera had written an open letter demanding the immediate release of those in prison and denouncing the Stalinist methods used in their arrest and imprisonment. The two were brought to "trial" and found "guilty" on the same charges as the others. Roberto was sentenced to six years; comrade Ferrera was sentenced to nine years! Significantly, the leader of the group received the most severe sentence, indicating the purely political character of the repressions. Both are serving their sentences in "La Cabana" prison. As of the time the American students left Cuba in August, there has been no mention whatsoever in the Cuban press of these drastic actions.

In addition to these illegal jailings, there has been a whole series of events that indicate the determination of the Cuban leadership to isolate and crush the Trotskyist party and its supporters, liquidate the only organized critical voice of the Revolution, and in the process, intimidate anyone else who may wish to offer a criticism or oppose a policy of the leadership or the Government.

Late in 1963, the residence permit of the delegate in Cuba of the Posadas Fourth International was abruptly cancelled, and after having his watch, clothes, and typewriter seized by the police, he was deported from the island. This attack came only a few days after the five Latin American Trotskyists participating in the Havana Congress of Architects had unconditionally offered their services following the strike of the hurricane. Around the same time, other Cuban Trotskyists were prevented from leaving the country to attend a world gathering in Europe of the Posadas tendency. While in Cuba some of the students spoke with another comrade from Guantanamo City, who had been fired from his job by the factory administration because he was a Trotskyist. A baker, he had been a union militant for almost thirty years and was well known by his fellow workers. He appealed his dismissal (a very serious punishment in Cuba that prevents a worker from getting a job anywhere except in the tiny private sector that remains) to the factory Reclamation Commission (a grievance panel consisting of representatives of the factory workers, the Factory Directorate, and the Secretary of Labor), who ordered that he be reinstated. The lo-

cal Party members and the factory management refused, so he appealed to the Ministry of Labor in Havana. The Ministry ordered him reinstated, but again the Party said no. He was in Havana fighting this last ruling when we spoke with him.

Slanders

The exemplary revolutionary record of the arrested five, and the Cuban Trotskyists as a whole, both before and after the triumph of the Revolution, stands in marked contrast to the official rumors and cynical statements of the Cuban leadership. (Among the slander circulated by the Stalinists are stories of Trotskyist participation in the Bay of Pigs invasion, where actually, one of the comrades fought with his militia unit to repel the invaders; of sabotage of transportation at Guantanamo; that the hated and corrupt union leader Mujal, former PSPer, was in reality a Trotskyist agent, and so on.

During a meeting this summer with the American students, one of them asked Che Guevara, concerning the jailed Trotskyists, if it would not be better if political criticism in the framework of unconditional support and defense of the Revolution, should be handled politically, rather than by suppression of views. Guevara replied, "I agree with your statement, but the Cuban Trotskyists are not inside the Revolution, but only 'divisionists.' I did not see them in any mountains, I did not see them dead in any city battle. They appeared after the revolution was over giving instructions about Guantanamo, and so on. I won't say they are CIA agents—we don't know. *They have no history of support to the Revolution.* They say there is a right-wing formed by the Stalinists and we (Guevara) are the left-wing."

Similar accusations were made by Blas Roca, thirty-year PSP member and professional opportunist, in an interview held for the student group following a tour of *Hoy*. After giving a brief "history" of the Trotskyists in Cuba, Roca said, "They are always to the left. In 1959 they were calling for soviets in Cuba. This would have provided Imperialism with the excuse to attack our Revolution as 'Communist.'" Strange excuse from a presumably Communist state leader!) To a subsequent question he admitted that at the present there was *nothing* in Cuba comparable to the Soviets or Workers' Councils of revolutionary Russia, i.e., elected representative bodies of workers' and peasants' control of the State. Another question to Roca pointed out that since this was the case and since neither the structure of the party (PURSC) nor the present role of the unions were substitutes

for this function, there seemed to be an organizational gap between the Government and the working people of Cuba. "Yes," he replied, "*formally* there is a gap, but in reality there is none." That so-called "gap" has been the principal focal point of the criticism and program of the Cuban Trotskyists, namely, that the Cuban workers' state is not controlled by the Cuban working people.

Interview with Leon Ferrera

We had a lengthy interview in Havana with Leon Ferrera, son of the imprisoned General Secretary and editor of *Voz Proletería*, Idalberto Ferrera. We spoke with Leon and other comrades of POR in his small apartment in a workers' district of old Havana. His father had received his nine year sentence only about three weeks before we had arrived in Cuba and he was not sure just when he and the rest of his comrades would also be arrested. Sitting there in his Militia uniform he looked very much "inside" the Revolution. When questioned about the repressive actions taking against his father and the other comrades, he was primarily concerned that, aside from the discredit to the Cuban Revolution by these Stalinist tactics, the arrests represented a very serious threat to the advance of the Revolution. He explained that all of the Trotskyists' criticism had only one purpose—to strengthen the Revolution and correct its weaknesses already manifesting themselves. Whatever happened to Cuba affected the revolutionary movement and the workers' struggles in all of Latin America and throughout the world. The charge that they were "seeking to overthrow the Cuban government" was ridiculous, he said. "We do not struggle to seize political power from Fidel. We fight in order that state power may pass totally to the masses; in order that communes and soviets—which are the masses' political organs of expression—may be organized and function; in order that the masses may intervene and directly participate in all the administrative processes of economic production and distribution, thus preventing bureaucratization. We struggle for self-administration of the masses and not mere obedience of orders imposed from above." He said that even though the Cuban workers and peasants possess arms, they could not exercise political power without soviets. Leon said that their program consisted generally of the following points: (1) for free elections in the unions, no slates chosen by the Party; (2) for the convening of a National Congress of the Central de Trabajadores de Cuba Revolucionaria with new leaders and delegates freely elected; (3) for the es-

... CUBA

establishment of Workers Councils to control, through their delegates, the administration of the Cuban State; and (4) for the right of all political tendencies that support the Revolution to freedom of expression.

Letter from Prison

A striking confirmation of the revolutionary character and devotion to the Revolution of the Cuban comrades is found in a recently published letter by Andrés Alfonso, written from the prison where he is serving his five-year term. In it he expresses concern over whether prison labor is being utilized in the most efficient manner and says he feels "a revolutionary disquietude for being condemned already for five months to total inactivity, eating as a parasite, depriving the Revolution of my humble mechanic's role." Later he states, "We criticize the bureaucracy as an obstacle to the Revolution, but we offer solutions, the means to combat it and to attenuate the damage caused by the bureaucracy and we understand that the best form, if not to eradicate it, at least to diminish the negative influence of the bureaucracy, is the intervention of the masses, control by the working class, and the functioning of socialist democracy. Our struggle has no sense if we do not defend this basic socialist principle."

The apparently confused and ambiguous nature of the early moves against the Cuban Trotskyists, the "cat and mouse" character of the whole repression, is an indication of the variety of powerful forces acting on the Cuban leadership and elements within it, that prevent it from acting as a unified and free agent. Some of the Trotskyists were detained and released several times before their final arrests; while three were being held for months without charges or any sign of release, their modest press was permitted to continue publication. Several of those that are in prison, for clearly political reasons, have been appointed *Political Instructors* in their respective prisons! They have not been sent to the prisons for counter-revolutionaries, but to those for "workers who make mistakes." Also, while the Ministry of Labor was ruling in favor of re-instating the worker fired from his job, his comrades were being sent to jail.

Robert Williams

Also indicative of the recent state of affairs in Cuba is the experience of Robert Williams, the black revolutionist in exile to escape the racist FBI. He said he had been prevented

from broadcasting his "Radio Free Dixie" program for several weeks and also wasn't able to publish his newsletter, "The Crusader," during that period, and was having his mail interrupted. Those responsible for this are the "Amigos de Cuba," a group of expatriate American Stalinists residing in Cuba. They have been hostile to Williams' militant stand on self-defense and black revolution, favoring instead "nonviolence," as does the CPUSA. If anything the "Amigos" are worse than their counterparts in the CPUSA because in Cuba they have influence. They circulate rumors that Williams, in fact, represents only a tiny group in the U.S. and has no following. They have repeatedly attempted to compel Williams and his wife, Mabel, to lend their names to one or another of their pacifist projects.

Behind the Repressions

These repressions are a manifestation of a distinct shift to the right by the Cuban leadership, adopting the "peaceful coexistence" line, with the corresponding strengthening of the most conservative, conciliatory trends and forces within the Government, represented generally by the sector made up of the leaders of the old PSP (Cuban Communist party) and a whole layer of new elements in the administration.

It is a rule in the class struggle that a shift to the right by an organization or a government is generally accompanied by an attack on its left. The arrests of the Trotskyists started around the time of Castro's trip to the Soviet Union, where he agreed to support the Russians in the Sino-Soviet dispute in exchange for the vital stable sugar price. (See: "Castro in Moscow, SPARTACIST #1.) After his return Castro arranged the interview with *The New York Times* where he indicated his willingness to take a step back from any revolutionary role in Latin America, among other concessions, in return for a relaxing of pressure by the United States. All the developments of the past year or so have taken place against a general right turn throughout Latin America: Brazil, Venezuela, Argentina, Chile, and now Bolivia.

The suppression of the Cuban Trotskyists marks a dangerous milestone in the development of the Cuban Revolution. It should be of particular concern to those uncritical supporters and "friends" of the Revolution who, in the last five years, have seized on one substitute after another as "trends toward democratization." These attacks on a critical political tendency fully in support of the Revolution, are, in fact, an attack on the historical necessity and absolute right of the Cuban

working masses to exercise political control of their State (not Fidel's or Raul's or Che's). Workers' democracy is not just a question of "forms" or an abstract social concept. In a workers' state with a nationalized and planned economy the centralized administration of such an economy involves above all *political* questions and not just technical-economic ones, therefore, of necessity, demanding the greatest participation of the working people of the country.

For a thorough elaboration of the critical relationship between workers' participation and vital economic questions, readers are referred to a perceptive analysis of Cuban political life by Adolfo Gilly, "*Inside the Cuban Revolution*," in the October 1964 *Monthly Review*.

At every major stage in the development of the Cuban Revolution it has been the working masses of the country that have taken the initiative and the Castro leadership that has responded or reacted to this pressure. The first Agrarian Reform merely codified and limited what had already taken place in the countryside. The wave of occupations of factories in 1959 was the basis of the later nationalizations; the action taken against Anibal Escalante (without the benefit, incidentally, of any democratic procedure and with the concurrence of the leadership of the Soviet Union) was admitted by Castro to be in response to enormous pressure from below. However, what this "pressure" lacks is a *conscious, organized* expression, i.e., a *revolutionary party*. This, plus the fact that the Castro leadership showed itself to be very sensitive and responsive to the drive from below, explains why the Cuban working people stopped mid-way, acceding the political control of their state to the Castro leadership. Now the right of the country's worker and peasant masses to organize such a party, to create the political instruments to express their opinions, has been rudely denied by that same leadership.

Needs of the Revolution

To survive, the Cuban workers' state *must* break out of its political and economic isolation and its corrupting dependence on the Soviet Union. The narrow nationalist ideology has to be discarded and replaced by a revolutionary foreign policy, building and providing leadership and assistance to the revolutionary movement throughout Latin America. The over-

throw of capitalism and the establishment of workers' states in Venezuela, Bolivia, and Chile are very much on the agenda and represent the *only* effective way to smash Cuba's present isolation. "Peaceful coexistence" not only is no solution but presents a major threat to Cuba, representing, more than anything else, an attempt by a large section of the capitalist world to influence the Revolution from the inside, seeking to indirectly create conditions for the development of the most conservative, bureaucratic trend in the Cuban leadership.

The formation of a conscious, revolutionary party—the instrument crucial to such a development, the establishment of soviets, genuine workers' councils, i.e., those representative bodies of self-government that in a workers' democracy express the will of the working masses, would result in the widest participation of the Cuban workers and farmers in the leadership of their state, with the free discussion and rich democratic, political life that marked the early years of the Russian Revolution. Such a development would have a profound effect on the working populations of the capitalist countries, exposing all the lies and slanders of their governments concerning the Cuban Revolution. In addition, this would provide a powerful impetus to the working masses of the other deformed workers' states to get rid of their own bureaucracies and take control of their state, continuing what was begun in East Germany in 1953 and Poland and Hungary in 1956. Neither the leaders of these states nor the capitalist governments, though each for their own reasons, are at all interested in seeing socialist democracy established in Cuba, providing, for Cuba, a dangerous intersection of interests.

Apologists

The questions of workers democracy and of building the revolutionary party are completely lost upon a wide layer of "friends of Cuba," not least the Majority of the Socialist Workers Party. Bluntly, the truth is that such people are not in reality for workers' democracy. Their reasoned apologetics represent nothing but a *fake* search for *fake* substitutes. They invariably identify with the elitist leadership itself, and betray in fact a *contempt* for mass rule, with various excuses that the working masses are "insufficiently educated" or "inexperienced" or "backward" or "stupid" or anything else *except* entirely capable of controlling their own state and society. Another variation of the same theme is that the working people don't really "deserve" to rule, since most of the "real" fighting was done by Castro and the guerrillas. With their "uncritical sup-

port" they join the ranks of those conservative forces within the Revolution and the capitalist and so-called socialist advocates of "peaceful coexistence" outside that have no desire to have the weaknesses of the Cuban Revolution exposed, criticized, and corrected, since they themselves view them as favorable tendencies.

The last time anyone in the SWP undertook an ostensible "defense" of the Cuban Trotskyists, the Cubans could have probably done better without it. That was in the summer of 1962 when Joseph Hansen, in his usual role of hatchet-man, wrote a series of articles for the *Militant* in reply to slanders of Trotskyism by Blas Roca in *Hoy*. The section dealing with the Cuban comrades (Part 2, August 13) consists essentially of a more direct attack on the Cuban Trotskyists, in the guise of exposing Blas Roca's distortions of their positions. In the article, Hansen refers to them as a "minor" tendency outside the "mainstream of world Trotskyism" (i.e., the centrist SWP); they were "ultra-leftists" that "added to the complications facing the central leadership"; whereas they, the SWP, could justifiably be called "Fidelistas" says Hansen. The proposals of the Cuban Trotskyists were "bizarre or utopian" and could lead to disaster if put into effect. He refers contemptuously to their criticisms of Castro as seeking to qualify Castro as a "simon-pure Marxist-Leninist" before entrusting him with "the red charter." This despicable attack by an unprincipled, centrist, opportunist goes on *ad nauseum*, revealing the SWP leadership in a position of obsequious adulation of the Cuban leadership in power, with whom they clearly identify and sympathize, attacking their nominal comrades in order to prove who the "good Trotskyists" are.

Since the recent waves of arrests starting in November, 1963, the SWP has been conspicuously mute in its press, too craven in its search for "respectability" to accept public responsibility for what is in fact its position, preferring instead to give a nod of approval to the suppression of the Cuban Trotskyists by maintaining a discreet silence. However, Barry Sheppard, YSA National Chairman, and member of the SWP National Committee, recently filled the breach. At a New York SWP public meeting, while acting as moderator of a panel discussion by several students just returned from Cuba, there was a question from the floor requesting comment on the fate of the Cuban Trotskyists. Sheppard intercepted the question and replied, "There are Trotskyists and there are Trotskyists. But, if I were in Cuba I wouldn't be arrested.

A spokesman of SPARTACIST took the floor to heartily agree with Brother Sheppard.

Deepen the Revolution

The Cuban Revolution must replace its present nationalist, "peaceful coexistence" ideology, its strangling economic and political dependence on the Soviet Union, with a revolutionary foreign policy, an orientation to the Latin American Revolution, to concretely building and giving leadership to the Revolutionary Movement in Latin America as part of a world movement. Internally, the establishment of genuine workers democracy, building soviets—workers' councils—elected representative organs of workers' power, and restoration of the rich internal life that is vital for any revolutionary movement in defeating bureaucracy. *Make all Government Ministers responsible to Workers' Councils!*

To begin these tasks that mean life or death to the Cuban Revolution, it is necessary first to build the instrument capable of waging this fight—a conscious revolutionary party that will be, in fact, the vanguard party, anticipating the course of events and the needs of the Revolution, and *leading* the Struggle.

Defend the Cuban Trotskyists!

At this point, a vital link in this rearmament of the Cuban Revolution, is for the Cuban Trotskyists to win freedom and complete vindication, as part of the right of all political tendencies supporting the Revolution to freedom of expression. It is imperative, therefore, that all supporters of the Cuban Revolution, all those that have not forgotten the grotesque results of forty years of apologies or silence concerning similar events in the Soviet Union, send protests to the Cuban Government demanding the immediate release of the Cuban Trotskyists! In the United States letters may be sent to: Prime Minister Fidel Castro Ruz, c/o Cuban Mission to the United Nations, 5 East 67th Street, New York, New York 10021. A.S. ■

CEYLON

The Great Betrayal

By Gerry Healy

24 pages — 25¢ a copy

Order from SPARTACIST

Box 1377, G.P.O.—New York, N.Y. 10001

PURGE HITS YSA

The National Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance expelled eight YSA members at its Labor Day weekend plenary meeting. Three of the expelled had been previously suspended for public activity as Spartacists following their earlier ideological expulsion from the Socialist Workers Party.

Spartacist Proscribed

What is really remarkable about the YSA's group expulsion are the implications of the key section of the NC's expulsion motion which promulgated a new general policy: "*Membership in, support to, or collaboration with the Spartacist group is incompatible with membership in the YSA.*" This motion singles out the Spartacists as a proscribed group—the only such in the history of the YSA—and in flat contradiction with the YSA Constitution which declares:

"Membership in the YSA is open to those young people who agree with the Statement of Purpose and who accept the program and policies of the YSA, *regardless of membership or non-membership in any adult socialist party.*" (Article III, Section 1. emphasis added)

Most serious for the future of the YSA is that not only has a group been proscribed, but so have its ideas. In the new policy motion, when one subtracts the meaning of both "membership in" and "collaboration with" the Spartacist group, the only sense in which the also banned "support to" Spartacist can be taken is as *political agreement*. This is indeed the case as was proved by the selection of that five of the eight who had been given no trial at all (nor in most cases even notice that action against them was pending). What the five had all shared in common was having voted for left-wing delegates to last year's YSA Convention. The YSA leadership singled them out as known or believed sympathetic with what had become, in the intervening period, the Spartacist group. In plain language this is called a purge. Here is the real measure for such cynical declarations as the one in the subsequent October *Young Socialist* that: "As an independent and democratic socialist youth organization, the YSA guarantees to all its members the right to freely express their political ideas and to share fully in all political and organizational decisions."

Appeal to Convention

Revolutionists do not simply acquiesce to unilateral organizational exclusions in the face of continuing, unresolved lack of political clarity. The SWP and YSA continue to call themselves Trotskyist, thereby reflecting the unfinished, centrist quality of their rightward motion. For this reason representatives of the expelled comrades are seeking to make an appeal before the forthcoming YSA National Convention, where, by rights, they should be participants. In addition to reversal of the YSA expulsions, the Convention will be asked to call upon the SWP to likewise reinstate those expelled from the party—and thus wipe out the immediate frictions and problems created by the waves of expulsions with the expelled necessarily giving public



EXPULLED FOR IT. Shirley Stoute does volunteer labor in Cuban sugar cane field. SWP expelled her for going on travel-ban-breaking trip last summer.

expression to their views and criticisms as in the SPARTACIST.

Witch Hunt Continues in SWP

One of those expelled at the YSA plenum, comrade Shirley Stoute, until then a member of the YSA National and National Executive Committees, had a par-

(Continued on Page 3)

SUBSCRIBE TO THE

SPARTACIST

50c — ONE YEAR — 50c

Name

Street

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

(Please PRINT Plainly)

Send to SPARTACIST, Box 1377, G.P. O.
New York, N. Y. 10001