

MARCH, 1970

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE WORLD SCENE

Gus Hall

RACIST WARS AND TERROR

William L. Patterson

NEW YORK MAYORALTY ELECTIONS

José Ristorucci and Ernest Kuddes

A LETTER TO LENIN

Industrial Workers of the World

TROTSKYISM IN THE MODERN WORLD

A. Basmanov

BETTY GANNET

60¢

IN MEMORIAM



BETTY GANNETT

July 30, 1906

March 4, 1970

**political
affairs**

BETTY GANNETT, Editor

HYMAN LUMER, Associate Editor

Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party, U. S. A.

VOL. XLIX, NO. 3

MARCH, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>The Staff</i>	
A Grievous Loss	2
<i>Gus Hall</i>	
The World Scene	3
<i>William L. Patterson</i>	
The Battle Against Racist Wars and Terror	11
<i>José Ristorucci and Ernest Kuddes</i>	
The New York Mayoralty Elections	18
<i>Industrial Workers of the World</i>	
Letter from American Workers to the Soviet Government	27
<i>M. Basmanov</i>	
The Role of Trotskyism in the Modern World	38
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	
Violence in the United States (Part II)	52
<i>H. C.</i>	
Science and Ideology	56
<i>Andrew Rothstein</i>	
A Correction	59
<i>Hyman Lumer</i>	
"Dangerous Scot": Story of a Communist Leader	60
<i>A. W. Font</i>	
The New York Teachers Union	63

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$6.00 a year; \$3.00 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$7.00 a year. Single copies 60 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

A Grievous Loss

Early in the morning of Wednesday, March 4, our beloved comrade Betty Gannet, passed away at the age of 63. She had been suffering for a long time from the illness which finally took her life.

It was typical of Betty that despite pain and suffering she continued to carry the full burden of editorship of *Political Affairs* almost to the very end. Her perseverance against such odds is testimony to her unwavering devotion to the Party and to *Political Affairs*, whose publication was for her truly a labor of love.

A member of the National Committee and the Political Committee of the Communist Party, Betty served the Party in many capacities since she first joined its ranks in 1923. She made her most outstanding contributions as a Marxist-Leninist, as a theoretician, a writer and a teacher. But the history of her leadership also encompassed many mass struggles over the decades. She never permitted concern with theoretical questions to divorce her from practical activity, and she always gave to her work, whatever the task at hand, the best she had. Betty was above all a Communist.

A victim of the Smith Act, she served a two-year prison term in the federal women's penitentiary at Alderson, West Virginia, together with Party leaders Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Claudia Jones. After she left prison the vindictive immigration authorities hounded her mercilessly. Threatened with deportation, she was compelled to report regularly and to give an account of all her movements outside the immediate area in which she resided—a harassment which made it extremely difficult for her to travel.

Betty's work as editor of *Political Affairs* was outstanding. It is all the more praiseworthy in that much of it was done in the face of serious difficulties and handicaps, not least of them the illness which led to her death. In addition to her editorial duties she maintained an extensive correspondence with readers and friends.

Space forbids an adequate tribute to Betty Gannet in this issue; this must be reserved for later. Suffice it to say now that her death is a grievous loss for us all. As comrade and friend, she will be sorely missed.

—THE STAFF

GUS HALL

The World Scene

In a general sense the world scene has not changed since our last National Committee meeting. The criminal U.S. military aggression in Vietnam goes on, including its genocidal character as exposed by the My Lai massacre. The Israel aggression aided by U.S. monopoly interests in the Mideast continues. West German imperialism persists with its policies of expansion, its aggressive designs on the socialist German Democratic Republic and its attempts to again dominate capitalist Europe.

U.S. policies of imperialist penetration into South America, Africa and Asia continue in every possible form. The United States is squeezing ever larger profits from the oppressed section of the world.

The disunity of the leadership of the Arab states has not lessened.

The Mao Tse-tung leadership, in a basic sense, continues its divisive and disruptive policies of trying to split the world movements against imperialism and disrupt the movement of world socialism. It is still basically motivated by concepts of narrow Chinese bourgeois nationalism cloaked in socialist terms. The Mao group remains as anti-Soviet as ever.

The military fascist dictatorships in such countries as Greece, Portugal, Spain, Indonesia, Haiti, Brazil, Argentina and Guatemala remain in power.

In a general sense, such a cataloging of the world appears to be true. But it is only a surface truth because beneath this scene there is ferment and movement, there is struggle and there are victories. A total balance sheet of these processes clearly reveals a further weakening of world imperialism and a further strengthening and growth of the forces of world socialism and anti-imperialism. The gathering of the forces of progress and the consolidation of these forces goes on in spite of temporary interruptions or setbacks.

Vietnam

During this past year the position of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam has become more vulnerable and the Nixon policy is headed for a new explosive crisis. The scheduled token withdrawal of U.S. troops at this

*This article contains the opening section of a report presented to a meeting of the National Committee of the CPUSA held on January 16-18, 1970. The full report is being issued in pamphlet form by New Outlook Publishers under the title *The Fight Against the Nixon-Agnew Road to Disaster*.

point is significant only as a symbol of the U.S. dilemma in Vietnam and as a device to halt the popular protest. The present policies cannot win and they also cannot drag on indefinitely. To reinstate the policy of a military victory in Vietnam would require a massive military escalation including possible nuclear war, a total economic and futile political commitment. This kind of a shift would result in a domestic and world crisis of catastrophic proportions.

On the other hand, the pressures for the United States to retreat from Vietnam are very heavy. They come from all quarters, both externally and internally. But how to retreat without giving up the objective of the aggression is the U.S. dilemma. The Nixon objective is no different than was the Eisenhower objective with the reactionary Diem regime. What Eisenhower and Kennedy tried to do through Diem, Nixon is trying to do through Thieu. It is to maintain a reactionary puppet regime. The Nixon plan envisions a cutthroat South Vietnamese armed force with the U.S. armed forces staying for a long time in fortified centers and in air fields with their bomber fleets. This is the essence of the so-called "Vietnamization of the war." Nixon's troop withdrawals are based on the expectation of such an end.

That is why U.S. imperialism has scuttled the Paris peace negotiations, as Dulles did with the Geneva agreement in 1954. The Paris talks would involve political questions. If it can help it, U.S. imperialism is not about to abandon its political plans for South Vietnam. The representatives of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam are not going to accept and are not even going to discuss a defeat they have not suffered on the battlefield. Thus the Nixon-Agnew plan is a fraud. It is, in fact, continued aggression advancing behind words of "withdrawal" and "troop withdrawals" based on conditions that will never become a reality.

Their plan is headed for a crisis because its mainstay is a miscalculation. Because of popular pressures Nixon will continue the token troop withdrawals. He will do this as long as it does not affect the military situation in Vietnam. He will postpone the inevitable crisis as long as possible by dragging out the troop withdrawals. But there will come a point when the troop withdrawals cannot continue without affecting the military balance. This will come at a time when the military, diplomatic and political strength of the Vietnamese national liberation forces will be greater, when the puppet forces will be weaker. At this point the millions of Americans who now believe Nixon is trying to end the U.S. aggression will become disillusioned—

because yet another option of maneuverability by U.S. imperialism will vanish.

Such are the ingredients of the new crisis-point of the Vietnamese aggression. It is to this reality that we and the broad forces opposing this ugly U.S. aggression must gear our activities. The removal of the Thieu-Ky puppets and the recognition of a people's representative government becomes a key demand. With fraudulent maneuvers Nixon has changed the scenery on the stage, but the plot remains the same. The shift in scenery has had a temporary blunting effect on the peace movement. But we would make a mistake if we did not foresee that the Vietnam policy is headed for a new crisis and that disillusionment and heightened anger among the American people is inevitable.

So on the balance sheet the position of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam has become weaker and more vulnerable. And as a result the forces of world imperialism are also weaker.

West Germany

During this past period there has also taken place some important movement in West Germany. The old reactionary Christian Democratic Party, staffed and led by the remnants of Hitler's cutthroats, was defeated in the general elections. The election of a Social Democratic government foreshadows some tactical changes in West Germany's policies. There are some indications of this in their approaches to relations with the socialist countries of Europe. These tactical changes are related to the changes in the balance of world forces as well as to changes in the forces within West Germany. It is tactical, yet it is a significant shift in the world scene. It is not a change in basic policy but it does affect world forces.

The more sophisticated of U.S. imperialist spokesmen are already showing concern about these shifts, because the established U.S. policy in Europe calls for a West Germany fully armed and rattling its saber at its socialist neighbors.

Of course, a more difficult hurdle for the new Willy Brandt tactic is for West German capitalism to give up its aggressive designs on the Socialist Germany. This it has not done. In his state-of-West-German-affairs speech Brandt wails because the leaders of the German Democratic Republic determinedly defend their socialist structure.

National Liberation

There has been further important consolidation of the forces of national liberation. The conscious anti-imperialist and socialist-ori-

ented forces in the revolutions of Libya, Sudan, Tanzania, Congo (Brazzaville), Algeria, Syria, Egypt and Peru have become more unified, consolidated and more influential. Further, in most of the oppressed or underdeveloped countries of the world—countries such as Chile, Venezuela, Puerto Rico, the Phillipine Islands—this has been a period of the gathering and the consolidation of broad people's democratic movements. These movements and struggles and the new consolidation are taking place around the issues of anti-imperialism, anti-feudalism and anti-militarism. In many ways, in these countries the period has been what Lenin had in mind when he said:

In other words, the immediate task of our Party is not to summon all available forces for the attack right now but to call for . . . uniting all forces . . . and guiding the movement in actual practice . . . using it to build up and consolidate the fighting forces suitable for the decisive struggle . . . that of concentrating all the elements of political discontent and protest and thereby vitalizing the revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

In most of these movements the Communist Parties are re-emerging as the decisive force. This gives these movements a new quality. Because of this, they are on a higher level. The period of disorientation, of hesitation and divisions, is coming to an end.

The struggle for the consolidation of the working-class forces goes on in most capitalist countries. This has especially been so in Italy and France. The strike struggles in the capitalist world have greatly increased.

Of course, the main element in the balance sheet is the continued successes in the building of socialism in one-third of the world. The continued progress of the Soviet Union is closing the industrial and technological gap between it and the United States. The construction of socialism is on a steady, solid course. The people of Czechoslovakia are again on a correct path. They have rejected any idea of returning to the mistakes of the Novotny days and they have defeated the anti-socialist and revisionist conspiracy. They are taking positive steps on the path of socialist construction. The first million tons in this year's sugar harvest in Cuba is an example of the vitality and power of masses when they are organized.

To all these positive developments one must add the growing unity in the world Communist movement. This process has continued after the World Communist Meeting in Moscow. This new unity in the

world Communist movement has resulted in a new level of unity in the ranks of the anti-imperialist forces in many countries.

Biafra

Developments in Nigeria are of great significance. Now that the fighting has ended in Biafra, the issues and forces involved become clearer.

It is another example of the fact that not all rebellions necessarily serve a progressive purpose. It is clear there are issues related to equality of Biafra within Nigeria. But it is also clear that the forces behind the rebellion were not interested in such matters.

The foreign imperialist forces were France, Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia, with the reactionary forces within the Vatican giving a hand.

China

It is necessary to take a deeper look at the nature of the motion relating to China. It is true people sleeping in the same bed can have different dreams. And people taking part in the same diplomatic moves can have different motives and different roles. They not only can but in most cases they do. There has been motion both in China-U.S. relations and in China-Soviet relations. This motion in the two areas is closely related. It involves a relationship of world forces and is related to the basic contradiction of our times.

We, and I believe the majority of the American people, are for putting an end to all forms of U.S. imperialist aggression against the People's Republic of China. We are for full recognition and diplomatic relations with China. We are for full and equal trade relations with China. We are for an end to the U.S. occupation of Taiwan and for its return to China.

But we must warn, this is not the purpose or the essence of the motion by U.S. imperialism. Its China policy has different aims. Trade is not the immediate factor motivating U.S. relations with People's China.

For over three years the reactionary imperialist grouping called "The China Lobby," originally organized as a spearhead against People's China, has been conducting a campaign to lift some of the U.S. restrictions against that country. These forces have not changed their anti-People's China imperialist designs, but they *have* changed their tactics. The Nixon Administration has now taken some of the steps the China Lobby is advocating. These actions have resulted in the

reopening of the U.S.-China negotiations in Warsaw.

During this same period the initiative of the Soviet Union has resulted in joint meetings between Soviet and Chinese representatives. The agreement to have these meetings has resulted in a cooling off of the situation on the Chinese-Soviet border. However, so far the indications are that the Chinese leadership is not ready to reverse its course or to give up its fanatical anti-Soviet position. It has not shown a willingness to discuss practical questions blocking the path to improved relationships. It is one of the oddities of the Mao policies that they resist discussing such questions with socialist countries but discuss and remove obstacles between themselves and the leading imperialist country of the world. As China has cut its trade with the socialist countries, it has increased its trade with the imperialist countries. It is in this context that one must ask: what is the essence of the diplomatic motion in the U.S.-China relationship?

There can be no doubt about the intentions of U.S. imperialism. It seeks to strengthen its world position by weakening the forces of world socialism in general, but of the Soviet Union in particular. The main obstacle to U.S. policies is the Soviet Union. Therefore its main goal is to weaken the Soviet Union. For the moment the main anti-Soviet effort of U.S. imperialism is to sharpen the relations between the Soviet Union and China. In the pursuance of this main goal U.S. imperialism is ready to make concessions.

This is in the very center of every diplomatic move U.S. imperialism makes. It is not just a diplomatic question.

The U.S.-Soviet relationship is the sharpest expression of the main class contradiction of our times on a world scale. The world position of the two classes, capitalist and working class, comes into its sharpest focus in these relations. There is absolutely no way a socialist country or a Communist party or any other political or social force can avoid reacting to this central challenge of this historic moment. The options are limited. Either one holds to a firm revolutionary position of in no way adjusting, accommodating, flirting with or "using" this central expression of the class contradiction, or one takes an opportunistic position of accommodation, of taking momentary advantage of the situation, or of ingratiating oneself with capitalist powers by one's silence.

This is playing the game by rules laid down by imperialism. As the balance of world forces has shifted, this contradiction has forced itself to the center of the stage more and more. As these U.S.-China relationships develop one is compelled to ask what is the essence of

the motion on the part of the Chinese leadership? How does it affect this main expression of the class confrontation? In this connection one has to take into account the nature of the Maoist line in foreign policy. In an important sense it has been a Chinese bourgeois-nationalist policy. It has not been based on working-class considerations. It has not shown any concern for problems of class unity, for the unity of the anti-imperialist or socialist forces. And in a final sense it has not been even a policy in the interests of Chinese socialism.

It is this erroneous policy of narrow, egoistic nationalism that has led the Maoist leadership to a position of fanatical anti-Sovietism. This has been its main thrust. It has been and is Mao's main preoccupation.

Therefore, it seems clear that no matter what anyone's intentions are, in the U.S.-China dialogue each one's own brand of anti-Sovietism, each for its own purpose, will be a factor.

If not for the past policies of the Mao leadership there would be no questions about these developing relations. Then they would not and could not have an adverse affect on the world struggle against imperialism.

It is the height of naivete and it is extremely dangerous and self-defeating for the leaders of any socialist country to think they can "use" an imperialist power as a counter-weight in settling disagreements with other socialist countries. It is opportunism because while it results in some temporary concessions, it takes place at the expense of the working class and the rest of the socialist community. Such policies become a drag on socialist countries and an obstacle to winning relationships of equality with capitalist countries based on their united strength.

To checkmate imperialism's use of differences between socialist countries, differences between Communist parties, differences between newly-liberated countries—in general, differences between any of the forces of anti-imperialism—has emerged as a most decisive question in our times. It is the acid test of one's ideological fiber.

In today's world it is *the* test of one's working class internationalism. To permit oneself to be an instrument of this imperialist tactic in any way, no matter how commendable one's intentions, is opportunism. To be of service to imperialism, even in the slightest, is to be a servant of imperialism.

Other Areas of Motion

There has been some motion in other areas of which we should

take brief note. One is the game U.S. and Japanese imperialism are playing in Okinawa. The U.S.-Japanese agreement is no victory for the people of Okinawa or the anti-imperialist forces of Japan or the U.S. Now Okinawa will have the presence of two imperialist masters. During this game no one asked the people of Okinawa whether they would have wanted independence or some other solution. In this agreement U.S. imperialism won the right to continue its presence in Okinawa plus the right to nuclear bases in Japan.

The American and Japanese people's movements should have united in the struggle for the right of self-determination for the people of Okinawa. Our Party's position has been and is for the immediate and total withdrawal of U.S. forces and for the right of the people of Okinawa to self-determination. It is the only correct anti-imperialist position.

We can never be partners to imperialist chess games—not only in general but especially when one's own imperialism is involved.

There has also been some motion in the world monetary field. U.S. imperialism has won some concessions from its partners-in-crime. Its main capitalist rivals, through such instrumentalities as paper gold, have made some contributions to momentarily alleviating the U.S. monetary crisis. They have postponed some of their demands and payments, thereby temporarily easing the U.S. financial position and indirectly helping to pay for the U.S. aggression against Vietnam. The sharp edge of crisis has for the moment shifted to other members of world capitalism.

Finally, there has been also motion in the strategic arms negotiations. There is now an agreement on a meeting place and order of business. It reflects the pressures and the problems of the strategic arms race. For the moment, I do not believe U.S. imperialism is going to agree on any basic limitation. The military-industrial complex has already placed its people on a full-time three-shift basis to come up with schemes that will block any agreement.

The mass pressures will have to escalate greatly before this Administration will agree to any limitations. There is no question this issue will emerge as a crucial issue because it is closely related to the crisis situation in the U.S.

That, in brief, is an assessment of some of the motion, some of the trends on the world scene. Much of the motion is in the form of processes, of the gathering of forces, but they are the very processes that are setting the stage for more dramatic and explosive changes.

The Battle Against Racist Wars And Terror

We have entered the decade of the seventies. Vistas of an enlargement and sharpening of the fight for peace and against every vestige of racism are visible on every side. In the arena of international relations, socialist diplomacy daily grows taller and stronger. Its impact is clearly to be noted in Africa, Asia, Latin America and councils of the United Nations. Those who have made of racism an export commodity find the market narrowing. They find in the socialist world's ideology of equal rights and opportunities an insurmountable barrier to racism's extension. Socialist morality challenges the morality of the USA, West Germany, Portugal, France and England, that of the aggressive warmakers and the racists with their myths of superiority of race based on color.

To the humanistic demand of the United Nations and oppressed peoples for a world purged of racist myths, the dehumanized racists give to this vicious tattered fiction of color superiority a divine origin and therefore a lasting life. But the end of racism as a policy of government and an instrument of official persecution, terror, dehumanization and degradation is not far off.

The cheated masses of the United States, entrapped for a century by the dehumanizing concepts of racial supremacy, hoaxed by ruling-class creation of a national security that has been used to vindicate aggressive wars, now find in the Nixon-Agnew-Mitchell Axis great clarity on the role of the state in state monopoly capitalism.

Air and water are polluted for profit. But the pollution of the mind offers security to the bourgeoisie. It means the splitting of the nation, the pitting of one minority against another and those who are white against black, brown, red and yellow together.

The FBI: Agency of Racism

In carrying out this pollution of the mind, a heavy burden is placed on what is called the Federal Department of Justice and specifically on its Bureau of Investigation. From this police source all can supposedly look for fair play, equal protection and lawfulness. But in this particular, the record of Hoover's crime hawks is unique. Their record is free of any account of harassment or prosecution of racist terrorists. But it is replete with stories recounting the vic-

timization of black people who were seeking to break through the barriers of prejudice and violence.

J. Edgar Hoover, perennial chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has come up with another of his year-end reports. As usual, his eyes were clearly focused on the next budget and his mind on the support of the lawless racist contingent in Congress, whose vote he might need in his quest for money. The racist content of his report, its ill-concealed promotion of racist police terror, and its appeal for the creation of "white backlash" activities can only be aimed to intimidate and further polarize the nation. Hoover fears the developing black liberation movement. He fears the unity of white and black. He fears the seventies and the activities of the Black Panthers. The secret-police chief has produced an astounding report. Police terror and lawless attacks by uniformed and other white racists upon blacks protesting the continuing criminal denial of their Constitutional rights are rampant. But these things find no serious condemnation in Hoover's statement.

The year 1969 saw scores of black ghettos turned into police-occupied areas. The obvious reasons were that blacks sought to link their demands for justice with the fight for all forms of social welfare, which constitutes the real national security. In this they were partially successful, especially among white youth, and these successes of the black liberation movement alarmed reaction and its apologists.

Under the pretext of maintaining "law and order," open hunting season has been officially declared on the most militant of blacks in almost every large city. Leaders of the Black Panther Party are murdered indiscriminately. In a score of cities their headquarters have been cordoned off and shot into as one would shoot into a cage of uncontrollable wild beasts. An image of black militants as terrorists is being created. This racist terror, national in scope, has to be charged against the head of every branch of government on every level. But it is against the Department of Justice that the charge must be loudest.

Never, since the days when the magnificent efforts of blacks and poor whites during the Reconstruction period were betrayed and smashed by a rising capitalism that feared the unity of the liberated masses of both races, has this country witnessed such racist savagery as is now condoned and abetted by government.

At that time, having come to power, capital had at the same time to come to reaction. Lynch terror reigned supreme. That era of governmental-inspired KKKism set the stage for racist reaction to flourish.

The federal courts repudiated a series of civil rights laws passed by Congress in order that the 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution might be stabilized and made politically and ideologically effective. The periods of racist terror during the Spanish-American War and the pre-World War I years revealed the true character of bourgeois democracy in the United States. The nature of that terror was, however, not readily comprehended by the masses.

The working class had not yet become a class for itself, and before it became such, racism had been made an American way of life. Labor leaders, indoctrinated with that mythology, were induced to practice it in their organizations and in their collaboration with capital. Now racism is thoroughly and systematically organized and given all manner of genocidal forms. It is fascist-like in character. It is a vital part of the arsenal of capitalism, as the Wallaces, Madoxes and Agnews blatantly reveal and as many unions show.

Through the trial of the Chicago Seven and the "law and order" edicts of government, the present period exposes the desperate turn of capitalist democracy toward the establishment of a police state. But the social forces behind this terror—the military industrial-racist complex—are concealed by language devoid of class content. However, racism is the ideology of American monopoly capital and a favored weapon of its governmental institutions.

J. Edgar Hoover had nothing to say about the obvious menace of race hate and terror to the security of the nation and the furtherance of world peace. He had nothing to say as to the criminality of police brutality, the flagrant denial of the rights of minorities and the maintenance by government of a criminal situation that brings inestimable profits to the bourgeoisie.

The past decade has produced numerous reports from official and private sources treating of the scope and danger of police brutality and racism. Thus the Kerner Report of the Johnson era declared:

It is time now to turn with all the purpose at our command to the *major unfinished business of the nation*. It is time to adopt strategies for action that will produce quick and visible progress. It is time to make good the promises of American democracy to all citizens—urban and rural, white and black, Spanish-surname, American Indian and every minority group. (Emphasis added.)

For whom is it "time to turn"? The people, the masses, labor or the Establishment? At what date should the "major unfinished business of the nation" have been finished? Was this completion a task of the

Civil War and the era of Reconstruction? But to finish it then meant the unification of the nation along the color-line.

Obviously the time is indeed late for a turn "to the major unfinished business of the nation." Racism is an established institution in the USA. The Report recognized that the preachment and practice of racism has created "two societies . . . separate and unequal." The time to turn to the "unfinished business of the nation," that is, the establishment of full and complete equality of rights and opportunities for black citizenry, was when the government moved to deprive blacks of what they had paid for with their blood in the Civil War. The time was the period of the Hayes-Tilden Compromise.

It was then that the "promises of American democracy" became matters of political expediency. It was then that capitalism turned to dependence on racism. Obviously, it is past time to say glibly that government ought to "adopt strategies for action." That task is impossible for a moribund and decadent bourgeoisie. Its structure does not permit national unity. The turn must be toward the people.

Governmental "strategies for action" have no weight. Such "strategies" were outlined in the Wickersham Commission Report in 1931, in the Report of the Truman Administration's Civil Rights Commission, "To Secure These Rights," in the reports of the Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson Civil Rights Commissions. These strategies clutter the shelves of libraries and are meaningless.

A People's Task

The time has long passed for investigations and inquiries and the formulation of meaningless strategies. *It is now time to put an end to racism, to punish those guilty of the racist crimes continuing so savagely.* The lines of procedure were laid down by the Nuremberg war-criminal trials that convicted the Nazi racist monsters. This is a people's task. It can be achieved under labor leadership.

Among the foremost crimes that threaten the security of the nation, that have dehumanized millions of peace-loving whites and made cowards of millions, are racist crimes. To end those crimes of government demands a fundamental change in the class nature of government. Obviously, its police could not be headed by a J. Edgar Hoover. This change is a people's task.

The racist-minded criminals of the military-industrial-racist complex do not act from a position of moral strength. Quite the contrary. From the bowels of the black ghettos come cries, daily increasing in volume, to put an end to police brutality, for community control

of all service institutions, and for an end to hellish ghettos. The voices of black men, women and youth call for all manner of changes to save the nation. The voices of black men, women and youth are heard on every front of struggle. They correctly charge genocide, and genocide is a crime against all people.

From every state of the Union comes the cry for peace. From abroad, the cry is "Yankee, Go Home!" The strength of the enemy lies not in his morality. That is decadent. It lies in his ability to fascinate and mesmerize the white masses, particularly those in the ranks of labor, with the myths of white superiority, and to create a core of ideological prostitutes who sing praises of an "American way of life" that is non-existent. Racism has become a weapon against the people that must be destroyed by a united people.

The Hoover report is an ideological weapon of the most reactionary forces of our country and in the world today. It has nothing in common with internal security. It seeks the isolation and political emasculation of those most vocal and most active in the fight to preserve national security through enforcement of the Constitutional rights of all through the safeguarding of world peace. Far from providing a guide to the punishment of those who have made of the "promises of American democracy" and our commitments under the Charter of the United Nations scraps of paper, such a report is itself a clear and present danger to national security. Hoover belches out the lie that: "Extremist all-Negro hate-type organizations, such as the Black Panther Party, continue to fan the flames of riot and revolution during 1969." The racist forces of counter-revolution are draped by Hoover with a mantle of nobility, while those who seek enjoyment of the Constitution are labeled promoters of "riot and revolution." What hypocrisy! The FBI is itself an "extremist hate-type" institution.

The "flames of riot" issue forth from the mouths of the guns of those who are ordered to quell the democratic demands of blacks and other progressive social forces. The directive to still the cries for enforcement of the Constitution is issued in the name of "maintaining law and order."

From the introduction to the *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*, written by Tom Wicker, an editor of the *New York Times*, comes the following:

. . . the rioters are the personification of the nation's shame, of its deepest failure, of its greatest challenge. *They will not go away.* They can only be repressed or conceded their humanity, and the

choice is not theirs to make. They can only force it upon the rest of us, and what this Report insists upon is that they are already doing it and intend to keep at it. (Emphasis added.)

But who are the "rioters"? Are they the police or those fighting for their Constitutional rights against a government committed to racist policies? The national liberation fighters are *not rioters*. *They are defenders of the nation's integrity and honor*. They "will not go away." To go away would be a betrayal of the greatest goal in all the world—the liberation of mankind. Their moral strength sustains them. They must go into battle for their people, their country and progressive humanity.

Hoover charges the so-called "Negro hate-type organizations such as the Black Panther Party" with "unbridled vulgarity, obscenity, blasphemy, perversion and public desecration of our cherished ideals and symbols." They, the "rioters," "threaten the American way of life." But Hoover lies. The gunman from the FBI turns reality on its head. What are our "cherished ideals and symbols"? Their perversion and desecration stem from the bourgeoisie—the real "rioters." Vulgarity and obscenity are evidence of the decadence of bourgeois society, and the columns of the daily press give evidence of their prevalence. Vulgarity and obscenity are not the property of those seeking a fundamental change in the American way of life. They are baggage that has been caught up by some who mistakenly believe that their use adds to the vitality of revolutionary struggle. The contrary is true. Such language demobilizes. The language of revolution is an ennobling, lofty language.

Bestiality, hate, viciousness and an all-consuming lust for political and economic power characterize the relations of the military-industrial-banking consortium with the people at home and abroad. "Unbridled vulgarity, obscenity, blasphemy, perversion and public desecration" are the property counter-revolution is seeking to foist upon the revolution. The counter-revolution will not succeed.

Hoover Must Go

Hoover has slandered all that is decent in the United States, especially the black citizenry. He incites to murderous attacks upon the Black Panthers. These are determined revolutionaries, and revolution purifies, ennobles, cleanses, destroys that which corrupts, that which debases and dehumanizes. The growth of the Black Panther Party testifies to the creativity of black America.

It is time for Hoover to go, time to make the FBI a defender of

national security. The time calls for a new alignment of power. The source to which to turn is the people. In the realm of society, only the people are eternal.

A new decade confronts us. It demands unity in struggle of black, brown, yellow and white against the racists. Such unity can profoundly influence the decade ahead. It can be of decisive political significance to all mankind. It is possible to achieve if its limitless potentialities are recognized by the masses in the labor movement. For black leaders who are citizens of the United States, human beings, and part of a world movement for the liberation of all mankind from oppression, the fight for unity is a fight for allies without whose aid victory stands in the greatest danger.

It is time for the development of a nationwide defense movement that above all else will defend the Constitutional rights of the Black Panthers. It should be a non-partisan body that will afford a multi-national class legal defense for the anti-war forces. It should be a body that defends those gallant and heroic GI's, black and white, who are against the mass murder of aggressive war, that defends the men of labor who immediately feel the full weight of all the government security agencies when fighting for better conditions, that defends the black causes desperately struggling to break the iron grasp of racism on the labor movement.

Fearful of the growing fight-back of the people, reaction is opening, turning its courts into torture chambers. The fight of the people to get justice and equity from the judicial branch of government must be lifted to the highest level yet attained. The fight against the police state is sharpening.

The New York Mayoralty Elections

The 1969 mayoralty election in New York City presents a real-life example of the three-level approach to electoral activity reaffirmed at the 19th National Convention of the CPUSA. As we know, this approach revolves around influencing the masses, traditionally involved in the electoral process within the framework of the bourgeois parties; the creation of, and working with, independent formations; and the development of an independent role for the Communist Party in the electoral arena.

In assessing the events that culminated in the reelection of Mayor John Lindsay, it is necessary to consider three major areas which were most important in advancing the objectives of our three-level electoral policy. There were the primary elections to choose the mayoralty candidates; the mayoralty campaign itself; and the campaign around the Communist Party candidates Rasheed Storey and Jesús Colón.

The Primaries

There is a tendency to underestimate the importance of the major parties' primary elections. The results of these primaries should go far to change this attitude. The truth of the matter is that if an all-out effort had been mounted behind the candidacy of Herman Badillo, Puerto Rican Borough President of the Bronx, it would have been a completely different ball game. Badillo could have won the Democratic Party nomination, and the New York Party must assume some of the responsibility for a missed opportunity of considerable magnitude. The closeness of the vote helps make the point. Mario Procaccino won with 32 per cent of the vote, former mayor Robert Wagner had 30 per cent, and Badillo ran third with 28 per cent. The other two candidates, James Scheuer, a Reform Democratic Congressman, and Norman Mailer, a writer, both trailed far behind.

In the post-election quarterbacking it was noted that Badillo could have won if Mailer and Scheuer had withdrawn. Mailer even went so far as to state that he would have withdrawn if he thought Badillo had a chance. It was also felt that Wagner's late entry into the primaries hurt Badillo. But this was only partially the case, because a large section of Wagner's machine support would have gone to Procaccino. We have to reject this kind of speculation. If the Party and those we

could influence had worked for the Badillo candidacy with full commitment Badillo could have won. The advantage of having a progressive Puerto Rican running for mayor on the Democratic line in New York City is obvious. He would have commanded the support of the Black and Puerto Rican people, large sections of the trade union movement, the forces in the New Democratic Coalition that grouped around Lindsay, and a large section of traditional Democratic voters. Such a coalition could have won against Lindsay on the Liberal Party line, and Marchi on the Republican and Conservative Party lines.

Herman Badillo was the first Puerto Rican to come forward as a possible candidate for the highest New York City elective office. As such he represents a historic first for his people. His near miss dramatizes the possibility and necessity of putting together the kind of effort that will result in the election of Black and Puerto Rican candidates to top office. Badillo's primary campaign was based on a stand against the war in Vietnam and for a shift to spending for domestic needs. He campaigned against the ultra-Right's racist "law and order" thrust and was for the takeover of the Democratic Party by its Reform and "New Politics" wings. However, lacking the consistent pressure of Left forces, he did not develop a strong approach to labor; and he opposed open enrollment in the City University—a key demand in the Black and Puerto Rican communities.

Lindsay's defeat by State Senator John Marchi in the Republican primary came as a stunning surprise, and gave New York City two major party candidates both committed to "law and order," racist programs. In Marchi's words, he was "very hawkish on crime." Procaccino made the issue "safety in the streets, security in your homes." In spite of the generally more conservative nature of the Republican Party, Lindsay, considered a liberal, obtained 48.5 per cent of the primary vote. The four candidates opposing Procaccino had 68 per cent of the Democratic primary vote. Therefore, although ultra-Right, racist candidates won the major party primaries, they did it with a minority of the total primary vote cast.

Coming on top of conservative election triumphs in Los Angeles and Minneapolis, the results of the New York primaries were inevitably seen as part of an emerging national pattern. President Nixon remarked that the message was "loud and clear" and that the American people are "fed up with violence and lawlessness." A growing realization of the threat inherent in this racist emphasis was one of the major factors in Lindsay's eventual victory.

Lindsay meanwhile had won the designation of the Liberal Party, and this became the main vehicle for his campaign, although he did obtain a second line on the ballot—the Independent Party—to counter Marchi's second line, the Conservative Party. The fight within the Liberal Party leading to the endorsement of Lindsay had deep-going repercussions in that party. It broke the stranglehold of the ILGWU forces, led by Dubinsky and Stulberg, which subsequently withdrew their support, financial and otherwise. It broke with the long-term Liberal Party custom of endorsing Democratic candidates; and with the victory of Lindsay on its line it became an independent political force to be reckoned with in New York State. An effective labor committee was organized which was instrumental in gaining considerable labor support for Lindsay. The Liberal Party thus emerges as an independent electoral force that can play an important role in the development of a people's electoral coalition in the 1970 gubernatorial elections.

The Communist Party Candidates

In the period immediately preceding the primary elections, it became apparent that the ultra-Right was making an all-out effort to take over the New York City administration. It was decided that, in order to clarify and sharpen issues, provide a Leftward pressure, reinforce the struggle for the Party's practical legality, and play an active role in building a movement and base for a people's electoral coalition, the Party in New York should run candidates in the elections, for city-wide office. On Saturday, June 14, 1969, the New York State Committee of the CP met and nominated Rasheed Storey, State Chairman, as its candidate for the office of Mayor, and Jesús Colón for the office of Comptroller. They were the only Black and Puerto Rican candidates to run for city-wide office. On June 17, Primary Day, with the victory of the ultra-Right in the bourgeois parties, the decision of the New York District became even more important. To the extent that it was possible it became necessary to mobilize the people to defeat the Marchi and Procaccino candidacies, and the Communist Party was best able to advance this aim during the course of its own campaign.

To set the historical record straight, this was the first time since Robert Minor ran for mayor in 1933 that the Communist Party ran a candidate for city-wide office in New York. It was also the first time since 1948, when Si Gerson ran for councilman from Brooklyn, that the New York Communist Party ran candidates under its own

name. The political importance of this breakthrough cannot be overestimated. Coupled with the successes achieved, particularly in the states of Washington and Minnesota, during the presidential campaign of Charlene Mitchell and Mike Zagarell, it points to the possibility of a complete breakthrough by the Party on a national scale, and lays the base for establishing the CPUSA as an integral part of a broad anti-monopoly people's coalition in the electoral struggles to come, as well as on many other fronts. In this light, the achievement of ballot status by the Party in New York is a major contribution to the fight for the open, legal functioning of Communists in all areas of the national life of the country.

The entrance of the Communist candidates into the picture sharpened and brought to the surface ideological trends that had to be overcome in order to conduct an effective campaign. The victories of Marchi and Procaccino posed the threat of a takeover by a reactionary, racist administration in New York. An intensive effort to organize sufficient strength around Lindsay to prevent this, involved the liberal and progressive forces in the city. Lindsay, for better or worse, had to be the candidate, because to attempt to bring forth a Reform Democrat would have hopelessly split the liberal-progressive front.

In view of this reality some in the Party questioned the wisdom of a Party ticket which might "divert" votes from Lindsay. This Right tendency would have us submerge the fight for the independent role of the Party and the Left in the interest of momentary objectives. In order to exert a Leftward leverage it proved to be absolutely necessary for us to pursue an independent electoral campaign, and the result sustained this position. The Communist Party vote had, as it turned out, no adverse effect on the Lindsay total. The main weakness of the coalition around Lindsay was its own lack of independence, and the failure to undertake a principled fight against racism and the entrenched bureaucratic municipal government. Through the Communist Party's campaign it was possible to present working-class candidates and a program that could rally forces in the struggle against the ultra-Right and for an advanced program as an answer to the crisis of the city.

The "Left" tendency was that of being unable to distinguish between the bourgeois candidates. It was seen that Marchi and Procaccino represented reactionary trends within their parties, but there was an inability to see the differences in Lindsay and the coalition supporting him. Therefore, the reasoning went, it is necessary to

oppose all three as equally reactionary, while running an independent, Left candidate. Forgotten was Lenin's admonition to the British Communist Party in 1920 to distinguish between Labor Party candidates and those of the Conservative and Liberal Parties. He urged that "Left" errors be avoided by recognizing that the Labor Party, although having reformist and class-collaborationist attitudes, is different from the ruling Conservative and Liberal Parties, and provides opportunities for working-class advances.

It is necessary to guard against both "Left" and Right tendencies if a Marxist-Leninist position is to be reached in electoral activity.

The Party's Campaign

In this campaign our position was one of independence and differentiation. We stripped the demagogic mask from the "law and order" campaigns of Marchi and Procaccino, exposing the racist face underneath. We said that the real criminals are those responsible for the policies of genocide against the Vietnamese people, and against the Black people in this country. We said that the real crime is that in the wealthiest country in the world many go hungry, are unemployed and ill-housed. At the same time Storey and Colón called Lindsay to task for the omissions and weaknesses of his first four years in office. His general anti-labor stance, and his support of UFT President Shanker's racist line in the struggle for community control, were major points of criticism.

We advanced a wide-ranging program for the elimination of unemployment, to solve the housing shortage, and around the lack of proper educational and medical facilities. We called for the re-modernization of the public transit system with no increase in fares. (Lindsay's backsliding on this issue, with the fare now at 30 cents, illustrates the need for constant pressure and organization to influence liberal politicians.) We campaigned for an end to anti-labor and racist legislation, such as the Taylor Anti-Strike Law, and the Marchi School Decentralization Law, and for real community control of schools.

Our campaign gave us the opportunity to expose the ultra-Right, criticize Lindsay, lay bare the demagogic promises of all the bourgeois candidates, and at the same time present a radical alternative. Most important of all we had the opportunity to come forward as Communists, present our Party's immediate program and our longer-range solution of socialism.

All this was done at numerous street rallies, coffee klatches, indoor forums, on radio and television, and through the pages of the *Daily World*. The blackout of the Party's campaign in the New York press was almost complete, but the necessity for allowing equal time to the city-wide candidates gave us an unprecedented exposure on radio and television. As a consequence millions of New Yorkers made their first acquaintance with Communist leaders, and heard about our policies. The reception at open-air meetings and forums was uniformly friendly.

The *Daily World* played an important role in covering the campaign. The paper was especially valuable in attracting people to mass rallies and meetings during the campaign, in mobilizing forces, and in helping to establish ideological clarity on the issues and groupings involved. Unfortunately, insufficient use was made of the *Daily World* by those involved in the work, and this weakness is one that will have to be eliminated in the future.

A key weakness was an inability to mobilize our forces consistently throughout the city. In order to be on the ballot it was necessary for us to collect a minimum of 7,500 signatures. In a six-week period ending Labor Day, almost 20,000 signatures were collected. This achievement involved a relatively small per cent of the Party membership in New York, however, and could not have been accomplished without the devotion and commitment of the young comrades. A certain amount of the foot-dragging is traceable to the ideological tendencies already discussed, which served to immobilize and inhibit some of our membership in their response to the campaign. This instance serves to reinforce our understanding of the need for ideological clarity in the Party, and the difficulties that develop in practical work if it is absent.

A reflection of the Right opportunist tendency could be seen in the final vote recorded for the Communist Party candidates on Election Day. Jesús Colón, running for Comptroller, received almost twice as many votes as Rasheed Storey, the mayoralty candidate. The final tally was approximately 4,000 for Storey and 8,000 for Colón. This reflects the fear of Lindsay losing and the lack of understanding of the key importance of the Party's independent candidacy. The size of the vote is no measure of the significance of this campaign. On balance it must be recognized that achieving ballot status was a major breakthrough for the Communist Party. Further, the tireless and enthusiastic campaign waged by Comrades Storey and Colón made a major contribution to the fight for the legality of our Party,

and towards our participation in the effort to build an anti-monopoly people's electoral coalition.

Forces and Issues

An electoral struggle brings into play all the social forces in the given situation. The extent to which the trade unions, the Black and Puerto Rican people and independent political formations are effectively involved can determine the outcome. With the victory of the ultra-Right in the Democratic and Republican primaries these forces were confronted with some hard decisions. Lindsay's record during his first term as mayor made him less than an ideal candidate. His role on the issue of community control of schools placed him in opposition to the needs and demands of the Black and Puerto Rican communities. He exhibited a general anti-labor stance in city-wide labor disputes, notably in the 12-day Transport Workers' strike that tied up the city in 1967. Although Lindsay opposed the war in words, he demonstrated very little leadership in effective action. For instance, he failed to lead a fight for a City Council resolution calling for an end to the war. In the ghetto communities Lindsay was identified with the cutbacks in welfare, Medicaid, the poverty program, the continued lack of housing construction, etc. He opposed open enrollment in the City University, and by his silence condoned police harassment and arrests of Black Panther Party members. Yet, faced with the racist, "law and order" candidates Procaccino and Marchi, Lindsay had to be the choice. As a result a realignment of the political forces in New York took place. The New Democratic Coalition headed by Paul O'Dwyer declared its support for Lindsay, a nominal Republican running on the Liberal Party line. Black Congresswomen Shirley Chisholm, Herman Badillo and many other Democratic Party figures worked for his election. He received the support of the Manhattan County GOP and of Senators Javits and Goodell. And in spite of the fact that the New York AFL-CIO officially supported Procaccino, numerous unions such as District 65, the Sanitation Workers' Union, and others announced public support of Lindsay.

The pressure and influence of the coalition made itself felt during and after the elections. Liberal Democrats like Robert Morgenthau and Jerome Kretchmer have been appointed to high posts in the new administration; and Lindsay has undertaken a more aggressive role towards the Rockefeller Administration in the fight for funds to help solve some of the most critical city problems.

The outcome of the elections was determined in two critical areas.

The first was the mounting public outcry against the war in Vietnam. Lindsay actively involved himself in the October 15th Moratorium demonstration and in the preparations for it. He was a main speaker at the enormous demonstration at Bryant Square Park in New York City, and was warmly received. In thus speaking out against the war and calling for its immediate end, Lindsay identified himself with the heartfelt desires of a vast majority of the citizens of the city. It was the turning point in a campaign which, up to that point, had been accorded little chance of success. It can be regarded as the main contribution to Lindsay's victory.

The other area was the "law and order" issue. In spite of his weaknesses on issues that deeply affected them, the Black and Puerto Rican people voted for Lindsay, and against the racist threat inherent in the candidacies of Procaccino and Marchi. The political sophistication of the Black and Puerto Rican vote is seen in the fact that predominantly Black districts gave Lindsay 82 per cent of their vote, and Puerto Rican districts gave him 64 per cent. In 1965 Black districts gave Lindsay only 35 per cent of their vote, and Puerto Rican districts 31 per cent. Those who were ready to equate Lindsay with Procaccino and Marchi might well ponder the estimate of the Black and Puerto Rican people on this matter. In the final analysis, it was this disciplined switch in votes that decided the election. There is no doubt that the Communist Party had an effect in influencing the ghetto vote. Much of our campaign was concentrated in these areas, with Rasheed Storey, Jesús Colón and other speakers making numerous appearances and receiving respectful attention.

The Outcome and the Future

The final tally showed Lindsay with 41 per cent of the vote for mayor, Procaccino with 35 per cent and Marchi with 25 per cent. In this election the Right-wing forces totalled a majority, 58 per cent of the total, but were split. The combination of events previously discussed, together with this split, allowed for the liberal victory in New York and stemmed what had seemed a conservative sweep in election after election across the country. The fears of many people, particularly in the lower middle class, incited by racist demagoguery along the lines used by the "crime in the streets," "law and order" bully boys, are reflected in the 58 per cent for Procaccino and Marchi. One of the most important tasks facing our Party in the 1970 elections, for which we must now begin preparations, is a consistent, tenacious struggle against divisive racism. This is the most vital

ingredient in the process of developing the kind of coalition movements that can successfully contend for electoral successes in the immediate period. That presupposes a struggle for the ending of repressive measures against the Black Panther Party. The genocidal attacks on the Black Panthers are at the heart of the racist onslaught now in progress in this country. Without developing a courageous struggle by whites against racism no lasting coalition with Black people on electoral matters is possible.

The experience in this campaign has served to test and validate the three-level electoral policy of our Party. A major thrust by the forces of reaction was defeated by bringing into play elements within the bourgeois parties and independent political formations, plus the effect of the Communist Party running its own candidates. The Communist Party initially placed the issue as that of defeating the candidates of the ultra-Right—the racist “law and order” candidates. This became the central focus of the coalition that elected Lindsay. The elements that can constitute a base for a people’s electoral coalition are now in existence in New York City. The base for such a development is contained in the revitalized Liberal Party with the mayor in its corner, in the New Democratic Coalition with its Reform Democrat base, in the organizations of the Black and Puerto Rican people, in the mass organizations for peace and civil rights, and in the progressive trade unions.

This combined force, if brought into political life, can turn New York State upside down in the 1970 gubernatorial elections.

Large sections of the American people are in movement. Traditional voting patterns were broken on all sides in the New York mayoralty elections. The electorate responded to issues in a way rarely seen before. People are ready for change, and we have to help prepare the electoral coalitions that can give expression to their needs. And in building these coalitions Communists must fight to be part of them. And we must more and more, where conditions permit, run our own candidates. Either in coalitions or in independent campaigns, a Communist presence in election campaigns is increasingly important. Our ability to raise and clarify issues, to exert a Leftward pressure and to mobilize masses can play a significant part in determining the outcome of elections.

Letter From American Workers To The Soviet Government

Introductory note:

We now present the text of the letter to Lenin that Lenin answered in his famous Letter to American Workers.

This letter was written by leaders of the Seattle locals of the IWW—the Industrial Workers of the World. It was secretly carried to Vladivostok inside a life belt on the ship Shilka, the first Soviet vessel to visit the USA after the revolution. The Shilka arrived in Seattle on December 21, 1917, six weeks after the storming of the Winter Palace, and left on January 8, 1918. It was sent across the Pacific by the Vladivostok committee of the Bolshevik Party in response to a request from Seattle longshoremen for a Soviet speaker, who would tell them about the revolution.

The story of the Shilka’s dramatic trip, and Lenin’s reply, was given to American readers for the first time in the January number of Political Affairs.

The IWW letter was discovered — after half a century — in the faded files of the Vladivostok party organ, the Krasnoe Znamya — the Red Banner. It appeared in the issues of March 20 and 21, 1918. It was translated into Russian by Alabushev, a member of the Shilka crew, and retranslated from the Russian. The original no longer exists.

The letter follows, with some of Lenin’s comments, and some historical data, in footnotes.

Art Shields

*End of December 1917 —
beginning of January 1918*

. . . To Nikolai Lenin and the representatives of the Bolshevik government, and through them to the workers of Russia.

Greetings

As colleagues in the struggle for social revolution we, the Industrial Workers of the World, send you greetings in the conviction that we feel and think the same as the socialists . . . as all the revolutionaries and as the broad mass of workers of the United States of America, whose awakening and understanding of the capitalist policy of enslavement and destruction is growing with remarkable rapidity.

You, the Russian workers, who have taken control into your own

hands and are creating a new social structure,¹ are molding much more than your own future: you are inspiring and accelerating a revolutionary movement, the like of which has never been seen before.

Workers who had up till then been deaf to all our propaganda now listen to us joyfully since they have seen the dawn of a new day in the Far East. It is no longer ignorance which prevents us moving forward, but the iron heel of violence against which the forces of revolution are rising as surely as they rose against the old regime in Russia.

This communication bears the stamp of the Central Executive Committee of the Seattle branch of the Industrial Workers of the World in the firm conviction on our part that the feelings and hopes expressed in it are those of the whole organization all over the country. We could not obtain the stamp from our center in Chicago due to the fact that it is all in the hands of the United States Government officials and the wily internal censorship, and also because William D. Haywood,² the chief secretary-treasurer, and many other officials from our organization have been imprisoned on charges under federal laws, as a result of the direct instigation of our employers.

We should add that this communication will reach you thanks to the kindness of the sailors on the transport *Shilka* to whom we are giving it secretly for delivery to you.

* * *

We should like to acquaint you with the state of affairs existing at the present time in "free America". For this reason we have not limited ourselves to sending you a letter, but are also attaching several publications of the radical press containing a detailed account of the

¹ Lenin's *Letter to American Workers* explained how the Russian toilers were building the new social structure.

The "workers," said Lenin, ". . . in a few months nationalized nearly all the large factories and works, and by arduous everyday labor are learning to manage whole branches of industry, learning to run nationalized factories, overcoming the enormous resistance of conservatism, petty bourgeois ideology and selfishness, and brick by brick are laying the foundation of *new* social ties, of a *new* labor discipline, or a *new* workers, trade union authority over their members."

² Haywood's life was an epic of struggles. He led the Western Federation of Miners in its most militant years, defeated a murder frame-up in Boise, Idaho, in a sensational trial, led a series of dramatic IWW strikes, was sentenced to 20 years imprisonment in a wartime trial in Chicago, joined the Communist Party and died in Moscow. His ashes lie under the Kremlin wall.

various atrocities committed in the name of democracy.³

The incident on the ship *Verona* in Everett, Washington, on November 5, 1916 during which 5 workers were foully murdered by agents of the wood trust,⁴ many more swept off to sea and dozens wounded, gave an enormous impetus to the Industrial Workers of the World movement, and by the time that war was declared the membership of our organization had advanced well past the hundred thousand mark.

Our program which aims at the working class taking over all the branches of industry has begun to terrify employers.

Membership of our organizations increased to such an extent that it threatened owner control in the sawmill industry of the Pacific Northwest, in the copper mines of Arizona and Montana and in many agricultural regions in the West.

As soon as the United States officially entered the war on April 6, 1917, a terrorist policy was put into operation against all the well-known radicals and radical organizations, that is, the Industrial Workers of the World, the Socialist Party, the anarchists and various foreign federations of the socialist revolutionary movement.

Later the impact of the policy was extended to pacifist, Christian and other organizations.

At first terrorist activities were carried out by villainous gangs of employers with the assistance of the local authorities and under their control. Later the local authorities took the matter into their own hands and it finally passed into the hands of direct representatives of the United States acting through the agency of various district marshalls and suchlike officials.

The Industrial Workers of the World organization has had to bear the main brunt of the attacks. Its members have been imprisoned by their thousands without any legal warrant, thousands of them have been seized, thrown out of their flats and left to starve in the desert, dozens have been whipped to death by hired assassins, tarred

³ Lenin's letter explains the difference between working-class democracy and capitalist democracy.

"... The Soviets of workers and peasants," said Lenin, "are a new type of state, a new and higher type of democracy; they are the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a method of administering the state without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie. For the first time democracy is serving the masses, the working people, and has ceased to be a democracy for the rich, as democracy in all the bourgeois republics, even the most democratic, still is . . ."

⁴ This is called The Everett Massacre. A shipload of volunteer IWW organizers was arriving in Everett—a big sawmill and shingle town—when deputies opened fire.

and feathered, and in many cases their murderers have disappeared into thin air. One member of our organization, a sick man and a cripple, was dragged from his bed in the middle of the night and hung from the railway bridge. The offices of the Industrial Workers of the World have been searched, papers confiscated, premises and equipment either confiscated or destroyed, and members' flats have also been ransacked at the order of officials ranging from local to federal ones, with or without legal cause.

We quote a few examples out of hundreds of cases of victimization.

During June and July 1917 in Yakima, Cle Elum, Ellensburg and other smaller towns in Washington State hundreds of agricultural workers were thrown into prison for demanding higher pay or for carrying a membership card of the Industrial Workers of the World.

No warrants or charges were issued against these people. In prison they were cut off from all communication with the outside world and detained there for four months, subsequently being released without trial. When they came out all the prisoners were sick and emaciated with hunger. Some of them had been beaten and chained to a concrete floor, while others had nearly been drowned when prison warders flooded their cells with water. In all cases they had received disgraceful treatment.

On June 10, 1917 agents of the copper trust in Bisbee, Arizona, seized control of the telephone and cable offices to prevent communication with the outside world, and then with the help of Sheriff Viler and a crowd of armed gunmen, detectives and employers arrested about 1,200 miners who were on strike. Many of the latter were separated from their families and deported to the Mojave Desert where they were left without food or shelter. Later the government began to send a negligible amount of food and shanties for a short time, but refused to allow the men to return home. Insult was added to injury: some of the miners were arrested and detained in prison until October, when they were put on trial and found not guilty of the charges brought against them.

It was ascertained that full responsibility for all these disgraceful events lay with the Phelps Dodge Co. Nevertheless in spite of this MacLean, an official of the above-mentioned company, continues to hold an important government post on the co-operative copper committee of the National Defense Council of the United States.

Together with others this copper company has signed a contract with the government for the supply of copper at 23.5 cents per lb. which gives them a clear profit of 10 per cent on each pound of

copper being used for military purposes.⁵ The Phelps Dodge Co. alone has made a net profit of 21,974,263 dollars which is 300 per cent higher than the usual and notwithstanding high profit of the company in the period preceeding the war. Nevertheless the United States Government is not taking or proposing to take any steps against those guilty of the deportation of workers and the many murders which accompanied the disturbances.

On June 16 in Seattle, Washington State, as a result of inflammatory articles in the bourgeois press and capitalist incitement, an attempt was made [by soldiers] at night to raid the offices of the Industrial Workers of the World. They were beaten off by a handful of the organization's members, with one soldier being wounded in the leg when he attempted to enter through the back door. Later that night 41 IWW members were taken from the building and imprisoned without any charge whatsoever being produced against them. Some of them were released after a few days, but the remainder are still in detention without trial and without any charge. There has been no indication that the authorities have taken any action against the soldiers and sailors who fired on the building and attempted to slaughter the workers inside. They have not even been reprimanded.

At approximately the same time raids were carried out in other parts of the country, such as Kansas City, Missouri, which suffered several attacks without the defenders being able to have recourse to the law, in spite of the fact that men, women and children were mercilessly beaten.

On the night of August 1 in Butte in the State of Montana a gang of masked men broke into the apartment of Frank Little, a member of the IWW and, although Little was a cripple and a sick man, seized him and dragged him round the streets tied to the back of a car. They then hanged him on the railway bridge pinning a warning on his dead body to other members of the IWW that a similar fate awaited them. The local authorities and the government have not made the slightest attempt to investigate this crime, in spite of the fact that the Butte miners are ready to produce at least two of the murderers if an investigation were initiated.⁶

⁵ Lenin's letter has this to say about the war profits the capitalists' war profits:

"On every dollar there is a clot of filth from the lucrative war contracts which in every country have made the rich richer and the poor poorer. Every dollar is stained with blood . . ."

⁶ Frank Little, an American Indian, was one of the IWW's national leaders. He was lynched during a copper strike. The lynchers were identified by the IWW as Anaconda Copper Co. gunmen.

All these events simply served to increase the membership of the IWW. Soon it had become so strong that it was able to call a strike in the timber-sawing industry on the Northwest coast to get an 8-hour working day.

This provided a signal for new attacks, and IWW offices were subjected to a series of raids in many towns in that region. Delegates, secretaries and members of the organization were imprisoned without warrant. People were beaten and subjected to all forms of abuse, but the solidarity of the workers remained unbroken. An 8-hour working day is now being worked in all the forests in this region.

On September 5 the United States Government organized a concerted attack on all IWW offices of which it was aware. Every single document, letter, typewriter—in short all IWW property was confiscated and taken first to government offices and later to Chicago. *Solidarity*, the official organ of the IWW, was closed down together with many other newspapers of similar views. The newspaper *Industrial Worker* published in Seattle had all its property confiscated, but since its right to make use of the postal services remained untouched it continued to appear as usual.

Later, on September 29, officers of the federal government arrested William D. Haywood, all known secretaries of district organizations and district executive committees, the editors of Russian, Italian, Polish and other newspapers published in foreign languages, Ralph Chaplin, the editor of *Solidarity*, MacDonald, editor of *Industrial Worker* and many other IWW members. In all 110 were arrested. They were charged with treason for having obstructed government action and contravening the law about military conscription, etc. However even the bourgeois press is admitting that the real reason for the persecution is the revolutionary character of the IWW organization which aims at destroying the system of hired labor.

The Socialist Party is also being victimized by the profiteers who conceal their perfidy under the mask of patriotism. But so far there has been only one case of its members receiving the savage treatment which has been applied to members of the IWW.

This particular victim was a priest, the socialist Herbert Bychelov who was arrested in Cincinnati, Ohio, and deported to Kentucky where he was subjected to corporal punishment and soaked in oil. Bychelov is a pacifist.

The United States Government took no action to investigate this matter.

On October 17 a band of people dressed in black capes and black masks obtained the consent of the police and judiciary of the town

of Tulsa in Oklahoma to take 17 IWW members out of jail who had been imprisoned without any legal cause. These 17 men were then taken to an isolated small settlement, where they were undressed and beaten with ropes until their bodies were one mass of lacerated flesh. After this they were covered with hot tar mixed with feathers. The "patriots" responsible for this atrocity told their victims that all this had been done "in the name of the suffering women and children of Belgium." One after another the victims of this brutal act were released and chased into the "black hills" by shots from the crowd. News has been received of only four out of the seventeen. People attempting to establish the identity of members of the gang have subsequently been threatened with death.

Local and federal authorities have taken no action to investigate this matter.

That this is not just an isolated incident but systematic government policy may be seen from the fact that the governor of the area, Fred Robinson, a United States Government official, has wiped out the IWW in the oil industry all over Kansas.

His latest achievement was done in the interests of the employers who own the oil businesses in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

On November 12 in the town of Omaha, Nebraska, a meeting was held of the IWW Industrial Union No. 573. At this meeting nothing was said either for or against the war. Nevertheless the local authorities with federal assistance swooped down on the meeting and arrested 64 delegates. Any person attempting to gain access to them, not excluding their lawyers, was imprisoned. The arrested delegates are still imprisoned without any charge having been brought against them and without a date being fixed for their trial.

A few days ago they were offered release if they would give their word to renounce their convictions and cease their revolutionary activities. Needless to say, they all rejected this proposal outright. But it is interesting in that it reveals the true reason for the searches and arrests. These are all conducted with the aim of wiping out the IWW and preventing the further organization of the workers.

In Frisco as in several other parts of California there are many detainees who are shortly to stand trial.⁷

The following is an extract from the charge for which they are to

⁷ More than 30 IWW's were sentenced to prison for long terms, ranging up to ten years, in a trial in Sacramento, California, later. This was called the "Silent Defense Trial," because the defendants stood mute to express their contempt for the frame-up proceedings.

be tried:

"The defendants are charged with plotting to cause harm to and threaten certain United States citizens, if those citizens were to continue to take advantage of certain rights and privileges conferred on them by the Constitution of the United States. This infringement by the defendants is expressed in their demands for a fixed wage and certain standard labor conditions throughout the United States and in the fact that in cases where the employer refused to pay the fixed wage and to provide the required conditions, the defendants did agree among themselves to refuse to work for the employers in question, which in common parlance is called a strike."

Last month in Red Lodge (Montana) the owners of the coal mines had recourse to the following stratagem, among others, in their dispute with Finnish workers over a wage cut.

The Secretary of the IWW union of coal-miners was seized and taken to a municipal meeting where he was strung up and left until he lost consciousness. Then the thugs laid him on the floor until he regained consciousness and the whole procedure was repeated all over again. Finally he was transported out of town. There he was beaten mercilessly and eventually released under the threat of death if he should return. Nothing more has been heard of this man since. Three other workers, Finns, were with him at the time and suffered similar maltreatment.

The people responsible for this heinous offence call themselves the "Knights of Liberty." The above-mentioned gang in Tulsa, Oklahoma, also went under the same name.

All this will show the Russian workers what "freedom" in America really is.

In order to frighten the workers of Red Lodge even more a hired gunman fired into a house and killed an old lady. Her husband went mad with the shock.

Russian workers will, no doubt, be familiar with the details of the Tom Mooney case, since it has assumed international significance. This affair is an excellent example of the treachery, duplicity, bribery and corruption of the judiciary and other officials. The worst aspect of the affair is the behavior of the American Federation of Labor which was so concerned about maintaining friendly relations with the employers that it gave practically no support whatsoever to the imprisoned victims of the San Francisco brawl.

The American Federation of Labor which calls itself a "labor organization" is in fact nothing more nor less than an appendage of

capitalism.⁸

If the life of Tom Mooney had depended on this country's trade unions alone he would have been hanged a long time ago. It is to the workers of Russia that Tom Mooney owes his gratitude for the fact that his life was saved. The demonstration by Russians in front of the American Embassy in Petrograd reached the ears of President Wilson, and the death sentence was repealed for fear of international repercussions.⁹

Last week in Ione (Washington) one of the most outstanding figures in the IWW, Roy Brahn¹⁰ was severely beaten up by a hired gang from the timbersawing trust and put in prison. At that particular time there were no workers in the small towns like Ione, because they had all gone into the big centers for the holiday. It was this that made it possible for the police to carry out the filthy business referred to above.

* * *

On December 20, the day before the *Shilka* docked in Seattle, the local police with assistance from the federal authorities raided the editorial offices of the *Industrial Worker* and the local committee for the legal defense of those imprisoned in Chicago jail and also searched the district office of the union of transport seamen. Everything in these buildings was confiscated with the exception of one small office belonging to the *Industrial Worker* which was smashed to pieces. Six people were arrested, including Catherine B. MacDonald, the wife of John A. MacDonald imprisoned in Chicago jail. These people were arrested without warrants and were held in jail for almost a week without any charge being brought against them. Catherine MacDonald was put in a section for prostitutes many of whom had syphilis and, contrary to all the regulations, was not allowed bail until almost a whole week later.

When the transport ship *Shilka* arrived in Seattle it was arranged that some members of the crew would give a talk at the IWW offices

⁸ Actually many local AFL unions and central labor bodies supported Tom Mooney and his co-defendant, Warren K. Billings, although high AFL officials were cold to the defense campaign.

The IWW's sweeping condemnation of the AFL as a whole reflected the views of many other Left-wingers at the time. This incorrect attitude was sharply criticized by William Z. Foster.

⁹ Mooney's death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment after the Petrograd demonstration. President Wilson stressed the danger to the "international" situation in his widely publicized plea to the governor of California to halt Mooney's execution.

¹⁰ "Roy Brahn" was Roy Brown, who became national chairman of the IWW and later joined the Communist Party.

on the evening of Sunday, December 23. Thousands of leaflets were distributed and everything appeared to be going well. On Sunday morning the reactionary capitalist organ *Post Intelligencer* announced that the *Shilka* had about 100,000 dollars on board for the defense of 166 American revolutionaries standing trial. Local employers immediately joined forces with the federal authorities and this resulted in the *Shilka* being surrounded by a cordon of 50 sailors. A search was subsequently carried out on board.

When the crew attempted to go ashore they were prevented from doing so by the local authorities. One sailor from the *Shilka*, who had remained on shore, went to the IWW offices and gave a talk there to an audience of about 5,000. He was arrested on leaving the building.

A whole torrent of abuse hailed down on the crew of the *Shilka*. The capitalist papers were crammed with all sorts of fantastic stories about the ship being laden with arms and ammunition to start a revolution in the United States with the help of the IWW and so forth.

Evidently, however, news was soon received from Washington that the rumors were unfounded, for the whole capitalist press changed its tune considerably and the local capitalists, who hate the Bolsheviks like poison, started inviting the whole crew to banquets and motor trips in an attempt to make up for their earlier behavior.

Naturally no one was taken in by the capitalist tactics.

Their friendship, just like their democracy, was empty pretense. All the bourgeois press of the United States without exception cannot stand the Bolsheviks. This press calls the Bolsheviks the Industrial Workers of the World of Russia, and the Industrial Workers of the World it calls the American Bolsheviks. This compliment fills us with pride and we hope that the Russian workers share it with us.

The bourgeois press is the echo of the employers' class which is at the present time master in the United States.

Such socialist renegades as Charles Edward Russell¹¹ and the like are working hand in hand with the capitalists against the Bolsheviks. Luckily they are few in number. However one of them, George Creel, a former hack journalist, is now in charge of a censorship board as a result of which all organs of free thought have been closed down. *Masses*, *The International Socialist Review*, *The New York Call*, *The Milwaukee Leader*, *The Labor Leader of Duluth*, *The American Socialist*, *The Texas Rebel* and dozens of other newspapers and magazines have either fallen victim to the censor or been compelled to be published illegally.

¹¹ Charles Edward Russell, a former Hearst editor and muckraking magazine writer, left the Socialist Party to support the imperialist war.

The newspaper *Seattle Daily Call* was not allowed use of the postal service. But in spite of this its circulation has been increasing daily.

The worst thing is that certain newspapers are bought which are socialist in outward appearance only, such as *Appeal to Reason* and the *Christian Socialist*.

But let the Russian workers not be deceived: such things as freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of assembly do not exist in America, and the democracy which the capitalists like to go on about is nothing but a snare.

In conclusion, the Industrial Workers of the World once more assure the revolutionary socialists of Russia that even the rank and file (the hitherto politically unaware workers in the United States) have great admiration for the Bolsheviks' noble struggle for freedom from the yoke of the capitalists and landowners.

Your struggle is essentially our struggle and your victory—our victory and any defeat which you may suffer will be a blow in the face for us. Rest assured, fellow-workers, that your victory which is paving the way for the foundation of the first true republic of the producers of riches, will not have the whole world against it. The proletariat of the other countries will make a supreme effort to throw off the parasites and set up a similar social order in its land. In this hour the organization of the Industrial Workers of the World would be deeply indebted to the Bolshevik government if it were to send an official note to the capitalist government of the United States to force our authorities to give us at least something in the nature of a fair trial in the serious case which is coming up before the courts in Chicago in a few weeks' time.

If such a note from you were to have even the slightest restraining influence on their plans to crush us, this would give us a vital breathing-space which would enable us to gather strength for the final struggle in which, we know, victory will be ours. A single word from you, Russian revolutionaries, means a great deal to us. You will not leave this word unsaid and will not refuse us the help you are able to give.

Once again we assure you of our firm friendship, solidarity and our desire that in the very near future true democracy and lasting peace will triumph the whole world over.

We remain your comrades in the struggle for social revolution.

The Industrial Workers of the World

The Role of Trotskyism in the Modern World

The activities of the Trotskyites in the capitalist countries never seems to flag. Their efforts to influence the youth of France and Japan, their constant intrigues in the Latin American countries, are doing serious damage to the revolutionary struggle. In addition, they proliferate fabricated propaganda materials, which the bourgeois press then quickly accepts and publicizes.

Just what does contemporary Trotskyism stand for?

Flotsam of a Wrecked Ship

Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uruguay, describes the groups that sometimes call themselves Trotskyite parties as the flotsam of a long-wrecked ship. The simile fits rather aptly. For Trotsky's whole apparatus was so totally wrecked four decades ago that the organizations of its followers are indeed like the fragments of a sunken ship.

The ideological and organizational defeat of Trotsky himself in our country has gone down in the history of the Communist movement as a remarkable example of principled, uncompromising struggle against opportunism. Our Leninist Party not only preserved the purity of its ranks, it enriched Communism the world over with its invaluable experience of exposing ultra-Leftism and its essentially capitulationist nature. Since then, true to Lenin's behests, other Communist parties have suppressed the Trotskyites' attempts to disrupt and destroy the international working-class movement from within.

Expelled in the nineteen-twenties and thirties from Communist and Workers' Parties, the Trotskyites soon began making strenuous efforts to find new forms of anti-Communist struggle. In some countries they formed small groups which, being outside the organized working-class movement, continued their subversive activities from without, smuggling their concepts and views into the workers' parties.

With the political adventurism typical of him, Trotsky decided to knock together an international organization out of these fragments. This he hoped to oppose to the Communist International. A handful of his followers from several European countries, gathering in Paris in 1930, declared themselves to be "the international Left-wing opposition." Somewhat later, this "opposition" announced eleven condi-

tions for admission to its ranks. These included a denial of the very possibility of victory of socialism in a single country, denunciation of the economic policy of the USSR, and recognition of the "theory of permanent revolution."

Soon the Trotskyites found out, however, that it was much easier to work out conditions for admission than to extend their ranks, even insignificantly. When they faced worker audiences, they met with sharp rebuffs. At the same time, the internal dissensions tearing their organizations apart grew from bad to worse.

It was on such shaky foundations that Trotsky nonetheless decided to build his "International." What's more, before it even began to be formed, he already started acting, in 1934-37, on behalf of a non-existent "Soviet section" of the non-existent "International."

In 1938, Trotsky was finally able to gather a group of his followers for a "constituent conference" in Paris. This conference, attended by only twenty-one participants, stated that both the "international Left-wing opposition" and its bureau "have in the past shown an inability to act." Nevertheless it decided on the founding of the "Fourth International."

The slogans advanced at the time by Trotskyism further exposed it as a political trend hostile to the working class. Its program was based on a negative attitude toward everything that Communists and the international working-class movement as a whole fought for. The Trotskyites fiercely attacked the very idea and practice of establishing a united anti-fascist front. They also denied the necessity for a struggle for peace, since, they alleged, war was the mother of revolution. The hypocrisy of their pseudo-revolutionary theories was already clear from their whole policy of that period. From dark predictions about the destruction of the Soviet Union in case of imperialist aggression (Trotsky wrote: ". . . The defeat of the Soviet Union is inevitable. From the technical, economic and military points of view, imperialism is incomparably stronger. Unless it is paralyzed by revolution in the West, imperialism will sweep out of existence the system born of the October Revolution.") the Trotskyites passed in the years of World War II to openly subversive activity in the anti-fascist movement.

Measuring with the same yardstick the policy of the fascist bloc countries and the countries subjected to aggression, they denied the liberating nature of the struggle waged by the forces opposed to fascism, and even after Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, declared, as late as the end of 1941, that "the very concept of anti-fascist

struggle" was "a Communist fraud and invention." The Trotskyites broadcast their fabrications about the creation of the anti-Hitler coalition being an act hostile to the interests of both the Russian and the world revolution. They also called for preventing the opening of the Second Front which, they said, "would delay the revolutionary struggle in Europe," thus showing themselves up in their true colors—enemies of socialism and allies of the forces of reaction and fascism. They discredited themselves so thoroughly that by the end of the war their groupings in a number of countries simply disintegrated.

With the strengthening of socialism's position in the postwar period, internecine strife and disagreements in the Trotskyite camp became even more widespread, and differences began to appear between its two main groupings, each of which defended its own platform of anti-Communist activities. One of these, out of tactical consideration, advocated certain departures from the old Trotskyite formulations as well as revisions of some of Trotsky's own views. The other, on the contrary, demanded that all the old principles be kept intact. In 1953, the "Fourth International" split into the so-called "International Committee" and the "International Secretariat." Later on, still another grouping—the "Latin American Bureau"—branched out separately. Even the Trotskyites themselves were compelled to admit at the time that their already feeble "International" was going through such a serious crisis it could hardly hope to find a way out.

Since the beginning of the nineteen-sixties, the Trotskyite groups and groupings, with their one foot in the grave, have again been trying to raise their heads. Seeing in Mao Tse-tung's policy a fresh opportunity to revive anti-Communist activity, they hastened to snatch at it, at the same time shouting about the "vitality" and "correctness" of their ideas. The Trotskyite congress held in 1961 stated in a special resolution that the differences that had arisen in the Communist movement "open up before Trotskyism such opportunities for action as have never existed before."

The attempt to overcome the split was made by the American Trotskyites, who, in their message circulated in 1963, declared that the position of the Mao Tse-tung group "determines an important stage of reconstruction" of the "Fourth International." The message, which called for unity in the name of struggle against the Communist parties, was the core of the debate at the so-called unity congress held in the summer of 1963.

In actual fact, however, no unification was achieved. The "Latin American Bureau" and part of the British, French, and Japanese

Trotskyites refused to take part in the congress. The remaining few participants divided into a "majority" and a "minority," which to this day remain at loggerheads.

Present-day, just as prewar, Trotskyism represents a medley of groups and groupings to be found in some West European countries (Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, and Holland), the United States, a number of Latin American countries (Chile, Bolivia, Guatemala, Peru, Argentina, and Brazil), in Japan, Ceylon, and in Australia. The number of members in each of these groups does not as a rule exceed several dozen. In some cases they constitute microscopic "initiative" groups which however, each publish a paper or even a magazine.

How, then, do the Trotskyite groups manage to keep their heads above water? What do they hope to accomplish? First of all, they capitalize on the fact that considerable social strata tending toward the ultra-Left have in recent years been drawn into the anti-imperialist movement and the struggle against the monopolies. They bank on the petty bourgeois, who is being ruined and is suffering privations and who, as Lenin indicated, "easily goes to revolutionary extremes but is incapable of perseverance, organization, discipline, or steadfastness."

Intellectuals and students are sometimes also infected with Leftism. Representatives of these strata are often inclined to deny the leading role of the working class in the anti-monopolist struggle. They even try to subordinate the working-class movement to themselves, to infect it with petty-bourgeois illusions.

Trotskyism does possess a certain tenacity because its ultra-Left views accord with the sentiments of sections of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, of declassed elements, and various adventurers. Trotskyism does adapt itself to such sentiments. Besides, the experience of class struggle shows that Leftism often comes as a reaction to the "original sin" of Right-wing social democracy, rejecting revolutionary forms of class struggle. The leaders of Trotskyism themselves do not conceal the fact that they hope to find their support among the extremist petty-bourgeois elements. And the latter, who as a rule are ready to denounce capitalism in words, are at the same time inclined to reduce all forms and methods of struggle against capitalism to adventurism alone.

Here and there the Trotskyites operate in the same environment as the groupings of Mao Tse-tung's supporters. During last year's student actions in France, for instance, the Trotskyites and the Maoists actively helped each other, inciting the youth with equal zeal to rashness and violence. The Trotskyites' alliance with pro-Maoist organizations

is also to be observed in some of the Latin American countries.

The "body of theory" of contemporary Trotskyism shows up its complete ideological impotence, its inability to offer positive solutions to the major problems of revolutionary struggle. The fact that it produced no clear, definite program after the war speaks for itself. The numerous statements made by the various "congresses" cannot even be called a substitute for such a program, for they are full of contradictory, hastily proposed and as hastily rejected theories. Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, long since discredited, remains the fig leaf hiding the ideological nakedness of his followers.

World Socialist System The Main Target

One of the most characteristic features of Trotskyism has always been the negation of the gains of the international working class and indiscriminate denunciation of the results of revolutionary struggle. While prewar Trotskyites concentrated on a slander campaign against the country that triumphantly accomplished the first socialist revolution, on negating the Soviet Union's role in the world revolutionary process, today they not only maintain and magnify their hatred of the USSR but breed malice against the socialist system as a whole.

An element of their slander against socialist realities is contained in their very understanding of the prospects of social progress. The reconstruction of society along socialist principles after the proletariat has gained power in individual countries, the Trotskyites claim, is possible only in the very distant future, and only with the victory of socialist revolutions throughout the world or, at the very least, in an absolute majority of countries. The "Fourth International" repeats almost word for word the old Trotskyite arguments of the nineteen-twenties about the impossibility of successfully building socialism in one or even in several countries. The difference is that at the time such assertions showed only a lack of faith in the ability of the working class of the Soviet state to build socialism; today they represent an unsubstantiated negation of the achievements of world socialism.

The Trotskyites have always distorted reality to suit their own far-fetched, lifeless schemes. Naturally, they have no answers to what is the nature of the socialist states. On the one hand, they cannot help but admit the actual fact of progressive social changes within these states; on the other, they would rather bite off their tongue than call the countries socialist. In trying to find a way out of their impasse, they have invented the thesis of "distorted workers'

states," and have thus found themselves in the company of the Right-wing socialist reformers.

The canards about the "deformation" and "bureaucratization" of the socialist countries are intended to discredit the historically justified methods of socialist construction. Asserting that the experience of the socialist countries, the Soviet Union first of all, should be disregarded, the Trotskyites act as henchmen for the imperialist forces which try to disunite today's revolutionary currents.

The same purpose is served by their malicious fabrications about the interests of the world socialist system being in conflict with the interests of the working-class movement in the capitalist states and with the national liberation movement. In the past, Trotsky brazenly accused the Soviet people of building "their isolated socialist house" while allegedly ignoring proletarian internationalism. Today Trotskyites hold forth on the subject of "national exclusiveness" and "holding back the progress of world revolution." It is easy to discern in their present orientation the influence of Trotsky's views on war as the only means of "advancing" or "pushing through" revolutions.

This is proclaimed with extraordinary frankness by the Latin American Trotskyites whose leader is Posadas. Their assertion is that war is the only possible means of doing away with capitalism and that the socialist countries should start a war immediately "for preventive purposes." Arguing that the people must not fear the sacrifices a thermonuclear war must bring, Posadas says: "Communist society can be built on ruins, too." Incidentally, he claims to have been the first to advance this "theory" and accuses Mao Tse-tung of plagiarism. Similar views are voiced by the British Trotskyites, who believe that only a war between the socialist and the capitalist systems will give the working class "a decisive opportunity for the seizure of power."

True revolutionary humanism has always been alien to Trotskyites. World War II took a toll of millions upon millions of lives. It imposed a heavy burden on the working class. Nevertheless, just as in the thirties, the Trotskyites continue to advocate war, seeing in it an inevitable point of transition on the road to revolution. They do not choose to take into account the fact that a new world war would be the greatest of tragedies for mankind, that while burying imperialism it would also spell horrible damage for the cause of Communism.

Adhering to a proposition which is "more Left than common sense," the Trotskyites fiercely attack the policy of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems. Behind their endless accusations about the socialist countries' "desire to reach agreement

with imperialism on the preservation of spheres of influence" one clearly sees the same old theory about war being the sole means of settling the historical contest between socialism and capitalism.

Equally pitiful, in our day, are also all their attempts to discredit the role of the socialist system in the world revolutionary process and their formulas for "advancing" the cause of the revolution. These malicious activities are still best described by what Lenin in his day said about Trotskyist organizations. He called them "impotent little groups, angry at their own impotence." It is just this impotent malice that impels the motley Trotskyite groups to concentrate on finding ways to penetrate the revolutionary movement in the capitalist and the "third world" countries and on carrying on their subversive activities there.

*Trying to Impede the Working-Class
Struggle in Capitalist Countries*

The Trotskyites are fiercely and constantly attacking the Communist parties of the capitalist countries, trying to divert the attention of the revolutionary movement from its main tasks and to cause splits in the ranks of anti-imperialist fighters.

Just as Trotsky himself once championed the concept of leaping over certain stages of the revolution, so today his successors oppose mass demands of a generally democratic nature. They say that to struggle for democracy is not only useless but harmful, for it keeps the working class from concentrating all its efforts on the "revolutionary overthrow" of the capitalist system. Trotskyites accuse the Communist parties of "showing a tendency to fragment the struggle in time and space into too many aims." But in what do they see signs of such "fragmentation?" In that the Communists, while consistently paving the way for social revolution, do not at the same time evade the urgent tasks set by life—in that they carry on a struggle to extend democratic rights and freedoms, to improve the living standards of the working people, and to preserve the peace. In other words, the Trotskyites reject the general democratic movement, without which no revolution is ever possible, and which today increasingly draws the masses into vigorous action against monopolies, against capital, preparing them for the socialist revolution.

To this day the Trotskyites adhere to the pseudo-revolutionary formula, "all or nothing," which has always served them as a justification for sectarianism and revolutionary idleness. Thus one of the groups of British Trotskyites even tries, inveterate adventurers that

they are, to break strikes. Its justification here has been to assert that only general political strikes are useful. And some of their French colleagues, acting under the slogan, "The Working Peoples' Power Can Be Found in the Streets and Not in Ballot Boxes," are today trying to impress upon the workers the idea of the uselessness of any form of class struggle save only armed struggle. But armed struggle itself they interpret not as the conscious action of the masses but as "a conspiracy of revolutionaries" outside and above "the crowd."

Putch-type action disassociated from the masses—a denial in fact of the revolutionary role of the masses—is the favored method of Trotskyism in its pseudo-revolutionary strategy. "A team that does not know its job cannot replace the specialist"—this is the smug, reassuring motto the British Trotskyites use in propagandizing their anti-popular theory. The "team that does not know its job" refers to the masses, and the "specialists" would be a handful of adventurers isolated from the people.

Such theories, adventurist and capitulationist at the same time, glaringly contradict the true needs of revolutionary struggle that find their expression in the strategy and tactics of the world Communist movement. The Marxist-Leninist program, distinguished for its profound and consistent purposefulness, arms the working people and the oppressed masses in general with a rich arsenal of forms, means and methods for carrying on the struggle. It is a matter of principle for Communists to recognize the necessity of mastering all forms of struggle, including armed class struggle, and to be ready to shift them rapidly and resolutely, depending on concrete conditions, and on the alignment of class forces within any particular country as well as in the international arena. Communists believe that revolutionary struggle in all its forms, whether peaceful or non-peaceful, is the province of the masses themselves, the working class first of all, led toward revolutionary goals by its conscious vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist parties.

No wonder, then, that while trying to don the armor of revolutionaries, the Trotskyites are at the same time making every effort to cast aspersions on the international Communist movement, to slander the true revolutionary force of our day. As has already been said, their preferred method consists first of all of malicious falsifications; out of a whole complex of strategic and tactical aims of the Communist and Workers' parties, they will pick a single slogan out of context, then begin to shout hysterically about our "one-track mentality," about our "suppressing revolutionary initiative," and so on. As was

pointed out by O. Kuusinen in 1964, the Trotskyites do this because, should they present their opponents' views honestly, no one would believe their slander; but by "shamelessly distorting other people's views they can lay their own political sins at someone else's door."

One such characteristic trick is the Trotskyite allegation that the Communist parties advocate only peaceful means of struggle; moreover, they distort the Marxist-Leninists' very interpretation of the idea of a peaceful way to revolution. When Marxist-Leninists speak of the possibility of peaceful development of the revolution, they refer to the possibility of ensuring for the working class and its allies a decisive superiority of forces, capable of preventing the monopolist bourgeoisie from resorting to armed violence. Marxist-Leninists believe that even while following the peaceful road of revolution one must be ready for armed struggle should the situation demand it.

But the Trotskyites care little about the interests of the revolution. They only seek pretexts for launching attacks on the Communists and for attempting to spread their views throughout the working-class movement. While loudly advocating their idea of the revolution by punch, they are basically hostile to the creation of any broad anti-monopoly front. They declare that the idea of establishing such a front would only lead to class cooperation, that it takes the edge off the class struggle and "delays" the revolution.

The Trotskyites present a distorted general picture of the class struggle in the capitalist countries. They intentionally exaggerate certain objective negative features that inevitably exist in the struggle of the working people (political indifference on the part of sections of the working class or the persistence of Right-wing reformist ideology), and just as intentionally, they shut their eyes to the fact that the masses are taking an increasingly active part in clear-cut actions against monopoly capital, so that social battles more and more often acquire great political significance.

Their lack of faith in the forces of the working class has led the Trotskyites to odd conclusions about the "passivity" of the proletariat in the capitalist countries and its "evasion of historical responsibility," and to the equally ill-grounded idea that only a profound economic crisis can rouse the masses to revolutionary fervor. Here they come close to sharing the views of bourgeois ideologists, who assert that the workers have ceased to think about revolution and are reconciled to the capitalist system.

In order to disseminate their views, the Trotskyites openly resort

to double-dealing. They use the so-called "penetration" tactic, that is, the tactic of infiltrating mass organizations in order to recruit new supporters. They pretend that they agree with the progressive aims of such organizations and conceal their continued association with their own groups. Back in 1960, the leaders of the "Fourth International" called upon Trotskyite groups in capitalist countries to "learn to use underground methods" in order to "avoid stagnation," and not to "allow themselves to be scared off by the bogey of being absorbed in other organizations."

Trotskyites try their best to penetrate first of all into youth organizations, and do this by playing on the political immaturity of some of the youth who, in addition, have only a very vague notion of Trotskyism and its true aims. They adapt themselves to the moods of youth and flatter it, calling it the most "radical wing of the movement." As was pointed out in the theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain, *Marxism Today*, the Trotskyites constantly root about among teenagers, assuring them that "the revolution is around the corner" and that only they, the Trotskyites, have the true "revolutionary program."

As already mentioned, they carry on intensive subversive work among the youth of France, where they have been able to form small student groups. *L'Humanité*, the organ of the French Communist Party, wrote in this connection on March 20, 1968: "Young people inexperienced in political and social struggle, and even less knowledgeable about the battles of the working class, can obviously be easily caught in a trap of phrases. Those of them who sincerely seek ways to change the social system will certainly change their minds if and when Trotskyism is exposed all the way."

In Japan, the Trotskyites have done considerable harm to the Federation of Japanese Students, where at one time they even managed to work their way into the leadership. At a meeting of active members of the youth movement of a number of Asian and African countries, held in Sofia in August, 1968, the Vice-chairman of the Central Committee of the Union of Democratic Youth of Japan, N. Imai, said of them: "Playing on the sentiments of petty-bourgeois radicalism found among some of the students . . . [the Trotskyites] . . . continue their underground activities while hiding behind the backs of reactionary forces, whose cunning policy is to support them."

One of the Trotskyites' notorious subversive methods of work in mass organizations is to distribute anonymous leaflets and pamphlets. At conferences of international democratic organizations their emis-

saries bend every effort to foist their propaganda materials on delegates. In short, they try to utilize every opportunity to prevent the broad masses of working people in capitalist countries from finding their way to Communism, to the ideas of scientific socialism. Adventurism, so typical of their actions in this area, works on an even larger scale when they turn their efforts at subversion against the peoples that have joined in the national liberation struggles.

Adventurism in the National Liberation Movement

The numerous resolutions and statements issued by the Trotskyites during the nineteen-sixties have paid special attention to questions of the national liberation movement. First of all, they counterpose it to other revolutionary trends of the day. They claim, for instance, that colonial revolutions are the force which today is striking the heaviest blows at imperialism, whereas the rest of the revolutionary movement is in a state of crisis. This thesis was first advanced at one of their congresses in 1957. Then, at the so-called unity congress held six years later, it was announced that "the revolutions in colonial countries play the main role in the world revolutionary process" and that "the main center of the revolutionary upsurge has for some time been shifting to the colonial countries." At the end of 1966, the secretariat of the "Fourth International" again stated that colonial revolutions were the "main aspect of the socialist revolution."

The question now arises, why should the Trotskyites, who have always ignored national liberation struggles (through their leader Pierre Frank they stated that "the question of national independence does not form any essential part of the theory of permanent revolution"), today see in it "the main aspect" of such revolution? Here Trotskyism clearly shows its characteristic features of time-serving and political gambling. Another of the Trotskyite leaders, Germain, said in 1969, that his party's "greatest chance" lies in the area of the national liberation movement. This "chance" is seen in the fact that here petty-bourgeois groups often totally lacking in solid political experience are drawn into political struggle. The Trotskyites hope that it will be easier for them to find among such elements allies on whom they can rely to support their policy.

It is in this connection, incidentally, that they have also amended their traditional negative appraisal of the peasantry. While remaining contemptuous of the peasants of the capitalist countries, they have nothing but praise for those in the national liberation movement, and call them the leading force of our day, ascribing to them "the de-

cisive radical role," while at the same time belittling in every possible way the revolutionary role of the proletariat and its vanguard, the Communist Parties.

All Trotskyite program statements on questions of the national liberation movement objectively serve to deprive the movement of clarity of aims. They reject the idea of anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, calling it another "Communist invention." "To move step by step up the stairs," they said in 1961, "quite obviously means to turn away from the revolution." Now, true to itself, Trotskyism advocates leaping over some stages of the revolution; it undermines the unity of patriotic, democratic forces without which neither the abolition of imperialist oppression nor the destruction of the feudal system are possible; and the full harm of this policy has already been proven by the Trotskyists themselves as they attempted practical interference in the liberation struggle.

Equally unrealistic are their formulas regarding the forms and means of revolutionary action. In point of fact they propose only one universal means—guerrilla struggle, which they recommend launching even in countries that have recently taken the road of independent political development. And in order somehow to explain away such a policy they slander the young national states, asserting that the "neo-colonialist forces" have won or that "traitors have come to power" everywhere.

At the same time, in contrast to the policy of the Communist parties, which support the guerrilla movement in those countries where favorable conditions for it do exist, the Trotskyites try artificially to isolate the guerrilla movement from all other forms of class struggle and thus to undermine it.

These tactics obviously have nothing in common with the truly revolutionary views of the guerrilla form of anti-imperialist struggle. Communists, of course, are guided by the ideas of V. I. Lenin who, while noting the political validity of guerrilla struggle as one of the forms of the revolutionary action of the masses, stressed that "the party of the proletariat can never consider guerrilla warfare as the sole, or even the main, method of struggle" (*Collected Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 9). This today is the position of the Communists of Colombia, where revolutionary guerrilla tactics have been carried on under Party leadership for many years. In fact, the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Colombia clearly stated, in January, 1966, that "to combine all forms of struggle and emphasize those forms which correspond to each concrete situation is the true reflection of Marxist-

Leninist ideology and its consistent application to the process of social development in our country."

How dangerous and harmful Trotskyite tactics can be is brought out clearly by the events in Peru. There, under the slogan, "Land or Death," the Trotskyites managed in 1963 to provoke ill-prepared actions by isolated peasant units. These units were quickly defeated by government troops, and hundreds of peasants accused of guerrilla action or of giving aid to guerrillas were thrown into prison. The Trotskyites repeated the same maneuver in 1965-66. As Peruvian Communist Carlos Zamora pointed out in his letter published in *L'Humanité* on January 3, 1968, "a few dozen guerrillas, completely isolated from the people, represent no serious threat to the government. But the government seized this opportunity to strike a heavy blow at the entire Left-wing opposition. Hundreds of activists and trade union members not even connected with the guerrillas were arrested."

The Trotskyites are trying to spread their sectarian concepts first of all among the ranks of insurgents in those Latin American countries where armed struggle is in progress. In Guatemala, they tried to wreck the Organization of Insurgent Armed Forces, representing a military-political alliance in which all groupings supporting the people's armed struggle are taking part. In 1964, they entrenched themselves in the November 13th Movement, which was part of that alliance, and began to issue ultra-Left manifestos calling for "socialist revolution now," for armed action alone, for the "establishment of local communes having the functions of Soviets." The Central Committee of the Guatemalan Party of Labor stressed in a statement issued in August, 1964, that to follow the Trotskyites' advice meant to isolate the armed struggle, to facilitate the defeat of the rebels by the enemy. As subsequent events have shown, the Trotskyites did indeed play into the hands of the anti-revolutionary forces, splitting the November 13th Movement in the process. In his speech at the Conference of Representatives of Three Continents, held in Havana on January 15, 1966, Fidel Castro termed these actions a crime against the revolutionary movement.

The Trotskyites also keep trying to spread ultra-Left slogans in the trade unions and other mass organizations of working people in the Latin American countries. Wherever they appear, they act as opponents of unity of the revolutionary forces, as the practical helpmates of reaction.

This, then, is the role of Trotskyism today. Banished from the

ranks of the organized working-class movements, its followers have not given up. They continue to do everything in their power to undermine the Communist movement and to befuddle at least part of the petty-bourgeois sections of the populations and student movement. That is why the true representatives of the interests of the broad anti-imperialist movement, the Communist and Workers' parties, carry on an acute, irreconcilable struggle against Trotskyism. That is why they continually expose the Trotskyites as enemies of the working-class movement, showing their anti-revolutionary nature and unmasking their methods of fostering subversive activity.

William Gallacher, Communist member of the British Parliament for many years, describes in his memoirs the following conversation between himself and V. I. Lenin during the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920:

"Lenin covered one eye with his hand and looked at me intently. 'I would like to ask you a question,' he said. 'You say that the bourgeoisie successfully manages to bribe everyone who is elected to parliament. Now if the workers of England had sent *you* to parliament to represent their interests would you become corrupted?' I looked at him with surprise and muttered: 'What a strange question!' 'Comrade Gallacher,' Lenin continued, 'that is a very important question. Would you permit the bourgeoisie to bribe you?' 'No,' I replied, 'I cannot allow anyone or anything to corrupt me.'

"Lenin had been leaning forward, looking at me. When he heard my answer, he straightened and, smiling broadly, said: 'Comrade Gallacher, you must make the workers send you to parliament. Then you will show them how an incorruptible revolutionary works there. Show them how to utilize parliament in a revolutionary way.'

"In the course of our conversation I was forced to admit that we had made a serious mistake when we left the working class of England to the mercy of MacDonald, Henderson and Co."

HERBERT APTHEKER

Violence in the United States [Part II]

Last month we commenced a critique of the 800-page *Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence*, edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr and published under the title *The History of Violence in America*. Having commented upon the sections of the Report devoted largely to narrative and description, we turn now to its concluding sections which concentrated upon theoretical questions related to sources of revolution and to what the Report called "Processes of Rebellion."

An essay of nearly sixty pages is contributed by Ivo K. and Rosalind L. Feierabend and Betty A. Nesvold on "Social Change and Political Violence." These scholars present what they call a "frustration-aggression theory" wherein social systems induce frustration which "creates the social strain and discontent that in turn are indispensable preconditions of violence." The authors feel that "the commonsense assertion that revolutionary behavior has its roots in discontent, and the more technical postulate that frustration precedes aggression, are parallel statements indicating a common insight" (635).

We find this formulation quite unsatisfactory and we do not think that the "commonsense assertion" and the formulation of the authors are "parallel."

Our difference lies in the fact that the authors place the burden for violence upon those seeking significant social change; that they identify revolutionary behavior with the employment of violence and label such employment as "aggression." None of this is valid. The source of violence in hitherto existing and presently-existing exploitative systems lies in that very exploitation itself. It commenced with violence, it is maintained to a significant degree through violence and when threatened by consequential discontent—whose manifestations normally are non-violent—it seeks to drown the threat in the blood of the discontented.

Frustration characterizes reactionary classes rather than revolutionary masses; and aggression is a term that aptly marks the normal response of such classes, with the aggression directed either outside or inside and often directed against both simultaneously. The colonists in the 18th century were not guilty of aggression against George III; on the contrary, the monarch was guilty of aggression against the

colonists (and the Irish and, as George put it, the "London mob," too). Lincoln was not guilty of aggression in the 19th century; on the contrary, dominant elements among the slaveholding class were. The Vietnamese people have not been guilty of aggression in the 20th century; on the contrary, the ruling classes of France and of the United States have been guilty of aggression.

Certainly "revolutionary behavior has its roots in discontent" but such behavior need not be and usually is not violent. Behavior that earns the title of revolutionary is mass activity guided by the conscious purpose of fundamentally transforming the social order. Such activity is long-term and not momentary; such behavior is part of a *process* and not of an instant. Those who practice such behavior will not *advocate* violence—unless absolutely no possibility of other activity exists (as *may* occur with chattel slavery and with fascism). In any case—including cases of slavery and fascism—without mass support and participation, success is not possible. It is the behavior which prepares the way for and helps produce that mass support which is really revolutionary behavior.

The authors of this essay on "Social Change and Political Violence" assert that the evidence is contrary "to Marxian expectations"; that is, it shows, according to them, that "revolutions do not occur during periods of prolonged abject or worsening situations of social deprivation." Where, in Marx, does one find these "expectations"? No source is offered by the authors; there is none for this is not in Marx.

The authors say also that contrary to de Tocqueville who offered the opinion (and he did) "that revolutions are perpetrated during periods of relative prosperity and improvement," actually "revolution occurs in social systems in which social well-being has been continually raised for an extended period of time, followed by an abrupt and sharp setback" (637).

One of the deficiencies in the authors' analysis is that revolutions are not "perpetrated" at all. Counter-revolutions are, but not revolutions. Revolutions are mass and result from long-time social processes; from the accumulation of an intensification of contradictions, from growing awareness and consciousness and organization on the part of the victims of such contradictions; from a shift in the relationship of forces which makes possible the transformation of the social order. It is, therefore, not possible to achieve any mechanical kind of generalization as to the immediate period preceding the *culmination* of the process. There may be in fact a vast intensification of suffering as was true in the years just before the Bolshevik Revolution; there may be a *brief* period (not prolonged as the authors would have it)

of an economic upswing as there was preceding 1775 in the colonies. These are details which are not fundamental to the social development of those forces and relationships which finally culminate in a decisive challenge to the ruling class and its State.

Moreover, of great significance in revolutionary culmination is the overcoming of counter-revolutionary attempts and this is altogether ignored by the authors. Thus, the revolution which is the Civil War in the United States became so as part of the effort to suppress the slaveowners' counter-revolution.

Equally unsatisfactory, in terms of analysis, is the very elaborate essay by James C. Davis, elaborately entitled, "The J-Curve of Rising and Declining Satisfactions as a Cause of Some Great Revolutions and a Contained Rebellion."

Davis also rejects Marx: "Marx to the contrary, revolutions are made not only by economically depressed classes and their leaders but by the joint effort of those people in all social groups who are experiencing frustration of different basic needs" (694). Once again, we have no footnote to anything that Marx ever actually wrote; of course, Marx never affirmed that revolutions were made only by economically depressed classes and their leaders. It is Marx, for example, who referred to the 1775-1783 and 1861-1865 events in the United States as revolutionary; in both he emphasized the multi-class character of the movements. Moreover, of course, Marx was well aware of the reality of bourgeois-democratic and national-liberating revolutions; in neither case was Marx as absurdly simplistic as Davies makes him out to be.

Marx did insist that revolutions may be accurately and helpfully characterized by the classes exercising hegemony in them and he did insist that for a socialist revolution, the working class would be and would have to be the *decisive*—not the sole—revolutionary force. And in pointing to the leading role of the working class Marx emphasized not its "economically depressed" but rather its *exploited* condition and its position at the heart of the productive process.

That Marx (and Engels) had no such narrow view as that mentioned by Davies is confirmed further by the fact that both men consistently fought against sectarianism—not least in the United States; in that sense Lenin's emphasis upon peasant-working class unity and upon the interlocking of the anti-colonial and anti-capitalist movements were logical extensions of the Marxian position.

The sheer historiography of Davies is amateurish (as shown in his slanderous remarks about John Brown and his absurd errors regarding the French revolution) which permits the editors, in summarizing his effort, to remark that he considers as essentially similar phenomena the French revolution and "the Nazi revolution"! The

first, however, was a revolution and the second was a counter-revolution; to equate the two is to render all subsequent analysis faulty.

Actually, Mr. Davies knows his analysis is not historical; as he writes: "The J-curve is a psychological, not a sociological explanation" (728). But in the first place the phenomena he is examining are historical-sociological and not basically psychological; and in the second place his psychology is the psychology of Bruno Bettelheim which leaves much to be desired in its own terms. In particular, since that psychology insists that oppression degrades the oppressed, that victimization succeeds in creating *only* victims, the psychology of Davies is not only inadequate as an explanation of great socio-historic phenomena; when applied to revolutionary transformation such a psychological outlook is positively vitiating.

The text of the Report which we have used is a New York Times-Bantam Book; it carries a special introduction by John Herbers of the *Times*. In the tradition of that newspaper, Mr. Herbers does a fine job of obfuscation. He notes that the Kerner Report had blamed "the white majority" for the special oppression of Black people; he is right about that Report but fails to note that such a finding is quite false and leaves really unscathed the ruling classes in the United States which from the days of slavery to the days of Songmy have been the source and maintainers of and the benefitters from racism. Similarly, Herbers finds that in the Report before us "the central lesson" is that "the facts cry out for a search for a non-violent tradition—one that would preserve the mobility of American classes and groups and allow for changes, reforms and political pressures without the use of violence."

This is the central lesson of the Report—and its central failing. The Report—though not much of the data and description—puts the main blame for the violence that has stained the United States upon those "classes and groups" which have sought changes. The truth is the opposite; the classes which have dominated the economics and politics and ideology of the United States have practiced continual violence—inside the country and outside it. They have murdered millions, ravished the continent and now made of the United States—as even Arnold Toynbee wrote—the main bastion of repression and reaction in the world.

Mr. Herbers ends his Introduction by remarking: "Perhaps there must be a new tradition before there can be a New Jerusalem." The old tradition—of inhumanity and violence—was made by the Temple's despoilers; in rescuing it from their bloody hands, Americans of all colors who value a productive, creative and fraternal life will thereby create—are thereby creating—that new tradition.

February 12, 1970

COMMUNICATIONS

H. C.

Science and Ideology

In the ideological struggle against the socialist world, all kinds of weapons are used by its enemies. Intellectuals of capitalist countries are constantly enlisted and are seeking ways to alienate and disaffect intellectuals of the socialist countries from their socialist role in their society. This was at the heart of the crisis that developed in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and led to the action of the Warsaw Pact countries. Czech and Slovak intellectuals were in the forefront of the effort to take Czechoslovakia out of the socialist orbit — writers, journalists, economists, scientists and others had lost their socialist way.

Of late there have been efforts by some American intellectuals to probe the area of science and scientists in the Soviet Union and to initiate similar disaffection by using statements of Soviet scientists to attack Marxist ideology. Erik Bert's review in *Political Affairs* (November 1969) of Harrison Salisbury's "Introduction, Notes and Afterward" to Andrei D. Sakharov's *Progress, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom* (which first appeared here in the *New York Times* of July 22, 1968) makes it clear that this was Salisbury's purpose.

At about the same time there

appeared in *Science* (March 16, 1968), the official organ of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, an article entitled "Science and Morality: A Soviet Dilemma." Its author was Alexander Vucinich, professor of sociology at the University of Illinois. This article did not receive much public attention but was probably much more widely noted by the scientific community, for which it was intended.

My reading of the article convinces me that it calls for a critical Marxist review for much the same reason that Bert's review of Salisbury's and Sakharov's "works" was necessary.

The main thrust of the article is that science is an open-ended, autonomous mode of thought, with no hampering ideology to deflect it from its efforts to arrive at truth in all areas where it is competent to operate. Science is supposed to develop its own set of "internally" derived rules. Science of this kind, it is made clear, is in direct opposition to Marxist ideology which today can be rigid and hampering to the practice of open, honest science.

The author maintains that there is developing in the Soviet scientific community a strong demand for the creation of a new scientific

SCIENCE

57

intelligentsia, internally chosen and determined, free of all governmental restrictions and of ideological restraints. He maintains further that the model for this is the kind of scientific community that has developed in the West and has there been uniquely successful.

Vucinich tries to use Soviet scientists to attack Soviet and Marxist-Leninist ideology. How does he go about this?

The article starts with a recital of the development of the views held by leading scientists in Tsarist days and the early years of the Soviet Union regarding the philosophical problem of the relation of science to morality. It establishes the leading role played by science and "scientific truth" in Soviet and Marxist-Leninist ideology. Pretty soon one is led from this to "the identification (identity, equality) of ideology and science" and from there into the "ethos of science" as defined by Stalin, which advanced the supremacy of ideology *over* science and led to the debacle of Lysenkoism and the subsequent decline of Soviet genetics. With the demise of Lysenkoism the author sees Soviet science as having come full circle.

Vucinich writes: "Stimulated by considerable relaxation of political and ideological controls, the [Soviet] men of scientific knowledge are presently engaged in a quiet and subtle quest for more favorable conditions for the growth of science as a system of knowledge, an institutional com-

plex and a *world view*. The reassessment of the ethical foundations of Soviet science is the motive force of this quest."

Here, just as Salisbury makes use of Sakharov's views to attack the CPSU and the whole Communist movement, Vucinich similarly makes use of some Soviet scientists' thoughts concerning certain aspects of scientific practice in their country. These are perfectly natural in their context, but Vucinich turns them in his own mind and for his own purposes into a questioning of the fundamental validity of the application of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Science is viewed by Vucinich as an open-ended quest for knowledge, "doubting and challenging every authority." He cites Brecht, "quoting his own creature Galileo." Above everything else, the members of the scientific community "must have the moral qualities to fight for the integrity of science and to guard against the interference of forces external to science." The author then tells us that "the current search of Soviet scientists for a reassessment of the relationship of science to morality and for a deeper understanding of the moral foundation of science is a part of the growing quest for a firm separation of science from ideology."

Next comes the clincher. "[Soviet] scientists operate on the safe assumption that the identification (identity) of science and the officially defined moral code of Soviet society has opened the gates for the ideological control

of science—for the subordination of the welfare of science to the interests of ideology.” The author then puts into the mouths of Soviet scientists the reverse view: the supremacy of science over Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Through a series of quotations by leading contemporary Soviet scientists on their views of the relationship of science to morality, the author arrives at attributing to Soviet science “the current search for an affirmation of the inalienable rights of scientists to define the domain and limits of scientific inquiry, and to safeguard science — not from ethics, esthetics, metaphysics or religion—but from *pseudoscience*.” Clearly, though he does not say so explicitly, he has in mind Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Going on to speak about a perfectly normal desire on the part of Soviet scientists to develop a genuine community of scientists, Vucinich quotes Kapitsa, a leading physicist, as saying that “the community of scientists alone can objectively judge the achievements of science. . . . Only an advanced scientific community can fully appraise the intellectual power of a scientific discovery independently of its direct practical significance.”

From this he jumps to the Stalin period, in which Stalin’s erroneous application of dialectical materialism to science led to some setbacks in the development of Soviet biological and genetic science. His attack is oblique, but it is there nevertheless. “Until

recently,” he writes, “a major source of this unevenness [of growth of Soviet science] was the officially enforced limitation on criticism of certain ideologically relevant scientific orientations or propositions — such as Marxist-Leninist historicism, Michurinian evolutionism, Lenin’s caution against ‘mathematical idealism’ and physical and physiological determinism.”

He writes further: “Today much of the Stalinist ‘ethos’ of science is history. The idea of the international nature of science has become rule in the assessment of scientific thought. As anti-objectivism crumbled, sociology has been recognized as a legitimate science and may well inaugurate an era of scientific studies of the social problems engendered by the Soviet system.” And still further: “Of particular relevance is the question: does historical materialism provide a sufficient explanation of the growth of science?” It is not clear whether this is Vucinich’s question or whether he is implying that it is one put forward by Soviet scientists. “Today,” he says, “there is a lively interest in the *inner logic* of the development of science — the growth of scientific thought determined by the internal logical mechanisms of science rather than by external conditions.”

It is clear that in raising to preeminence this concept of the “inner logic” of science, the author divorces science from the ideology of Marxism-Leninism and denigrates Marxism-Leninism as

the science of the development of societies and economic systems. Instead he counterposes open-ended but undefined “science” as a world view, in direct opposition

to Marxist-Leninist dialectics. And all the time he seeks to give the impression that he has made the point out of the mouths of Soviet scientists themselves.

ANDREW ROTHSTEIN

A Correction

There appears to be a slip of the pen in Hyman Lumer’s article on Trotskyism in your September-October issue.

He writes (p. 43, line 3) that Trotsky “after the October Revolution . . . was made a member and later chairman of the Military Revolutionary Committee.”

The latter body was the organ of the Petrograd Soviet, directed by the Party, which carried out the October Revolution. It ceased to exist within two months or so thereafter (December 12).

Trotsky was a member of the MRC *before* the October Revolution, and figures as such in its minutes, published two years ago—although he never played the part the Trotskyites have attributed to him in it.

He was *never* chairman of the MRC, a post filled first by the Left Socialist-Revolutionary Lazimir and later by the old Bolshevik Podvoisky,

What Trotsky became chairman of, later—after his tactics at Brest-Litovsk had proved a disastrous failure, and he had been removed from his first post of People’s Commissar for Foreign Affairs—was (September 1918) chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic.

(and People’s Commissar for War). This of course was an entirely different body from the MRC of the Petrograd Soviet—it was in supreme charge of the Red Army, and continued in existence until 1934. Trotsky was removed from his post in the RMC in January 1925.

Allow me to compliment you on this issue, with its record of truly heroic struggle against difficulties without and overcoming of troubles within which would inspire Communists in every other country if they could read it. For one like myself it brings back moments of admiration from 1919 onwards, which thrilled and encouraged in one’s work.

* * *

Comrade Rothstein’s correction is well taken. The *intended* reference was to the Military Revolutionary Council.

The article also contains a misleading formulation on page 48, which I should like to take this occasion to correct. It states: “The Soviet people are repeatedly referred to as ‘fighting for their freedom,’ and the Hungarian and Polish counter-revolutionary efforts in 1956 are hailed as supposed examples of this ‘freedom fight.’”

There was, of course, no actual attempt at counter-revolution in Poland in 1956, as there was in Hungary. However, the Trotskyites did latch on to whatever

anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary elements showed themselves at the time, hailing them as "freedom fighters."

(H.L.)

BOOK REVIEWS

HYMAN LUMER

"Dangerous Scot": Story of a Communist Leader

There are certain immigrants to our country whom its rulers consider "desirable." Among them are the Svetlana Alliluievas and other renegades from the socialist countries. Among them are the anti-Semitic, fascist scum who fled the wrath of the people after the defeat of fascism in World War II. Among them are the *gusanos* who, having failed in their efforts to undermine the socialist revolution in Cuba, took flight from that country. All these and others of their ilk, who serve the interests of reaction, are welcomed to these shores and are freely granted U.S. citizenship.

There are others, however, whom the U.S. monopolists and their servants in government look upon as wholly "undesirable." Among these, first place is held — and proudly — by the Communists. Not only do U.S. immigration laws forbid entry to Communists; under them, men and women who came to this coun-

try in childhood or in infancy are held ineligible for citizenship and subject to deportation. Many who have spent most of their lives here have been driven out, often at an advanced age, and forced to seek new lives in the lands of their birth.

Why? Because they did not serve monopolist reaction but unflinchingly opposed it. Because they stood in the front ranks of those who fought exploitation and joblessness, racial and national oppression and all the other evils of our profit-based society.

Outstanding among these fighters is John Williamson, whose recently published autobiography is aptly subtitled *The Life and Work of an American "Undesirable."** The book chronicles a lifetime of active political struggle, particularly the forty-two

*John Williamson, *Dangerous Scot: The Life and Work of an American "Undesirable,"* International Publishers, New York, 1969. Cloth, \$5.95; paper, \$2.25.

"DANGEROUS SCOT"

years of it spent in the United States from his arrival from Glasgow at the age of ten to his deportation to England in 1955.

Son of a marine engineer and a working-class mother, young Johnny, after his father's death, came to the United States with his mother in 1913, eventually settling in Seattle. There he grew up, completing eight years of schooling and becoming a shipyard worker. This was the Seattle of the World War I years with its militant labor movement and its brash radicalism. It was the Seattle of the 1919 general strike, of the refusal of longshoremen to load the *S. S. Delight* with munitions destined for the counter-revolutionary forces in Russia.

It was in this atmosphere that the young Williamson got his first political education. "Hardly a person living during the years 1916-1920," he wrote, "could escape the impact of events. The entire world was ablaze with wars and revolution." At an early age he became involved in the struggles of the times and in 1918 he joined the Socialist Labor Party. He soon left it, however, because of its rigid dogmatism and sectarianism. In 1922 he joined the Communist Party, setting his feet on the path he has followed unswervingly up to the present day.

He became active in the Young Workers League, forerunner of the Young Communist League, and swiftly rose to a position of top leadership. In 1923, as national industrial secretary of the

YWL, he moved to Chicago and later to New York. In 1930 he left the field of youth work and returned to Chicago as Illinois district organizer of the Communist Party. Three years later he was transferred to Ohio as district secretary, remaining there until 1940. During these years his activities were interspersed with journeys to the Soviet Union as a delegate from the United States to meetings of the Young Communist International and the Communist International. After 1940 he returned to New York where he successively occupied the posts of national organizational secretary and national labor secretary of the Party. Thus, virtually his whole adult life was devoted to participation in the struggles of the working class as a leader in the Communist youth movement and the Communist Party.

So much for chronology. The book itself is no mere dry-as-dust account of day-to-day activities. On the contrary, it presents an exciting panorama of working-class struggles in the United States over a period of more than three decades, portrayed from the vantage point of one who was in the thick of them and in many instances played a leading part in them. Hence it makes fascinating reading, not only for old-timers for whom it relives these events but also for younger readers seeking to learn something of the history of this period.

There is, for example, the story of a confrontation between

Samuel Gompers, head of the AFL, and a delegation from the Young Workers League. The YWL had asked for the meeting in connection with its campaign to get the trade unions to admit young workers and give attention to their problems. The conservative, class-collaborationist Gompers, shocked to find that he had unwittingly let himself in for a meeting with Communists, quickly backed off. But the struggle went on.

There are the first-hand accounts of the battles of the unemployed in Illinois for bread and jobs during the early thirties, battles waged in the face of police terror and the stubborn opposition of reactionary local and state officials. There is the dramatic story of the struggles against evictions of small homeowners in Cleveland, led by the Small Home and Landowners Federation.

Especially exciting are Williamson's graphic accounts of the fights to organize workers in basic industry. He tells of the historic breakthrough in the organization of auto — of the Autolite strike in Toledo, of the great sitdown strike in 1937, which began in the Fisher Body plant in Cleveland. He tells also of the hard-fought campaign which brought about the organization of the rubber workers in Akron, and of the bitterly contested Little Steel strike which was largely centered in Ohio.

In all these varied struggles the Communist Party stood in the forefront, and Williamson, as one

of its most able and respected leaders in the Midwest, played an especially prominent role. With the modesty characteristic of him he tends to underplay his own part in these events. But it comes through nevertheless, and it is this which gives the book much of the vitality and interest it possesses.

The book goes on to depict the role of the Communist Party in World War II, and particularly its dogged struggle for the opening of the second front against Hitler. It deals briefly with the dissolution of the Party in 1944 under the influence of Browderism, and with its reconstitution and the expulsion of Browder in 1945.

From there it proceeds to the period of the cold war and the rise of McCarthyism. Here we encounter the shameful capitulation of the center forces in the CIO leadership to the cold-war pressures of the State Department and to the Taft-Hartley Act, leading to the expulsion of Left-led unions with a combined membership of nearly one million. As national labor secretary of the Party, Williamson was in close touch with these developments, and it is worth noting that the picture he presents gives the lie to those revisionists who some years later sought to attribute these reverses solely to errors committed by the Party.

This was a period of mounting persecution of the Communist Party, highlighted by the indictment in 1948 of twelve top Party

leaders, of whom Williamson was one, under the notorious Smith Act. Eleven were tried, convicted and eventually imprisoned. The vindictive frame-up trial conducted by Judge Harold Medina was a forerunner of the frame-up trials of Black Panthers and the Chicago Seven today.

Williamson was also one of five Communists imprisoned on Ellis Island and held for a month without bail as deportable aliens. Mass protest demonstrations coupled with a hunger strike finally brought about their release. Eventually, on completion of his prison term as a Smith Act victim, Williamson was deported. The final chapter of the book tells something of the subsequent life of himself and his family in England.

It is characteristic of him that he did not adopt the life of an exile looking in on the struggles in Britain from without, so to speak, but plunged into active work in the British Communist Party until a heart attack in 1963 compelled him to ease up. He is presently head of Marx House, which maintains the Marx Memorial Library and offers programs of lectures and classes on Marxism.

This book is not just a narrative of struggles and the au-

thor's part in them. It is above all a book about the Communist Party and its indispensable role in these struggles. And this role the book makes plain not by lecturing about it, but by showing the part which the Party has actually played in the struggle for progress.

Williamson repeatedly stresses the pioneering stand of the Party on basic questions. He notes, for example, the importance of the Party's recognition of the Negro question as a national question and of the special role of the black liberation struggle on the American scene. The struggles initiated by the Party for the rights of black people played no small part in unifying black and white workers in the unemployed struggles and the great drive to organize the unorganized in the thirties.

What is important is that in telling his life story John Williamson has made a notable contribution to our knowledge of the Party's past and our appreciation of its role. And not least, he has written a most interesting book. It is one which ought to be read by every Party member, young or old, as well as by all other fighters for peace, freedom and progress in our country.

The New York Teachers Union

In one of the worst of the irrational confrontations which have become a commonplace of the Vietnam-war era, the teachers' union in New York City called a series of three strikes in the Fall of 1968 which had a political, rather than an economic, goal. The confrontation was principally with the impoverished sections of the black and Puerto Rican population and the goal was to frustrate community control of education. The name of the union is United Federation of Teachers. This is the collective bargaining agent for the public school teachers of the city.

No one should confuse the UFT with the New York City Teachers Union which went out of existence in January 1964. The fondly remembered Teachers Union enhanced the New York scene for almost fifty years. Its entire history argues that it could never have provoked the kind of collision, with gross racist overtones, which in the fall of 1968 caused great wounds in the city that have yet to heal.

The history of the Teachers Union has now been told in a book by Celia Zitron.* (Mrs. Zitron, a long-time member of the Teachers Union is one of the many fine teachers who were forced out of the school system because of their

*Celia Lewis Zitron, *The New York City Teachers Union 1916-1964*, Humanities Press, New York, \$6.50.

dedication to the principles the union stood for.)

The TU was born into controversy, from which it rarely emerged, sired by the socialist-progressive wing of the labor movement, in 1916. This was about a year before the United States entered World War I. Only 600 teachers out of 20,000 were sufficiently indifferent to prevailing myths about "professionalism" to join at the start. The repressive atmosphere which was generated by the first imperialist world war and its revolutionary aftermath was one in which the TU, fighting simultaneously for teachers' rights and against reaction, was bound to suffer. The Red scare was used to suppress the civil liberties of teachers in 1917 just as it was again, with destructive effect, in the early fifties.

One of the most punishing ordeals of the Teachers Union was that occasioned by the investigations of the Rapp-Coudert committees of the New York State legislature in 1940-41. An investigation into budgetary matters of the New York City public education system was under the chairmanship of Assemblyman Herbert A. Rapp while Senator Frederic R. Coudert probed "subversion" in the system. The investigatory methods used by Coudert were those already established by HUAC under Martin Dies. Coudert generated an anti-Communist

witch-hunt atmosphere in the public schools and city colleges. This took its insidious toll in the suppression of teaching freedom in the classrooms. The human toll of the attack on the union and its members included 36 teachers dismissed from their jobs and one jailed on perjury charges.

The union became becalmed during the speculative prosperity of the late twenties but became an invigorated fighting force as the teachers shared the punishing blows of the depression in the thirties. Under the wing of the CIO the union made important organizational gains in the forties but, with the onset of the cold war, it was subjected to some of the worst manifestations of McCarthyite reaction. The so-called Timone Resolution (April 6, 1950) made it practically illegal in the schools. But it did not give up easily, and some of the union's finest efforts and successes on behalf of the teachers and the communities came during the difficult years when it was being hammered into organizational decline.

The ascendancy of the United Federation of Teachers, which won collective bargaining rights, eventually decided the fate of the Teachers Union, but even in dissolution the TU retains a reservoir of affection and accomplishment. This is because the TU members never regarded their union as a narrowly economic craft organization. Rather, it represented also their highest educational aims and social ideals.

In a truly vanguard sense the

TU always fought for quality education for all children. Its annual educational conference continued to draw an attendance of 2,000 and to attract outstanding speakers and honored guests down to its final year. U Thant, W E. B. DuBois, Sean O'Casey, Albert Einstein, Linus Pauling, Harold Taylor were among those who figured in the conferences.

The minority groups (who have become the majority of New York's public school population) were the subject of the union's concern long before recent civil rights struggles put them on the current agenda. From the thirties on the union fought for more and better schools in the ghettos, for teaching of black history and culture, for purging the textbooks of racial bias, for school integration and the recruitment and promotion of black teachers.

The kind of leadership the Teachers Union provided in its day could be used to good advantage in New York's present school crisis. And there is no doubt that its former members, now members of the UFT, can contribute their know-how and sense of principle toward making that benighted organization the kind of union the school teachers and their pupils and their pupils' parents need. The old TU showed what could and should be done in its field.

For teachers this book can serve as a textbook in teacher-unionism. For others it records an inspiring chapter in labor history.

THE WORKS OF WALTER LOWENFELS

All Points of View is proud to offer all the works of Walter Lowenfels that are still in print:

THE LIFE OF FRANKEL'S DEATH, by Walter Lowenfels and Howard McCord. A Catholic-Marxist dialogue. Washington State Press, Pullman, 1970, 92 pp. paperback 3.00

IN A TIME OF REVOLUTION: POEMS FROM OUR THIRD WORLD, edited by Walter Lowenfels. New young black and white poets. Random House, New York, 1969, 153 pp. cloth 5.95 paperback 1.95

THE WRITING ON THE WALL: 108 AMERICAN POETS, edited by Walter Lowenfels. From Whitman to Mike Gold to young black poets of today. Doubleday & Company, New York, 1969, 189 pp. cloth 4.95 paperback 1.95

THE PORTABLE WALTER: FROM THE PROSE AND POETRY OF WALTER LOWENFELS, edited by Robert Gover. International Publishers, New York, 1968, 160 pp. cloth 5.95 paperback 1.95

THOU SHALT NOT OVERKILL: WALTER LOWENFELS' PEACE POEMS. Hellric Publications, Belmont, Massachusetts, 1968, 59 pp., limited edition of 500 copies. paperback 2.50

WE ARE ALL POETS, REALLY. Lowenfels' poetry, prose-poetry, and letter-poetry. Intrepid Press Buffalo, N.Y. 1968, 66 pp. paperback 1.50

WHERE IS VIETNAM? AMERICAN POETS RESPOND, edited by Walter Lowenfels. Doubleday & Company (Anchor Books), New York, 1967, 160 pp. paperback 1.25

POETS OF TODAY: A NEW AMERICAN ANTHOLOGY, edited by Walter Lowenfels. Eighty-five living poets. International Publishers, New York, 1964 (fourth printing 1969), 143 pp. cloth 5.00 paperback 1.95

SOME DEATHS. Selected poems, 1925-1962. Jonathan Williams, The Nawahala Foundation (Jargon 32), Highlands, North Carolina, 1964, 109 pp., limited edition of 1500 copies. paperback 3.50

TO AN IMAGINARY DAUGHTER. Unique prose work. Horizon Press, New York, 1964, 128 pp. cloth 3.50

WALT WHITMAN'S CIVIL WAR, edited by Walter Lowenfels. Whitman's Civil War experience. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1960, 333 pp. cloth 5.00

ORDER FROM:

All Points of View
P.O. Box 321, San Antonio, Texas 78206