

New Stage in the Russian Revolution Analyzed

SWP Resolution Evaluates Crisis Of Stalinism

[We publish herewith the full text of a resolution on The New Stage of the Russian Revolution and the Crisis of Stalinism adopted by a meeting of the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party held April 13-15. — Ed.]

A new stage has opened in the continuing development of the Russian Revolution. The masses of the Soviet Union, who were politically expropriated by the bureaucracy under Stalin and who suffered its brutal rule for nearly three decades, are evidently once again in motion; they have already forced far-reaching concessions from the ruling bureaucracy and more can be expected to follow. The international repercussions, great as they are, have only begun. The correctness of Trotsky's struggle against Stalinism bids to rapidly become a key issue among the ranks of the Communist Parties throughout the world. Stalinism, the main obstacle in the path of the world revolution, faces its death agony. Great new possibilities are now opening up for reassembling the world revolutionary socialist movement on a new plane and thus solving the "crisis of leadership" which has paralyzed the revolutionary proletariat. This is the meaning in brief of the death knell of the Stalin cult sounded at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

EAST GERMANY AND VORKUTA

After putting Stalin's corpse on display, the heirs of the dictator attempted to rule in his name as high priests of the cult they had helped establish. But this proved short-lived. To gain the time needed to consolidate their shaky regime, they felt forced to grant actual concessions to the masses and to promise more. These involved primarily better living conditions for the workers and a relaxation of the purge system. The concessions, however, served to hearten the masses who had already felt fresh hope with the death of the foul dictator who had ruled the Soviet Union with blood and terror for some three decades.

One of the consequences was the strike movement throughout the Soviet zone of Eastern Europe which culminated in the uprising of the East German workers in June 1953. This was put down. But the uprising served to inspire workers elsewhere under the Kremlin's heel. Throughout the concentration camps stirrings were apparent. The most dramatic was the strike at Vorkuta where 250,000 slave laborers downed tools. These two events, the East German uprising and the Vorkuta strike, frightened the Kremlin. They revealed the mood of the workers and the abyss separating the ruling strata from the Soviet masses.

CONCESSIONS TO WORKERS

The result was the decision to give a really major concession — nothing less than Stalin himself. This was done at the Twentieth Congress, making it a landmark in Soviet history. In addition, other concessions — genuine concessions — were made. These included the promise of a shorter working day, an increase in social benefits, better housing, an end to lawless dictatorial rule, the rehabilitation of victims framed up by Stalin. But the greatest concessions were the promise to return to Lenin and the deliberate destruction of the artificially constructed image of Stalin. This set in motion forces that will inevitably pass beyond the control of the bureaucracy, for the Congress pronouncements on Stalin will become a banner for the masses in marching forward to completely cleanse the Soviet Union of the hated Stalinist system. It legalizes their demand for an end to Stalinism and a return to Lenin. They will know how to put this significant concession to full advantage. The Congress thus marks the beginning of a new, profoundly revolutionary stage in the Soviet Union.

The immediate reason for the concessions, as we have indicated, was the palpable pressure of the masses which has grown so great that the bureaucracy calculates it cannot be suppressed simply by sweeping purges as in the days of Stalin — it is more expedient to bend with the pressure in hope of avoiding being broken by it.

The growing mass pressure within the Soviet Union is a consequence of profounder developments. Most important of these is the shift in the balance of world power away from capitalism. The crushing of the Axis powers,

(Continued on page 3)

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XX — No. 19



NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, MAY 7, 1956

PRICE: 10 Cents

30-Hour Week Is the Answer To Mounting Layoffs in Auto

Franco Spain Seethes With Workers' Unrest

By John Black

The fascist regime of General Franco is fighting for its very existence on three fronts. The strike wave in Northern Spain which appeared to have ebbed is now gripping the industrial city of Bilbao. Student unrest, which the regime has met with arrests, trials and prison terms is persisting. The Spanish North African Empire is disintegrating under the impact of the Arab National revolution.

The strikes that took place last month throughout northern Spain in defiance of the laws forbidding all such actions, developed originally in protest against the inadequate wage concessions Franco had made to the demands of the workers. The meager increases, moreover, were swallowed up instantly when the cost of basic foods rose the day that the wage increases went into effect.

The strike hit the administration with such impact that local authorities used a mixture of bribery and threats to stave off greater trouble. In Pamplona, where the whole city was tied up in a general strike, the Governor of the Province had to agree to full pay for the days the workers had been out on strike before he was able to break the momentum of the movement.

SLOWDOWN AND LOCKOUT

The workers have now switched to a different form of struggle, the organized slowdown. The center of this movement, which is still growing, is the highly industrialized city of Bilbao in the Basque province. On April 24, the Civil Governor closed down three plants, involving some 6,000 workers for "illegal slowing down of the rhythm of production." The next day seven more plants were closed down and many workers dismissed. The lockout in Bilbao alone has brought 50,000 workers out into the streets, including the employees of the Spanish subsidiary of General Electric, the Babcock & Wilcox plant and the Construction naval shipyard.

The seriousness of the situation is underlined by the fact that the local garrison has been alerted and reinforced by 2,000 troops. In addition, 1,000 armed police from Burgos, Salamanca and Soria have been brought into the city. The militarized and barracked Civil Guard has

been reinforced, too. The Governor declares that the plants will stay closed until "the workers give up their present attitude." Reports from San Sebastian indicate a similar tense situation.

Unable to stem the tide of workers' insurgency in the north of the country, Franco has had to face organized opposition from the students, particularly at the large University of Madrid. Growing out of the clashes on the campus earlier this year between students and Falange goon squads, there has developed a persistent and courageously organized flood of leaflets from the students demanding reforms. These include the reinstatement of faculty members sympathetic to the students, the enforcement of the Unesco Bill of Human Rights, the release of arrested students and freedom to organize independently of the Fascist sponsored student organization.

STUDENT TRIALS

The regime answered with a wave of arrests which only served to show up just how widespread the movement really was. In the last two weeks, two trials took place in Madrid, and a number of students were sentenced to years of imprisonment. Among the convicted students were Manuel Montesinos, nephew of Garcia Lorca, Spain's most famous modern poet who was shot by the fascists in 1936.

The Dean of the Law School, testifying for the defense, described the invasion of the campus by the fascists armed with pistols, brass knuckles and truncheons. He, himself, was threatened and fled across the border into France, returning only when the defense attorney, Gil Robles, a prominent rightwing politician of the pre-Franco period, secured guarantees that the witnesses would be unharmed.

Even while the trial was on and with the Carabanchel prison in Madrid full of anti-fascist militants, students distributed a new edition of their leaflet by throwing bundles of them into the city's subway trains just as the doors closed and the trains pulled out.



Soviet Atom Energy Report "Amazes" British Scientists

Professor Igor V. Kurchatov, April 25, "amazed 300 of Britain's top scientists who heard him describe at Harwell, the British atomic Energy center, the results of

more than three years of research toward controlling the energy created by fusion, as in the hydrogen bomb explosion," according to the N. Y. Times, April 26. "Their work thus marks a step forward scientifically."

The next day Senator Albert Gore, D., N. M., declared that the Soviet Union would win the "atomic power race" unless the U.S. adopted a "crash program." And on April 27 Donald J. Hughes, Chairman of the Federation of American Scientists and a leading nuclear physicist, declared that for the first time in the atomic age the U.S. was lagging behind the USSR in the declassification of scientific information. "I believe [Dr. Kurchatov] revealed the great majority of the work they have

Auto Decline is Seen As "Recession Amid Boom" by N. Y. Times

By C. Thomas

Unemployment is taking a heavy toll in the auto and farm equipment industries with layoffs mounting weekly as production schedules are cut and new car sales continue

to decline. "Sales of new cars and farm tools have plummeted 10 to 80 per cent below levels of a year ago," reports a special survey of the automobile and farm equipment industries published on the front page of the May 1, New York Times.

The Times headlines its nation-wide survey: "Recession Amid Boom Hits Auto and Farm Tool Fields." "Sales of new cars," it points out, "are lagging as much as 50 per cent behind the 1955 pace. Farm equipment volume is off anywhere from 50 to 80 per cent. . . . Unemployment in both fields is rising rapidly, with new layoffs scheduled."

A NATIONAL TREND

Reports reaching the Militant from various parts of the country indicate an acceleration of the current trend. Over 800 workers were laid off last week at the General Motors Buick-Oldsmobile-Pontiac assembly plant in Linden, N. J. In Anderson, Ind. over 1,300 were laid off at the GM Delco-Remy and Guide Lamp plants for an indefinite period. From Buffalo, N. Y., comes the report that for the first time in its 18-year existence, the Chevrolet engine plant in that city laid off 750 workers.

The Buffalo Chevrolet plant produces 40 per cent of all Chevrolet engines. Although the company had previously laid off a small number of temporary employees in Feb. 1953 and again in Dec. 1955, this is the first time that workers with up to 13 months seniority have been laid off at this plant.

The significant thing about the sharp decline is that it comes at a time when the auto industry expected an upward turn in car sales. "Not only has the traditional spring pick-up failed to materialize," says the Times survey, "but business has slumped to the lowest point in two years or more."

Many dealers predicted last December and January that 1956 would be a record or near-record year second only to the phenomenal car sales volume of 1955. They accumulated large stocks of new cars in anticipation of the demand. Instead, beginning with January sales dropped sharply each month and production has been curtailed over 20 per cent behind the 1955 figures. It is estimated that stocks in the hands of dealers now number over 800,000 units. "Retailers by the score are going out of business," says the Times survey.

Farm implement sales and production has been even harder hit. The continuing decline in farm income has sharply reduced expenditures for new farm tools. The big farm equipment manufacturers, J. I. Case, International Harvester, Deere & Co., etc., are shutting down plants, slashing production and laying off thousands of workers. "The sales dip," in farm implements, says the Times survey, "was not entirely unexpected. What was unexpected was the severity of the decline. Dealers report volume off as much as 80 per cent. In many areas the market has completely dried up."

"HIDDEN RECESSION"

What effect will the growing crisis in the auto and farm equipment industry have on the rest of the economy? "The im-

plications," says the Times survey, "of this 'hidden recession,' as some dub it, are far-reaching. The auto and farm equipment industries are economic bellwethers. They are major employers, large consumers of industrial materials, important factors in total retail volume. A disappointing year, as is now indicated, is bound to have a depressing effect on the entire business scene."

Whether or not the "hidden recession" in auto becomes general in the period ahead and regardless of how soon its implications manifest themselves in the spread of unemployment to associated industries and trade, there is no discounting the immediate effect upon a large number of workers. Nearly 200,000 auto and farm equipment workers have been idled by layoffs due to curtailed production. A large part of those remaining on the job had their incomes reduced by short work weeks. The guaranteed annual wage clause in the union contract, even after it goes into effect, affords little or no protection to workers with low seniority and no protection whatever against reduced income because of short work weeks.

The only demand that meets the requirements of this situation is the sliding scale of hours: the 30-hour week at 40-hour pay. The "hidden recession" in auto finds the UAW again tied to a long term agreement. Unless the principle of the "living agreement" is invoked the union is straightjacketed. It is an object lesson for all union members. The only real protection against inevitable capitalist "recession" either "hidden" or otherwise, is the fight for the 30-hour week with no reduction in pay.

Kremlin Steps Up Campaign Against "Rotten Elements"

By Daniel Roberts

The chiefs of the Soviet Communist Party are stepping up their campaign of slander against "rotten elements," "demagogues" and "malicious faultfinders" in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The Stalinists designate under these labels party members who "take advantage" of the repudiation of the Stalin cult to criticize party policy and the bureaucratic regime. The nature of the criticisms has not been revealed nor has the identity of the critics. Khrushchev and Company — despite their promise to revive party democracy — do not discuss with those holding dissenting views. They follow Stalin's procedure of vilifying opponents and threatening purges unless they shut up.

"For more than a month the campaign against the critics has been mounting in intensity," says Welles Hangen, reporting from Moscow in the April 30 New York Times. A recent issue of Partinaya Zhizn (Party Life), organ of the Soviet CP's central committee threatened with expulsion any party members who went beyond the limits of discussion set by the Kremlin. This allows attacks on the cult of Stalin but forbids criticism of present leaders and

(Continued on page 4)

Reuther's Politics and Democratic Party Crisis

By Tom Kerry

The Democratic Party is in the throes of an internal crisis which seriously impairs its chances for victory in the coming elections. This growing crisis was highlighted by the recent "ultimatum" directed at its leaders by Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers union, who declared "that in 1956 you've got to make a choice — you cannot have Mr. (Mississippi Senator) Eastland and have us at the same time." In other words, Reuther is presumably telling the leaders of the Democratic Party: You cannot have the Dixiecrats and the labor movement too!

The Democratic party is a political monstrosity. It is composed of a coalition of mutually antagonistic elements with widely divergent interests. It comprises the Dixiecrats, the Negro people in the North and West, the organized labor movement, small farmers and the big city machines. So long as the coalition held together, the Democratic party constituted the majority political party. But the militant struggle of the Negro people for their civil rights, the mounting

discontent of the small farmers and the dissatisfaction of labor threatened to tear the coalition apart.

MISCALCULATION

When Stevenson began his campaign to win the Democratic nomination for president he had the support of the labor leaders and liberals. His policy of "patience," "gradualism," "moderation," was calculated to avoid giving offense to the conflicting elements in the coalition by skirting all the burning issues and above all, to appease the Dixiecrat wing of the Democratic Party. He succeeded in the latter purpose, but in the process stirred up a hornet's nest of opposition in the Negro community, aroused as never before by the Jim Crow atrocities in the South and the inspiring Montgomery bus protest movement. And, in the Minnesota primary election, his line of "moderation" on farm policy, led to his unexpected defeat despite the support of the labor leaders and the Democratic Party machine.

Subsequent primary elections registered a shift in the Negro

vote from the Democrats. The recent milk strike in Michigan disclosed a mood of growing militancy among the farmers. This is confirmed by the rapid growth of new farm organizations of a more militant character seeking an alliance with the organized labor movement. It was only when the lessons of these events had sunk in that Reuther bestirred himself.

Reuther prefaced his "ultimatum" to the Democratic party leadership with the declaration that the UAW was "not the tail to any political party kite." This stock phrase has been used over and over again by the top labor leaders as an expression of displeasure and an implied threat to withdraw their support. But the question is immediately posed: What does Reuther propose to do in the event the leaders of the Democratic Party choose to hang on to the Dixiecrats?

THE ALTERNATIVE?

The question of possible alternatives must have immediately occurred to Reuther for he hastened to disclaim any intention of fostering a "third party."

A third party, said Reuther, "is not the answer at this time." What then is the answer? If necessary, said Reuther, he might attend both conventions, Democratic and Republican, to press for the program and principles he believes in. Wherein does this differ from the bankrupt Gompers policy of "rewarding friends and punishing enemies." The answer is — it doesn't.

Reuther is bluffing and the capitalist politicians who run the Democratic Party know it. He boasts that he is not wedded to either party but he is wedded to the two-party system. He thinks a third party, a labor party, is un-American and has said so. What Reuther envisages is a "realignment" within the capitalist two-party structure with a labor-liberal wing in one party and a conservative-reactionary wing in the other.

It is precisely such a "realignment" that the politicians in control of the Democratic Party are determined to prevent. They need the Dixiecrats as a counterweight to the other component elements of the coalition and are prepared to cling to them with tooth and

naïl. The Dixiecrats need the Democratic Party to maintain their one-party system in the South which, under the seniority system prevailing in Congress, permits them to exercise an inordinate power over the legislative branch of government. As it works out in practice, the other component parts of the coalition are deprived of any effective political means for defending their interests.

So long as he upholds the two-party system what realistic alternative can Reuther offer? Does he propose to emulate John L. Lewis who gambled his power and prestige as head of the CIO in a vain attempt to swing labor to the Republican party? Hardly! Reuther is long on talk but short on action. What he is demanding in essence, is that the Democrats take the labor leaders and liberals off the griddle by outpromising the Republicans.

The Democratic Party could win in 1956, Reuther declared in his "ultimatum" speech, "only if it supported without compromise the New Deal and Fair Deal values of humanity and liberalism." What does this mumbo

jumbo mean? There has not been a single piece of significant social legislation adopted since 1938. In 1948 Truman outpromised not only the Republicans but Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party as well. His election was hailed as a great labor victory. But when promise is weighed against performance what was the result?

Among other things, Truman promised to repeal the union-busting Taft-Hartley Act. It's still with us. He promised sweeping civil rights legislation and produced nothing. He did produce a virulent witch hunt that unleashed the plague of McCarthyism. And he did trigger the "police action" in Korea. Both are outstanding examples of the "humanity and liberalism" produced by Fair Deal Harry Truman.

Eisenhower, of course, is no better. His "middle of the road" demagoguery is a transparent cloak for naked Big Business rule. What Reuther is really after is a "promising" candidate and a "promising" platform to deceive the workers once more into believing they have a real choice.

MOSCOW FRAME-UP TRIALS II

Facts of Trotsky's Life Refuted Vyshinsky

[We publish herewith the second installment of Leon Trotsky's closing speech at the hearings of the Preliminary Commission of Inquiry into the Charges Made Against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials. The hearings took place April 10 to 17, 1937 at Coyoacan, Mexico. The Commission of Inquiry was an impartial body headed by John Dewey, the eminent philosopher and teacher and a veteran of American liberalism. It included Carlo Tresca, outstanding leader of the anarchist movement and one of the men most hated by the fascist dictator, Mussolini. Otto Ruehle who stood side by side in the Reichstag with Karl Liebknecht in fighting German imperialism in World War I, was another member. The Commission selected as its legal adviser John Finerty, of world-wide fame in the defense of Tom Mooney and of Sacco and Vanzetti. The verdict of the Commission after nine months of thorough investigation in several countries was that the defendants in the Moscow Trials were "Not Guilty." Leon Trotsky's speech has been reprinted by Pioneer Publishers in a pamphlet entitled Stalin's Frame-Up System and the Moscow Trials. — Ed.]

A Juridical Farce

By Leon Trotsky

The investigation, in the twentieth year of the Revolution, is carried on in absolute secrecy. The entire old generation of Bolsheviks is judged before a military tribunal composed of three depersonalized military functionaries. The whole trial is dominated by a Prosecutor who has been all his life, and still is, a political enemy of the accused. Defense is waived, and the procedure is deprived of any vestige of controversy.

The material proofs are not presented to the court; they are talked about, but they do not exist. The witnesses mentioned

Frame-Up Artist



VYSHINSKY, who died in November 1954 was mourned by the Stalinists as the "dean" of Soviet law. He came to prominence in the Stalinist machine as a result of his role as prosecutor in the infamous Moscow "confession" trials. In 1917, Vyshinsky opposed the workers' revolution. He came over to the Soviet regime only after victory over the counter-revolution was assured. Later in the 1936 trials he called the old Bolsheviks framed-up by Stalin "fascist mad dogs" and sent them to their death.

by the Prosecutor or by the defendants are not questioned. A whole series of accused who form a part of the judicial inquiry are absent from the defendants' bench, for reasons unknown. Two of the principal accused who happen to be abroad are not even apprised of the trial, and, like those witnesses who are outside Russia, are deprived of the possibility of taking any steps whatsoever to bring out the truth.

The judicial dialogue is wholly constructed of a pre-arranged game of question-and-answer. The Prosecutor does not address a single concrete question to any of the defendants which might embarrass him and expose the material inconsistencies of his confession. The presiding judge obsequiously covers up the work of the Prosecutor. It is precisely the "verbatim" character of the

Autobiography

It is not a court we see in action, but a play in which the chief actors play their roles at pistol point. The play can be performed well or badly; but that is a question of inquisitorial technique and not of justice. The "purely juridical" examination of the Moscow trials reduces itself essentially to the question of whether the frame-up was well or poorly executed.

To illumine the question still further—in so far as it requires illumination—let us take a fresh example from the domain of constitutional law. After Hitler took power he declared, contrary to all expectations, that he had no intention of changing the fundamental laws of the State. Most people have probably forgotten that even today in Germany the Weimar Constitution remains intact; but into its juridical framework Hitler has introduced the content of the totalitarian dictatorship. Let us imagine an expert who, adjusting his scholarly spectacles and arming himself with official documents, sets out to study the

record which most clearly reveals the malicious sidestepping of the Prosecutor and the judges. To this it is necessary to add that one is scarcely inspired with confidence in the authenticity of the record itself.

But, however important these considerations are in themselves—opening as they do broad grounds for juridical analysis—they are nevertheless secondary and tertiary in character, since they concern the form of the frame-up and not its essence. Theoretically, one can imagine that if Stalin, Vyshinsky and Yezhov are able over a period of five or ten years to stage their trials with impunity, they will attain such a high technique that all the elements of jurisprudence will be found in formal accord with one another and the existing laws. But perfection in the juridical technique of the frame-up will not bring it one millimeter closer to the truth.

In a political trial of such exceptional importance, the jurist cannot divorce himself from the political conditions out of which the trial arose and in which the preliminary investigation was conducted—to put it concretely, the totalitarian oppression to which, in the final analysis, all are subjected: accused, witnesses, judges, counsel, and even the prosecution itself.

Here is the nub of the question: Under an uncontrolled and despotic regime which concentrates in the same hands all the means of economic, political, physical and moral coercion, a juridical trial ceases to be a juridical trial. It is a juridical play, with the roles prepared in advance. The defendants appear on the scene only after a series of rehearsals which give the director in advance complete assurance that they will not overstep the limits of their roles.

In this sense, as in all others, the judicial trials only represent a coagulation of the political regime of the USSR as a whole. At all the hearings the orators say one and the same thing, taking their cue from the chief orator, in utter disregard of what they themselves said the day before. In the newspapers all the articles expound one and the same directive, in the same language.

Following the orchestra leader's baton, the historians, the economists—even the statisticians—rearrange the past and the present without any regard for facts, documents, or the preceding editions of their own books.

In the kindergartens and schools, all the children in the same words glorify Vyshinsky and curse the defendants. No one acts this way of his own volition; everyone violates his own will. The monolithic character of the judicial trial, in which the accused try to outdo each other in repeating the formulas of the Prosecutor, is thus not an exception to the rule, but only the most revolting expression of the totalitarian inquisitorial regime.

structure of the German State "from a purely juridical point of view."

After several hours of intellectual effort, he will discover that Hitler's Germany is a crystal-clear democratic republic (universal suffrage, a parliament which gives full power to the "Fuehrer," independent judicial authorities, etc., etc.) Every sane man, however, will cry out that a juridical "appraisal" of this nature is at best a display of juridical cretinism.

Democracy is based on the unconfined struggle of classes, of parties, of programs and ideas. If this struggle be stifled, there then remains only a dead shell, well suited for cloaking a fascist dictatorship. Contemporary jurisprudence is based on the struggle between the prosecution and the defense, a struggle which is conducted in certain judicial forms.

Wherever the conflict between parties is stifled by means of extra-judicial violence, the judicial forms, whatever they may be, are only a cover for the in-

quisition. A genuine investigation of the Moscow trials cannot avoid embracing all their aspects. It will, of course, utilize the "verbatim" reports; not, however, as things in themselves, but as a constituent part of a great historical drama, whose determining factors remain behind the scenes of the judicial play.

In his summation of January 28, Vyshinsky said: "Trotsky and the Trotskyites have always been the agents of capitalism in the working-class movement." Vyshinsky denounced "the face of real, genuine Trotskyism—this old enemy of the workers and the peasants, this old enemy of Socialism, loyal servant of capitalism." He painted the history of "Trotskyism" which spent the more than thirty years of its existence on preparing for its final conversion into a storm detachment of fascism, into one of the departments of the fascist police.

While the foreign publicists of the GPU (in the Daily Worker, New Masses, etc.) spend their energy trying to explain, with the aid of fine-spun hypotheses and historical analogies, how a revolutionary Marxist can change into a fascist in the sixth decade of his life, Vyshinsky approaches the question in an entirely different manner: Trotsky has always been an agent of capitalism and an enemy of the

"No Better Bolshevik"

I spent four and a half years in prison, was twice exiled to Siberia, where I spent about two and a half years. I escaped twice from Siberia. In two periods I spent about twelve years in exile under Czarism. In 1915 in Germany I was sentenced in contumacy to prison for anti-war activities. I was expelled from France for the same "crime," arrested in Spain, and interned by the British Government in a Canadian concentration camp. It was in this manner that I performed my function as "an agent of capitalism."

The tale of the Stalinist historians that until 1917 I had been a Menshevik is one of their customary falsifications. From the day Bolshevism and Menshevism took form politically and organizationally (1904), I remained formally outside of both factions, but, as is shown by the three Russian revolutions, my political line, in spite of conflicts and polemics, coincided in every fundamental way with the line of Lenin.

The most important disagreement between Lenin and me in those years was my hope that through unification with the Mensheviks the majority of them could be pushed onto the path of revolution. In this burning question, Lenin was entirely right. Nevertheless, it must be said that in 1917 the tendencies toward "unification" were very strong among the Bolsheviks. On November 1st, 1917, at the meeting of the Petrograd Party Committee, Lenin said in this connection "Trotsky long ago said that unification is impossible. Trotsky understood this, and from that time on there has been no better Bolshevik."

From the end of 1904, I de-

Role in October Revolution

After my arrival in Petrograd (May 6th, 1917) from the Canadian concentration camp where I taught the ideas of Liebknecht and Luxemburg to the imprisoned German sailors, I took a direct part in the preparation and organization of the October Revolution, particularly during the four decisive months when Lenin was forced to hide in Finland.

In 1918, in an article in which his task was to limit my role in the October Revolution, Stalin was nevertheless forced to write: "All the work of practical organization of the insurrection was carried out under the immediate leadership of the chairman of the Petrograd Soviet, Comrade Trotsky. We can say with certainty that the swift passing of the garrison to the side of the Soviet and the bold execution of the work of the Military Revolutionary Committee the Party owes principally and above all to Comrade Trotsky." (Pravda, No. 241, Nov. 6th, 1918.)

This did not prevent Stalin from writing six years later:

"Comrade Trotsky, a comparatively new man in our Party in the period of October, neither did nor could play a special part, either in the Party or in the October Revolution" (J. Stalin, "Trotskyism or Leninism," pp. 68-69.)

At the present time the Stalin school, with the aid of its own scientific methods, in which both the court and the prosecution are educated, considers it beyond dispute that I did not direct the October Revolution but

workers and peasants; for thirty-odd years he has been preparing himself to become an agent of fascism. Vyshinsky is saying what the publicists of the New Masses will say, only later on. That is why I prefer to deal with Vyshinsky. To the categorical assertions of the Prosecutor of the USSR, I oppose the equally categorical facts of my life.

Vyshinsky errs when he speaks of my thirty years of preparation for fascism. Facts, arithmetic, chronology, as well as logic, are not, generally speaking, the strong points of this accusation. Indeed, last month marked the completion of the fortieth year of my uninterrupted participation in the working-class movement under the banner of Marxism.

At eighteen I organized illegally the "Workers' Union of Southern Russia," numbering more than 200 workers. Using a hectograph, I edited a revolutionary paper, *Nashe Delo* ("Our Cause"). At the time of my first exile to Siberia (1900-1902), I participated in the creation of the "Siberian Union of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class." After my flight abroad, I joined the Social-Democratic organization "Iskra," headed by Plekhanov, Lenin and others. In 1905 I did leading work in the first Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies.

fended the view that the Russian revolution could end only in the dictatorship of the proletariat, which, in its turn, must lead to the Socialist transformation of society, given the victorious development of the world revolution. A minority of my present adversaries considered this perspective fantastic right up to April, 1917 and inimically labelled it "Trotskyism," opposing to it the program of the bourgeois democratic republic. As for the overwhelming majority of the present bureaucracy, they did not adhere to the Soviet power until after the victorious termination of the Civil War.

During the years of my exile I participated in the workers' movement in Austria, Switzerland, France and the United States. I think of the years of my exile with gratitude—they gave me the possibility of coming closer to the life of the world working class and of changing internationalism from an abstract concept into the driving force of the rest of my life.

During the war, first in Switzerland and then in France, I carried on propaganda against the chauvinism consuming the Second International. For more than two years I published in Paris, under the military censorship, a Russian daily newspaper, in the spirit of revolutionary internationalism. In my work I was closely connected with the internationalist elements in France and took part, together with their representatives, in the international conference of opponents of chauvinism in Zimmerwald (1915). I continued in the same work during my two months' stay in the United States.

was opposed to it. However, these historical falsifications do not concern my autobiography, but the biography of Stalin.

After the October Revolution, I was in office for about nine years. I took a direct part in the building of the Soviet state, revolutionary diplomacy, the Red Army, economic organization, and the Communist International. For three years I directly led the Civil War. In this harsh work I was obliged to resort to drastic measures. For these I bear full responsibility before the world working class and before history. The justification of rigorous measures lay in their historical necessity and progressive character, in their correspondence with the fundamental interest of the working class. To all repressive measures dictated by the conditions of civil war, I gave their real designation, and I have given a public accounting for them before the working masses. I had nothing to hide from the people, as today I have nothing to hide from the Commission.

When in certain circles of the Party, not without the behind-the-scenes participation of Stalin, opposition arose to my methods of directing the Civil War, Lenin in July, 1919, on his own initiative and in a fashion wholly unexpected by me, handed me a sheet of blank paper, on the bottom of which he had written: "Comrades, knowing the harsh character of Comrade Trotsky's orders, I am so convinced, so absolutely convinced, of the rightness, expediency and

Lenin and Trotsky During Civil War



Lenin speaks to Soviet workers during the revolutionary war to defend the young workers' republic. Trotsky, organizer of the Red Army, is standing beside the platform. For years the Stalinists have been publishing the part of the picture showing Lenin with Trotsky cut off.

necessity, for the good of our cause, for the orders he has given, that I give them my full support."

There is no date on the paper. In case of need, the date was to be inserted by myself. Lenin's caution in everything that concerned his relations to the workers is known. Nevertheless he considered it possible to counter-sign in advance an order coming from me, even though on these orders often depended the fate of great numbers of men. Lenin did not fear that I would abuse my power. I may add that not once did I make use of this carte blanche given me by Lenin. But this document is testimony to the exceptional confidence of

a man whom I consider to be the highest model of revolutionary morality.

I participated directly in the drafting of the programmatic documents and tactical theses of the Third International. The principal reports at the congresses on the international situation were shared by Lenin and me. The programmatic manifestoes of the first five congresses were written by me. I leave to Stalin's prosecutors to explain what place this activity occupied on my road to fascism. As far as I am concerned, I still stand firmly today by the principles which, hand in hand with Lenin, I put forward as the basis of the Communist International.

Against Bureaucratic Absolutism

I broke with the ruling bureaucracy when, due to historical causes which cannot be adequately dealt with here, it was transformed into a conservative, privileged caste. The reasons for the break are set down and sealed at every stage in official documents, books, and articles, accessible for general verification.

I have defended Soviet democracy against bureaucratic absolutism; the raising of the living standard of the masses against excessive privileges at the top; systematic industrialization and collectivization in the interests of the toilers; finally, international policy in the spirit of revolutionary internationalism against nationalist conservatism. In my last book, "The Revolution Betrayed," I attempted to explain theoretically why the isolated Soviet state, on the basis of a backward economy, has extruded the monstrous pyramid of the bureaucracy, which has almost automatically been crowned by an uncontrolled and "infallible" leader.

Stifling the party by means of the police apparatus and crushing the opposition, the ruling clique banished me, at the beginning of 1928, to Central Asia. On my refusal to cease political activity in exile, it deported me to Turkey at the beginning of 1929. There I began to publish the Bulletin of the Opposition, on the basis of the same program I had defended in Russia, and entered into relations with ideological compan-

ions, still very few at that time, in all parts of the world.

On February 20th, 1932, the Soviet bureaucracy deprived me and the members of my family who were abroad, of Soviet citizenship. My daughter Zinaida, who was abroad temporarily for medical treatment, was thus deprived of the possibility of returning to the USSR to rejoin her husband and children. She committed suicide on January 5th, 1933.

I am presenting a list of my most important books and pamphlets, which have been completely or partly written during my last period of exile and deportation. According to the calculations of my young collaborators, who in all my work have given and are giving me devoted and irreplaceable aid, I have written 5,000 printed pages while abroad, without counting my articles and letters, which together would comprise several thousand pages more. May I add that I do not write with facility? I make numerous verifications and corrections. My literary work and my correspondence, therefore, have constituted the principal content of my life in the past nine years. The political line of my books, articles and letters speaks for itself. The citations given by Vyshinsky from my works represent, as I will prove, gross falsification—that is to say, a necessary element of the whole judicial frame-up.

Political Revolution Inevitable

In the course of the years from 1923 to 1933, with respect to the Soviet state, its leading party and the Communist International, I held the view expressed in those chiseled words: Reform, but not revolution. This position was fed by the hope that with favorable developments in Europe, the Left Opposition could regenerate the Bolshevik Party by pacific means, democratically reform the Soviet state, and set the Communist International back on the path of Marxism.

It was only the victory of Hitler, prepared by the fatal policy of the Kremlin, and the complete inability of the Comintern to draw any lessons from the tragic experience of Germany, which convinced me and my ideological companions that the old Bolshevik Party and the Third International were forever

articles, and bulletins of discussion which relate to this are at the disposal of the Commission, and present the best proof that it is a question not of "camouflage" but of an intense, impassioned ideological struggle on the basis of the traditions of the first congresses of the Communist International. I have been continually in correspondence with dozens of old and hundreds of young friends in all parts of the world, and I can say with assurance and pride that precisely from this youth will come the firmest and most reliable proletarian fighters of the new epoch which is opening.

Renouncing the hope of peaceful reform of the Soviet state does not mean, however, renouncing the defense of the Soviet state. As is particularly dem-

onstrated in the collection of extracts from my articles in the past ten years ("In Defense of the Soviet Union"), which recently appeared in New York, I have invariably and implacably fought against all vacillation on the question of the defense of the USSR. I have broken more than once with friends on this question.

In my book, "The Revolution Betrayed," I theoretically proved the idea that war menaces not only the Soviet bureaucracy, but also the new social basis of the USSR, which represents a tremendous step forward in the development of mankind. From this flows the absolute duty of every revolutionist to defend the USSR against imperialism, despite the Soviet bureaucracy.

Stalin Paved Way for Hitler

My writings in the same period give an unequivocal picture of my attitude toward fascism. From the first period of my exile abroad, I sounded the alarm on the question of the rising fascist wave in Germany. The Comintern accused me of "over-estimating" fascism and of becoming "panicky" before it. I demanded the united front of all organizations of the working class. To this the Comintern opposed the idiotic theory of "social-fascism." I demanded the systematic organization of workers' militias. The Comintern countered with bragging about future victories. I pointed out that the USSR would find itself greatly menaced in case of a victory for Hitler.

The well known writer, Ostretsky, printed my articles in his magazine, and commented on them with great sympathy. All to no avail. The Soviet bureaucracy usurped the authority of the October Revolution only to convert it into an obstacle to the victory of the revolution in other countries. Without the policy of the Kremlin's need to force the world to forget its criminal policy in Germany, "If it is demonstrated that Trotsky is an agent of fascism, who will then consider the program and tactics of the Fourth International?" Such were Stalin's calculations.

It is quite well known that during the war every internationalist was declared to be an agent of the enemy government. So it was in the case of Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, Otto Ruehle and others in Germany, of my French friends (Monatte, Rosmer, Loriot, etc.), of Eugene Debs and others in the United States, and finally of Lenin and myself in Russia.

The British Government imprisoned me in a concentration camp in March, 1917, on the charge, inspired by the Czarist Okhrana, that in agreement with the German high command I attempted to overthrow the provisional government of Miliukov-Kerensky. Today this accusation seems a plagiarism from Stalin and Vyshinsky. In fact, it is Stalin and Vyshinsky who are plagiarizing from the Czarist counter-espionage system and the British Intelligence Service.

On April 16th, 1917, when I was in the concentration camp with German sailors, Lenin wrote in Pravda: "Can one even for a moment believe the trustworthiness of the statement... that Trotsky, the former chairman of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies in Petersburg in 1905—a revolutionist who has devoted decades to the disinterested service of revolution—that this man had anything to do with a scheme subsidized by the German Government? This is clearly a monstrous and unscrupulous slander against a revolutionist." (Pravda, No. 34.)

"How fresh these words sound now!" I wrote on October 21, 1927—"I repeat, in 1927!—"In this epoch of contemptible slanders against the Opposition, differing in no essential from the slanders against the Bolsheviks in 1917."

Thus, ten years ago—that is, long before the creation of the "unified" and "parallel" centers and before the "flight" of Pyatakov to Oslo—Stalin was already flinging against the Opposition all the insinuations and calumnies that Vyshinsky later converted into an indictment. However, if Lenin in 1917 thought that my revolutionary past of twenty years was in itself sufficient refutation of these filthy insinuations, I make bold to think that the twenty years which have since elapsed—important enough in themselves—entitle me to cite my autobiography as one of the most important arguments against the Moscow indictment.

— 308 pp. (cloth) \$2.50 (paper) \$1.50

The First Five Years of the Comintern

The Kremlin's current slogan of "back to Leninism" makes it important to understand what the Leninist program was after the October Revolution. No better source exists than this two-volume collection of Trotsky's writings and speeches connected with the first four congresses (1919-1923) of the Communist International. Here is a great variety of historical source material: Official manifestoes, theses and resolutions of the world congresses written by Trotsky, orders to the Red Army, speeches, reports, newspaper articles, letters, etc. The capitalist press has no desire to recall in print this early Leninist epoch. The Stalinist falsifiers rewrote the history of the Communist International. In these two volumes you may judge the documented record for yourselves.

— Vol. I (cloth only) \$3.50 Vol. II (paper only) \$3.00 both \$5.00

Order from PIONEER PUBLISHERS 116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

...The New Stage in the Russian Revolution

(Continued from page 1)

accompanied by the extension of planned economy to Eastern Europe, was a blow from which the capitalist system has not been able to recover.

The tremendous victory over German imperialism, achieved despite Stalin's crimes, served to inspire the Soviet working class — already grown in size and skills to second in world importance — with new self-confidence. The incapacity of American imperialism to rebuild Germany and Japan as powerful military threats took away from the bureaucracy the specter of invasion which it had used for decades as a means of diverting attention from itself and securing sullen submission to its dictatorial rule. The post-war wave of revolution and uprisings that swept through the colonial world, above all in China where the greatest victory since 1917 was registered, began to catalyze revolutionary moods among the Soviet masses. These were furthered by the death of Stalin. The success of the Chinese together with the North Koreans in blocking American military power demonstrated in the most vivid way how drastically the balance of power has shifted. This objective weakening of the capitalist structure also objectively weakened the Soviet bureaucracy as a bourgeois growth upon the workers state structure. Tito's successful challenge was already an intimation of this. Thus precisely when the power of the bureaucracy seemed at its pinnacle, with vast new territories and populations brought under its domain, its fatal internal weakness was revealed. The Russian Revolution, heaving up again from the depths, has begun to break the bureaucratic crust.

In foreign policy, Khrushchev & Co. did not make any concessions whatsoever that could be interpreted as a return to Lenin's policy of revolutionary socialism. In fact they openly revised Lenin, declaring that imperialism war on the Soviet Union is no longer inevitable and that socialism can be achieved in capitalist countries along strictly parliamentary paths. These revisions signaled no change in the foreign policy followed by Stalin. In fact, as diplomatic formulations, they served to give notice to the Western powers that the slogan of a return to Lenin was designed to meet domestic pressures. The revisions were calculated primarily as reassurances to the capitalist statesmen that no return to Lenin is envisaged for the foreign Communist Parties even partially or as demagoguery for rank and file consumption.

FRESH BETRAYALS

At the same time the announcement of these revisions was designed to facilitate new fresh betrayals of Leninism by the Communist Parties abroad. Moscow views such betrayals as a way of helping to secure a deal with the Western Powers. As in the time of Stalin, the Kremlin means by "peaceful coexistence" a mutual policy with imperialism of live and let live, or mutual assistance in putting down, derailing and heading off revolutionary movements of the workers and colonial peoples. The present policy of the Communist Party of France in supporting the French imperialist government against the insurgent North Africans is a case in point. Another example is the policy of the U.S. Communist Party in supporting the Democratic Party and attempting to head off all moves of the working class toward independent political action.

The attempt by spokesmen of American imperialism to make out the end of the Stalin cult as due to pressure from abroad is thus false to the core. The imperialists never had any trouble in getting along with Stalin. They even assisted him in building up the cult when it suited their purposes. The Social Democrats likewise never found the cult an obstacle to alliances and coalitions with the Stalinists. The acceptability of Stalinism to both imperialists and Social Democrats during the past 30 years is actually additional proof that the decision to smash the cult was due to internal pressures that threaten the rule of the bureaucracy.

That these pressures are proletarian in character is demonstrated by the simple fact that what the bureaucrats promise in breaking up the Stalin cult is a return to Lenin. This is the most popular promise they could make, the promise best calculated to appease the forces moving against the bureaucracy. A return to Lenin means keeping the planned economy but restoring the workers democracy that existed in Lenin's time. The slogan "Back to Lenin!" is thus a proletarian slogan which the masses will inevitably fill with their own revolutionary socialist content. Naturally, this will not occur in a day. The workers are as yet unorganized. The bureaucracy will fight desperately as it nears its doom. The entire process will have its ups and downs and even reversals. The important thing is that the process has begun and in the final analysis it will prove to be irresistible.

'COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP'

The bureaucratic tops are seeking to present a solid front which they call "collective leadership." They hope to stabilize their enjoyment of special privileges, to end the uncertainty and fear that existed in their own ranks under Stalin's purge system. But at the Twentieth Congress itself nuances in the "collectivity" were observable. These can be expected to deepen and to be reflected among Stalinist bureaucrats abroad as the mass pressure takes more direct and open forms. The weakening position of the bureaucracy will, as in the case of all other similar formations in history, manifest itself in sharpening internal differences in which some bureaucrats can be expected to cast their lot with the revolutionary movement of the workers. Such splits, of course, are of subordinate importance to the appearance of revolutionary currents among the Soviet workers and the ranks of the Communist Party.

Differences in the bureaucracy will tend to break out at specific points involving what limits should be set to the concessions. Each new concession will cause fresh tremors among the bureaucratic tops.

Each new revelation constitutes a fresh indictment of their share in Stalin's crimes. The crimes go back to 1923 and include the crushing of the Left Opposition, the smashing of workers democracy, the slaughter of Lenin's entire generation of Bolsheviks, the murder of millions of peasants, the establishment of slave labor camps, the decapitation of the Red Army on the eve of war, reliance on the Stalin-Hitler pact to safeguard the Soviet Union, the useless sacrifice of millions of soldiers, the wrecking of scientific institutions, pillaging of Soviet income, repeated blood purges of the working class, imposition of totalitarian regimes on the satellite countries, the smashing of the Communist International and murder of working-class leaders abroad, the betrayal of one revolution after another beginning with the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27, the German Revolution that could have prevented the rise of Hitler, the Spanish Revolution that could have blocked Franco, and ending with the betrayal of the great post-war revolutionary upheavals in France and Italy. Khrushchev & Co. will not willingly admit their guilt in these crimes.

HOW FAR CAN THEY GO?

Aside from the subjective aspect — and we must recognize that the Soviet workers can force the bureaucrats to admit a great deal — for the bureaucracy as a whole the concessions cannot go so far as to eliminate it as the ruling caste. To go that far would mean to accept the program of Trotskyism; that is, end the rule of the parasitic caste and replace it with genuine workers democracy exercised through revived soviets, trade unions and workers' political parties. Above all it would mean the end of the special privileges that constitute the material base of the bureaucracy. In this respect, in its tenacious defense of its special privileges, the bureaucratic caste in the Soviet Union is akin to a ruling class. The basic conflict is between the organized bureaucracy and the working class which is seeking to overthrow it.

Khrushchev & Co. are conscious of this, for they accompanied their denunciation of Stalin with praise for his purges of Trotskyists and other oppositionists. They are attempting to justify the early years of Stalin's rule when the cult was established and the bureaucracy consolidated its rule. And Pravda has already begun denouncing "rotten elements" — that is, workers and their spokesmen who want to carry the ending of the Stalin cult beyond the narrow limits within which the bureaucracy would like to keep it. By bringing the dead Stalin partially to justice for his monstrous crimes, crimes that were really due to the entire system of bureaucratic rule, Stalin's heirs hope to retain this system which they helped Stalin establish and which they now head. This aim sets the ultimate limits to the concessions they will grant.

Thus in conceding to the masses on the Stalin cult, the bureaucracy will find itself in a worse predicament. Taking this concession with relief and joy, the masses will demand more. Each new concession will further heighten the self-confidence of the masses and bring closer the decisive point where political revolution can break out in the Soviet Union. An attempt by the bureaucracy to turn back now to the use of savage repressions as in Stalin's time can precipitate the coming political revolution that will overthrow their rule. Thus neither concessions nor repressions can long delay the Soviet masses from once again putting in power a government that represents their will. The bureaucracy faces a contradiction it cannot escape.

TROTSKY VINDICATED

The bureaucracy has no intention of rehabilitating Trotsky or of permitting the Soviet public to read his works. Yet despite their intentions, Trotsky's great struggle in defense of the conquests of the Russian Revolution against Stalinist degeneration is being vindicated point by point. All those issues that seemed to have receded into history are now being reviewed by world public opinion as if they were fresh living events. This is what always happens when the truth catches up with the lie.

The historical review became inevitable once the Kremlin began admitting the frame-ups of the final years of Stalin's rule. Already, in trying to appease the Soviet people who suffered some 40,000,000 casualties in World War II, they have been forced to go back to the key period of the infamous Moscow Frame-up Trials. The confession that Tukhachevsky and the other Red Army generals, plus some 5,000 officers, were slaughtered by Stalin in a frame-up confirms what Trotsky said at the time. The confession about the fearful costs of Stalin's policy to the defense of the Soviet Union confirms one of Trotsky's main charges against Stalin. In face of such admissions the verdict of the Dewey Commission in 1937 that Leon Trotsky and Leon Sedov were innocent of the charges leveled by Stalin and that the Moscow Trials were frame-ups gains fresh force.

In the Soviet Union itself, the whole structure of slanders against Trotsky must crumble along with the plaster statues of Stalin that are now being hammered to powder. The truth will begin to spread among the masses about Trotsky's proposing the first five-year plan, advocating industrialization against Stalin's opposition, collectivization against the Stalin-Bukharin bloc, friendly alliance with the peasantry, balanced production of heavy and consumer goods, continuation abroad of Lenin's policy of furthering the world revolution as against Stalin's policy of blocking it under guise of building "socialism in one country." Trotsky will emerge as the revolutionary socialist hero who joined Lenin in 1923 in beginning the fight against Stalinism and who remained true to that struggle until he was struck down by Stalin's pick-axe.

This is certain to happen because the Soviet workers with their socialist consciousness will not be satisfied

with the explanation that Stalin's crimes were due to his paranoid aberrations. In dumping the cult which ascribed all good in the Soviet Union to Stalin's remarkable personality, the bureaucracy will not succeed in turning the cult into its opposite, ascribing all the evils of bureaucratic rule to Stalin's villainous personality. From the Marxist outlook, how can it be explained that a blood-thirsty lunatic could become personal dictator in the Soviet Union? This question must loom large right now in the USSR. Marxism demands an analysis of the social forces making such a phenomenon possible. Trotskyism has already provided that analysis just as Trotskyism is now providing the Marxist analysis of the social forces bringing an end to the cult of this madman. Soviet Marxists among the masses, whose names we do not yet know, are surely making their own independent analysis, demonstrating that the degeneration of the Russian Revolution was due to the formation of a parasitic caste which put Stalin in power. When their voices are heard they will prove to be the voices of Russian Trotskyism, the leaders of the regenerating Russian Revolution.

Since Stalin usurped power, the Soviet Union survived the pressure of encircling capitalism thanks to the power of planned economy. The new property forms established by the Bolshevik Party under Lenin and Trotsky proved incomparably more powerful than even the founders of the Soviet Union with all their great confidence dreamed. Despite Stalinist degeneration and mismanagement, planned economy brought the Soviet Union victory in World War II against the full weight of German imperialism, the conqueror of the European continent. From the weakness of Czarist Russia, this country has emerged as the second most powerful in the world, the only one outside the United States capable of developing atomic energy out of its own resources. The new property forms have proved even more powerful than the Stalinist degeneration, for the Stalinists themselves despite their own intentions were forced to extend them by military bureaucratic means.

THE CONSCIOUS FACTOR

This long and painful stage is now closing. The conscious factor is coming to the fore. It is visible in the pressure the masses are exerting upon the bureaucracy. Revolutionary consciousness is moving toward reasserting its rightful rule in the Soviet Union. When this occurs revolutionary socialism will appear once again on a world scale — if this has not happened already by then — in the form of mass parties as it did in the early years of the Communist International. This time the power of socialist consciousness will prove to be decisive in the struggle to replace capitalism with the superior order of socialism.

The end of the Stalin cult is a great victory for revolutionary socialism. No worse mistake could be made than to dismiss or underestimate the significance of this event. The verdict of the impartial Dewey Commission discredited Stalin in the eyes of informed public opinion. The verdict of the very partial bureaucracy discredits Stalin among the rank and file of the Communist Parties throughout the world. This opens up wholly new perspectives for removing the obstacle of Stalinism and bringing the Trotskyist program to the workers whose minds are now being freed of the Stalin cult.

Trotskyist works now acquire burning actuality, with fresh facts pouring in every day to confirm our entire position on the Soviet Union. In historic perspective our movement is seen to have been preparing for this great turn since the days of the Left Opposition when Trotsky first organized the struggle against Stalin.

In contrast, the entire Stalinist movement, large and powerful as it is, finds itself in utter confusion and consternation. What doesn't it have to revise in its ideology? What book does it have that must not be converted into pulp? What pamphlet even? All its histories must be rewritten and the new ones will remain suspect so long as they attack Trotskyism. All the resolutions and pronouncements must be scrapped, the entire education of the rank and file admitted to be loaded with lies and perversions of the truth.

None of the groups in the Stalinist periphery can escape these devastating consequences. What are the dissident Stalinists, for instance, left with? Nothing but a record of boasts about their exemplary loyalty to the paranoic butcher.

Those circles who pretended to be independent of Stalinism but who always managed to end up approving the purges and frame-ups and false confessions are now seen for what they are — either ignorant dupes or conscious apologists for the fiendish crimes of a modern Ivan the Terrible.

VICTORY FOR MARXIST THEORY

The groups here and there who decided that Trotskyism had been by-passed by history and that the wave of the future belonged to Stalinism are now confounded by each fresh concession calling the world's attention to the fact that Trotskyism was the only force that told the truth about Stalinism. The politics of betrayal narrows down for these groups to vying with the worst Stalinist hacks in providing rationalizations for the bureaucracy, painting up the desperate efforts at rehabilitation in face of the mass pressure as "self-reform" of the bureaucracy. Deutscherism, which leaves out the Soviet masses as if the bureaucracy were a rational autonomous power, turns out to be the ideology best suited to assist the demagoguery of the Khrushchevs.

Among the victories that the end of the Stalin cult gives Trotskyism in the field of theory, two are outstanding. The contention that Stalinism was the logical continuation of Leninism has now been repudiated by its originators, Stalin's own hand-picked political gangsters. They are forced to confess what Trotsky insisted upon from the beginning, that Stalin was not the continuator of Lenin but his opposite. The bourgeois ideologues who also tried to make out that Stalinism was the continuation of Leninism are not much better off. To explain why Stalin has been dumped and the banner of Lenin raised again, they must explain the differences between the two. Rather than do this they have for the present preferred to maintain a discreet silence about the subject.

The other theory that has been dealt a mortal blow by the new stage of the Russian Revolution now opening up is "bureaucratic collectivism." According to this theory,

planned economy upon superseding capitalism becomes the economic base for a new type of ruling class never before seen in history, a "bureaucratic collective" that exploits the working class through its control of the state. This view is a revision of the basic theoretical structure of Marxism, inasmuch as Marxism puts planned economy — in its full, rational development — as the essential and sufficient economic requisite for the coming classless society.

Planned economy has the capacity to eliminate the scarcity that nourished all previous class formations. The Soviet economy was confined to one country, and hampered and distorted in its development by a bureaucratic caste formation, parasitic in character. The caste, enjoying bourgeois privileges, represented the tendency toward restoration of capitalism. The caste is basically alien to planned economy and not, as the bureaucratic collectivist theory holds, inherent to it. It is parasitic and not exploitative. Therefore the caste lacks the stability of a true ruling class.

THE HYPNOSIS IS BROKEN

Trotsky maintained that in the Soviet Union the development of planned economy, as it revealed its enormous potentialities and heightened the industrial level at a new and unprecedented rate, would undermine the caste — not strengthen it — and create the necessary economic and social conditions for its overthrow. He predicted that the further development of Soviet planned economy would, therefore, be accompanied by increasingly severe manifestations of the basic instability of the bureaucracy's rule. Trotsky's Marxist position has now received the most powerful confirmation as against the novel theory of bureaucratic collectivism, for the first stirrings of the Soviet working class in the new stage of the Russian Revolution shook down the central ideology which had bound the bureaucracy together for three decades. Moreover, the bureaucrats themselves were forced to confess to the precariousness of their positions under Stalin, thus adding graphic testimony to the instability of the caste's place in Soviet society.

Trotsky's defense of the Soviet Union against imperialism has likewise received the most powerful confirmation as against the defeatist line of the bureaucratic collectivists and others of similar views. It was the new self-confidence of the Soviet workers, gained through their victory in World War II, the consequent extension of state ownership and planning into Eastern Europe and the victory of the Chinese revolution, that resulted in today's demolition of the Stalin cult as a harbinger of the overthrow of the bureaucracy and the restoration of democratic workers rule.

The entire Stalinist movement has been hit by the most profound ideological crisis since its origin. The sacred Kremlin texts have been thrown into the ash can. The Stalinist parties are in a state of shock. The hypnosis that closed the eyes and ears of the Stalinist rank and file has been broken. They are now compelled to think. They are beginning to ask searching questions. Many of them, it is true, especially the older generation will drop aside in demoralization. The cynical hard core will continue to serve the new Kremlin masters as they did the old. The Stalinist youth, however, will prove increasingly willing to discuss with Trotskyists and the best of them can be won over to revolutionary socialism. Already, with deep shame, they are dropping the epithets they were taught to use like robots in referring to Trotskyists such as "Hitlerite agents," "fascist mad dogs," "cohorts of the Titoite scum," and so on. All the elements are present for profound differentiations within the boasted monolithism of the Stalinist machine. In countries such as France and Italy, where great mass Communist Parties exist and where the Stalinist bureaucrats are going to new lengths in supporting the imperialist government, the opportunities are especially favorable.

SEIZE THE OPPORTUNITY!

To realize these opportunities, however, requires the utmost attention on the part of the Trotskyists. Aloofness to this work would be sterile sectarianism. We have prepared for this for more than 25 years. Now we must move in, and move energetically. Campaign methods must be used to bring the message of Trotskyism to rank and file Communist Party members. Our press must turn full attention to this task, attentively following the developments in the new stage of the Russian Revolution and making sure that the Marxist interpretation is consistently brought to the attention of the Communist Party rank and file. This means that they must be persistently sought out, their attention called to pamphlets and books in our rich arsenal elucidating the events of the past that are now being relived in the world press and in the consciousness of millions as Stalin's victims are rehabilitated. The Communist Party rank and file can and must be made to know the truth about Trotsky's struggle against Stalin. They can and must be taught the truth about the stubborn fight of the Fourth International to keep alive the tradition of Leninism.

This campaign must not be viewed as a short-term proposition but as a sustained effort, primarily educational in character. The objective must be to win Communist Party members to the program of Trotskyism without the slightest illusions about reforming the apparatus that has been rotting for more than a quarter of a century. Some, it is true, will go all the way in repudiating Stalinism. But most of this apparatus, their hands dripping with the blood they helped Stalin spill, will sooner or later depart from the scene as discredited, as despised and as hated as the master they served. But the rank and file members who joined the Communist Party because they thought it was genuinely revolutionary will draw the bitter lesson of their experience and become key cadres in the reassembling of forces now made possible by the death of the Stalin cult.

The great victory won by world Trotskyism should serve to inspire the entire movement to follow up in the most vigorous way. The Russian Revolution by rudely pushing over the Stalin idol and forcing concessions from Stalin's heirs has again proved its vitality. We must now prove ourselves capable of seizing the opportunities it opens up for revolutionary socialism in other lands. That is the best way to help the Soviet workers as they move forward to a final settling of accounts with the Stalinist system.

<p>Subscription \$2 per year \$1.50 for 6 months. Foreign \$4.50 per year; \$2.50 for 6 months. Canadian: \$5.00 per year; \$1.75 for 6 months. Single Order: 5 or more copies 6c each in U.S. To each in foreign countries.</p>	<p>THE MILITANT Published Weekly in the Interest of the Working People THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION 116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 2-7408 Editor: MURRY WEISS Business Manager: ANNE CRESTER</p>	<p>Revised articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Militant's position. These are expressed in its editorials. Entered as second class January 7, 1944 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.</p>
Vol. XX — No. 19	Monday, May 7, 1956	<p>Detroit Fri. Night Socialist Forum "The End of the Stalin Cult and the crisis in the Communist Parties" Speaker: FRANK LOVELL May 11, at 8 P.M. 3737 Woodward Donation 25c. Free for Unemployed</p>

By Tom Kerry

THE COLOR CURTAIN: A Report on the Bandung Conference. By Richard Wright. The World Publishing Company, 1956, 221 pp., \$3.75.

While spending the Christmas holiday with his family in Paris, Mississippi born and self-educated novelist, Richard Wright, leafing through the evening paper stumbled upon an item that sent an electric current tingling through his consciousness. "I bent forward," he relates, "and read the item a second time. Twenty-nine free and independent nations of Asia and Africa are meeting in Bandung, Indonesia, to discuss 'racialism and colonialism.'"

Wright saw at once the historic significance of the proposed gathering and decided to go to Bandung to cover the conference. The nations invited to the conference represented over half the human race. Most of them had only recently won their national independence following World War II. Some had been under white imperialist domination for over three centuries.

There had been many conferences in the past to deal with Asian and African problems. But these had been gatherings of representatives of the imperialist powers to divide and re-divide conquered territory, to haggle over spheres of influence, to dispose of the fate of millions of subject peoples without their consultation and against their will. Now: "The despised, the insulted, the hurt, the dispossessed — in short, the underdogs of the human race were meeting." What did it mean?

Two things struck Wright as outstanding characteristics of the new development: "race and religion." "The populations of almost all the nations listed were deeply religious," he remarks. And, in addition: "The nations sponsoring the conference — Burma, India, Indonesia, Ceylon and Pakistan — were all religious. . . This smacked of something new, something beyond Left and Right. Looked at in terms of history, these nations

represented races and religions, vague but potent forces." Armed with this preconceived thesis Wright flew to Bandung in April 1955 to seek verification. Those sections devoted to the author's attempt to bolster his thesis constitute the weakest and most superficial parts of the book. It leads him to gloss over the treacherous role played by the puppets of Anglo-American imperialism at Bandung.

CLASS STRUGGLE

Both "Left and Right" were very much present at Bandung — but in distorted form. Men like Sir John Kotelawala, then Prime Minister of Ceylon, represented the native capitalist class who proposed to use their newly won "independence" to exploit their "own" workers and peasants. To bolster their role they sought material aid from the erstwhile imperialist master. In return for American dollars, Sir John was not averse to using Bandung as a forum for the expression of Anglo-American foreign policy.

Sir John was repudiated in Ceylon, not because "race and religion" were unimportant factors in the struggle for national independence, but because the underlying class conflict is brought to the surface once the common enemy is disposed. Both "Left and Right" confront each other in each of the former colonies previously ruled by imperialism. One in the form of the native capitalist and landlord class and the other in the form of the insurgent masses seeking adequate food, clothing and shelter. Capitalism cannot begin to solve the most elementary needs of the impoverished masses in the former colonies.

Richard Wright recognizes the problem by posing the premise upon which Western capitalism could solve the problem. It would, he points out, involve "human engineering" — devoid of political and profit motive — on so vast a scale that it "would bankrupt the United States in one year." The premise is wholly utopian.

Roving Diplomat



CHOU EN-LAI, Chinese premier, target of Anglo-American "cold war" propaganda attack at the Bandung conference last year. The conference, comprising 29 Afro-Asian countries, was called on initiative of "neutralist" Indian premier, Nehru. Chou advocated Stalinist coexistence policy.

Montgomery Meeting: "No More Jim Crow"

By John Thayer

Out of the confusion following the Supreme Court's off-again, on-again decision on bus segregation, one fact stands out bold and clear — the Montgomery bus protest continues as solid as ever. This was decided and made known to the world by the unanimous vote on April 26 at a mass meeting of the Montgomery Improvement Association, the organization conducting the protest.

What action the April 26 meeting would take was unclear in the three days preceding it. The Supreme Court's ruling of April 23 was taken at first to mean the outlawing of bus Jim Crow. On that assumption the Montgomery City Lines, which has suffered tremendous financial loss during the 20-week boycott, quickly instructed its drivers that it was illegal to enforce segregation in seating passengers. In a number of other Southern cities bus segregation was ended. What has happened in these cities since is not yet clear. In Montgomery the MIA leaders hailed the Supreme Court decision and it was thought possible the protest might be ended on the basis of the city's 50,000 Negroes reentering the buses and, in accordance with the Supreme Court decision, taking seats as they wished.

On second reading of the high court's ruling, however, lawyers and newspapers throughout the country realized that the first impression had been mistaken. The high court had made no clear-cut ruling on bus segregation but only on the technical procedure by which the case had been brought before it.

MIA LEGAL CHALLENGE

This realization plus the threatening statements of the mayor, city commissioners and police chief of Montgomery (all members of the White Citizens Councils) that any bus driver not enforcing segregation would be arrested changed the situation confronting the MIA. On the legal front it has its own legal challenge of bus segregation coming up for a hearing in federal court on May 11. This is a suit against the Alabama Public Service Commission and is a constitutional test of the right of state officials to enforce bus segregation.

At the great mass meeting on April 26 it was unanimously resolved to continue the boycott not only for the original three demands (courtesy from drivers, fairer seating within the segregation system and Negro drivers on some routes) but for an end of Jim Crow seating itself. "We'll never go back to Jim Crowism," declared Rev. B. D. Lambert, amid great cheering, as he seconded

the motion to continue the protest movement.

Preparation to continue the fight till complete victory was seen in the purchase of station wagons for the car pool by four Negro churches in Montgomery. A story in the Afro-American (April 28, by reporter Al Sweeney) revealed that eight more churches in town are awaiting delivery of station wagons. Rev. Ralph D. Abernathy, one of the MIA leaders, is quoted as saying that many of the vehicles in the car pool need repairs and that the station wagons will be of "great assistance to the car pool."

Several weeks ago Rev. M. L. King, president of the MIA, stated that 100 station wagons were needed to operate an effective free-transportation system for the Negro people of the city.

STATION WAGONS SENT

In the North efforts to provide Montgomery's heroic fighters with station wagons and other aid was bearing fruit. Already a station wagon has been sent from Detroit as a solidarity present to the MIA. Funds for its purchase were raised by a committee of the Friday Night Socialist Forum which was inspired to that action after hearing Farrell Dobbs, Socialist Workers Party national secretary and presidential candidate, give a first-hand account of the Montgomery struggle.

Dobbs, upon his return from Montgomery, where he covered the trial of MIA leader M. L. King, spoke in a number of mid-western cities on the need to aid Montgomery with station wagons and money. Another result of his tour is the presentation to the MIA of a car from Chicago plus \$265. This aid was raised by a Station - Wagon - For - Montgomery Committee formed by the audience which heard Dobbs speak on April 13.

In Cleveland Local 500 of the Meat Cutters and Butcher Workers' Union has declared solidarity with the MIA and union stewards are collecting donations for it. At Roosevelt College in Chicago the Student Council has undertaken a campaign to send a station wagon to the MIA and has asked other student organizations to do likewise.

New York Open House Social
Sat. May 12, 8:30 P.M.
An informal good time with comrades and friends
116 University Place (near Union Square)
Refreshments
Contribution 50c.
Auspices:
Socialist Workers Party

The REVOLUTIONARY PARTY IN THE U.S.

In Defense of Marxism

Cloth \$2.50 By Leon Trotsky Paper \$2.00

The Struggle for a Proletarian Party
Cloth \$2.50 By James P. Cannon Paper \$2.00

The History of American Trotskyism
Cloth \$2.75 By James P. Cannon Paper \$1.75

These three books deal with fundamental problems of the building of a revolutionary socialist party in the United States. What is the relation of the Russian Revolution in all stages of its development to the building of such a party? Who does the defense of the Soviet Union against imperialism remain the elementary duty of every class-conscious worker? What is Stalinism? How did it destroy the American Communist Party as a revolutionary organization and transform it into a supporter of the Democratic Party? Against what tendencies did American Trotskyism struggle in order to preserve the revolutionary character of the Socialist Workers Party? How does Lenin's concept of a party of the workers' vanguard apply to the American scene? What are the perspectives for socialism in the United States and what is the road to its realization?

Order from
PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

VOLUME XX

MONDAY, MAY 7, 1956

NUMBER 19

Why Stalinists Backed Smith Act Against SWP

By George Lavan

Without blowing any trumpets or even devoting an article in the Daily Worker to it, the American Communist Party has nonetheless declared that it was wrong in supporting the first use of the Smith Act in the celebrated Minneapolis Labor Trial of the Socialist Workers Party leaders.

Virginia Gardner, well-known Stalinist writer, reviewed Corliss Lamont's latest book, "Freedom is as Freedom Does," in the April 11 Daily Worker. At the end of the review she takes up Lamont's statement that the American CP made one of its greatest mistakes during the Minneapolis Smith Act trial when it "supported this prosecution of its bitter enemies under a bad law which was later to be used against the Communists themselves."

Her answer is: "The Communist Party has admitted through various spokesmen that this was a mistake, and has altered its position on civil liberties." The April 22 issue of the Worker carries a report of a lecture by John Gates, the paper's editor, in which the following passage is found: "Among mistakes of the American Communist Party, Gates cited its failure to carry on a fight against the indictment of the Trotskyites under the Smith Act. 'For while we despise the political views of the Trotskyites, that does not justify us in our failure to take a forthright position on their arrest and conviction.'"

HABIT OF FALSIFICATION

Gates' description of the Stalinist line as a "failure to take a forthright position is not the understatement of the year but a deliberate falsification. The American CP was very forthright. In fact it was brazen. It was for the prosecution! And it fought with every dirty means available the movement to defend the civil liberties of the first Smith Act victims."

To recall the Stalinist line just pick up any of the many pamphlets they put out on the subject. Typical is one, published in 1945, by George Morris then, as now, the labor specialist of the Daily Worker, entitled "The Trotskyite Fifth Column in the Labor Movement." It contains such items as this: "Strange as it may seem there are people who call themselves 'liberals' who shield this scum, (the SWP Smith Act victims) under the banner of 'civil liberties' . . . To

call their case a civil liberties case, is a mockery of the most elementary concept of democracy . . . for an American responsible to a community or a labor organization to have anything to do with them is nothing short of consorting with the enemy."

Morris and the other CP leaders were not guilty of "failure to take a forthright position." They were forthright enough but on the side of the prosecution and the jailors. Unions dominated by them passed resolutions denouncing the SWP Smith Act victims. Unions that supported the 18 Minneapolis victims were pressured and smeared by the CP to rescind such support. Louis Weinstein, the Stalinist head of the Painters Union in New York, corresponded with the Department of Justice about ways and means of battering down the movement for support of the Trotskyist defendants. Stalinists throughout the country reported SWP members to the FBI. Now the editor of the Daily Worker in his belated admission of a "mistake" would like to cover this all up as "failure to take a forthright position."

But this isn't the heart of the "mistake." The American Stalinist leaders are too timid to go to the heart of it despite their pretense that, having had their eyes opened on the Stalin cult, they are now bold and outspoken critics. The heart of the matter is the Moscow Trials!

The whole anti-labor, anti-civil liberties role of the Stalinists against the SWP and the Minneapolis defense was based on the Moscow Trials. In the pamphlet cited, George Morris declared: "To get at the real cesspool from which the Trotskyites draw their program of treachery, we must look back to the celebrated Moscow trials of 1936-38 when their top leaders made full confessions of their crimes." Further on he asserts, "No responsible and honest people today would question those trials," and in his windup he says the Smith Act defendants' "words at Minneapolis flowed directly from the confessions at the Moscow trials."

Everything the Stalinists said or did against the SWP was based on the "irrefutable" Moscow confession trials. These "justified" siding with the Smith Act prosecutor, beating up Trotskyites, denouncing them to the FBI and the whole campaign to "drive them out of the labor movement."

Will there be a re-evaluation of the Moscow Trials, as has begun with the Stalin cult? If

there is, the impulse won't come from the American CP leaders. They are outspoken today in denouncing the Rajk and Kostov confession trials as frame-ups because those have already been repudiated by the Kremlin. But they don't know how far things will go and so they dare not take a chance on criticizing the Moscow Trials of 1936-38 until the tip-off has been given.

A good example of this was presented by William Schneiderman, state chairman of the California CP, in the question period of a recent Los Angeles meeting on the Stalin cult. Asked whether the trials and purges of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin and Trotsky, might be re-opened now that the Rajk and Kostov trials were shown to be frame-ups, he replied in the negative. His arguments were that Trotsky and the others had joined with counter-revolutionaries and that the excesses of Stalin were of more recent times than those trials.

This is, of course, vicious, cowardly nonsense. The "evidence" that the victims of the Moscow trials of 1936-38 "joined with counter-revolutionaries" is based solely on forced confessions, as with Rajk and Kostov. Moreover the trial and execution of Tukhachevsky and the rest of the Red Army General Staff, now admitted to be a frame-up, was of the same period (1937) and was intimately linked to the other trials.

The monstrous details of the greatest frame-up in history — the Moscow Trials — will be brought to full light of day, nonetheless. This will result from the same cause that impelled the present rulers of the Kremlin hastily to attempt to divorce themselves from the all-pervading hate of Stalin and everything associated with Stalinism. This is the mounting pressure of the Soviet workers on the privileged bureaucracy. It will not stop till that bureaucracy has been toppled and replaced with Soviet democracy and social equality as in the days of Lenin and Trotsky.

... "Rotten Elements" in USSR

(Continued from page 1)

current policies. The journal also castigated local party leaders for remaining passive in the face of "anti-party demagogic attacks by persons who are immature or got into the party by chance."

The mounting campaign against party dissidents testifies to a rapid growth of oppositional moods among the Soviet population. The masses — the working class principally — are gaining in self-confidence. Police terror has begun to lose its dread. "Every-one here has noticed of late that people talk more freely than they used to," says Hangen in the April 29 N. Y. Times. The pressure of the Soviet workers forced the Kremlin chiefs at the 20th Congress to launch significant concessions — including destruction of the Stalin cult, keystone of the bureaucracy's rule. The concessions in turn, by legitimizing attacks on Stalin's tyranny, have emboldened the working people and sections of the intellectuals to push their condemnation of the bureaucratic dictatorship.

CRITICAL MOODS IN ARMY

The growing revolutionary spirit has invaded the Soviet armed forces. This was revealed when two top ranking Soviet army commanders, Marshals Zhukov and Timoshenko, both alternate members of the Politbureau, recently demanded strengthened discipline in the armed forces. The high Soviet brass is severely criticizing Communist Party and Young Communist units in the armed forces for having failed to bolster the authority of the commanding officers.

In an interview with Krasnaya Zvezda, organ of the Defense Ministry, Timoshenko declared that many young officers now regard compulsion as a remnant of "bourgeois order." He charged they were neglecting forceful methods of exacting obedience in favor of efforts to convince the troops by talk. "Our army does not need false democracy," said Timoshenko.

What these statements indicate is a strong demand in the ranks for revival of the Red Army's revolutionary structure. It was until 1935 — long after the bureaucratic caste had consolidated its dictatorship under Stalin — that an officers' hierarchy (from lieutenant to marshal)

The Attack On Daily Worker

An Editorial

The Treasury Department's raid on the Daily Worker and Communist Party offices and bank account which started March 27 aroused widespread protest and indignation from many sources. Even the Big Business organization of the American Newspaper Publishers of America expressed disapproval and alarm at the government's political harassment of a newspaper on flimsy technical pretexts.

Richard W. Slocum, president of the ANPA, said at its convention in New York April 25 that "procedure of the Treasury Department in any newspaper demands critical scrutiny. It is easy for some to pass over an incident like the recent seizure and padlocking of the New York Daily Worker with the thought that this was a Communist newspaper and Communists deserve nothing better."

Yes. Even the Big Business publishers have protested the attack on the Daily Worker. But not the leaders of the labor movement and the Negro organizations. How can such a shameful situation be explained?

Apparently the officials of the labor and Negro movement are so blinded by their own "red" phobia they cannot see that an attack on the elementary democratic rights of a left-wing minority party is a blow aimed at the entire working class movement.

The open-shop interests, North and South, employ the red scare as a major weapon to keep workers unorganized. The Eastland gang of white supremacists have shown the intimate connection between red baiting and race baiting. Despite these facts the officials of the labor and Negro movement continue to (a) practice red baiting themselves; (b) stand by with folded arms when the civil rights of radicals are under attack.

There is absolutely no justification, nor any possible excuse for such treacherous conduct. Certainly, if even the Newspaper Publishers of America can see a danger to their democratic rights from the T-raids on the Daily Worker and Communist Party, the officials of labor and Negro organizations could at least have worked up enough courage to protest the Government's brazen assault on the Bill of Rights.

Perhaps the whole episode will have value in an unexpected way. If the rank and file of the unions and Negro organizations become aware of this shocking contrast between the timidity of their officials and the relatively forthright civil liberties stand of a Big Business outfit, it will arouse sufficient protest to put some heat on these officials and force them to stop their scab conduct on the civil rights of minority political groups in the labor movement.

Stalin's orders. Rakosi is still head of the government.

A meeting of the Hungarian Writers Federation on March 13 delivered such a blistering attack on Rakosi that he ordered it suspended. According to a report by John MacComaak in the April 27 N. Y. Times, "Mr. Rakosi was called 'warder' and 'Judas' . . ."

When a vote of confidence in the party was moved only twenty persons supported it out of 180. When the congress was resumed on April 13, the attack was reopened. Furthermore unrest continues throughout the lower levels of the Communist Party despite expulsion of Rakosi's fiercest critic, Sandor Lukacsi, and despite a new public declaration for Rakosi made by the Kremlin.

Although they rant against independent criticism, the Kremlin bureaucrats are not able to throw the process of concession giving into reverse gear. They must continue to liquidate the Stalin cult as evidenced by complete absence of Stalin's pictures in any of the Soviet May Day parades and in the change of name of the leading Soviet scientific institution from the Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin Institute to the Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

Salary cuts for a few of the highest brackets have been decreed by the regime, which has also renewed its promises to the workers for wage increases. In addition, an article in Party Life urges party members not to be afraid of engaging in the "widest freedom of discussion." The journal insists that the drive against "rotten elements" "should in no way hold up the development of intra-party democracy, criticism and self-criticism."

Clearly, the Stalinist bureaucrats are caught between compulsion to give concessions under mass pressure in order to preserve their rule, and the equally strong compulsion to halt concession giving lest the working class opposition gain momentum. The net result of their zig-zags is to discredit the Kremlin rulers even further before the masses and strengthen the masses' self-confidence. This prepares the explosion of a political revolution which will clear away the dictatorship of the bureaucratic caste and restore workers' democracy on the social foundations established by the October, 1917 revolution.

Subscribe!

Start your subscription now. Clip the coupon and mail it in today. Send \$1.50 for six months subscription or \$3 for a full year to The Militant, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

Name _____
Street _____ Zone _____
City _____ State _____

\$1.50 Six months \$3.00 Full year New Renewal