

THE MILITANT

Published in the Interests of the Working People

Vol. 28 - No. 39 Monday, November 2, 1964 Price 10c

Communist Parties Balk On Khrushchev's Ouster

By Dick Roberts

OCT. 26 — The still unexplained ouster of Nikita Khrushchev as head of the Soviet Communist Party is sending shock waves through the international Communist movement, unparalleled since the eruption of the Sino-Soviet dispute in 1960. Criticism of the Kremlin's methods in removing Khrushchev has been coming from leaders of Communist Parties throughout the world. It is stronger than any criticism these parties have levelled at Moscow since before Stalin's accession to power nearly 40 years ago.

So far three delegates from the French Communist Party had arrived in Moscow to demand an explanation; delegates from both the Italian and Austrian CPs were en route to Moscow; and Leonid Brezhnev and Aleksei Kosygin, the new heads of the Kremlin bureaucracy, had made a secret trip to the Polish border to explain matters to Polish Communist chief Wladyslaw Gomulka.

The embarrassment felt by CP leaders in both Western and Eastern Europe at the sudden dumping of the Soviet premier may be gauged by their initial reactions. French Communist circles felt that the information was nothing but a monstrous provocation cooked up by the anti-Communists.

An Oct. 19 declaration of the Czechoslovak Communist Party said: "The news that Comrade Khrushchev had been relieved of his duties was received by our whole party and the public with surprise and emotion."

When the truth of Khrushchev's ouster had been fully assimilated, the largest Communist Parties in Western Europe were the most outspoken critics. An editorial in the Italian CP newspaper, *L'Unita*, declared:

"We hold open reservations, are even in disagreement, on the

Dobbs to Speak On Deposing of Khrushchev

NEW YORK — Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, will speak on "Khrushchev's Ouster — Crisis in the Kremlin" at a public meeting Friday evening, Nov. 6, at 116 University Place. The meeting is sponsored by the Militant Labor Forum.



Farrell Dobbs

methods employed in replacing Comrade Khrushchev. . . . We think that complete and convincing information on the latest events that took place in Moscow is necessary."

An emergency session of the French CP Politbureau declared that the French Communists want

(Continued on Page 6)

Khrushchev's Downfall — New Stage in Kremlin Crisis

— See page 4 —

Gov't Fumbles Around While Miss. Racists Bomb, Jail, Negroes

By Fred Halstead

Timid and half-hearted moves by the federal government against racist murderers and bombers in the Mississippi towns of Philadelphia and McComb have failed. What is more, they have boomeranged, with the local white racist officials using them to launch new attacks against the civil-rights movement.

The racists were able to do this because the Johnson administration insisted on moving only through white-racist-controlled courts and white-supremacist local officials.

The federal grand jury in Jackson, Miss., which was charged by the U.S. Department of Justice with the task of taking action against the murderers of three civil-rights workers in Philadelphia, Miss., last June, refused to do so. Instead, the jury last week called for the indictment of several Negro witnesses on trumped-up charges of perjury.

When Justice Department officials refused to draw up these trumped-up indictments, Federal Judge Harold Cox on Oct. 22 ordered a jail term for the local U.S. Attorney and directed the Acting U.S. Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach to show cause why he should not also go to jail for contempt. Thus the federal government has been put on the defensive by the protectors of the Mississippi murderers and apparently has abandoned its attempts to bring the murderers to

(Continued on Page 2)



SNCC photo

ONE OF 21. Bombed-out interior of Society Hill Baptist Church in McComb, Miss., which was destroyed by dynamite blast Sept. 20. It was one of 21 churches in Mississippi destroyed or damaged by fire or explosives during past summer.

Midwest Youth Political Action Parley

250 Hear DeBerry at Detroit Student Rally; Rev. Cleage Urges Vote for Negro Nominee

By Robert Shann

DETROIT — "Any Negro with all his marbles will vote for Clifton DeBerry," Rev. Albert Cleage told 250 people at a rally for independent political action held here Oct. 24. The rally was sponsored by Youth for DeBerry and Shaw, and was part of a weekend conference on independent political action organized by the youth group.

While many of the conference sessions drew more, 112 young people registered for the entire two-day program. They came from Chicago, Cleveland, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, Toledo, Indianapolis, Detroit, and from many small towns and campuses in Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois.

Rev. Cleage, Freedom Now Party candidate for Governor of Michigan, also urged the cheering audience of students and Negro FNP supporters to vote for the



Clifton DeBerry

Freedom Now Party. Other speakers at the rally were James Shabazz of the Muslim Mosque, Inc. of New York, and Clifton DeBerry and Edward Shaw, Socialist Workers Party candidates for President and Vice President.

Edward Shaw pointed out that while on his national speaking tour, he met many young people who were becoming dissatisfied with the two major parties. "In Berkeley, California, I saw where some students had cut Johnson and Goldwater bumper stickers and pasted them together to read 'Johnwater for President.' I think this was a step forward."

James Shabazz said, "After hearing Rev. Cleage speak, I think that the first phase of the black revolution has begun." DeBerry, speaking of his own campaign as a Negro and a socialist, said that he had been labeled "red." "But to be black in this society, if you



Rev. Albert Cleage

fight against your condition, is to be red."

Beside the rally, the high point of the conference was a symposium of Negro candidates that turned into a sharp and lively debate. Symposium participants were Clifton DeBerry, Jackie Vaughn, candidate for Detroit Common Council, John Conyers, Democratic Party nominee for Congressman in Michigan's First District, and Conyers' Freedom Now Party opponent, Milton Henry.

DeBerry praised the Michigan Freedom Now Party for having embarked upon the road of independent political action against the Democrats and Republicans, and lit into the anti-Negro policies of both Johnson and Goldwater. Milton Henry and John Conyers had a lively exchange of views over whether Negroes should vote

(Continued on Page 6)

...Miss. Racist Terror

(Continued from Page 1)
trial even on minor charges carrying maximum sentences of ten years.

In addition, the action by the grand jury and Judge Cox makes it dangerous for witnesses against racists to come forth for it is now clear that even as federal witnesses they may be framed up besides being made known to racist terrorists. For this reason, the editor of *Ramparts*, a national Catholic lay magazine, which published a story Oct. 25 giving eyewitness accounts of the murder of the three civil-rights workers in Philadelphia, announced that he has declined to turn the names of the eyewitnesses over to the Justice Department.

The *Ramparts* story, published in a special issue of the monthly, is by Negro author Louis Lomax who said the witnesses had identified at least six members of the mob that committed the triple lynching.

Judge Cox, a notorious white racist and former law partner of Senator Eastland, was appointed by President Kennedy in 1961, despite his constant use of the insulting term, "nigger," at Senate committee hearings on his suitability for the federal bench. Prior to his appointment, Cox was interviewed in Washington by Robert F. Kennedy, then the Attorney General, who approved his appointment.

Consistent Judge

Judge Cox has consistently held that Negroes who testify that they have been denied the right to vote in Mississippi should be prosecuted for "perjury."

In the McComb bombing cases, nine white men arrested and convicted in the bombings of several Negro homes were freed Oct. 23 on probation after receiving suspended sentences. Circuit Judge W. H. Watkins said the bombers had been "unduly provoked" by the civil-rights activity in McComb, were from "good families" and "deserve a second chance." Six of the bombers were given \$500 fines. The law under which they were convicted carries a maximum penalty of death.

In this case, federal authorities had finally ordered the FBI to investigate a long series of bombings, but the evidence was turned over to "local authorities" for ac-

tion. The suspended sentences were announced following an agreement between defense attorneys and prosecution by which the men pleaded guilty or no contest. In freeing the convicted bombers, Judge Watkins said of the civil-rights workers who were the targets of the bombs: "some of them were people of low morality and unhygienic."

The same day McComb city officials were arresting 13 civil-rights workers at their Freedom House on the charge of "operating a food-handling establishment without a license." The civil-rights workers sleep and eat at Freedom House.

The outcome of the Philadelphia and McComb cases is definitive proof that the administration policy of co-operating with and depending on "existing local authorities" in cases of racist violence in the South is a policy of treachery to the civil-rights movement. Meanwhile the racist terror in Mississippi continues and mounts.

In Indianola, Miss., another bombing took place Oct. 22. This time the bomb was dropped from a light plane which repeatedly buzzed a church where some 200 Negroes were holding a meeting. The bomb fortunately exploded in mid-air and no one was injured. The meeting continued.

ATLANTA, Georgia — The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee has reported "more than 50" bombing or burning incidents aimed at civil-rights workers and local Negroes in Mississippi in a four-month period. The Atlanta SNCC office said arson and dynamite attacks had leveled 21 churches and other structures, and had partially destroyed 31 other buildings between June 16 and Oct. 4.

Firebombings and Molotov cocktails were reported in Brandon, McComb, Moss Point, Ruleville, So So, Canton, Vicksburg, Natchez, Laurel, Hattiesburg, Jackson, Meridian, Summit and Sharon.

Early attacks by nightriders were directed at churches, homes, offices or businesses associated with the Mississippi Summer Project, but later church bombings seemed to occur at random. The only injuries reported due to the heavy bombings were on Sept. 20 in McComb, when two children were hurt in the bombing of the home of a local rights leader, and in Vicksburg on Oct. 4, when two civil-rights workers sleeping in the Vicksburg Freedom House were cut by flying glass during an explosion.

Some Mississippi whites have also been targets of the anti-civil-rights bombers. A church pastored by a white man was burned on June 26 in Clinton after the minister spoke to a Negro Bible class. On Aug. 27, the office of a white moderate newspaper in Jackson was bombed. Two offices owned by Natchez Mayor John Nossor were bombed Sept. 14. Mayor Nossor's home was bombed Sept. 25 and a Sharon store and postal station managed by whites was bombed Sept. 26.



Robert F. Kennedy

Hearing Postponed In Joseph Johnson Deportation Case



Joseph Johnson

MINNEAPOLIS — In a last minute change, the federal Immigration Service granted a postponement in the deportation hearing against Joseph Johnson, the organizer of the Twin Cities branch of the Socialist Workers Party. Originally scheduled for Oct. 6, the date for the hearing has now been set for Nov. 23.

Johnson is being threatened with deportation for the "crime" of having participated in his youth in a municipal election in Canada as if he were a Canadian citizen. The government charges that he thereby lost his U.S. citizenship. It further charges that when he returned to this country from Canada he was really a stateless individual and is consequently subject to deportation to some unspecified country.

A Committee to Oppose the Deportation of Joseph Johnson has been formed to defend the young Twin-Cities socialist leader in this highly unusual and contradictory case. The committee points out that Johnson was born and raised in this country entitling him to rights of American citizenship which cannot be arbitrarily taken away. Moreover, such a deportation would be tantamount to banishment, which is unconstitutional.

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee is giving legal aid in the case and is providing the services of Leonard B. Boudin, the noted constitutional lawyer, as general counsel for the defense. Douglas Hall, well-known Minneapolis attorney, is serving as local counsel.

Contributions for the defense are being asked by the Committee to Oppose the Deportation of Joseph Johnson, P.O. Box 8731, Northstar Building, Minneapolis 2, Minn.

New Book Tells Story Of SNCC and Its Battles To Abolish Segregation

ATLANTA, Ga. — Workers from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) are described as the "ragged, incorruptible front line in the struggle to abolish racism in the United States" in a new book about the militant anti-segregation group.

The book, *SNCC: The New Abolitionists*, was written by Boston University Professor Howard Zinn and was published by Beacon Press. The book is available from SNCC, 6 Raymond St., N.W., Atlanta, Ga. The price is \$4.95.

How Cuba Uprooted Race Discrimination

By Harry Ring

16 pages 15 cents

Pioneer Publishers
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

REVIEWS and REPORTS

UPSIDE-DOWN JUSTICE. The Albany Cases. A pamphlet published by the National Committee for the Albany Defendants, Albany, Ga. 9 pp. Free.

The Albany Movement became known throughout the world for its efforts to win Negroes in that Georgia city their rights through nonviolent direct action. This pamphlet describes the reign of terror instituted there under Chief of Police Laurie Pritchett, who, although not personally beating up Negroes and their white sympathizers, runs the city in the "silent, sure manner of an efficient police state."

Not only have there been numerous cases of violence and brutality against civil-rights workers in Albany and neighboring areas of Southwest Georgia, but it is now clear that the State of Georgia and the federal government have joined forces to crush the movement by persecuting the leadership. At one time, the civil-rights fighters thought that the federal government would come to their aid. They sent appeals to Robert Kennedy, then Attorney General of the U.S., with sworn statements by victims of police atrocities.

They thought Kennedy would heed their call for help. Instead, the Justice Department came in on the side of their persecutors, with federal indictments against the civil-rights fighters.

For instance, the Rev. Samuel B. Wells, one of the main leaders in the Albany Movement, was arrested July 8, 1963 after a march to city hall to protest the failure of the mayor and city officials to grant Negroes fair and equal treatment. The minister swore that he was dragged by his genitals from the street into the police station, where he was dropped on the floor. Mr. Wells made a complaint to the Justice Department in Washington.

Three weeks later, a federal grand jury was called into session at Macon, Ga., to investigate the situation in Albany. "Some people thought that the FBI and the grand jury were going to look into charges of brutality and denial of civil rights to Negroes over the years. Such illusions disappeared as soon as the grand jury began questioning the witnesses," says the report. The Rev. Wells was one of the eight who were in-

dicted by the federal government. All the others were either leaders or active participants in the protest movement. Among them was Joni Rabinowitz, a white student from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).

Attorney General Robert Kennedy took the unusual step of announcing the indictments at a special news conference in Washington.

While out on appeal from the federal conviction, Rev. Wells organized a very successful voter-registration drive in Georgia. Last August, he was picked up at his home and charged under a state "insurrection" law which carried the death penalty. It is obvious that the state and federal governments are determined to crush the movement and silence its leadership. Rev. Wells has been held in prison since his arrest.

Readers are urged to circulate this pamphlet. Copies may be obtained by writing to National Committee for the Albany Defendants, 532 Mercer St., Albany, Ga.

—Constance Weissman

TRIAL BY BATTLE. The Case History of a Washington Witch-Hunt. By Edward Lamb. Introduction by Harry Ashmore. Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Santa Barbara; 24 pages; 25 cents.

This pamphlet describes Toledo industrialist Edward Lamb's four-year battle to clear his reputation after he had been labeled a Communist during the McCarthy hearings of 1953. A professional stool pigeon had then vaguely associated Lamb with communism and his troubles began. The Federal Communications Commission refused to renew the license for one of his TV stations and a lengthy, expensive court case followed.

Lamb explains in this pamphlet: "It cost me, first to last, around \$900,000 to clear my good name and protect my properties—a sum far beyond the reach of hundreds of minor officials, hapless intellectuals, college professors and bystanders who were run down by the McCarthy juggernaut during the great witch-hunt."

The witch-hunt victims are still with us, but how many of them have \$900,000 lying around loose for a long court battle?

—Evelyn Sell



VICTIMS OF FEDERAL FRAME-UP. Leaders of Albany, Ga., movement convicted on trumped-up federal "perjury" charges. From left to right, Slater King, Rev. Samuel B. Wells, Thomas Chatmon, Robert Thomas and, in foreground, Mrs. Elza (Goldie) Jackson.

Weekly Calendar

AD RATES

The rate for advertising in this column is 40 cents a line. Display ads are \$2 a column inch. There is a ten percent discount for regular advertisers. Advertising must reach us by the Monday prior to the date of publication.

BOSTON

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION. Speaker, Patrick Kelly. Fri., Nov. 6, 8 p.m. Rm. 307, 295 Huntington Ave. Contrib. 50c. Ausp. Militant Labor Forum.

CHICAGO

THE FIGHT TO REGISTER NEGRO VOTERS IN MISSISSIPPI. Speakers: two SNCC workers from Mississippi. Fri., Nov. 6, 8 p.m. Debs Hall, 302 S. Canal St. Ausp. Friday Night Socialist Forum.

DETROIT

HEAR SOCIALIST VIEWS ON RADIO. Every Monday, 7:15-7:30 p.m. Station WQRS-FM (105.1).

MINNEAPOLIS

THE MYTH OF AMERICAN LIBERALISM. Speaker, Jack Barnes, national organizer for the Young Socialist Alliance. Fri., Nov. 6, 8:30 p.m., 704 Hennepin Ave., Hall 240. Ausp. Friday Night Socialist Forum.

NEW YORK

KHRUSHCHEV'S OUSTER — CRISIS IN THE KREMLIN, an analysis by Farrell Dobbs, national secretary, SWP. Fri., Nov. 6, 8:30 p.m. 116 University Place. Contrib. \$1. Ausp. Militant Labor Forum.

THE MILITANT

Editor: JOSEPH HANSEN

Managing Editor: GEORGE LAVAN

Business Manager: KAROLYN KERRY

Published weekly, except during July and August when published bi-weekly, by The Militant Publishing Ass'n., 116 University Pl., New York 3, N.Y. Phone CH 3-2140. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y. Subscription: \$3 a year; Canadian, \$3.50; foreign, \$4.50. Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Militant's views. These are expressed in editorials.

Vol. 28 - No. 39

345

Monday, November 2, 1964

The Chinese Nuclear Parley Bid

Chinese Premier Chou En-lai followed up his government's proposal for a world summit conference to ban nuclear weapons by sending a direct message to President Johnson and all other heads of state urging such a meeting. But the only reply that the cynical cold-warriors in Washington would make was that it was a "sucker" proposal and that the Chinese weren't serious. The Johnson administration thereby demonstrated its own lack of seriousness on the vital issue of banning nuclear weapons.

UN Secretary General U Thant, by contrast, made a serious proposal. He suggested that the five nuclear powers — the U.S., Soviet Union, Britain, France, and now, China — should meet sometime in 1965 to discuss ending all nuclear tests, measures to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, and "other phases of disarmament."

Thant emphasized that the UN General Assembly had passed a resolution in 1962 condemning not only above-ground tests which poison the atmosphere with radioactive fallout, but all nuclear testing of whatever kind.

The Washington politicians were more polite to Thant than to the Chinese. After all, they do recognize his existence. But they rejected his proposal just as categorically.

In fact, the same day that Thant made his proposal, the U.S. government touched off an underground nuclear blast in Mississippi. At the same time, this government — which has set off "something like 320 to 375" nuclear tests, far and away the biggest tester — repeated its hypocritical denunciation of China for testing one bomb.

U.S. policy toward China did not serve the interests of the American people before the Chinese nuclear test. Now that policy is more fraught with danger than ever. Instead of its arrogant cold-war stance, the U.S. should recognize China, abandon opposition to China's entry into the UN, establish diplomatic and trade relations, and accept the proposal for negotiating a ban on nuclear weapons.

U.S. Elections and Cuba

A staple of both Johnson's and Goldwater's campaigns is enmity to the Cuban Revolution. Both of them have repeatedly voiced their hostile attitude toward the Cuban government. Clifton DeBerry, candidate of the Socialist Workers Party, calls for friendly and normal relations with Cuba.

On the "Issues and Answers" television program, broadcast over the ABC national network Oct. 25, DeBerry urged the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the naval base at Guantanamo, Cuba. DeBerry is the only presidential candidate who has taken such a stand.

The U.S. base also came under fire from the conference of non-aligned nations which met in Cairo last month. Leaders from 47 nations were at the conference and signed a document urging the United States to "negotiate the evacuation of this base with the Cuban Government." The resolution further called upon Washington to lift its embargo on Cuba and open negotiations with Cuba aimed at putting relations between the countries on a normal footing.

The existence of a U.S. military base on Cuban soil is a continuing provocation to Cuba. It exists by virtue of force alone, against the expressed will of the Cuban people and their government.

The demands raised by the non-aligned nations and by candidate DeBerry are reasonable and just. A U.S. foreign policy really dedicated to peace would restore friendly relations with Cuba, restore free trade with the island, and would begin by dismantling the U.S. base in Guantanamo.

Local Directory

BOSTON. Boston Labor Forum, 295 Huntington Ave., Room 307.

CHICAGO. Socialist Workers Party and bookstore, 302 South Canal St., Room 210. WE 9-5044.

CLEVELAND. Eugene V. Debs Hall, Room 25, 5927 Euclid Ave., Cleveland 3, Ohio. Telephone: 391-1425.

DENVER. Militant Labor Forum, Telephone 222-4174.

DETROIT. Eugene V. Debs Hall, 3737 Woodward, TEmpLe 1-6135. Friday Night Socialist Forum held weekly at 8 p.m.

LOS ANGELES. Socialist Workers Party, 1702 East Fourth St. AN 9-4953 or WE 5-9238. Open 12 noon to 5 p.m. daily and Saturday.

MILWAUKEE. 150 E. Juneau Ave.

MINNEAPOLIS. Socialist Workers Party and Labor Book Store, 704 Hennepin Ave., Hall 240. FEderal 2-7781. Open 1

to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, Saturday, 11 a.m.-5 p.m.

NEWARK. Newark Labor Forum, Box 361, Newark, New Jersey.

NEW YORK CITY. Militant Labor Forum, 116 University Place. AL 5-7852.

OAKLAND-BERKELEY. Socialist Workers Party, P.O. Box 651, Main Post Office, Oakland 12, Calif. Phone 562-4667.

PHILADELPHIA. Militant Labor Forum: P.O. Box 8412.

ST. LOUIS. Phone Evergreen 9-2895. Ask for Dick Clarke.

SAN DIEGO. San Diego Labor Forum, P.O. Box 1581, San Diego 12, Calif. For labor and socialist books. Sign of the Sun Books, 4705 College Ave.

SEATTLE. 3815 5th N. E. Library, book store. Open 12 noon to 5 p.m. Saturdays. Phone ME 2-7449.

WHO'S WHERE ON THE LEFT

Radicals and the '64 Election

By Harry Ring

Twenty-eight years ago the Communist Party and members of the Socialist Party shattered a previously unchanged tradition and principle of the radical movement by supporting Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democratic Party candidate for president.

Until that time such an idea had not been considered by even the most conservative of the reformist socialists. For a socialist to support the candidates of a capitalist party was regarded by the entire radical movement as a form of political class collaboration roughly equivalent to supporting a company union or crossing a picket line.

In the current election, the leaders of the Communist Party and a majority of the leaders of the Socialist Party feel they have an ideal justification in plumping for the Democrats. Pointing to the ugly gang of racists, ultra-rights and neo-fascists grouped around Goldwater, they feel no particular discomfort in joining with powerful monopolists, reactionary gutter rags and hide-bound labor fakers in going "all the way with LBJ."

For the record, it should be noted that the Communist Party has not officially endorsed Johnson. In fact the party's voice, the *Worker* frequently and piously reminds its readers that it has not made any endorsement in the campaign.

Why Not

The reason for this seems to be to avoid embarrassing Johnson (who would promptly and vigorously repudiate such an endorsement). Also, the Communist Party leaders apparently feel the absence of a formal endorsement of the Democrats will disarm those in the party's ranks who quite properly regard their painting up the Democrats and Johnson as a disgrace to socialism.

While the party officialdom refrains from "endorsing" Johnson they see to it that the most dull-witted reader of their paper gets the pitch to vote the straight Democratic ticket.

The *Worker* trumpets the need to "Smash Goldwaterism." Long articles explain the need for piling up a huge vote against Goldwater. Harsh polemics are directed against the progressive weekly, the *National Guardian*, for refusing to urge its readers to vote for Johnson.

In one such polemic, *Worker* writer William Weinstone spelled out the paper's vote-Johnson line a bit more directly than usual. He was discussing a New York Militant Labor Forum symposium where Russ Nixon, general manager of the *National Guardian*, declared he would not vote for Johnson because he did not consider it an effective way to stop the trend toward what Goldwater represents.

Real Line

Declared Weinstone: "To oppose Goldwater one does not have to endorse or support Johnson. But under the electoral system and with the candidates running, what choice do people have but to vote for Johnson if they want to defeat Goldwater?"

Leading members of the Socialist Party have also declared for Johnson. Norman Thomas, now honorary national chairman of the party, made a national tour, speaking for Johnson. At least eight of the party's 17-man national committee are reported in favor of Johnson.

The Socialist Party permits those favoring Johnson to campaign for him. However, the party's youth affiliate, the Young Peoples Socialist League, which came out against both Goldwater and Johnson has been suspended.

One target of particularly heavy pro-Johnson pressure has been the progressive weekly, the

Symposium Slated On Election Policy

NEW YORK — Editors of various left-of-center publications exchanged views on the presidential elections here at a meeting sponsored by the *National Guardian* Oct. 28. Participants were James Aronson, *National Guardian*; M. S. Arnoni, *Minority of One*; David Dellinger, *Liberation*; James M. Jackson, *The Worker*; Fred Jerome, *Challenge*; George Lavan, *The Militant*; Dan Watts, *Liberator*; and James Weinstein, *Studies on the Left*. Our next issue will report this meeting.

National Guardian. At the outset of the campaign, in a June 27 editorial, it had declared: "The point is not whether to choose a 'lesser evil' but rather that there is no significant gradation of evil between the major party choices and Americans . . . cannot in all conscience cast their vote for evil."

This refusal to come out for Johnson evoked a storm of controversy among the paper's readers and supporters. The debate was heated and one *Guardian* editorial suggested that some supporters had gone so far as to threaten withdrawal of financial aid to the paper.

Unable to arrive at agreement in the paper's staff itself, and with its readers so sharply divided, the *Guardian* reconsidered the question in an Aug. 22 editorial declaring that, because of what it then saw as a strong possibility of a Goldwater victory, it could not "in good conscience recommend abstention" from the election.

Finally, in an Oct. 24 editorial, the *Guardian* declared: "Where we have differed with some of our friends on the Left is in addressing ourselves to the question whether a Johnson victory will provide a real alternative to Goldwaterism . . . The threat of fascism cannot be effectively countered by the kind of national administration which for the last two decades has laid the groundwork for just this threat."

No Choice

However, the paper said, because of the continuing division in its staff, it was not making a recommendation to its readers on whether to vote for Johnson, for a minor party, or to abstain. It urged that immediately after the election a united effort be made to build a political force capable of opposing the reactionary policies of the two major parties.

Opposition to the Republicans and Democrats was also registered by the Socialist Labor Party which, as always, ran its own presidential ticket. Unfortunately, its campaign was marred — as in the past — by its sectarian insistence that it is wrong to fight for civil rights or other immediate goals.

Challenge, a New York weekly published by the Progressive Labor Movement, a Maoist split-off from the Communist Party, has also condemned both Johnson and Goldwater. However, it refused to recommend a socialist vote. In an Oct. 27 editorial, *Challenge* declared:

"There is another way to vote than to choose between Johnson's war and Goldwater's war.

"(We are NOT advocating a vote for one of the minor socialist candidates. Although many honest persons will vote for them out of desperation and a desire to protest, these candidates offer no solution. In one case, the 'socialist' candidate calls for taking the

troops who are now murdering colored people in Vietnam and sending them to run loose in Mississippi. His party, whose policy includes overthrowing the government of the People's Republic of China, evidently believes that the Negro people of the South will benefit from having more bayonets in their backs . . .)

"There is another way to vote besides pulling a lever in a voting booth. That is to vote with your mind and body — to come together with the working people in your community and on your job and organize a real alternative to the two big-business parties."

The nameless "socialist" candidate is obviously Clifton DeBerry of the Socialist Workers Party since he is the only candidate who has called for withdrawing U.S. troops from Vietnam and sending them to Mississippi. He does not, as the editorial rather loosely suggests, believe that they should be permitted to "run loose" there.)

2 Points

Two points should be briefly noted on this question. First, if the American people could exert enough pressure on Washington to compel it to withdraw the troops from Vietnam and send them to Mississippi wouldn't it be a reasonable possibility that the people would also be able to mount sufficient pressure to see to it that the troops were used there to enforce the Constitution? Secondly, doesn't the refusal of the government to accede to the demand to get the GIs out of Vietnam and send them to Mississippi serve to expose the lying claim that the GIs are in Vietnam to preserve freedom?

In any case, logic would suggest that even if socialists disagree on this particular slogan they should certainly support the only candidate in the race who advocates socialism, calls for the end of U.S. intervention in Vietnam and seeks to rally support for enforcement of the constitutional rights of the Negro people.

The argument that DeBerry should not be supported because he allegedly advocates "overthrowing" the Chinese government is also a poor one. DeBerry is the only candidate who unconditionally defends the Chinese revolution against imperialism; who urges that the U.S. recognize China and establish normal trade relations with it; who urges that China be admitted to the UN.

It is also true that within that context, DeBerry and the SWP favor the establishment of socialist democracy in China rather than the present bureaucratic rule. But this is not anti-socialist. On the contrary it is the best guarantee for the building of socialism in China. Or must we wait for a Chinese version of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union where the crimes of Stalin were catalogued before we see the relevancy of this point?

Ducks Issue

The question of how to vote on Nov. 3 is ducked completely by the paper, *Workers World*, published by a group of former Trotskyists whose pro-Maoist politics are quite similar to those of the Progressive Labor Movement. *Workers World* has stated that it rejects the "lesser evil" theory but on the basis of a careful reading of its editorials on the elections, it is impossible to determine what kind of a vote the paper recommends on Nov. 3.

This recitation of the record of the various radical groups on the elections is not a very happy one. On the bright side of the ledger, however, is the fact that an encouraging number of black militants and rebel youth have rallied to the DeBerry-Shaw campaign and have already made clear that the revolutionary socialist forces will emerge from the election contest stronger than they entered.

Khrushchev's Downfall — New Stc

[The following is the text of a declaration issued Oct. 19 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the international organization of revolutionary socialists founded in 1938 by Leon Trotsky.]

I

The sudden removal of Khrushchev as head of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union [CPSU] and head of the Soviet government offers fresh and striking proof of the deep contradiction between the progressive character of the economic structure of the Soviet Union and the retrograde political institutions set up by Stalin.

The launching of the spaceship *Voskhod* was the most tangible evidence of the immense advances achieved by Soviet science and industry. Three days later came the downfall of Khrushchev, offering a completely opposite spectacle of political weakness and confusion.

The new Kremlin chiefs at once hastened to assure the world that the sudden change-over did not signify any alteration at all of a major character in either domestic or foreign policy. They propose to follow substantially the same course as Khrushchev.

Why Dumped?

Why then did the bureaucracy dump Khrushchev?

If the top bureaucrats display little concern over Khrushchev's general line, it is because they, like him and Stalin before them, are utter empiricists. They became worried over what they consider to be Khrushchev's excesses and blunders in applying the line.

The truth is that Khrushchev ended up in blind alleys in various fields, increasing tensions and sharpening contradictions. Seeking a way out, the bureaucracy decided to make a start by offering him up as a scapegoat.

In the field of domestic economic policy, Khrushchev was associated with the grandiose promises about raising the standard of living of the Soviet masses. For nine years, things did improve for Soviet consumers — Khrushchev's popularity during this period was based on this. But the situation changed radically when, due to the stagnation of agricultural production for five years, he was obliged to increase the price of meat and butter and to import large quantities of grain from the capitalist countries. The long lines in front of bakeries last winter dealt a mortal blow to his popularity. The good harvest this year could not save the situation.

More Failures

Khrushchev's "virgin-lands" project likewise ended in failure. *Pravda's* sudden allusion to "hare-brained schemes" that disregard the advice of scientific specialists refers to the "virgin-lands" project which was undertaken against the advice of the Academy of Sciences.

The bankruptcy of Khrushchev's agricultural policy — which the Fourth International has pointed to since 1955 as decisive for Khrushchev's leadership of the CPSU — is all the more serious in view of the fact that the belated turn toward intensive agriculture cannot give immediate large-scale results; and the creation of a major chemical industry, required as a concomitant, demands time.

The plans for establishing a chemical industry, which were launched with great publicity, have been considerably slowed down due to a general lowering of the rate of industrial growth in the USSR. It was impossible at one and the same time to maintain a rapid improvement in the standard of living for the masses, to keep up with the imperialist powers in an armaments race, grant increasing aid to the colonial bourgeoisie, undertake feverish construction of homes, and in-

crease the volume of investment on the colossal scale needed to maintain a constant high rate of industrial expansion.

It must also be emphasized that the economic reforms introduced by Khrushchev, which succeeded in overcoming the difficulties created by the hyper-centralization and grossly oversize scale of approach in Stalin's time, began to decline in effectiveness. The present economic discussion in the USSR is symptomatic of this new economic impasse.

Khrushchev was not ready to take the "big leap forward" that would have been possible with the introduction of democratic planning and workers' self-management.

The bureaucracy sacrificed Khrushchev, holding him responsible for the agricultural and industrial difficulties, hoping in this way to gain time for experimenting with new solutions. However, possible reforms can prove only of limited efficacy. What is needed is a radical transformation of the whole system of management.

In the field of foreign policy, Khrushchev became the scapegoat for a series of blunders that gravely lowered Soviet prestige. These included the miscalculation involved in putting rockets in Cuba, the unkept promise of an imminent solution of the problem of West Berlin; the vote in the UN to send the "blue helmets" to the Congo where the operation ended in the murder of Lumumba. It was above all the way in which he handled the Chinese question that aroused the most resentment and opposition.

Was it necessary to carry the dispute between the CPSU and the Chinese Communist party onto the government level? To



Brezhnev

abruptly halt Soviet aid to China? To grant military aid to Nehru in a war involving the People's Republic of China? To go back on the agreement to help China in setting up a nuclear industry? Such questions undoubtedly worried a growing number of Soviet leaders. Above all, was it wise to schedule the pre-conference of 26 Communist parties for Dec. 15, 1964, without assurances in advance that a big majority of these parties would accept the invitation and support the Soviet theses?

In truth, the manner in which Khrushchev handled the Sino-Soviet conflict added up to a disastrous balance in the eyes of the Soviet bureaucracy. The unity of the Communist international movement was destroyed, the authority of the Soviet party brought to a new low everywhere. Its directives were no longer followed even among parties backing the Kremlin against Peking. The conflict set up enormous centrifugal forces, not only among par-

ties, as shown in Italy, but among governments, as shown in Rumania. Should East Germany tomorrow protest against the projected rapprochement with Bonn and take the road being followed by Rumania, Kremlin control over more than half of the buffer countries would be in a state of disintegration.

Again, by sacrificing Khrushchev, the Soviet bureaucracy sought to halt the steady deterioration in its relations with Peking. The main obstacle to resumption of the dialogue having been eliminated, Peking can in turn make its own concessions without losing face.

If the December pre-conference now takes place, its meaning may be completely altered. The unbridled polemics, the irresponsible acts that have characterized both sides may cease. If reconciliation is not reached, the conflict is at least taken out of the gutter and returned to the green baize tables of the diplomats and "theoreticians."

II

Khrushchev's years in office will become known as the period of "de-Stalinization." Under national and international conditions completely different from those that made it possible for the Soviet bureaucracy to usurp power in the Soviet Union and for Stalin to convert this power into a personal autocracy wielded with increasing arbitrariness, the Soviet masses are no longer willing to endure a ruthless police regime, the complete subordination of their standard of living to spectacular-sounding projects that involve enormous waste.

To avoid an impending explosion such as occurred in East Germany in 1953 and in Poland and Hungary in 1956, and to save their special privileges and their grip on power, the leaders of the Soviet bureaucracy deliberately sacrificed the Stalin cult and liberalized their regime. In doing so, they also eliminated some of the most arbitrary and obnoxious methods of leadership and administration that Stalin introduced into Soviet economy, government, science and culture and which increasingly blocked progress.

De-Stalinization

Khrushchev, often pictured as the most typical representative of this "de-Stalinization" was neither its principal initiator nor its most resolute protagonist. Many times, in various fields, younger and more dynamic forces sought to press "de-Stalinization" further. The logic of this would have been the rehabilitation of Leon Trotsky and his generation of Bolsheviks. The advocates of further "de-Stalinization" were called to order or even silenced.

"De-Stalinization" was not Khrushchev's fundamental orientation nor his personal policy. It was a course of half measures, of doled-out concessions, approved by the immense majority of the bureaucracy which gained from it a higher degree of personal security as well as a popular response from the masses. The objective factors that determined this course will continue to operate after Khrushchev's downfall.

The years of progressive improvement in their standard of living lessened the fear that paralyzed wide sectors in Stalin's time. The Soviet masses, their self-confidence on the rise because of the concessions they won, will never tolerate a return to the regime of misery and terror. Any attempt to return to the methods of Stalin would be met with a violent popular reaction.

It is highly significant that the new leaders hastened to declare, in the first issue of *Pravda* after Khrushchev's downfall, that the line of the Twentieth and Twenty-second Congresses of the CPSU will be continued. In this way they promised the masses that whatever

else may occur and whatever the appearances in secondary fields, the essential gains of "de-Stalinization" will be maintained. There will be no going back to an all-powerful police, to ferocious repressive laws in the plants, to the low standard of living of Stalin's time. The effort to raise the standard of living of the masses will be kept up. These concessions to the masses will in the long run only reinforce their self-confidence and further undermine the rule of the bureaucracy.

Just as objective conditions permit no fundamental retrogression in "de-Stalinization," so they permit no fundamental alteration in the field of foreign policy. The



Khrushchev

Soviet bureaucracy has never headed toward world war — the opposite contention is simply one of the lying themes of imperialist propaganda. On the other hand it has never deliberately fostered socialist revolution, the only road to a world of enduring peace. Both courses, in quite different ways, involve destruction of bureaucratic rule.

What the men who ousted Khrushchev will do is follow his policy of so-called "peaceful co-existence." This policy did not originate with Khrushchev: paragonage belongs to Stalin. Khrushchev's policy of "economic competition with the United States" was only the application under new conditions of Stalin's old thesis about "building socialism in one country."

The new leaders of the bureaucracy may use stronger language than has been Khrushchev's habit for the past two years, if only to facilitate resumption of conversations with the Chinese and to camouflage their own uncertainty and lack of assurance until their positions have been consolidated. It is possible that they will modify some of the more scandalous ways in which Khrushchev has lately collaborated with American imperialism, his course, for instance of joining with the Pentagon in arming the Indian bourgeoisie (against the Indian masses as well as the People's Republic of China) and giving American imperialism a free hand in the Gulf of Tonkin and in the Congo.

Without doubt any spectacular softening of relations between Moscow and Bonn has now been ruled out, a perspective that had caused uneasiness in East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia, particularly since the West German bourgeoisie refuses to recognize the new borders of Germany and continues to seek nuclear arms within the framework of a NATO multilateral nuclear force.

As under Khrushchev and Stalin, the Soviet bureaucracy will continue to seek an overall arrangement with Washington based essentially on joint defense of the status quo. It will continue to oppose the dissemination of nuclear arms, faithfully doing its best to keep them from other workers'

states, no matter what Washington does in giving countries like Canada stockpiles of nuclear weapons. It will propose slowing down the arms race and advocate disarmament.

It will continue to seek economic collaboration with the colonial bourgeoisie as an alternative to fostering socialist revolutions in the colonial area which could radically alter the relationship of forces to the disadvantage of bureaucratic rule in the USSR however advantageous it might turn out for the workers' states as a whole. It will continue to do what it can to confine working-class struggles in the imperialist countries within the limits of capitalist rules and regulations, postponing any bids for power there until after per-capita production in the USA has fallen behind that of the USSR.

Under these conditions, any sudden liquidation of the Sino-Soviet conflict through both states and both parties coming to complete agreement on a common line is as improbable as a reversal of "de-Stalinization" and the policy of "peaceful co-existence." The Sino-Soviet dispute is not the product of any "blunders" by Khrushchev. It expresses the deep differences in interests of two bureaucracies differently situated with regard to imperialism, the international revolution and the masses of their own countries.

Chinese Test

The success of the first Chinese nuclear test has profoundly affected the international situation of the People's Republic of China. It could accelerate its admission to the United Nations, a possibility already improved by the recognition of China among many African countries following the recognition granted by France. But Johnson will not withdraw the Seventh Fleet from the Far East, give up Taiwan [Formosa] or approve the dissolution of SEATO. So long as Washington maintains its pressure, China faces the possibility of imperialist aggression and suffers a partial economic blockade. This situation has long been sufficient to compel Peking to pursue a course that is quite different from Moscow's.

By continuing to follow the main lines of policy advanced by Stalin and developed by Khrushchev, the new Kremlin chiefs will find themselves caught in the same profound difficulties that led to political disaster for their predecessor.

III

The Soviet bureaucracy dumped Khrushchev in hope of finding a temporary solution to the contradictions it faces. It will perhaps have gained time, provided that the new team is accepted by the great majority of the apparatus and the political crisis does not undergo a new sensational turn. But the bureaucracy is incapable of overcoming the contradictions resulting from the very nature of its rule. Far from being able to attenuate the contradictions and difficulties, Khrushchev's successors are more likely to exacerbate them.

To prevent things from becoming highly explosive in the economic field, the plan for agricultural investments must be put through in doublequick order. But Kosygin the technocrat, who is known to have got into a dispute with Khrushchev over the allocation of investment funds among the different sectors, will certainly not display greater readiness than Khrushchev to sacrifice heavy industry. The very fact that Kosygin was chosen to share top rank with Brezhnev is evidence of the weight of his sector in the bureaucratic caste.

On the other hand, a general slowing down of the rate of industrial growth would certainly not augur well for the chemical-

ge in Crisis of Soviet Bureaucracy

Industry plans and for a quantitative improvement in agriculture. In order to get out of the impasse something has to give — either the aspirations of the masses, the predilections of the technocratic sector of the bureaucracy, the demands of the managers of plants and trusts, the appetites of the Kolkhoznian peasants, or the interests of several layers at once.

Things are not much better in the field of international politics. The new masters in the Kremlin are anxious to demonstrate their attachment to the cause of "peaceful co-existence" by some spectacular gesture. But how is it possible to win improved relations with Peking and at the same time reassure Washington when the two aims require moves of a diametrically opposite nature?

International Tensions

The same holds true in the international Communist movement. Of course, some improvement in relations with Peking could slow down the Chinese in their drive to set up a new international pro-Chinese Communist movement in competition with Moscow's "official" movement. But how is it possible to avoid seeing that the sudden downfall of Khrushchev has increased the uneasiness, the worry and the confusion affecting all the Communist parties?

How is it possible to avoid seeing that this ouster and the conditions under which it took place, will inevitably strengthen the already skeptical attitude of foreign Communist militants toward Soviet documents and theses, their tendency to stop lining up mechanically with every turn taken by the Kremlin? Precisely those who are into the biggest difficulties in explaining "de-Stalinization" and establishing the prestige of the unknown Khrushchev may feel the worst foreboding at the prospect of putting a new god on the pedestal, after the transition of collective leadership" once again ends in the selection of a new first secretary" to wear the mantle of power.

Contrary to the intentions of the top bureaucrats, and even the immediate consequences which can prove to be deceptively encouraging to them, the elimination of Khrushchev, instead of arresting the slow disintegration of the Kremlin's sway over the international Communist movement, can end up by accelerating it. The bureaucracy reproached Khrushchev with having promoted the tendency toward "polycentrism" by his acts. The act of suddenly discarding him can only encourage the growth of this same "polycentrism" in the international communist movement.

Stalin's Men

Without a single leader of high caliber, with only bureaucrats screened and doubly screened by Stalin in the days of the purges and the liquidation of every single figure who displayed the slightest capacity for independent thought, the bureaucracy will prove less capable than ever of re-establishing its prestige after this new low to monolithism. The Soviet bureaucrats will have to accustom themselves to seeing their moves discussed more and more, their wishes subjected to increasing hard criticism in the international Communist movement.

Those parties that have displayed tendencies to follow an independent course, whether to the right as in Italy or to the left as in Venezuela, will now be all the more inclined to give free rein to their inclination. And those parties that managed up to now to present themselves as models in submission, as in France, may suddenly display a quite new look. Polycentrism" will tend increasingly to reveal that it has a logic of its own.

The same logic applies to the workers' states. For them, too, the

downfall of Khrushchev is both an outcome of a crisis profoundly affecting the whole system of workers' states and a new element tending to deepen that crisis. All of them are well aware of the coincidence, if not causal relation, between the explosion of the first Chinese atom bomb and the downfall of Khrushchev. The abrupt removal of the head of the Soviet Union contributes to a radical modification in the relationship between the USSR and the other workers' states.

These states have changed considerably since the days of absolute subordination under Stalin. First they saw the Yugoslav revolt, then the appearance of



Mao Tse-tung

China as an independent power. The feeling of revolt grew high, flaring in the uprisings in East Germany, Poland and Hungary. The Kremlin regained its grip at the cost of some loosening of control. Years followed of steady erosion of the authority of the Soviet bureaucracy under pressure of the masses as well as the indirect consequences of "de-Stalinization." The collapse of Khrushchev dealt this authority another very hard blow. The result will be fresh impetus to "polycentrism" on this level, too.

And what will be the ultimate consequences in Soviet society of Khrushchev's downfall? The masses are ripe for a radical change in the political regime. After the shock of surprise at the abrupt disappearance of Khrushchev from the political scene, the masses will feel inclined for many reasons to demand of the new Kremlin chiefs that they carry out the promises repeatedly made by Khrushchev.

The list of these promises is a long one, ranging from erecting a statue to commemorate the victims of Stalin's terror to assuring a standard of living within a few years equal to that of the workers in the United States. New demands, suggested by the nature of the change-over itself, will be added.

The downfall of Khrushchev will give new and powerful impulsion to critical thought among the masses of the Soviet Union and therefore new and powerful impulsion to further dislocations in the bureaucratic regime.

Historic Crisis

After the liquidation of the cult of Stalin, after the sudden removal of Khrushchev, the Communists in the Soviet Union, in the workers' states and throughout the world can better appreciate the historic scale of the crisis shaking the rule of the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union. They can better understand that far from constituting a threat to the stability of the Soviet state and the "socialist camp," the establishment of the norms of proletarian democracy is a primary condition for achieving stability. Trotsky's analysis is being proved to the hilt.

IV

The main lesson to be drawn from the downfall of Khrushchev is the need for a thoroughgoing change in the political structure of the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev was ousted by a decision of strange nature. Neither the Soviet Communists in their vast majority nor the members of the international Communist movement know who made it, who carried it out, the reasons for it, the arguments advanced. They do not know the views of the victim nor his defense against the secret accusations. Clearly genuine socialist democracy, proletarian democracy, does not exist in the Soviet Union.

Official Propaganda

The official propaganda assures us that a communist society is being constructed; that is, a society in which the state and all forms of constraint associated with the state have disappeared. The official propaganda assures us that "the entire people" holds power (the new program adopted by the CPSU at the Twenty-second Congress solemnly baptized the Soviet state as the "state of the entire people" and the Communist Party as the "party of the entire people").

The people, supposedly in power, saw the government abruptly changed without even knowing what members of the Central Committee were present at the Oct. 14 meeting that made the decision, how they voted, or what the motions were they voted on. It does not know in what respect the program of the new government differs from that of the old. The state belongs to the "entire people" but the "entire people" remain in ignorance of the state's business.

Government power in the Soviet Union is exercised by a force much broader than a single man, even one as dictatorial as Stalin. But clearly it is not the "entire people" nor the proletariat. What is this force?

Bureaucratic Caste

Is it the "Communist Party of the Soviet Union" wielding power in the name of the people? The millions of party members heard the news for the first time over the radio Oct. 15 or read it in *Pravda* the next day. What about the "Central Committee" of the CPSU? This body displayed its real social base when it assembled hundreds of top bureaucrats from all over the country in 1957 to give Khrushchev his mandate. Whether the meeting that deposed Khrushchev was of this character or much smaller, it, too, represented only the bureaucratic caste which has monopolized political power in the Soviet Union for more than 35 years.

In his "testament" — which unquestionably played a role in the downfall of Khrushchev — Palmiro Togliatti declared that the Soviet Union has not yet returned to Leninist norms and has not yet established freedom of opinion and discussion in political questions. This is correct, if but a pale reflection of the truth. The way in which Khrushchev was replaced shows how distant the Soviet Union is from the norms established in Lenin's time when the USSR was much poorer, weaker and under far greater imperialist pressure than today.

The norms of Soviet democracy call for workers' and peasants' councils (soviets), within which all groupings and persons who respect the country's constitution are guaranteed freedom of expression. Under these norms, a congress of all the councils (congress of soviets) designates the head of the government on the basis of a stated program and after full public discussion.

In the Communist Party, Lenin's concept of democratic centralism

meant full discussion among the ranks before decisions were taken by leading bodies, it meant freedom to form tendencies on the basis of publicly declared platforms and with full right to debate the issues before the membership, delegates to decision-making bodies being elected on the basis of such documents and after a democratic discussion throughout the party. Under the conditions of today a system of multiple working-class parties to strengthen the process of proletarian democracy would be quite feasible.

The re-establishment of proletarian democracy in the Soviet Union would greatly strengthen the unity of the proletariat and the peasantry. It would make possible the establishment of popular confidence in the government such as has not existed since the days of Lenin. One of its enormous advantages would be the establishment of an orderly institutional mechanism for the normal changes in leadership.

Abroad, especially in the imperialist countries, the attractiveness of the Soviet Union to the laboring masses would be greatly enhanced. The advantages of Soviet democracy for the workers both individually and as a whole would be proved in life.

It is for the establishment of norms of proletarian democracy along such lines — even broader and more effective than in Lenin's time — that the Fourth International has long battled.

The bourgeois journalists and politicians contrast "Western democracy" with the practices that became established under Stalin. Capitalist democracy, however, never extended into produc-



Kosygin

tive relations, and in the political sphere it has suffered vast erosion, giving way at times to fascism. The norms of proletarian democracy extend right into the factories and farms and throughout the whole structure of society. Proletarian democracy is qualitatively superior to the best ever developed under the bourgeoisie.

Political Revolution

The introduction of socialist democracy in the Soviet Union requires a political revolution to break the monopoly of power now held by the bureaucrats and to return it to the mass of workers in the cities and countryside. The downfall of Khrushchev and the manner in which it was brought about show both how necessary this revolution remains and how its approach is being hastened.

When the Stalin cult was dealt its death blow in the Soviet Union at the Twentieth Congress in 1956, the international Communist

movement was shaken to the bottom. In the United States, for instance, it finished the Communist Party as an effective organization. Elsewhere it gave rise to big discussions, to changes in leadership and to splits.

The Sino-Soviet conflict has had similar impact, the repercussions going far beyond the ranks of the membership. The success of the Cuban Revolution, which brought to the fore a new revolutionary leadership originating outside the Communist movement, added further to the ferment.

Dynamic Ingredient

Khrushchev's downfall now brings a new dynamic ingredient in this gigantic process which at bottom involves the break-up of fossilized structures and the construction of a new revolutionary-socialist leadership on a world scale.

Communist militants therefore have a deep interest in drawing all the lessons from this latest event. They should press for full and free discussion of every single issue involved in the ouster of Khrushchev. One of the first requisites is to hear Khrushchev's own defense of his course. The stenographic record of the sessions that ended with Khrushchev in a minority should be made available at once and Khrushchev should be granted space in the Soviet press and an opportunity to appear on television and the radio to explain his side. All working-class tendencies, including the Trotskyists, should be granted the right to participate in the discussion.

In their own parties, Communist militants everywhere should draw one very big obvious lesson; that is, the danger of relying on Moscow for leadership. The disastrous nature of Stalin's guidance was revealed for the blind to see at the Twentieth Congress. Now fresh revelations are on the agenda concerning the consequences of Moscow's leadership since Stalin's death.

Independent Thought

The Communist parties must learn to work out their own revolutionary Marxist policies independently in the light of the needs of the revolutionary process in their own countries. The end result of this will be to enormously strengthen the camp of the workers' states by hastening the end of capitalism.

The downfall of Khrushchev underscores once again the fact that the major problem facing the international working class is the crisis in leadership. This crisis can be resolved only through the construction of a new leadership genuinely capable of carrying out the program of revolutionary socialism on an international scale — in the imperialist countries, the colonial world and the sectors that have already won their revolutions and achieved the status of workers states. This is what the Fourth International has fought for since its inception.

Peking
vs.

Moscow

**The Meaning
Of the Great Debate**

By William F. Warde

The first comprehensive appraisal of the Sino-Soviet dispute from a Marxist standpoint

50 cents

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

San Francisco, New York Meetings Hear Lane-Belli Debate on Oswald

Large audiences in both San Francisco and New York turned out to hear debates between Mark Lane and Melvin Belli on the Kennedy assassination.

Lane, a former New York state assemblyman, who was retained by Oswald's mother to represent her son before the Warren Commission, has dedicated himself to investigating the Dallas events of last November. He is an unsparing critic of the Commission's procedures and findings. Belli, a celebrated San Francisco attorney, was counsel for Jack Ruby, Oswald's slayer. He is a defender of the Warren Commission's Report.

The San Francisco debate took place Oct. 9 at the Masonic Auditorium with Jake Ehrlich, the noted criminal lawyer, as moderator. The 3,200-capacity hall was nearly sold out.

"Was Oswald the Lone Assassin?" was the title of the New York debate. It was held Oct. 19 at Manhattan Center with William M. Kunstler, the noted civil-rights attorney, as moderator. The 4,000-capacity hall was completely sold out and there were standees. Though both speakers were generously applauded, it was evident that the audience overwhelmingly favored Lane's arguments.

Lane declared that the Warren Report was really a prosecution case against Oswald and that no defense lawyer had been permitted at the secret hearings. He listed witnesses who had not been called before the Commission. He described testimony and evidence which called into question the direction from which the shots at Kennedy were fired, the location of the fatal wound, the identification of Oswald's alleged rifle and numerous other details of the Warren Commission findings.

Belli, too, likened the report to an indictment but declared that since in legal procedure grand-jury proceedings are secret and without defense counsel, the Warren Commission's refusal of counsel for Oswald was not amiss. He failed to discuss the fact that while a grand jury can only bring a charge, the Warren Commission had pronounced a verdict of guilt.

Obviously unequal to Lane in knowledge of the myriad factual details of the case, Belli's main arguments were 1) that Americans must have "faith" in the FBI,



Mark Lane

Secret Service, Dallas police and the eminent men who constituted the Warren Commission; and 2) Lane had no evidence of a conspiracy to kill Kennedy or that anyone other than Oswald had done it. To this Lane replied that while he had no evidence of a conspiracy that did not mean that there could not have been one.

The day of the New York City debate, the Harris public-opinion poll released figures showing that a majority of the American people do not believe the Warren Report answered all the questions about the Kennedy assassination. Of those polled shortly after publication of the Report, 45% did not believe it told the full story; another 10% were unsure.

Compared with a similar poll taken before the issuance of the Report, the number convinced Oswald was the assassin rose from 76% to 87%; the number of those who believe him innocent dropped from 3% to 2%; while 11% are not sure as compared to a previous 21%.

Belief that Oswald had accomplices dropped from 40% to 31%, with 13% unsure. Those believing Oswald was the lone assassin numbered 56%.

Though the Harris Poll makes no mention of it, in almost every other country there is overwhelming disbelief in the official version of the assassination presented in the Warren Report.

... Communist Parties Balk

(Continued from Page 1)

"more complete information and necessary explanations concerning the conditions and the methods under which the changes decided by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were carried out."

In Eastern Europe, CP leaders hedged on direct attacks on the Soviet bureaucracy, but made their criticism apparent through strongly worded praises of Khrushchev, himself. Hungarian Premier Janos Kadar said Oct. 18,

"the hundreds of thousands of Hungarians who in the recent past and also this year were able to welcome Comrade Khrushchev in our country from the depths of their hearts . . . as the tireless fighter for peace did well in so doing and need have no afterthoughts about it subsequently."

Perhaps the weakest criticism—if it is criticism at all—came from the Communist Party of the United States. Implying that the bureaucratic shift had been democratic and parliamentary, Gus Hall declared: "The world can accept with confidence the statements of their leaders that these policies will continue. The Soviet Union will continue to be a bastion of world peace."

While praising Khrushchev for "an historic contribution," Hall condemned Khrushchev's method of "mobilizing the grass roots before an idea was presented to the leading bodies." With no "grass-roots" pressure on the long-discredited CPUSA, Hall, unlike the French and Italian leaders, attempts to preserve the illusion that the Kremlin bureaucrats were responsible leaders of the Soviet and world working class.

This image, long projected by CP leaders, is becoming increasingly untenable, as the repercussions of the latest coup in the Kremlin become felt around the world.

Antioch Gives "Der Fuehrer" A Hard Time

By Arthur Maglin

YELLOW SPRING, Ohio — George Lincoln Rockwell, leader of the American Nazi Party, spoke here at Antioch College Oct. 14. The audience of 800 — mostly students — was obviously hostile to the racist and reactionary poison he offered.

Rockwell called Antioch "the vilest" and "the most communistic race-mixing college" in the United States. In his attack he hopped onto the witch-hunt bandwagon started by the American Legion whose recent national convention in Dallas called for a Congressional investigation of Antioch. The veterans' organization was angered by the college's policy of allowing speakers of all viewpoints on the campus, which the Legion said, allowed "Communists" to propagandize the students.

Rockwell said that he was against not only Johnson, but Goldwater as well, because the Republican nominee was not a true right-winger. His proof was the assertion that Goldwater is a "Jew." The American Nazi leader also predicted the future occupancy of the White House as follows: Johnson in '64, Goldwater in '68, and Rockwell in '72.

At the close of Rockwell's speech, the audience, virtually as one man, got up and left without waiting for the question period. This method of expressing opposition to what Rockwell stands for had been recommended in a leaflet distributed before the meeting by the Antioch Committee for Racial Equality. While Rockwell spoke ACRE also distributed six-pointed Stars of David for people to wear in protest against the anti-Semitic utterances of the speaker. About half the audience wore the stars which Hitler had made obligatory dress for Jews in the period before they were arrested and exterminated.

A small picket line had been formed outside the hall. One of the pickets, reportedly a former Jewish refugee from Hitler, bore a sign reading: "In Memory of 6,000,000 Jews Killed by Rockwell's Associates."

... Student Rally

(Continued from Page 1)

Freedom Now or continue supporting the Democratic Party.

The dynamic FNP candidate for Congress pinned Conyers to the wall on the question of support to Samuel Olsen, the Democratic candidate for re-election as the Democratic Wayne County (Detroit) Prosecutor, who is notorious for his anti-Negro bias. Conyers, who claims to have opposed Olsen in the past, said he wouldn't ask people to vote for the Freedom Now candidate "because Olsen will win anyway."

While Conyers said he would vote for Johnson, Henry declared he would vote "for this man here," pointing to Clifton DeBerry. About 180 people, mostly young, attended this session of the conference.

James Shabazz outlined the living conditions of Negroes in America in a talk entitled "Twentieth Century Slaves." Negroes are economic slaves, cultural slaves, political slaves and religious slaves, he said. "Capitalism is synonymous with slavery for me, the black man."

Edward Shaw's subject was "How to Fight the Ultra-Right." He analyzed the drift to the right in America, and discussed what fascism is.

The last session of the conference was a talk by Barry Shepard, national chairman of the Young Socialist Alliance.

Coast Guard Jails Pacifists Seeking to Sail for Havana



JAILED AGAIN. CNVA peace walkers during trek through Georgia where they were jailed several times. Sailing from Miami they were arrested by Coast Guard.

NEW YORK, Oct. 27 — The office of the Committee for Non-violent Action (CNVA) said here this afternoon that five members of the Quebec-Washington-Guantanamo Walk for Peace were arrested while attempting to sail to Cuba today. The Coast Guard brought the *Spirit of Freedom*, the 24-foot powerboat of the Peace Walkers, into tow shortly after it left Miami.

After towing the boat to one of its stations, the Coast Guard proceeded to "seize" it. The five crew members refused to leave their boat, and the Coast Guard then called in the Miami Beach police and had them arrested on charges of "trespassing" and interfering with the normal operation of the Coast Guard, according to the CNVA office.

The group has spent the last three months in Miami, where they have been getting their boat in shape for the voyage and attempting to secure passports validated for travel to Cuba by the State Department. After repeated failures to secure such passports, the CNVA-sponsored group decided to go to Cuba in defiance of the ban on travel there.

The Quebec-Washington-Guantanamo Walk for Peace began in May 1963 in Canada, and marched its way down to Florida. The inter-racial group met racist violence and police harassment in some Southern states. The Walk was tied up in Albany, Ga., for two months. There they suffered at the hands of Chief Laurie Pritchett's police and were repeatedly jailed.

In Florida, they met with violence from Cuban counter-revolutionaries. The pacifists intended to go to Cuba to complete the last leg of their Walk, from Havana to the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo.

The Peacewalkers carried signs and distributed leaflets, on the U.S.-part of their march, urging a friendly attitude toward Cuba and calling for the rescinding of the ban on travel to the island. If and when any members of the CNVA group get to Cuba, they plan to urge Cubans to adopt

"nonviolent alternatives" to U.S. aggression. At the U.S. base at Guantanamo, they will conduct a nonviolent demonstration, calling for abandonment of the base.

Those arrested today are Bradford Lyttle, Marv Davidov, Peter Gregonis, Bob Clapp, and Erica Enzer.

Lethal Bomb Sent To 'Worker' Office

NEW YORK — A highly lethal bomb was received in the mail at the office of the *Worker*, the bi-weekly newspaper which expresses the views of the Communist Party, here on Oct. 21. It was rigged to explode when a string attached to the outer wrapping was pulled, as would normally happen when the package was unwrapped.

The package was addressed to the *Worker* Staff, care of George Morris, the labor editor. Morris was suspicious of the package which was labeled "Educational Materials" but did not feel like books, and called the police.

The return address on the package was the Modern Bookshop in Chicago, which sells the *Worker*. The manager of the bookshop said that he too had received a crude incendiary device in the mail on Oct. 17.

On Sept. 7 a fire bomb exploded in the basement of the building in which the *Worker* office is located. The fire was confined to the office of *Political Affairs*, the theoretical magazine of the Communist Party.

Back in Print In Defense Of Marxism

by

Leon Trotsky

Unavailable for nearly two decades. This invaluable handbook of Marxist theory probes the class nature of the Soviet state and provides a major exposition of dialectical materialism.

paperback

\$2.50

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

Yours for the Asking

For books and pamphlets on Cuba, the Freedom Now struggle, the labor movement, socialist theory, send for a free copy of our catalogue.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

Letters From Our Readers

[This column is an open forum for all viewpoints on subjects of general interest to our readers. Please keep your letters brief. Where necessary they will be abridged. Writers' initials will be used, names being withheld unless authorization is given for use.]

"Without Fear"

Princeton, N.J.

Having heard your vice-presidential candidate on the radio I am writing to obtain a copy of your election platform, or perhaps some other piece of election campaign literature pertaining to general philosophy or policies.

I can only say I was greatly impressed. It is refreshing beyond words to hear a voice coming from

the radio, of all places, speaking without fear.

I will pay whatever cost are necessary for the literature.

D.L.

Rejects 2 Major Parties

Philadelphia, Pa.

I also feel that the two major parties do not offer a suitable candidate. As an American and a worker, I could not give either man my support this year. I will vote for a third-party candidate. Because of this I will appreciate any information available on the Socialist Workers Party candidates, platform, etc.

J.B.

Opposes Vietnam War

Carbondale, Ill.

I am opposed to the war being carried on in Vietnam by U.S. troops. From all the press reports coming out, it will only be a matter of time before another full-scale intervention starts, with all the tragic loss this would involve. What can I do to promote the candidacy of Clifton DeBerry and Edward Shaw?

R.P.

For Socialist Course

Filmore, Utah

Your symposium article (Sept. 21) was timely and hurrah for Shaw. The issue is not Johnson vs. Goldwater, but social justice vs. rigged exploitation.

When and where has free-booting imperialism relinquished its stranglehold without a blood-bath? Did Russia, China, Cuba, secure their independence by soliciting the graces of their Johnsons over their Goldwaters? No, friends. If you cannot be a staunch socialist, please get out of the movement before it becomes too corrupted.

A. C. Gregersen

The Warren Report

New York, N.Y.

Well, the Great Report to the nation is out and over. Thousands of pages of testimony. Ten months to write over a million words. And what started on account of big business — the lords of the steel industry's discontent — and the civil-rights forwarding movement, which brought about the assassination of the late President Kennedy, ended with the glorious triumph of big business — books galore; profits, money, dollars!

It was not a plot or conspiracy, they resolved. Harvey Lee Oswald was the sole assassin of the late president, and the sole killer of officer Tippit. And the "insane" Jack Ruby also acted alone when he murdered Oswald. Period!

If there were too many questions to be answered at the time of that sad national event, there are even more questions to be answered today, at the end of that Special Commission Report.

Haven't we read of some people who heard more than three shots, or what sounded to them like fire crackers or backfire?

And that the preliminary findings of some surgeons at the Parkland Memorial Hospital found an entrance wound on the President's throat? Though this was later discounted in the Report.

Weren't some policemen and civilians with guns on the overpass where the motorcade was to go under seconds later? Or on the grassy knoll close to the railroad overpass? Where were Ruby and officer Tippit at that time?

Thought for the Week

"No one else on the face of the earth today is blowing up churches and getting away with it. We all know that if a Negro would blow up one church anyplace, the FBI would not sleep until they brought him in. So, this proves to me not only that the FBI is not only a very vicious group but also shows that the FBI, as far as the Negro is concerned, is a second Ku Klux Klan." — Dick Gregory commenting on Southern racist violence in a special issue of *Rampart* magazine entitled, "Mississippi Eyewitness."

The Commission also discounted lawyer Mark Lane's findings of a meeting on Nov. 14 at Ruby's Club in which Ruby, Tippit and a Bernard Weissman met.

A research team, husband and wife, George and Patricia Nash of the Columbia University's bureau of Applied Social Research has found new witnesses to officer Tippit's slaying, and their names are given. One of them saw a grey car, and a man getting in and driving off at the time of the shooting. These witnesses were discarded by the Commission.

Who was, or is, behind the silencing of Tippit and Oswald?

The lies, crimes and injustices in this rotten society under capitalism could only be erased out when we all have chosen socialism as our system and way of life. Let's vote Socialist Workers Party on Nov. 3.

Jose (Chico) Cuba

Utah Socialist

Salt Lake City, Utah

As a student of political, social and economic affairs, I am very interested in the socialist alternative to capitalism with its social decay, poverty, unemployment, inequality and threat of war.

I regard our present social system as unjust, unfair, stupid, authoritarian and inefficient. But am unable to defend the interests of the people in the face of these "free-enterprise" idiots. I have been studying socialism for some time now but still feel "uneducated."

I feel that only through education can we convince people of the benefits of socialism. Anything you can send me to further that goal will be appreciated.

I do not think this election is

truly for two divergent modes of political thought. It will be an election to indicate who will continue as the servant of the status quo.

I know you are running a campaign to offer the American people a choice — not an echo of defunct capitalism. Could you send me campaign material — for example, buttons, bumper stickers, policy positions, speeches, etc. This would be much appreciated because Utah has NO opposition to ignorance and stupidity.

M.P.

Liked Shaw Talk

Madison, N.J.

Mr. Shaw's radio address on WOR aroused my interest in your party platform and purposes. Please send me pertinent information on these subjects. Thank you.

R.C.

The Ultra-Right Threat

Detroit, Mich.

The 1964 Presidential campaign has served to clearly point out just how potentially dangerous the neo-fascist right-wing has become. While a defeat of Senator Goldwater will not demolish the ultra-conservative movement it will serve to check the unbridled slanders and misrepresentations on socialism being fostered by the capitalist lackeys Goldwater and Miller. *The Militant* cannot be too vigilant on the source of our possible national suicide, namely the resurgence of McCarthyism. The crude and apparent tactics of the infamous Senator McCarthy have been replaced by the Madison Avenue-type pandering of Goldwater-Welch & Co. It has been stated with obvious validity that the Arizona Senator is attempting to make the entire ultra-right respectable.

To defeat the forces of racism,

reaction, and economic exploitation it is necessary that such papers as *The Militant* and all interested liberals band together in one unified common effort. It is nothing less than a scandal that while the forces of the radical right can combine to achieve their vile goals; forces of the Left constantly fight each other. Right now is the time for a coalition or "Popular Front" to embrace all elements of the democratic and progressive Left. Without such a coalition the Birchites will pick off the political Left like "sitting ducks."

I have also noticed that the vast bulk of organizations of the Left have taken a soft stand as regards abolition of HUAC; the McCarran Act; and especially the continued political persecution of the Communist Party here in the United States. In a country that prides itself on democratic ideals it amounts to rank hypocrisy that we permit fascist-bent parties like the National States Rights Party on the ballot and yet harass and try to destroy legitimate parties on the Left.

Unless the broad scope of political organizations on the Left make an effort for national unity; then the fanatic sense of unity of the Right will ultimately destroy us. If the effort is not taken soon our only recourse will be to "take to the streets." The time is NOW and we must make the choice NOW!"

R.M.W.

Wants Platforms

New York, N.Y.

I saw the program on NYC's Channel 7 and would like ten copies of the Socialist Workers Party platform and campaign positions before the election.

R.M.

It Was Reported in the Press

That Mississippi A-Blast — We were reminded of the movie, "Dr. Strangelove," when we read the accounts of the underground atomic blast set off in Mississippi by the Atomic Energy Commission. According to the UPI, "On the surface at the blast site were a collection of instruments, a Confederate battle flag and a small sign that said: 'The South shall rise again.'" Mississippi Negroes might have considered it a nice touch if someone could have had added to the sign: "On a mushroom cloud."

Bossomania — An Oct. 17 AP dispatch from Los Angeles reported: "Are you sore at the boss — but don't dare show it? Maybe you've got status medicamentosa. Says Dr. C.W. Wahl, of the UCLA Neuropsychiatric Institute: 'Self-medication with aspirins, tranquilizers, cough syrup, sleeping pills and what-have-you often produces a bizarre set of symptoms hard to diagnose . . . Among the important causes is frustration created by suppressing ill-feeling toward the boss, Wahl told the Industrial Health Conference yesterday.'"

Partially Reconstructed — In the old days the Communist Party refused, as a matter of "principle," to speak on the same platform with Trotskyists. This week the editors of *The Worker* dis-

carded such sectarianism to the extent of accepting an invitation from the *National Guardian* to participate in its New York election symposium with editors of various left-of-center publications including *The Militant*. However, in running the *Guardian's* ad for the meeting, *The Worker*, without permission, deleted the listing of *The Militant* and the Progressive Labor Movement paper, *Challenge*.

Thank-You Note — A number of readers have responded to our request for clippings suitable for this column. Among other things, this helps when we slip up on something. For example, a Chicago reader sent us an Oct. 7 AP item that we had failed to pick up. It was about David Lilienthal's revelation that the U.S. had been planning to use poison gas against Japan and dropped the idea only because Britain feared it would provoke a German gas attack on

England. Lilienthal, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said the disclosure had been made to him by the late Gen. Marshall, who "made no mention of the fact that international law forbade its use."

Keeping Record Straight — A headline in the Oct. 23 *New York Times* announced: "Priest Denies View: Church Is Pro-Union." The story was about a statement of a Roman Catholic priest issued by the National-Right-to-Work Committee which is spear-heading the drive for open-shop "right-to-work" laws.

He'll Keep It That Way — Rep. Bruce Alger, the Texas Republican, who is against virtually all forms of welfare legislation, philosophizes that "The needy have always been with us." Mr. Alger is also opposed to legislation to help the mentally ill. But he has declared that he favors mental health.

SPECIAL \$1 INTRODUCTORY OFFER

To reach the widest audience with our coverage of the Freedom Now Movement we are offering a 4-month introductory subscription to *The Militant* for \$1. (\$1.50 outside of the U.S.)

Name

Street Zone

City State

Send to *The Militant*, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.



Cops Abuse, Beat and Jail Negro Candidate in Detroit

DETROIT — Richard David, Socialist Workers Party candidate for Congress, is the latest victim of this city's anti-Negro police force. After being insulted and beaten, David was jailed. Five of his friends and campaign workers were also jailed.

The incident, as related by the socialist candidate and the other victims, was as follows.

Late in the evening of Friday, Oct. 23, David drove to Debs Hall at 3737 Woodward Ave. Robert Higgins, a passenger in the car, went into the hall on an errand, leaving David and Mrs. Dorothea Breitman sitting in the car. David is Negro, Mrs. Breitman is white.

While they were waiting, two white men walked to the car parked ahead of them. Upon noticing the mixed couple, these men began to shout racial insults, calling Mrs. Breitman a "nigger-lover." David got out of his car and was soon in a fight with the two. They beat him over the head with a flashlight, wrestled him to the pavement and were choking him. Mrs. Breitman tried to intervene but was knocked aside, suffering an injured ankle.

Upon returning, Higgins saw that two men had David down and he went to his friend's aid. The assailant whom he engaged identified himself as a detective and Higgins stopped struggling.

Several police cars arrived on the scene. Without listening to any explanations police started hustling David, Higgins and Mrs. Breitman into the cars. By this

time the noise had been heard upstairs in Debs Hall and some members of the Youth Committee for DeBerry and Shaw there came down to investigate. They saw David and the two others being showed into police cars.

One, Daniel Rosenshine, 20, asked the police why they were being arrested. He was immediately grabbed and shoved into a police car. His companion Edward D'Angelo, 17, who had said nothing, was likewise arrested. A third youth, James Griffin, 17, who was simply standing in the crowd of bystanders, was recognized by a cop as one of those detained earlier in the week for distributing DeBerry-Shaw leaflets, and was also arrested.

All six were held overnight in the jail. One of the youths was kicked and his nose bloodied by a cop who threw him into the jail cell. The next morning their release was secured on \$500 bond each. David required hospital treatment for bruises about the head and severe bruises and swelling of his neck and throat.

David did not learn that the men in civilian clothes were detectives till he was in the car taking him to the station. Mrs. Breitman (put in a different car) did not learn this fact till the next morning.

The story told by the police to the assistant prosecutor was that the two plainclothes men had been walking along the street when David suddenly jumped out of a parked car, yelled at them: "You hate all niggers, well I hate all whites, I'm going to kill you —"; and thereupon attacked them. Police also said that in swinging at one of the detectives David missed and broke the windshield of their car with his fist. (David's fist shows no such cuts or bruises as would result therefrom).

Formal charges were lodged Oct. 27 as follows: (1) David and Higgins — assault and battery; (2) David — malicious destruction of property; (3) Mrs. Breitman, D'Angelo and Rosenshine — interfering with an officer. Charges against Griffin were dropped.

All defendants are being represented by Attorney Milton Henry, the Freedom Now Party candidate for Congress in the First District, and by O. Lee Mollette, vice president of GOAL, this city's militant Negro organization.



Richard David

KENTUCKY MINERS' CASE

Charges Dropped Against Berman Gibson

The federal case against Berman Gibson, leader of unemployed miners in Eastern Kentucky, has been dropped for lack of evidence. Gibson and seven others were tried for "conspiracy and attempt to dynamite a railroad bridge" last June. Three miners were acquitted, four were convicted, and the jury deadlocked on Gibson, with ten of the 12 jurors voting for acquittal. The federal prosecutor had thereupon scheduled a re-trial of Gibson for Oct. 14.

A campaign of harassment and intimidation against the Appalachian Committee for Full Employment, the organization formed by the unemployed miners, has been going on in Hazard, Ky.

The night of Oct. 6, six rifle shots crashed into the home of the Committee's vice president, Rev. Jason Combs. Shortly thereafter another fusillade was fired into the Committee's headquarters. No one was hit, but Combs and his wife were sleeping directly in the path of a bullet stopped only by a piece of furniture.

Everette Tharp, secretary of the

Committee, charged that coal operators and local officials were attempting to destroy the Appalachian Committee. He said a telegram had been sent to Gov. Breathitt asking for protection. Similar demands were made on city and county officials. Committee officials say they do "not get the protection of any police powers of this state — local or state."

Students from various parts of the country who came to Hazard to help the miners in their fight were a particular target of police harassment.

Fake Charge

One student, Steve Ashton, for example, was arrested on a trumped up charge of "libel" for writing a letter — which was never sent to anyone — describing conditions in the area and the conduct of the authorities.

The appeals in the cases of the four miners convicted in the frame-up trial are being prepared by the Committee for Miners, 1165

Malcolm X Will Distribute 35 Scholarships



Malcolm X

Malcolm X, whose recent activities in Africa were instrumental in getting the Organization of African Unity to pass a resolution condemning racism in the United States, announced that he has received a number of scholarships from African and Arab countries which will enable young Afro-Americans to go abroad to study — expense-free.

Twenty scholarships were made available by the Supreme Council on Islamic Affairs at the University of Al-Azhar in Cairo, Egypt, where Malcolm X has been guest of state for several months. Fifteen scholarships were granted to the University of Medina in Saudi Arabia.

The scholarships are to be distributed to Afro-Americans between the ages of 16 and 30. Distribution will be nation-wide. For further information write: Malcolm X Scholarships, 2090 Seventh Ave., Suite 128, New York 27, N.Y. Letters must be received by Nov. 15.

According to an Oct. 11 *New York Times* account, Malcolm X plans to return to the U.S. after the Nov. 3 elections. He also reiterated his earlier position on the presidential campaign that it was a mistake for Negroes to become identified with either the Democratic or Republican parties.



Berman Gibson

Most GM Plants Back; Key Issues Unsettled

By William Bundy

OCT. 27 — The United Auto Workers' strike of General Motors came to a formal end nationally on Oct. 25, after a full month, but a number of key plants remained on strike over so-called "local" issues. The key issues of job-security and speed-up were touched upon by the national agreement, which was ratified Oct. 25 in local meetings across the country, but these problems actually remain unresolved.

Most of the "local" issues actually involve these matters and it will be impossible for local unions to make much progress on them within the limits set by the national agreement.

On the question of job-security — providing more jobs, and protection against job-loss through automation — the national contract will have almost no effect. In this respect the key feature of the national agreement — in Chrysler and Ford as well as GM — is the provision for retirement at age 60 instead of 65. This is put forth by UAW President Walter Reuther as a job-creating measure, since men who retire make room for younger men.

In this case, however, it requires such long service with the company to be eligible for the earlier retirement that not many men are expected to be able to take advantage of it. Economists generally agree that the new auto contracts will create no significant number of job openings.

The traditional demand of the labor movement for creating jobs — the shorter work week with no reduction in pay or "30 for 40" as it is often called in the UAW — has simply been buried by the conservative Reuther machine.

On the question of speed-up, a key feature of the national GM contract is an increase in the number of hours allowed to union committeemen for handling workers' grievances inside the plants. But GM will still not allow full-time union committeemen in the plants (though they exist at Ford and Chrysler) and unsettled grievances will still pile up. On the main principle regarding speed-up — the right of the workers to a voice in regulating the speed of the assembly line or production process — the com-



Reuther

pany made no concessions whatever. In fact, Reuther did not raise the demand for workers' control of the speed of the line in these negotiations.

Twenty-eight key units, including most of the assembly plants where speed-up is worst — remain on strike over "local" issues. The striking locals, however, are more or less on their own and are faced with fighting for local improvements in working conditions which the company will now claim are in conflict with the national pattern.

Thus Reuther has set it up for the first national GM strike since 1946 to end "not with a bang but a whimper" — not with a historic victory over GM on working conditions and job security but with the dribbling out of the fighting spirit of the rank and file.

The real story of this GM strike is that it has been an attempt by Reuther to allow the rank and file to "blow off steam" in a well-controlled national strike and then in the local strikes without ever really coming to grips with the problems that caused the steam to build up in the first place. The most remarkable thing about the strike is that it revealed the existence of more steam than almost anyone expected.

Paul Boutelle Sues New York For \$25,000 for False Arrest

NEW YORK — Paul Boutelle, Freedom Now Party candidate for state senator of the 21st District in Harlem, has filed a suit against the City of New York and its police department for \$25,000 damages.

Boutelle was arrested at an Oct. 8 street meeting in Harlem, when he refused to follow police orders to stop speaking. Police Captain Kruzewski told Boutelle that he could not speak on the election because of an injunction issued after the disorders in Harlem last August. This flagrantly illegal injunction specified individuals and groups forbidden to hold meetings in Harlem, but neither the Freedom Now Party nor Boutelle were among those listed.

The American Civil Liberties Union defended Boutelle against charges of disorderly conduct and obstructing the sidewalk. ACLU attorney Nancy Dembitz won an acquittal for the defendant.

Boutelle maintains that by its criminal prosecution and harassment of him the City of New York prevented the people of Harlem from making a real choice among candidates for state senator in the

21st District. He believes that the Democratic candidate, Constance Baker Motley, and the Republican, Cora Walker, offer no real choice. Boutelle has retained Conrad Lynn, civil-rights attorney, to prosecute his claim against the City.



Paul Boutelle