

PL

50¢

PROGRESSIVE LABOR

Vol 8 No 4

March 1972

'30 FOR 40'

The Historic Struggle of U.S. Workers for the Shorter Work-day

CAUCUSES: The Road to Workers' Power in Trade Unions

SDS Fights Racism

Call to A Convention

Book Review: *SDS-A Profile*

Students and Revolution

Drugs: The U.S. Government is the Biggest Pusher of All

Rebellion in Ceylon

Send for PLP Publications

CHALLENGE-DESAFIO

Newspaper in English and Spanish reporting and analyzing struggles from the shops, campus and communities.

1 Year, \$3.00

PL MAGAZINE

Magazine of political analysis

6 issues—\$2.50 Single issue—50¢

PAMPHLETS & BOOK

1. **Build a Base in the working class**.....50¢
What PLP is; how we organize; why a revolutionary party is necessary.
2. **PLP Trade Union Program**.....25¢
Building the rank and file to fight the bosses and union misleaders; the role of communists.
3. **Black Liberation**.....25¢
The relation of working-class struggle and theory to black national consciousness; the bosses' trap of nationalist ideology; the central role of black workers in the class struggle.
4. **Vietnam: People's War or Negotiations?**.....25¢
The history of imperialist war against the Vietnamese people; the role of the Kennedy-Fulbright liberals in support of U.S. aggression.
5. **SIT-DOWN—The Great Flint Sit-Down Strike Against General Motors, 1936-1937**.....25¢
How the auto workers occupied the GM plants for 44 days and nights and won industrial unionism in the CIO.
6. **Rank-and-File Caucuses for Workers' Power in Unions**.....5¢
Organizing committees of workers to fight the boss on the job and throw out the sellout leadership to take power in the unions.
7. **Students and Revolution**.....5¢
How the contradictions of capitalism exposed the nature of class society and the role of education in advancing the bosses' ideology. A national strategy for smashing racism on the campus and uniting students with workers.
8. **Program for Workers in Auto, Steel, Telephone, Electrical, Transit and other industries**.....5¢ each
9. **REVOLUTION, U.S.A.**.....\$2.00
Strategic ideas for revolutionary struggle in the U.S., a collection of basic PLP articles in recent years. (355 page book)

Progressive Labor Party,
Box 808, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

Send me: **CHALLENGE-DESAFIO**
 1year - \$3.00

PL MAGAZINE
 6 issues, \$2.50
 current issue, 50¢

PAMPHLETS:
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
6. 7. 8. 9.

Enclosed is \$

Name

Address

City

State


Zip

Union & Local; or School

I would like more information about the Progressive Labor Party.

In This Issue of Progressive Labor

- ✓ **EDITORIAL:** Intense imperialist rivalries are clearly demonstrated during and after the India-Pakistan war. A declining U.S. imperialism takes in the Chinese Communist Party as its junior partner, while the soviet opportunists rapidly overtake their previous mentors, U.S. bosses. The editorial demonstrates how the U.S. devaluation of the dollar indicates a floundering and sinking U.S. economy. The goal of world harmony of U.S. bosses is being dashed on the shoals of class struggle... 2
- ✓ **'THIRTY FOR FORTY':** The historical goal of U.S. workers has been the shorter work-day. Workers around the world have responded to the lead of U.S. workers. May Day has become the revolutionary holiday of the international working class. Thirty for Forty puts workers on the offensive in the face of the bosses' attacks. Finally, the article shows the relationship between the fight for '30 for 40' and revolution; in the last analysis the thing which is going to go a long way in meeting the aspirations of workers and their ideas is communist revolution... 10
- ✓ **BUILD CAUCUSES:** This article points out that workers are helpless if they rely on the union leadership. What is necessary, the article states, is the need for independent workers' organization at the point of production. This form of organization—the caucus—can give leadership and ultimately win the struggle for power of the workers in the shops. Additionally, there is the need to integrate revolutionary politics in shop struggles, because the long-range struggle requires winning state power by the working class. A coalition of communists and the broad masses of workers can lead to both goals—power in the shop, and state power..... 28
- ✓ **STUDENTS AND REVOLUTION:** A Progressive Labor Party pamphlet; how the contradictions of capitalism exposed the nature of class society and the role of education in advancing the bosses' ideology. A national strategy for smashing racism on the campus and uniting students with workers 33
- ✓ **SDS— A PROFILE:** This book review tries to summarize some of the author's important ideas and information about the SDS. In brief, it places two lines before the reader: One trend in the SDS wants to go it alone; it has no concept of how to win. This drives them to nutty—but dangerous (and anti-working class) actions. The other trend in SDS wanted alliances with workers based on mutual needs of students and workers. They realized that significant social change and revolution can only take place through this massive alliance, with workers in the lead. The book also refutes many anti-communist lies about the PLP..... 37
- ✓ **A CALL TO THE SDS CONVENTION:** Students from all over the world converge on Harvard this Easter to fight racism and anti-working class ideas. Hundreds of anti-racist and pro-working class actions precede the convention. It is a fighting convention, proving "it ain't dead," and especially that most students can be won to anti-boss ideas 42
- ✓ **LITTLE BIG MAN:** A significant movie review depicting how the liberals pander to the people's intuitive support for the oppressed, only to divert them from real action..... 42
- ✓ **THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IS THE BIGGEST DRUG PUSHER:** The writer shows how the bosses, through their media, help stimulate young people to use drugs. Students and workers on drugs can't fight oppression. Once the bosses get you hooked on "illegal drugs," they then hook you on "legal" drugs—especially methadone. This drug is administered by the ruling class, and it ties you to them for life. Another holding device they use is the various anti-drug agencies. These sob-sisters push bosses' ideas on addicts, further consolidating the rulers' hold over their victims. Future articles will deal with other aspects of this question 51
- ✓ **INSIDE RACIST LIBERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS** 46
- ✓ **CIO: 1937-1950** 75
- ✓ **REBELLION IN CEYLON** 82
- ✓ **Letters to the Editor** 7



Published by the Progressive Labor Party

PROGRESSIVE LABOR: G.P.O. Box 808
BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

to contact PLP:

- CALIFORNIA**—Long Beach: Box 1124, Long Beach, Cal. 90801; Los Angeles: Box 19724, Los Angeles, Cal. 90019; Monterey-Salinas: Box 426, Seaside, Cal. 93955; Oakland: Box 23612, Oakland, Cal. 94623; San Diego: Box 8156, San Diego, Cal. 92102; San Francisco: Box 562, San Francisco, Cal. 94101 San Jose: 10096 Torrance Ave., San Jose, Cal. 95127.
- GEORGIA**—Box 54176, Civic Center Station, Atlanta; Ga. 30308.
- ILLINOIS**—Box 7814, Chicago, Ill. 60680.
- INDIANA**—Box 106, Gary, Ind. 46401.
- MARYLAND-WASHINGTON, D.C.**—Box 3081, Washington, D.C. 20010
- MASSACHUSETTS**—Box 1336, Boston, Mass. 02104.
- MICHIGAN**—Box 1162A, Detroit, Mich. 48216.
- MISSOURI**—Box 6027, Kansas City, Mo. 64110
- NEW JERSEY**—Box 1326, Newark, N.J. 07101.
- NEW YORK**—Albany: Box 843, Albany, N.Y. 12210; Buffalo: Box 74F, Buffalo, N.Y. 14212; New York City: GPO, Box 808, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201 & Rm. 617, 1 Union Sq. W., N.Y.C. 10025 (Manhattan); Rochester: Box 8468, Rochester, N.Y. 14618
- OHIO**—Box 10209, Cleveland, Ohio 44110.
- PENNSYLVANIA**—Philadelphia: Box 6930, Philadelphia, Pa. 19132; Pittsburgh: Box 10248, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15232.
- TEXAS**—Corpus Christi: Box 8281, Corpus Christi, Tex. 78412; Ft. Hood: Box 1258, Kalleen, Tex. 76541; Houston: Box 8510, Houston, Tex. 77009.
- UTAH**—720 South 12th East, Salt Lake City, Utah 84102.
- WASHINGTON**—Box 12774, Seattle, Wash. 98112.

Subscription rates: \$2.50 per six issues, 50¢ per issue.
Airmail subscription rates:
USA, North and South America — \$7
Europe (excluding Eastern Europe) — \$10
Asia, Africa, Middle East Oceania and Eastern Europe — \$12

Unity of International Working Class Will Defeat ALL Imperialist Bosses

The headline in the San Francisco **Chronicle** said "1971 was a good year for President Nixon." For U.S. workers 1971 was a bad year, but for U.S. bosses 1971 was not a particularly good year either. Two severe defeats at the end of 1971 shook the U.S. bosses' empire—the dismemberment of Pakistan and the currency crisis. A look at these two defeats for U.S. bosses will show how far downhill they've slid in recent years.

The new nation of Bangladesh was born out of the India-Pakistan war but its independence will be in name only. The economic strings will be continued to be held by outside forces. Hundreds of thousands of peasants and workers were slaughtered by W. Pakistan and the already small and weak Bengali capitalist class was virtually wiped out by the fascist West Pakistani generals in a Hitler-like genocide of all Bengali upper and middle classes. Thus when the new Bangladesh cabinet moved to Dacca in the baggage train of the Indian army they had no "capable administrators." The remaining Bengali nationalists relied on their class instincts. Rather than risk the workers and peasants of Bangladesh taking over, they asked the Indian government to provide administrators. The obliging Indian bourgeoisie was all too glad to staff the state structure of the new "independent nation."

The Indian army stayed on "to maintain order," and to protect the Pakistani war criminals from their deserved fate at the hands of the Bengali people. The first order of the Indian army was to try to disarm the Mukti Bahani guerrillas made up largely of Bengali workers and peasants. It is certain that life of the superexploited working people of Bangladesh will not change much under the new government. The logic of nationalism in today's world leads only to trading one boss class for another.

This does not mean the war was without significance. On the contrary, it represents the biggest victory of the Soviet imperialists since World War II. As the main power behind the Indian bourgeoisie, the Russians became the real rulers of Bangladesh, and in the bargain tightened their growing control over the Indian economy and government. The U.S. imperialists suffered a devastating defeat; as the power behind the Pakistani generals, they lost big, not only in Bangladesh, but in India. Their new-found allies, the Chinese boss class was likewise knocked down in their first major venture in power politics.

The currency crisis likewise represents a U.S. defeat; this time at the hands of the Japanese and Franco-German imperialists. While the agreement



GOING INDIA: While Pakistan is on the brink of war, a bit of diplomacy is being done to light. Despite heavy criticism from many nations, China continues to support the regime against East Pakistan. The Soviets recently signed a treaty with East Pakistan. A casual observer might expect a vigorous propaganda barrage from the U.S. But diplomacy doesn't work that way. There was a warm exchange of notes between the U.S. and Chou En-lai on the occasion of his visit to the U.N., but now it appears that diplomatic relations will be resumed between the two nations. In the midst of frantic troop movements along the East Pakistan border, India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi paused to say a few words to Pakistan's ally, China, and concluded with a mission in Peking and New Delhi to secure a temporary ambassadorial status.



Mary McGrory

— THE TWO MYSTERIES

WASHINGTON.

The mystery of Richard Nixon's resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam was exceeded only by the mystery of Chou En-lai's acceptance of it.

Chou En-lai could have stopped the raids by hinting that their author would not be welcome in Peking. Chou apparently knew the attacks were coming. While the thunder of jets filled the sky of his old ally, the announcement was made that the advance logistics party from his new friend in the White House would leave for Peking on schedule.

In other words, Chou is as anxious for Richard Nixon to come to China as Nixon is to go.

Ever since the trip was announced, American peace circles were wondering if the Chinese leader was a secret Republican, dedicated to the reelection of Richard Nixon and willing to let him open his campaign in the Forbidden City.

Now he surely has demonstrated that he is ready to join the big power poker club, whose members never trouble themselves about little guys who get clobbered.

* * *

hammered out at the Smithsonian Institute probably represents the best the U.S. imperialists could hope for under the circumstances, and Nixon hailed it as a victory, the devaluation of the dollar is another milestone in the decline and fall of the American Empire. The "American Century" proclaimed in 1945 was to be based on the power of the U.S. dollar and the U.S. military machine. The Vietnam war chewed up the U.S. military machine to the point where the best they could do to help their client state Pakistan was to send an aircraft carrier and a few destroyers into the Bay of Bengal in a gesture so weak it only provoked contempt in India.

The sixties which saw the U.S. military weakened in Vietnam also saw the "almighty dollar" knocked off its pedestal. The imperialist powers that had suffered most in World War II, Germany Italy, Japan and France—launched a series of attacks on the over-extended dollar that culminated in devaluation agreed upon at the Smithsonian Institute on December 19.

The dollar was devalued 8.6% relative to gold while certain other currencies increased their value relative to gold. The end result was all major imperialist currencies increased their value rela-

tive to the dollar. (Japan 17%, West Germany 13.5%, Holland 11.5%, Belgium 11.5%, France 8.6%, Britain 8.6%, Soviet Union 8.6%, Italy 7.6%) This will undoubtedly give the U.S. a trade advantage since U.S. goods will be cheaper and foreign goods more expensive. But Nixon's claim of an \$8 billion shift in trade balances is a wild exaggeration. The 10% surcharge plus the 5.6% float in the Japanese yen had already produced the situation before December 19, that the price of Japanese goods rose 17% in the U.S. market. Yet that didn't even dent Japanese exports to the U.S. Since Nixon's August announcement Japanese exports to the U.S. had increased by 20% over last year. Moreover, many of the biggest U.S. imperialist concerns will be hurt by the higher prices of imports. What's going to happen to G.M.'s Opel or Ford's English Ford or Chrysler's Simca: they'll be priced out of the U.S. market. It's possible when these factors are taken into account that the devaluation will produce very little advantage for the U.S. imperialists on the trading front.

The other "concessions" Nixon got are completely meaningless. An agreement by Japan to allow a little U.S. investment in Japan means nothing when the cost of U.S. investment in Japan is now 17%

higher. Also a vague promise by Japan and West Germany to help with the costs of U.S. military bases in those countries is voided by the fact the cost of those bases will rise by at least 17% and 13.5%. Probably, the U.S. will be forced by its own "economic victory" to withdraw its troops from Japan and West Germany in the near future.

But the big loss U.S. imperialism trades for a largely illusory trading advantage is in terms of its ability to invest in foreign countries. In Europe, where U.S. investment has already been on the way out, (See PL, Vol. 8, #2) new U.S. investment (costing 7.6% to 13.5% more) is almost out of the question, and it is only a question of time before all major U.S. owned businesses are driven out of Europe. In Japan where the U.S. has almost no investment, but had the goal of starting some, the devaluation makes that goal an impossible dream. In Asia, Africa and Latin America further U.S. investment becomes more costly. (Although in the Mid-East, Latin America and Canada, the U.S. will force its most subservient client-states to also devalue at least to cover part of the loss of the dollar's buying power.)

The other side of the coin is the big advantage the Japanese and German imperialists get in investing in foreign countries. The next period should see a big spurt in Japanese and German investment in Asia, Africa and Latin America. (Also to a lesser extent the French, Italians and Russians are in a good position to do more investment.) Naturally with increasing economic control will come a drive for more political control; so the U.S. imperialists are in for more Bangladeshes.

Soviet influence in India has been on the increase for some time. In the article "Imperialists at Each Other's Throats" (PL, Vol. 8, #2) we showed that the situation in 1967 was such that the U.S. was still dominant, but Soviets were in second place and gaining. In the last four years, particularly in 1971, this situation has been changing. The Soviet control of key aspects of India's economy (steel, oil, electricity, chemicals, exports, military hardware) has been consolidated while U.S. hold on other branches, particularly finance, has been weakened. The victory of the Indira Ghandi clique over the "Old Congress" clique in the recent elections was a victory of a more or less pro-Soviet faction over a pro-U.S. faction and now the top levels of the bureaucracy are being staffed by pro-Soviet men, and while the secondary and middle levels still contain pro-U.S. and pro-British elements, this seems to be changing. The army—always a bastion of British (and pro-U.S.) influence—is now dependent on the Soviets for hardware and like the Egypt army is becoming more a pro Soviet element. While the situation is not irreversible, the weak and ineffective U.S. support of Pakistan serves to isolate those remaining pro-U.S. elements in India's state structure.

The new state of Bangladesh will even more so represent Soviet dominance in the subcontinent. (Neighboring Burma and Ceylon are likewise, for the most part, under Soviet control.) The new

Soviet-Indian military treaty represents the most solid military alliance the Russians have outside of Eastern Europe. While it is still too early to speak of complete Soviet domination of the 600 million people in the Indian subcontinent, the trend is clearly in that direction. From a strong base in South-Central Asia, the Soviets can move east to contest South East Asia or more likely west to the Mid-East. (At the last minute in the Pakistan-Indian war, the U.S. tried to get Iran and Jordan to intervene on the side of Pakistan; the Russians got wind of this and forced these countries to back down. Thus Russian power in the Mid-East is such that even Pro-U.S. regimes like Iran and Jordan will refuse to do the U.S. bidding for fear of Soviet power.)

The Chinese rulers came out of the India-Pakistan war no better than their U.S. friends. For years they preached to the Russians on the dangers of collusion with the U.S.

No sooner did they take their seats in the U.N. than did they gang up with the U.S. to force several pro-Pakistan resolutions through the Security Council.

Ever since the new Chinese boss class consolidated power in 1968, alliance with the fascist generals in Pakistan has been a cornerstone of Chinese foreign policy. If words could win wars, the Chinese would have won it for their Pakistani friends. But, alas, Russian tanks and planes proved more effective than militant Chinese resolutions and it is Mao-Tse-Tung and company who stand revealed as

New line, new names, in Peking

Chairman Mao has given us all another lesson in dialectics. The main Peking medical centre, christened the "Anti-Imperialist Hospital" by Red Guards during the Cultural Revolution, had just had its name switched to the "Capital Hospital". Is this another example of "a good thing turning into its opposite?"

paper tigers. Their new alliance with the U.S. proved to be as worthless as a U.N. resolution, and the latest developments must give pause to those in the Chinese leadership who so recklessly pursued the pro-U.S. policy. There were always those elements in the Chinese ruling class that preferred a pro-Soviet policy. These elements can only be strengthened. No one wants an alliance with a loser. (The genuine Chinese Left, which came close to smashing both factions in the cultural revolution, 1966-1968, of course has nothing to do with either a pro-U.S. or a pro-Soviet policy.)

The Japanese ruling class, whose long-run strength is unhurt by either Bangladesh or the currency agreement, is, nevertheless, smarting over the cavalier treatment they received at the hands of the U.S. rulers in recent months. The Sato government which had tried to steer clear of overt anti-U.S. acts is now on its way out. The next Japanese government will be more nationalistic, and will probably begin the full-scale re-armament of Japan. (The 250,000 man "self-defense force" is essentially an officer corps awaiting the draftees.) U.S. and Japanese imperialisms are now headed on a collision course.

The other imperialist powers generally have gained an advantage in the currency crisis and have avoided being tied to the U.S. defeat in Pakistan. Even the previously faithful British lapdogs avoided voting for any of the U.S.-Chinese resolutions on the war thus preserving some British influence in India. The British pound is now much stronger thanks to the shellacking the dollar took. With Britain now entering the Common Market increasing sections of the British ruling class want to get out of the position of "America's special ally." Nobody wants to go down with a sinking ship. The French imperialists got the best deal of all the imperialist powers in the December 19 currency agreement.

To a large extent, as a swing power between

the U.S. on the one hand and Germany-Japan on the other, the French were able to dictate the terms of the settlement. In keeping with their middle-man role they abstained on all the U.N. resolutions on the India-Pakistan war. The German imperialists have for some time been moving closer to the Soviets and the French; U.S. treatment of them in the currency crisis (which stung the pride more than the pocketbook) is no incentive for them to change direction. All this is true for the lesser imperialist powers as well. In Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Sweden, anti-U.S., nationalistic governments will probably come to power soon as a backlash of the currency crisis, and the example of Pakistan will make all these ruling classes desire to avoid the reputation of an ally of the U.S.

All this points to an increasing isolation of U.S. imperialism. As the "sick man of the world," the American empire is fair game for its increasingly stronger rivals. The U.S. rulers for the time will be unable to deal with the international situation; so they can be expected to take out their losses on U.S. workers and blame it on the Japanese as they did in the recent wage freeze. At the same time, they will send Nixon scurrying around the world trying to shore up the leaking dyke and hold off the inevitable. In the long run the U.S. rulers will try to prepare the nation for war to save the tottering economy by whipping up a torrent of racism, nationalism, patriotism and fascism.

For U.S. workers, the task is clear, we must, (1) defeat this bosses' offensive—bust the wage freeze and strike-ban, smash all forms of racist and nationalist ideology (and their "academic" spokesmen), that can be used to justify war and fascism; (2) turn the bosses' weakness to our advantage—fight for 30 for 40 (30 hours work for 40 hours pay), and help set the stage for socialist revolution—a world-wide revolution that will bury all the imperialist ruling classes once and for all.



Dick and Chou and George and Ted and Leonid. Consider the possibilities . . .

Choice From the Weeklies

Nixon's Trip Puzzles Some Chinese

Almost two months ago all Chinese airplanes were grounded. Then the annual Oct. 1 National Day parade was abruptly canceled. And most of China's top military leaders have been absent from public eye for more than a full month.

These are among some developments that have led many China watchers to speculate that something has been going on in the People's Republic of China.

Added to these pieces of the Peking puzzle is a small booklet smuggled into Tokyo by some Chinese residents in Japan who had traveled to Peking to mark the National Day.

The booklet helps to shed some light on the puzzle because it deals mainly with the confusion U.S. President Richard Nixon's coming visit to Peking has supposedly caused among the Chinese, especially party men.

It is said copies of the booklet published by the party's theoretical magazine Red Flag appeared in bookstores in Peking one day last September but they were all withdrawn by some Government agency later in the day.

Some China experts speculate that it was planted by the Chinese Nationalists but most of them are certain it was really written by one or another faction in the Communist Party's leadership.

The preface of the booklet titled "Problems Concerning Chinese-U.S. Relations" says that the announcement on Nixon's trip has triggered heated controversy in the socialist camp the world over and within China itself. "Especially party men and cadres at every level have been left very much confused . . .," it adds.

Then the booklet goes on to describe the confusion in a series of questions and answers. Here are some highlights:

Q: Did (Premier) Chou En-lai get the nod from Chairman Mao Tse-tung for inviting Nixon?

A: Yes, certainly he did.

Q: The Ninth Party Congress (held in April, 1969) decided to oppose U.S. imperialism, Soviet revisionism and their reactionary allies all at once. Has this policy been abandoned?

A: This much can be said. The issuing of the invitation to Nixon amounted to the revision or scrapping of this policy.

A: What kind of different views on Nixon's visit are there within the party?

A: This is the way most of our comrades think about it. No sooner had the People's Republic of China been founded than the U.S. confronted us with a most hostile policy. The Chinese people and U.S. imperialism were engaged in a life-and-death struggle in the Korean War. And the facts show that U.S. imperialism is China's No. 1 enemy. None of its aggressive nature has ever been changed to date. And now suddenly Nixon, the top warmonger who has always been hostile to China, is being invited to visit our country as a state guest. This is nothing but our surrendering to U.S. imperialism and preparing the way to revival of capitalism in our country.

Q: How should we deal with U.S. imperialism then?

A: The People's Daily provided a complete answer to this question in an article published last July 24. The commentator points out in the article that the U.S. will never change its aggressive nature and never give up its aggressive designs on Asia. The article also predicts that U.S. imperialism will stick to its aggressive policy, to its hostile attitude to the Asians and its power politics.

Q: Why, then, is China opening its gates to U.S. imperial-

ism?

A: The new party leadership as well as the proletarian headquarters is still divided into two on what domestic and foreign policies to take. Chairman Mao and Chou En-lai are busy emphasizing that Socialist imperialism (the Russians) is more menacing than U.S. imperialism. This is simply because it is impossible for U.S. imperialism to seize their power while there is always the possibility of Socialist imperialism maneuvering to seize it. So they are trying to save their power by pitting U.S. imperialism against Socialist imperialism . . . But those leaders who staunchly support Chairman Mao's teaching that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun are strongly opposed to their way of handling the U.S.

Q: Why did Chairman Mao approved this new policy?

A: The Cultural Revolution has left many important party and national problems unsolved to date. And his opponents at home and abroad still retain considerable power and are about to join hands to topple his leadership. Chairman Mao is trying to concentrate on suppressing these opponents and preventing the rift in the proletarian headquarters from widening by easing tension with the foreign enemy (the U.S.). He had no choice but to shelve the decision by the Ninth Party Congress to oppose both U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism for the time being.

Q: Why are some of our comrades criticizing the new policy as a rightist, opportunistic one?

A: They have gone far to the right and put too much at stake in working out the new policy.

Q: Now that Nixon, the top warmonger, is coming to Peking with impunity, what effect could it have on our country?

A: To say the least, there are these possibilities (1) Those Chi-

nese soldiers and the bereaved families of the soldiers who fought the Korean War are very much displeased with the new policy and would secretly speak ill of our Government and call it a treacherous one. (2) Capitalist ideas would again flood our country and the banks of Communist ideology would collapse in the future. (3) All the bourgeoisie now hiding in all fields of activities would come out openly and do every thing to revive capitalism. (4) The masses would demand the current war preparations be stopped at once, and (5) the present leadership would be toppled.

Q: In the past year our country has established diplomatic relations with some of capitalist countries. Does this constitute victories on our diplomatic front?

A: No, absolutely not. On the contrary, it means degeneration of our country.

The booklet emphasizes that internal stability should be put before diplomacy. It argues that the first thing to do is to reorganize the whole party system and then try and regain the masses' confidence in the party by improving the standard of living.

In short, it bitterly criticizes Chou's new attitude to Washington and, though hesitantly, grumbles about Mao's support behind it. And it also implies that the Cultural Revolution has left a lot of problems unsolved even though it ended more than two years ago. (Shukan Shincho Nov. 6) (A.O.)

letters to the editor

ON CHINA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Dear Editor,

The International Communist Movement has been operating for 35 years with an incorrect strategy. Originally known as the United Front Against Fascism, this strategy lined up peasants and workers under the leadership of the Big "Anti-Fascist" Bourgeoisie (who wouldn't hesitate to use fascism in their own country if they felt the need), like Churchill, Roosevelt, and J.P. Morgan. The communists organized this front, but played no independent role.

United Front governments arose in places like France where revisionist communists like Thorez got to be Vice-President in a United or Popular Front government and voted to send troops to put down Indochinese rebels. The Allende phony "socialists" in Chile follow this pattern. Today this same coalition is being built by the Chinese Communists: "All countries and people subjected to aggression, control, intervention or bullying by U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism, let us unite and form the broadest possible united front and overthrow our common enemies." (Lin Piao, **Political Report to 9th Congress of CPC, April, 1969**). This front includes Japanese and French imperialists as well as Canadian, Romanian and other junior grade imperialist agents.

During the 1960's, China's foreign policy appears to fall into three categories. In the pre-Cultural Revolution years (up to July, 1966), their line was mixed. While they supported national bourgeois and other misleaders about three times as much (from the amount of coverage in **Peking Review**) as they backed worker-peasant-led revolutionary movements, some of their longest articles and prime space was devoted to exposing the capitalist-imperialist enemy and building the revolutionary movement worldwide.

This mixed policy can be seen in:

1. On Brazil, they welcomed Pres. Goulart (**Peking Review** #33, 1961), but then met with representatives of the revolutionary Peasant League of N.E. Brazil (P.R. #17, 1962) whom Goulart had turned his Army's guns on, and welcomed some Brazilian communists (P.R. #22, 1965).

2. They first denounced De Gaulle and the French ruling class (P.R. #44, 1961) and later praised him and "France's sovereign rights as a great power" (P.R. #13, 1966).

3. They supported Ben Bella as a "revolutionary" and a "socialist" (P.R. #1, 1964) and denounced Tito, his class brother and political ally (P.R. #38, 1961)

4. They attacked "Nationalization—A Fraud of the Bourgeoisie" (P.R. #17, 1963) and then praised the Moroccan ruling class for just this fraud, urging them to "develop the national economy" (P.R. #1, 1964). Further, they hailed the "independence" of CIA agent Forbes Burnham's Guyana (P.R. #23, 1966). They even praised the industrialists and merchants of Bolivia for nationalizing the oil and wanting to trade with China (P.R. #35, 1962).

5. They supported Ne Win of Burma and Sihanouk of Cambodia as anti-imperialists (P.R. #5, 1960 and P.R. #3, 1960 respectively) and even played up the visit of the Belgian Queen who supported Chin's entry into the UN (P.R. #39, 1961), although later they hailed the re-organization of the Belgian CP under J. Grippa (P.R. #15, 1964).

During the second period, the Cultural Revolution (July 1966 to Nov. 1968), the Chinese Communists weakened or strained

ties to national capitalists and imperialists with the exception of the Pakistani ruling class. They called Ne Win, the "Chiang Kai-Shek of Burma" (P.R. #29, 1967). They supported the road of armed struggle in Bolivia under the revolutionary CP of Oscar Zamora (P.R. #18, 1967) who had attacked the Debrayist-Castro isolated guerrilla actions. China had already attacked the Cuban misleaders as part of the new Russian Empire (P.R. #9, 1966). Late in 1966, when the Cultural Revolution was in its infancy, the program of armed seizure of power by the workers and peasants of Chile under the Marxist-Leninist Party was printed (P.R. #35, 1966).*

There was at least a back and forth running feud with Sihanouk (see **New York Times**, 1967: April 18, May 1, Aug. 8, Sept. 1 and 12, Oct. 16, Nov. 14 and 16, Dec. 28). The polemics with the new Russian Tsars reached a new peak, as did the mass struggle to rid China of leaders who were trying to restore capitalism. The line was firmly drawn between revolutionary and sellout politics inside and outside China in the most advanced stage of class struggle yet known.

Yet, in the last year, (part of the third period, Dec. 1968 to now) the pro-nationalist, opportunist trend in foreign policy has returned, reminiscent of Chou En-Lai's "diplomatic offensive" of 1965 when he toured almost 20 countries. The trend is now heavily to the right.

The ties with the French imperialists were revived: "Though China and France are of two different social systems, we both ardently love independence and oppose control and interference by big powers." (Chou En-Lai in **Hsinhua News**, July 28, 1970). They urged the people of Japan

*See *World Revolution*, Vol. 12, #2 for good material from this Marxist-Leninist party denouncing the Allende types and explaining why they must be exposed.

Tito in Capital: Hearty, Funny and Difficult to View

By NAN ROBERTSON

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Oct. 30— Marshal Tito, the President of Yugoslavia and leader of the nonaligned "third world," whirled through Washington late this week.

For more than 20 years, he has habitually worn a ring with a glittering dia-

mond the size of a nickel on the third finger of his left hand. "The lord of the village where we were raised wore such a ring," he said, "and I resolved that one day I, too, would have one."

When he was asked at a news conference what he particularly liked about the American system, he said he liked "the business-like spirit of American businessmen"

to fight for "peace, neutrality, and democracy (P.R. #36, 1970). They renewed the Cuba-China Friendship Society (*Hsinhua News*, July 26, 1970).

After the Lon Nol-CIA coup they praised Sihanouk again as a great anti-imperialist (P.R. #18, April, 1970). They gave favorable reportage to Allende's 1st round election in Chile: "He reiterated that his policy programme is of an anti-imperialist and a nationalist character and it is aimed at taking back for Chile its important wealth from foreign capital and domestic monopoly groups" (without a word about the Marxist-Leninist party or the guerrilla warfare it is part of; P.R. #39, 1970).

They have resumed close ties to capitalist Romania and even called the big boss Ceausescu a "comrade." (*Hsinhua News*, July 27, 1970) Fang Yi, Chinese Minister for Foreign Economic Relations had this to say about the pro-Moscow-Bandaranaike-Trotskyite Coalition Gov't of Ceylon: "At home the Ceylonese Government is working to eliminate the imperialist forces and promote the development of the national economy." (P.R. #38, 1970).

The latest diplomatic "breakthrough" is Canada. Canada is a big country in the American continent. The White Paper on Foreign Policy issued by the Canadian Gov't last May reflects its desire and will to pursue an in-

dependent policy. This shows that the attempt by one or two super-powers to control the internal and external policies of other countries is becoming more and more unfeasible." (*Hsinhua Selected News*, #42, Oct., 1970). Not one word has yet appeared on the fascist laws that were imposed on the working class and its allies, nor about the growth of the revolutionary movement under the Canadian Party of Labor. The same is true for Palestine where Al Fatah and its leader Arafat are given the most support and mention (P.R. #39, 1970).

The Black Panther Party leaders are referred to as a "U.S. progressive group" in *Hsinhua News* releases and the Chinese Deputy Ambassador to Algeria greeted the opening of the BPP International Section in Algiers (The Black Panther Oct. 31, 1970) No mention is made of the Panthers "Lumpen are the Revolutionaries, the Workers are Parasites" line or their ties to the CP, Weathermen, Leary, Gay Liberation, or their "Revolution are Constitutional Convention. Nor do we get anything about Arafat's line of "a democratic, non-sectarian, Palestine."

All this seems to flow from the idea (in Mao's *On New Democracy*) of a "joint dictatorship" of anti-imperialist or revolutionary classes which are workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie and middle or national bourgeoisie.

We believe "joint dictatorships" are impossible; only

workers and their allies or the bourgeoisie and their allies can rule. Independent capitalist development is also impossible in a period where world imperialism and social imperialism are carving up the capitalist world. All national capitalists are basically nation-reformists and will eventually make their peace with imperialism, as Ben Bella, Nasser, Sukarno and others did.

For communists to believe in the strategic necessity of forming a permanent united front against imperialism which will be led by bourgeois forces is leading the movement up a dead-end. Rather, like in Albania, communists should organize and lead the whole worker-peasant movement against imperialism and within the movement, against the petty bourgeois line (usually represented by the middle bourgeoisie in the semi-colonial countries) which is a reflection of the imperialist line.

When a fighting movement has already started and is led by this local bourgeoisie and its flunkies (they will fight imperialism up to a point, for their own "right" to exploit), communists should be in it—mainly as belligerents to build up a caucus in opposition to the leadership. Clearly communists should also operate independently too. An example is the building of Soviets or Peoples' Councils during very sharp class struggle which one group, the DPF, did recently in Jordan. Those communists in the front should have the aim of winning the rank and file to communism. There would be parallels to work in trade unions, veterans groups, student federations, etc. in the industrialized countries. Communists can never give up their independent line for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. If they do, they cease being the vanguard of the working class and become revisionist agents of imperialism inside the movement. Communists must ruthlessly destroy the bourgeois line inside and outside the movement and always organize for the armed seizure and consolidation of all political power by the working class.--A.S.

A

To the Editor,

A recent PL article entitled "Imperialists at Each Others Throats" (August, 1971) predicts the development of another world war, based upon imperialist competition for territorial control, among other things. While the prediction may, by coincidence, be correct, the approach was entirely wrong.

It is hard to understand how such an article can be written without considering the working class at all. The truth is that the way history has developed, and will continue to develop, is not the product of competition between various elements of the capitalist class, either nationally or internationally. This has some effect, and at certain times may appear to be decisive, but the real motive force in history is the struggle of the oppressed people of the world to smash the bosses and free themselves. The bosses, through terror, bribes, and deception, do their best to postpone

their inevitable defeat. This is the class struggle, and it is this that must be considered in understanding history.

As the article demonstrates, imperialist wars can be viewed without regard to the working class. But this is essentially a bourgeois approach to history. No imperialist war could be launched and fought without the support of the working class. Certainly the capitalist class sees the absolute necessity of whipping up nationalism and anti-communism prior to, and during, every imperialist war. If the German Communist Party had had a good political line and a strong base in the working class, the international bourgeoisie would have had trouble getting Hitler into the history books, much less launching a war to smash the Soviet Union.

The same holds true for today. The people of Southeast Asia have shown, and are continuing to show, that they do not care to be

anyone's colony. When they see that they have been betrayed by leaders in Vietnam, China and the Soviet Union, they will resolve to rely on people's war. It will be they, not capitalists, who decide. What's more, workers in imperialist countries are slowly but surely seeing that nationalism is a cheap trick. As they grow in militancy and become exposed to socialist ideas, they will pose a serious threat to the very existence of imperialism. As the threat to imperialism mounts, unity between international capitalist elements will grow. They will only fight among themselves—that is, force "their" workers to fight for them—when they are secure.


If the present trend of growing militancy and acceptance of socialist ideas continues, U.S. imperialists won't be going to Asia to fight foreign wars. In fact, they won't be going anywhere—except down.

D.N.W., a friend of PLP

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1972

Chinese Airline Is Said to Get Soviet Jets

BIRDS OF A FEATHER FLY TOGETHER!



The New York Times

Ilyushin-62 on a visit to U.S.. Five of long-range jets were reportedly bought by China.

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 8—China has recently received from the Soviet Union two long-range jet passenger planes that will help her begin her first European air service this year, State Department and aviation industry officials said today.

The officials, in separate interviews, said that the planes, four-engine Ilyushin 62's, arrived in Peking two months ago as part of a trade agreement negotiated in 1970. Three more of the 186-passenger IL-62's are on order.

'30 for 40'

"...so long as there is one worker who seeks employment and cannot obtain it, the hours of labor are too long."

In 1791 when the journeymen carpenters of Philadelphia went out on strike, they resolved, "That in future, a Day's Work, amongst us, shall be deemed to commence at six o'clock in the morning, and terminate at six in the evening of each day."

That was the first recorded strike in this country for shorter working hours, the carpenters fighting to eliminate the sun-up to sun-down 15-hour day. For nearly 200 years, American workers have fought constantly to reduce both the hours of the work-day and the days of the work-week.

Not only is the battle for shorter hours the most continuously-fought issue in U.S. labor struggles, but it is also the single most unifying issue within the working class. Workers have fought for shorter hours not merely against their individual boss, but against all bosses, as a class. And in these battles, as shall be seen, all barriers of race, sex, age or national origin have been wiped away. When workers fight all together as a class for one great demand, they exercise their greatest power in their own best interests.

Of all workers' demands, the fight for shorter hours has been the biggest single spur to unionization. The intolerable length of the workday—up to 12 hours and more—and the necessity to work six and seven days a week impelled millions of workers to get together and organize themselves into collective, fighting bodies—unions—to make demands for an easier and decent life as a united, militant group, not as individuals begging the boss for a few crumbs.

From such battles have been produced the greatest and most militant leaders of the U.S. working class—the famous ones, such as Big Bill Haywood, William Z. Foster and the heroes of the Haymarket Massacre, as well as thousands of unsung heroes from lesser-known battles who have been buried by the bosses' historians. The shorter-hours struggle has created real leaders of the rank and file, who refused to sell out even under pain of death—and there were many who gave their lives in violent class battle rather than make a deal with the boss.

The unity of workers around this demand has leaped the boundaries of any one country to embrace the working class internationally. It has been a world-wide struggle of workers as symbolized by May Day, a holiday of the international working class, which was born in 1886 right here in the United States in the fight for the eight-hour day.

Workers have fought for shorter hours as an im-

mediate demand, to enjoy a little easier life as well as to reduce unemployment and make their jobs a bit more secure. But because the nature of the demand backs the bosses into a corner more so than most other demands, it has forced the rulers to expose their capitalist system more nakedly as the oppressive and repressive force it is. This violent reaction on their part has spurred workers to a greater understanding of the long-range necessity to not just fight for immediate demands but to overthrow the bosses and their government completely.

When workers struggle together and get a small taste of a better life, it increases the desire to receive more and more of the value of what they produce. As shall be seen, the struggle for shorter hours has brought out this desire and understanding more clearly than any other. So the fight for shorter hours stands out as a giant step on the road to the destruction of capitalism and the establishment of a workers' government and workers' power.

WHY WE NEED SHORTER HOURS NOW

In January 1972, there were a "reported" five million unemployed. However, millions are not reported as out of work because they have given up looking for non-existent jobs. More millions are on some form of public assistance, welfare or other starvation-level "aid" not counted by the government as unemployed. There are millions working part-time who would want, but cannot get, full-time jobs. And finally, there are nearly three million in the armed forces, most of whom would be unemployed if they were civilians (in fact, that's why many youths enlist; they can't find jobs).

So there are probably somewhere between ten and fifteen million workers who are actually out of a full-time civilian job who might want and need one.

The existence of such a large body of unemployed workers puts greater pressure on those still working. It allows the bosses to use this reserve army of unemployed as a club over their heads, threatening to replace them with someone who will work for less if they (those still employed) don't toe the bosses' mark on anything and everything—wages, hours, grievances, and the rate of production. **Mass unemployment has job insecurity built into it.**

Because workers have risen up to fight against these worsening conditions, in strikes, ghetto rebellions, marches and demonstrations, the ruling

class has been forced to squeeze the vise still tighter to maintain and increase their profits. Because of constant walkouts to keep up with the skyrocketing cost of living, the Nixon Administration has intervened directly with a wage freeze law that tries to put the determination of wages, hours and conditions into the hands of a Pay (Freeze) Board rather than being decided in the open class struggle at the point of production. The bosses cannot depend completely on their weakened sellout lieutenants in the labor movement any more—the Meanys, Woodcocks, Abels, Fitzsimmons, Bridges and all the rest.

One major demand of this Pay Board is that workers speed up their rate of production, as if it wasn't backbreaking enough already on assembly lines throughout the country. The more speed-up, the more produced by less workers, the more unemployment, the still greater pressure on workers to produce more to hold onto a dwindling number of jobs. (For instance, in 1965, 584,000 steel workers produced 131 million tons of steel; in 1972, only 520,000 workers could produce the same amount—while the actual amount of basic steel workers had

fallen to 430,000 in the Fall of '71, the lowest since the depression of the 1930's, according to the *New York Times*, Jan. 30, 1972. And this means, "As volume goes up, output per man hour will go up, with the steel makers cashing in on billions...")

While it's hard enough to pay the rising prices (creating tremendous profits for the bosses) while working, it's impossible to pay them without a job or on welfare. When "average hourly or weekly wages" are reported, they refer to those rates companies pay to **employed** workers; they don't take into account the weeks and months many workers spend without a job during the course of a year (or a lifetime, for that matter).

An additional burden is placed on the backs of black, Latin, Asian and Indian workers. These victims of racism—on which bosses' super-profits are based—get the lowest-paying and hardest jobs, are generally the last hired and first laid off, and therefore have double the jobless rate of white workers and find themselves at the bottom of the heap in the inflationary spiral. The bosses use racist ideology to try to get white workers to believe that these minority-group workers are a "threat" to the white



Strikers at McCormick's Reaper Works attack Chicago cops during battle for eight-hour day, May 3, 1886

workers' jobs, and that therefore the white workers should fight the black or Latin workers—not the bosses who are the real enemy—to protect what little they have.

On top of all this, capitalism's rat race produces a more frantic pace and less time for leisure among families. To try to pay today's prices, workers either have to work two jobs, or work overtime on a regular basis (many New York City phone workers' average work-week runs closer to 60 hours than to 40), or have two or three members of the family work. And because of the deterioration in mass transit, many workers spend even more (unpaid) time just getting to and from work.

Such conditions produce more illness—mental and physical—leading to still more lost wages, and creates the kind of back-breaking schedule responsible for tens of thousands of deaths and millions of injuries in industrial "accidents."

Is it any wonder that workers react so enthusiastically whenever the demand is put forward for shorter hours at no loss in pay—and with a big wage boost? As it stands now, millions of workers are forced to labor a lot longer than 40 hours on one job—at straight time—because they are either not covered by union contracts or by legislation. For them, a shorter work-week with a pay boost would be of still greater benefit. But even for the millions who work "only" 40 hours, cutting down to 30 hours at 40 hours pay would be of enormous benefit, also. "Thirty for Forty" would:

• Put tremendous pressures on the bosses to create up to 25% more jobs, especially in industries that operate around the clock where four 6-hour shifts would be needed to replace three 8-hour shifts. This would put a brake on unemployment, alleviating the results of increasing joblessness;

• Unite the working class like never before, since ALL workers stand to gain from "30 for 40";

• Be a big blow to racist super-exploitation of black, Latin and other workers who would be in a better position to fight their double rate of unemployment. "Thirty for forty" would be a lever to use in uniting with white workers in a common struggle against the same enemy—U.S. bosses;

• Push forward real rank-and-file leaders to replace the current crop of sellouts; in a militant struggle for such a just demand, the necessary all-out fight exposes the piecards even more, and creates the need for building leadership from the ranks;

• Give a tremendous impetus to organizing the unorganized. With only 25% of America's workers in unions now, many of the other 75% would flock to rank-and-file-led unions fighting for "30 for 40";

• Create more free time for workers and their families, some of which would give more time to think how to organize for even greater advances.

There are other benefits to be gained from such a fight, some of which will be dealt with later. However, even if bosses are forced to reduce working hours, this will not solve all these problems workers have. The bosses will aim to speed up workers even more; will choose to force overtime rather than hire the unemployed; and will look to

reverse the gain itself, crying "poverty" and "I'll have to go out of business and then you'll all be out of work."

These questions are discussed in the final section. For now, let us see how workers have fought for shorter hours in the past and then try to determine how this demand can be won today.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE FIGHT FOR SHORTER HOURS

"Eight-hour laws made by politicians will never be observed by the employers. The only eight-hour law that will ever have any binding force... will be made and enforced by workmen."

(The Carpenter, Jan. 20, 1891)

When those Philadelphia carpenters struck for shorter hours in 1791, it marked the beginning of the struggle to limit the work-day to 12 hours. By 1825, the fight turned into one for the ten-hour day. By the Civil War, workers had begun to achieve this goal, especially through the first unions organized in the 1830's and 1840's. However, the post-war depression virtually destroyed most unions and hundreds of thousands, even millions, were still working 10 to 12 hours daily, all six and seven days a week. Capital was organizing at every turn to smash workers' strikes, trying to strangle the infant trade unions in the cradle.

It was amid such violent struggle that delegates came together in Baltimore in 1866 to form the first nation-wide labor federation in U.S. history—the National Labor Union (NLU). The single issue that brought representatives of most existing trade unions together was the need to fight for an eight-hour day. "Whether you work by the piece or work by the day, decreasing the hours increases the pay," chanted the delegates. Vowing to make this their main goal, they resolved:

"The first and great necessity of the present to free the labor of this country from capitalistic slavery is the passing of a law by which eight hours shall be the normal working day in all states of the American Union."

But a year later at their next convention, after laws were passed and ignored in many states, the NLU decided that legislation by rich men's governments would never be enforced on behalf of working people; the laws were "frauds on the laboring classes." It was decided to organize through unions to win contracts for the eight-hour day.

Although the NLU died when its leaders got caught up in "currency reform" as the cure-all for the working class, its member unions launched strikes to gain the eight-hour day. The biggest walkout in the U.S. up to that time occurred in New York City in 1872 when 100,000 building trades workers went out for three months in a bitter battle. The eight-hour day was won by seven trades, but only the stone-cutters were able to hold on to it, the rest losing it in the depression of the 1870's. However,

the emphasis had shifted. Where earlier in the century the bosses were fighting against the 10-hour day, now they were fighting to keep it, against labor's demand for eight.

The workers were struggling to recover from the misery of the depression that began in 1873. One gigantic reaction was the 1877 national railroad strike, which answered a 10% wage cut with a shut-down of all rail freight traffic for ten days, coast to coast and saw workers take over the city of Pittsburgh and run it for four days. By 1882 the workers were marching again for the eight-hour day. In New York City's first Labor Day, 30,000 bricklayers, furriers, cigarmakers, seamstresses and others proclaimed, "Eight hours for work, eight hours for rest, eight hours for what we will." Every Labor Day of the early 1880's had as its main slogan, "Eight Hours to Constitute a Day's Work."

In 1884 the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions (later to become known as the American Federation of Labor—AFL) passed a historic resolution:

"Resolved... that eight hours shall constitute a legal day's labor from and after May 1, 1886 and that we recommend to labor organizations throughout this district that they so direct their laws as to conform to this resolution by the time named."

The "enforcement" of this resolution was to take place by a nation-wide strike. It was out of this resolution that the May 1st international workingman's May Day holiday was born, to be adopted later by workers all over the world. It was here in the U.S. that May Day began, and the issue was the fight for the eight-hour day.

As May 1, 1886 approached, the "Eight-hour Madness" gripped workers throughout the land. The bosses' press labeled the demand "Communism, lurid and rampant" which would encourage "loafing, gambling, rioting, debauchery and drunkenness." The workers' answer was to smoke "Eight hour tobacco" (made in shops on an eight-hour day); buy "Eight-hour shoes (manufactured in factories on the eight-hour day); and sing the "Eight-hour Song":

*We mean to make things over;
we're tired of toil for naught
But bare enough to live on;
never an hour for thought.
We want to feel the sunshine;
we want to smell the flowers;
We're sure that God has willed it,
and we mean to have eight hours.
We're summoning our forces
from shipyard, shop and mill:
Eight hours for work, eight hours
for rest, eight hours for what we will!*

And "summon" they did. In the weeks approaching May 1, 1886 the American working class had caught "eight-hour fever." In Chicago, the Central Labor Union organized a rally of 25,000 from 25 unions and formed the Eight-Hour Association. In New York, Cincinnati, Baltimore, Milwaukee, Boston, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Washington and nearly

every industrial city in the country, the skilled and unskilled, men and women, black and white, native-born and immigrant, were joining the fight for the eight-hour day. By mid-April over a quarter of a million were directly involved, and before May 1 over 30,000 had won either eight or nine hours without a strike.

That fateful day arrived: 350,000 workers in over 11,000 counties in every industrial center in the country laid down their tools in the biggest strike the country had ever seen. Nearly 200,000 gained the eight-hour day. In Chicago, the center of the movement, 45,000 won it without a strike while 40,000 went out, paralyzing the city. Tens of thousands joined unions prior to, and on, that day, aiming for the goal of an eight-hour day.

The ruling class was petrified. Never had workers been so organized, so united, so militant on such a national scale. Over 600,000 new members had joined the Knights of Labor the months before May 1. Chicago's bosses went crazy. Cops and Pinkertons swooped down on knots of striking workers all over the city. At the factory gates of McCormick Harvester, during a strike meeting on May 3, cops swung their clubs and then fired into the strikers, killing six workers and wounding many more.

August Spies, a member of the Central Labor Union organizing the strikes, was speaking at that meeting. He and other militants—anarchists, socialists, and other trade unionists—organized a protest meeting for the next day at Haymarket Square. About 3,000 attended the peaceful meeting, later attested to even by the mayor. Just as it was



Australian general strikers surround gas company in 1890, keeping scabs from going into employment office.

adjourning, police moved in ordering people to disperse. Suddenly a bomb was thrown and exploded, killing one cop. The police opened fire. By the day's end, seven cops and four workers lay dead. While it was never established who threw the bomb, it was widely believed to be a police agent-provocateur, trying to create the justification to break up the eight-hour movement.

At once, Chicago labor leaders were rounded up and jailed. Eight later were framed and convicted of murder after a 63-day trial, despite the fact that some of them were not even in Chicago at the time, much less near Haymarket Square. Seven were sentenced to death. Four were eventually hung—Albert Parsons, August Spies, Adolph Fischer and George Engel. The innocence of all eight was later affirmed and the three still alive (one had “committed suicide” in his cell) were released in 1883.

On the gallows, Spies had cried, “There will be a time when our silence will be more powerful than the voices you strangle today.”

And so it was. A world-wide movement for the eight-hour day grew from the Haymarket Massacre and its aftermath. Spies had been prophetic when he told the court before sentencing:

“If you think by hanging us you can stamp out the labor movement . . . the movement from which the down-trodden millions, the millions who toil in want and misery, expect salvation—if this is your opinion, then hang us! Here you will tread upon a spark, but there and there, behind you and in front of you, and everywhere, flames blaze up. It is a subterranean fire. You cannot put it out. . . .”

This prediction was fulfilled. Class war raged even more sharply as the robber barons of that era set out to reverse any gains won by workers. It had taken virtually the first 100 years to reduce the work-week to ten hours. (The average week ran to 57.3 hours in six days.) But many still worked 12 hours.

At the 1888 AFL convention the resolve was again made to “enforce” eight hours by May 1, 1890. The demand was put forward as one around which “all can unite.” It became an important tool for organizing workers into unions. And, where this was not possible, Eight-Hour Leagues were formed to organize huge rallies that pressed for the eight-hour day: 971 such rallies took place during 1889 in large and small cities throughout the country.

This huge outpouring of workers around a single issue was not lost on militant workers around the world. The leaders of many Socialist movements met on July 14, 1889 in Paris to found the Second International—a world-wide working-class revolutionary organization. Taking note of the May 1, 1890 date planned by the AFL, the Paris Congress resolved, “To organize a great international demonstration, so that in all countries and in all cities on one appointed day the toiling masses shall demand of the state authorities the legal reduction of the working day to eight hours . . .

“Since a similar demonstration has already been decided upon for May 1, 1890, by the American

Federation of Labor . . . the day is accepted for the international demonstration.”

In the U.S., AFL head Gompers moved to limit the strike to one union—the carpenters. So they struck, supported by the rest of the labor movement, and the eight-hour day was won for 46,000 in 137 cities; 30,000 won nine hours. Hundreds of thousands of other workers won reductions on that day also.

At the same time on May 1, 1890, May Day was born. Hundreds of thousands demonstrated throughout the world—Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Cuba, Denmark, England, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Hungary, Italy, Peru, Switzerland and the U.S. It was the greatest international demonstration of workers up to that time. In London, alone, 250,000 marched; one of the organizers was the daughter of Karl Marx, a founder of Scientific Socialism. Marx had died before that, but his close co-worker, Frederick Engels, wrote:


“...the proletariat of Europe and America is holding a review of its forces; it is mobilized for the first time as One army, under One flag, fighting for One immediate aim: an eight-hour working day . . . The spectacle we are now witnessing will make the capitalists and landowners of all lands realize that today the proletarians are, in very truth, united.”

The eight-hour day had become the single, all-embracing rallying cry of workers around the world. Thus, May Day became the symbol of the common class interests of the international proletariat—“Labor’s Emancipation Day,” said the **New York World** on May 2, 1890.

Just how much the shorter work-day issue was a unifying force was dramatically revealed in New Orleans in 1892. On Oct. 24, three unions—the Teamsters, Scalesmen and Packers, the so-called Triple Alliance—went out on strike for a ten-hour day, overtime pay and the preferential union shop. Arrayed against the workers were the merchants; the four railroads entering the city; the cotton, sugar and rice exchanges; the clearing house and the mechanics’ and dealers’ exchange. But the Triple Alliance had the backing of the Workingmen’s Amalgamated Council, representing, among others, every AFL union in New Orleans.

The bosses felt they had one ace in the hole in this Deep South city—the Teamsters were an overwhelmingly black union while the other two in the Alliance were mostly white. Taken aback that the “white” locals would even go on strike together with the Teamsters, the Board of Grade “offered” to sign an agreement with the Scalesmen and Packers but not with the “n---rs.” Then the press began featuring terror stories about “mobs of brutal Negro strikers,” and headlines like “Negroes Attack White Man.”

Not only did the Alliance remain solid amid this lynch atmosphere, but the Scalesmen and Packers declared they would never return to work unless the bosses signed with the entire Alliance, including the Teamsters. To top that, the rank and file of all the AFL unions began pushing for a general strike to back the Alliance. The **New Orleans Times-**



Eight-hour fight was international...Rally in Melbourne, Australia, August 31, 1890

Democrat labeled the white trade unionists (the AFL skilled crafts) "lunatics" for even considering a city-wide general strike to support black, unskilled workers.

But, unfortunately for the bosses, the "lunatics" went out on their threatened general strike on Nov. 8. And the 49 unions that walked out added demands of their own, including ones for shorter hours and higher wages, as well as union recognition. "Tie the town up," cried the 25,000 striking workers. And, indeed, that is precisely what happened—the first general strike in the history of the South.

For three days New Orleans stood still. Virtually all business stopped. Street cars didn't run; gas, light and power were cut off. The city was in total darkness. Again the press resorted to racism to split the workers—and again to no avail. The strikers became even more united. Troops were called but they, too, failed in trying to provoke the workers. The bosses were forced to sit down with black and white trade unionists, skilled and unskilled—an unheard of development up to that time.

The Triple Alliance, including the Teamsters, won the ten-hour day, overtime pay and adjusted wage schedules. And many of the other 49 unions won shorter hours and higher wages, also. Union membership increased and new unions were formed. The walkout was a landmark for AFL unions, who, for the most part, by organizing skilled workers only, excluded black workers from their struggles. But the Triple Alliance and the general strike in New Orleans showed it could be done, and that, when it was done, it won!

The "Panic of 1893"—another periodic depression built into capitalism—was used to wipe out many advances already gained by workers. Especially was this true in the West, in the mining fields of the Rockies, where possibly the most militant union in American labor history—the Western Federation of Miners led by Big Bill Haywood—had won an eight-hour day for most of its members. The mining moguls owning the gold fields of Cripple Creek, Colorado, saw their opportunity to wipe it out and—amid severe unemployment—lengthened the working day to ten hours. So, in February 1894, the WFM went out on strike. They fought the bosses, their strike-breakers, 1,300 armed deputies and the entire state militia—and won. After a five-month strike, the miners returned to work in June with the eight-hour day preserved. But this was just a prelude to perhaps the bloodiest extended battle ever fought by U.S. workers.

Over the next decade the WFM succeeded in getting eight-hour laws voted for, and passed by referendum, throughout Colorado. And just as regularly, the bosses—in control of the army and the courts—succeeded in nullifying these laws. Throughout Hollywood's "gay nineties," federal and state troops were sent in against the miners in the bloody strikes of Coeur d'Alene in 1892, of Leadville in 1896, at Salt Lake City and Coeur d'Alene again in 1899, at Telluride in 1901. Thousands of miners were put into barbed-wire concentration camps, held for months without charge or trial. Others were herded into freight cars and deported out of Colorado at bayonet point.



First Labor Day parade in New York City, 1882, coming into Union Square.



August Spies addressing Chicago workers just prior to Haymarket Massacre, May 4, 1886

These were miners who, through this violence and terror, had been forced back onto an 84-hour week—12 hours a day, seven days a week—for \$1.80 to \$3.00 a day! Haywood told the miners in 1903 that, "Now that we have to fight for the eight-hour day (since the laws had failed), it will be one strike after another." They vowed to end the condition where, "The fires that smelt the ores, like the fires of hell, never cool. There are no rest days, no Sundays, no holidays.

"The barbarous gold barons do not find the gold, they do not mine the gold, they do not mill the gold, but by some weird alchemy all the gold belongs to them."

That kind of talk scared the owners. The WFM had come out for support of the Socialist Party of Eugene Debs in 1902. Debs was receiving a tremendous reception in the mining camps as he called for "the collective ownership and control of industry . . . in the interest of all the people."

But the miners never backed off in the great hour strikes in Colorado. They fought the "bull-

pens," the deportations, shot it out toe to toe with the 30,000 vigilantes, federal troops and armed deputies. This was the real "wild West" the movies never touch. They plastered whole communities with handbills, during the night, under the very guns of thousands of troops. When deported, they returned home on the rods of the very freight trains on which they had been taken out. In this great strike for the eight-hour day, which lasted 15 months throughout the state of Colorado in 1903-1904, 42 men were killed, 112 wounded, 1,345 imprisoned in bullpens or military concentration camps and 773 deported from the state.

Finally, on Dec. 1, 1904, the mine and smelter owners of the Telluride district surrendered. The miners there, and many in Cripple Creek and other areas throughout the state, won a \$3 minimum for an eight-hour day. The mining barons had set out to destroy the Western Federation of Miners along with the eight-hour day. The result was destruction of the 84-hour week and a leap in the union's membership from 25,000 in 1901 to 40,000 in 1905.



These troops, gatling guns and all, were defeated by the Western Federation of Miners at Cripple Creek, Colo., 1894.

Colorado 1913-14

But perhaps the most significant result of this whole class struggle was the increasing belief of tens of thousands of workers that reliance on workers' strength, not on laws or politicians, was the way to fight—and that the goal was more than just shorter hours but the complete destruction of the capitalist class so no one could take back the gains won in violent battle.

Nowhere was this proven more clearly than in the same state ten years later, in the battle of Colorado's coal miners against the 14-hour day. Their strike for the shorter work-week, union recognition and payment in money (not scrip), stretched for 15 months, from Sept. 1913 to Dec. 1914. It involved pitched gun battles between the miners and the National Guard and ended in the bloody Ludlow Massacre.

Over 300,000 acres of mountains laden with the richest veins of coal were owned by the Colorado Fuel and Oil Co. (CF&O) and mined by 30,000 workers. CF&O was controlled by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., the multibillionaire lizard whose loins even-


tually spawned Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York's grasping, profit-hungry governor.

The miners lived under the worst conditions. Their homes were tent-hovels which offered no protection from either heat or cold. Garbage, human excrement and rats ran through mud furrows substituting as "streets."

Doctors were non-existent. Typhoid, diphtheria, scarlet fever and other diseases were as normal as sunrise, which meant a 14-hour work span, seven days a week, mining coal in crumbling unsafe mines.

If Hitler learned anything about concentration camps, he learned it from Rockefeller's tight control over the miners' lives. Mind as well as body was regulated to such a degree that nothing could be heard or seen without the consent of Rockefeller's private police.

The miners were paid in scrip, private Rockefeller money, which bought consumer goods in Rockefeller-owned stores at exorbitant prices. Workers who complained about their inhuman conditions were fired or brutally beaten. Women and



FORD IS DOWN!...89,000 workers close the River Rouge plant, heart of the Ford empire in Dearborn,, Mich., forcing King Henry to recognize the CIO in 1941.



Unemployed Ford workers march on River Rouge plant, driving attacking cops from the gates.

children also worked in the mines, and received the same treatment.

Governors, mayors, state legislators and other political jackals jumped to Rockefeller's command. He used every device his industrial empire could muster to keep the Colorado coal miners in line. But the depth of that very oppression forced the miners to fight back, and in Sept. 1913 they struck.

The United Mine Workers' (UMW) leadership had been beseeching Rockefeller for a number of years to sit down across the bargaining table and amicably settle the question of union recognition. The miners, however, understood their oppression could not be solved by "collective bargaining," and armed themselves, taking matters into their own hands.

Rockefeller imported scabs. Workers' guns drove the scabs back. The courage of the miners was an inspiration to the rest of the country's miners. However, the spineless UMW leadership backed off and left the rank and file to carry on the fight by themselves.

huckster
The struggle reached its peak in Ludlow, the largest mining town. For 14 days, miners fought with National Guardsmen, vigilantes and scabs. For most of that time the miners controlled the state of Colorado. Nothing moved without their consent. Rockefeller used every sort of scum to defeat them. Finally, when all else failed, he had the town of Ludlow set afire. Yet, although scores of men, women and children were burned to death in the "Ludlow Massacre," the miners refused to give up, so Rockefeller ordered President Wilson to send in the Army. After 15 months of bloody, brutal battle, the Colorado miners' strike was defeated.

The miners' struggle helped unify workers throughout the country as never before over the question of a shorter work-week. When, in 1916, railroad workers threatened a general strike if their demand for an eight-hour day was not granted, the rulers quickly gave in. At that time they were

immersed in the profit-making of World War I, which the U.S. was to enter the following year. But, when the war ended, they returned to their "never-give-an-inch" tactic.

In 1919, 365,000 steel workers, laboring 12 hours a day, six and seven days a week in the mills of Morgan, Rockefeller and Carnegie, went on an historic strike for union recognition. Led by William Z. Foster—who, two years later, helped found the first communist party in the U.S.—the steel workers put up a valiant fight, a struggle which needs a book to describe. After 3-1/2 months, the workers were forced back, betrayed by the AFL sellout leadership, facing armed troops in all the big steel centers. But the strike scared the wits out of the ruling class, heralding as it did the future unionization on an industrial basis of the mass, trustified industries. It was one of the reasons the bosses launched their Palmer Raids to terrorize working-class leaders from coast to coast.

The 1920's saw increasing battles for the shorter work-week coupled with union recognition. These two demands tell the biggest part of the story of nearly 200 years of working-class struggle in the U.S. It was in this decade that the fight began for the five-day week. Although eight-hour work-days had been won by many, most were still working a six-day, 48-hour week. Henry Ford tried to appear as the workers' "savior" by instituting a five-day week in 1926. But, as he later admitted, his plan was to "pay six days' pay for six days' work done in five days"—speed-up Ford style.

One of the most fiery battles of the "golden twenties" was the strike of 10,000 fur workers in New York City for the five-day, 40-hour week, plus a 25% wage boost. The fur union had been controlled by out-and-out gangsters nearly from its inception. However, in 1925 the rank and file managed to elect their own leaders overwhelmingly, led by Ben Gold. On March 8, 1926 the workers

CPUSA

shut down the fur market. The first day of that walk-out is described by Philip Foner in his **Fur and Leather Workers Union**:

"The police lunged into the mass of workers and beat down hundreds of strikers, men and women. The workers fought back. Frail girls leaped up fearlessly, and returned blows squarely in the policemen's faces. As the line of strikers continued to forge ahead, police in patrol cars drove with breakneck speed into large bars of workers on the sidewalk. Still the mass of strikers did not budge. In spite of every new assault by mounted police and motorized squads, the line grew. In the face of this immovable force the police were powerless. Finally the great mass of pickets broke through completely and marched triumphantly to the strike halls. Besides the hundreds of strikers beaten up in that single demonstration, 125 were arrested."

Such scenes were repeated day after day. But the workers held firm behind their militant leadership. Thousands of arrests, beatings and jailings did not stop them. And the five-day, 40-hour week was won, with a 10% wage increase, one of the first union-contracted 40-hour weeks in U.S. labor history. The 1926 fur workers' strike was a warm-up for the decade to come.


In 1929 came the Great Depression. By 1932, with factories, banks, mines and mills closing daily, over 17 million were unemployed, a third of the work-force. The AFL, with its lily-white, narrow craft set-up and business union "leaders" was no match for the organizing crying to be done of millions of unskilled black and white workers. Out of communist-led hunger and unemployment marches, out of hundreds of thousands of evictions in which workers' furniture was put back in their houses, out of starvation and beatings and tear gassing daily by cops and soldiers—out of all this grew the greatest unity and militance ever witnessed among U.S. workers.

Out of this biggest attack on working and living conditions grew the organization of the mass production industries—auto, steel, rubber, electrical, glass—as well as transport, and other monopolized industries. The first reaction to immediate hunger and unemployment had been, "Don't starve; Fight!" This advanced to the next logical step: "Get wise; Organize!" And so the CIO was born.

The organization of 5,000,000 workers into industrial unions in the 1930's was fought tooth and nail by the giants of U.S. monopoly capitalism—



GM sit-down strikers' answer to 1937 injunction; effigy of "fence-jumper" refers to anyone breaking ranks and leaving the worker-occupied plant.



Brooklyn hospital workers catch "sit-down fever" in 1937 strike

General Motors, Ford and Chrysler; U.S. Steel and Bethlehem Steel; General Electric and Westinghouse; and on and on. But with all their money and armies and guns they couldn't stem the tide of a militant, united working-class movement in which communists played a major, probably decisive role.

Two events stand out among most all others in that decade. One was the San Francisco General Strike in 1934; the other the great Flint sit-down against GM in 1936-37.

In San Francisco the longshoremen had walked out for a six-hour day and 30-hour week, for higher wages and for a union-controlled hiring hall. They were joined by the maritime workers. The ship-owners were raging. They ordered cops and vigilantes to "open the port." The workers and cops fought pitched battles. Two dock strikers were murdered by the cops. Soon every local union in the city was voting to go out on a general strike to back the dockers, defying the reactionary leadership of the AFL that was trying to sabotage the walkout.

While the bosses were decrying the "red plot" that was about to "take over the city," the workers refused to be intimidated by anti-communism. With the exception of the typographical and powerhouse workers, every union in the city walked out on the

morning of July 16. In his book, **The Big Strike**, Mike Quin wrote:


"The paralysis was effective beyond all expectation. To all intents and purposes industry was at a complete standstill. The great factories were empty and deserted. No streetcars were running. Virtually all stores were closed. The giant apparatus of commerce was a lifeless, helpless bulk.

"Labor had withdrawn its head. The workers had drained out of the shops and plants like life-blood, leaving only a silent framework embodying millions of dollars worth of invested capital. In the absence of labor, the great machinery boomed as so much idle junk...

"Everything was there, all intact as the workers had left it—instruments, equipment, tools, machinery, raw materials and the buildings themselves. When the men walked out they took only what belonged to them—their labor. And when they took that they might as well have taken everything, because all the elaborate apparatus they left behind was worthless and meaningless without their hand. The machinery was a mere extension of labor, created by and dependent upon labor.

"Labor held the life-blood and energy. The owners remained in possession of the corpse.

"Highways leading into the city bristled with picket lines. Nothing moved except by permission of the strike committee. Labor was in control."



While overturning scab-driven car, strikers fight off attack from cops, Cleveland, 1937

The general strike lasted for four days. More than 3,000 additional troops were dispatched. More vigilante-deputies were sworn in. Legionnaires wrecked union halls and communist headquarters. But when the final results were in, the longshoremen had won their 30-hour week, a raise in pay and a hiring hall. It was the biggest union victory since the depression had begun.


Two and a half years later, after a rank-and-file organizing drive, the auto workers in GM's Fisher Body plants in Flint, Mich. sat down and occupied the plants on the inside. The world-wide empire of the largest manufacturing corporation in the world came to a grinding halt. Demanding union recognition, higher wages, shorter hours and a halt to speed-up, on the back-breaking assembly lines, the militant workers had the entire country waiting on their every move—the bosses and their press and troops threatening them at every turn, and U.S. workers backing them all the way.

After 44 days and nights inside GM's plants, after capturing the Chevy plant #4, largest in the world, and with the physical support of thousands of workers in Flint and nearby Michigan, Indiana and Ohio cities, the Flint sit-downers defeated the National Guard, the local cops, the courts, injunctions, attempts to starve and freeze them out, and forced GM to surrender. The fledgling UAW (United Auto Workers) was recognized as the workers sole bargaining agent, elected by the workers. Immediate wage increases were won and soon afterwards the 40-hour week was established.

The Flint sit-down sparked the organization of the CIO which, in turn, helped establish the eight-hour day on a five-day week basis by 1940 for tens of millions of American workers. It was not "given" to workers by legislation (although laws were passed) as the bosses' history books would have us believe. It was fought for on picket lines and with guns in every corner of the country.

Until this day, except for some industries like construction, sections of the garment industry, and others, there has been no advance beyond the 40-hour week. And even these advances have been chipped away. The West Coast longshoremen's "30-hour week" was turned into a 45-hour week with the agreement to work nine hours a day, three at overtime rates—while many workers walk the streets unemployed. The 35-hour week in construction is accompanied by probably the highest unemployment rate of any industry in the country. And, for many garment workers, the "35-hour week" runs for less than half the weeks in the year in an industry of constant seasonal layoffs.

But more than just a "chipping away" has befallen the unions as a whole, especially the former CIO unions. What the ruling class was unable to destroy in the Thirties, at birth, it has accomplished over the past 25 years through a combination of anti-communism, racism, bribery and terror, so that the rank-and-file-founded and -led CIO industrial unions of the Thirties are but a shell of their former selves, unrecognizable to workers who remember them and disbelieved by young workers of today. The original advance of the CIO has been



Mile-long picket-line (cars, trucks included) mass in front of struck No. American Aviation plant, Inglewood, Calif., June 7, 1941 just prior to facing 3,000 troops (see other photo, P. 80)

turned around into a gigantic sellout, out of which the bosses have reaped literally tens of billions in profits over the past quarter century.

The key to reversing this set-back and surpassing even those past gains depends on two factors: workers' unity and workers' organization. The organization can be created through rank-and-file caucuses. (See PLP Program on Caucuses and Workers' Power in Trade Unions.) The unity can come around an issue that fulfills the demands of ALL workers. Such an issue is "30 for 40"—or any other variant of a shorter work-week without a loss in pay—plus a big wage boost.

Earlier we described why we and many other workers think a shorter work-week is needed. Even then, many arguments will be advanced against it, such as:

- "The bosses will never give it." True—the bosses never "gave" us anything. Whatever workers ever got from them was wrenched through militant struggle. No doubt the bosses will put up a terrific fight against workers' demands for "30 for 40"; but if that were to become the reason not to struggle for it, we would still be working 12 and 14 hours a day.

- "No one else has it." While this is not true (there are numbers of workers—New York City electricians, for one—who have it, or at least have 35-hour work-weeks), even though the overwhelming majority don't have it, this fact has always been true for every new advance by the workers; but that has never stopped workers from fighting for them. Whatever the working class has needed, it has fought for.

- "It won't create new jobs or an easier life because people will just work longer on their second jobs." Firstly, a shorter work-week with no loss in pay will make life easier for those who work only one job. People work two jobs because their main job doesn't pay enough money. That's why we couple the demand for shorter hours with the demand for a big wage boost. Moreover, one of the main reasons workers don't receive enough on their main jobs is because they don't work a full 12 months on insecure jobs. A shorter work-week would put pressure on the bosses to hire more workers, making for more job security, less time lost and less wages lost that must be made up on a second job.

- "We won't know what to do with ourselves with all this extra leisure time." That's what they told workers on a 12-hour day fighting for ten hours. Finding what to do with an extra eight or ten hours a week should only be our biggest problem.

- "Wages are a more important demand to fight for (or pensions, or fringe benefits, etc.)." But we say we should fight for both. The fact is that because the fight for a shorter work-week historically has been such a unifying demand for the whole working class, it has strengthened workers in the struggle for all other demands. It has spurred workers to organize unions, the biggest single road to higher wages and anything else workers need.

- "There will be no new jobs; the bosses will just speed us up even more. True, if the bosses are forced to cut the work-week with no loss in pay, and grant higher wages, they will fight like hell against hiring more workers. But certainly in round-the-clock industries, tremendous pressure

will be created for four 6-hour shifts instead of three 8-hour shifts. And even in areas that don't run seven days a week, the bosses will not find it easy to simply automatically speed up production to a point where the same group of workers can do eight hours work in six. While they will try, gaining shorter hours puts the workers more on the offensive and the bosses on the defensive. And the unity gained in winning a shorter work-week can be put to good use fighting speed-up. Besides, the bosses try to speed us up no matter how many hours we work. Staying on an eight-hour day won't prevent speed-up, for no matter how good bosses have it, the nature of capitalism impels them to fight for still more. We, as workers, can do no less.

- "They won't hire more workers; they'll just force us to work more overtime." Again, that's another fight to be coupled with the fight for shorter hours, just like the fight against speed-up. But, again, we're in a much better position to fight against anything the bosses try to do to us from the vantage point of a shorter, rather than a longer, work-day, again putting our strengthened unity to good use in the fight against forced overtime. The results of a victory in the campaign for a shorter work-week are still weighted in the direction of putting pressure on the bosses to hire more workers and reduce unemployment.

- "A shorter work-week will impel the bosses to introduce more automation, causing more—not less—unemployment." The bosses will always look for ways to cut jobs, no matter how long the work-day is. The sole determinant of whether or not they increase automation is: will it add to profits, especially by cutting jobs. In fact, one of the biggest reasons to fight for "30 for 40" is precisely because automation has cut jobs in such industries as steel, auto and mining. A shorter work-week—among other things—is an attempt by the working class to gain some of the benefits of automation and not allow the bosses to reap all the reward. Only under socialism—where there are no bosses—will workers be able to reap the full benefits of technological advance.

- "A shorter work-week"—say the bosses—"will force us out of business and there will be less jobs, not more." Well, we needn't cry for them. They've done pretty well when the work-week was shortened from 12 to 10, and even better when cut from ten to eight. (The fact is, if they're telling us that all bosses will "go out of business" if forced to grant "30 for 40," we'd like to see nothing better than for capitalism "to go out of business." But, unfortunately, it's not that easy.) If the bosses "can't afford" a shorter work-week, that's **their** problem. But they use that argument as a reason not to grant **any** demand, not just one for shorter hours.

The fact is, all their crocodile tears to the contrary, the bosses CAN well afford to grant a shorter work-week plus a big boost in pay. For instance, in the auto industry, Commerce Dept. figures (which probably understate things) show that in 1967 the total payroll was \$6 billion; the total "value added" in manufacturing (the amount of value created by the workers' labor) was \$14 billion. If the workers won "30 for 40" and 25% more jobs were put on, increasing the payroll to \$7-1/2 billion, the "poor" GM, Ford and Chrysler bosses would be left with "only" \$6-1/2 billion gross profit instead of \$8



Detroit workers' solidarity saw to it that GM sit-down strikers got "three squares" a day, Jan. 1937.

billion. And we should cry to them?

Actually, in that same year the total payroll for all manufacturing for 19 million workers (according to the bosses' figures) was \$132 billion. The total "value added" by these workers' labor came to \$262 billion, another \$130 billion over and above what they got in wages. If hours were cut to 30 from 40 at the same rate of pay (assuming the work-week average at 40 among those workers in 1967), and the work-force went up 25%, the payroll would rise to \$175 billion, still leaving \$85 billion for the bosses to "squeeze by" on. If they can't live on that, eventually we'll take all the value we add as workers in production and show them how it's done!

As usual, all the bosses' arguments against workers getting more or anything fall flat. No doubt, there are others they will dream up—this list, by no means, exhausts the fairy tales in the bosses' public relations offices. But it's time to turn to a program for action on "30 for 40."

As with any other demand, workers must organize and unite to win anything. The fight for a shorter work-week with a big pay boost can start on many levels, depending on the point a particular group of workers are at. As in the past, workers already organized into trade unions usually take the lead. Once the campaign is under way, unorganized workers are drawn into—or themselves start organizing—unions. Workers can:

- Start a petition in their shop, local and industry among unionized and non-unionized workers to

galvanize sentiment around "30 for 40";

- Raise the demand as the first order of business in the next contract negotiations, with the provision that the union strikes until "30 for 40" is won;

- Spread the demand to other locals and workers in the same union and other unions in the area;

- Organize unorganized workers in their industry into the union on the basis of fighting for shorter hours and therefore for more jobs, against unemployment;

- Call mass rallies and marches in the plant area and in the city where the local is situated, to bring the message to as many workers as possible;

- Call work-actions on the job during which workers can discuss how to fight for "30 for 40";

- Organize "Six-Hour Leagues" among working-class people, families, etc. in non-union areas and in communities, to draw on the full strength of the Eight-Hour Leagues—could spread the issue far beyond the 20 million workers in unions;

- Call for one-day strikes in a local or area on behalf of "30 for 40," to show the bosses we mean business;

- Aim for a one-day regional and/or national strike (like May 1st, 1886) with the possibility of continuing it until "30 for 40" is won;

- Organize industry-wide or city-wide general strikes to win "30 for 40";

- Organize referendum campaigns to publicize and unify sentiment around "30 for 40," knowing all

the time that the only thing that will enforce a shorter work-week will be workers' power at the point of production;

- Organize support for any group of workers out on strike for "30 for 40";

- Organize rank-and-file caucuses around the issue, developing new leaders to replace any old ones who refuse to fight for this demand.

- Link up with workers in Canada, Puerto Rico, Latin America and around the world fighting for the same demand. The fight for the shorter work-week knows no boundaries. We cannot allow the bosses to use workers of one country against those in another as a way to forestall the fight for the shorter work-week, on the grounds that jobs will go to those workers "willing" to work the longest and the cheapest. As in the past, it will become an international struggle against an international ruling class. What better way to celebrate May Day than in an international strike of the world's workers for the demand of a six-hour day!

This list is by no means complete. In the course of fighting for shorter hours, workers will develop many new forms and ideas and slogans to win. But we should not get side-tracked on restricting ourselves to winning this demand solely based on a "30 for 40" formula. Some workers, depending on the industry and the shift they already work, will call for "four days work for five days pay." Others, already working 35 hours now—seven hours a day—might call for "28 for 35." And still others might demand "32 for 40"—four 8-hour days instead of five.

But any way you slice it, if it comes out to a big dent in the present work-week plus a big pay boost, it will be part of a larger, unified movement for shorter hours and continue the fight of U.S. workers down through the years. (The main idea to stay away from is the bosses' new gimmick: four 10-hour days, without overtime pay, instead of five 8-hour days—the same 40 hours but with a three-day weekend. No doubt we'd need it after being in a state of collapse from four 10-hour days. Such a proposal doesn't put a penny more into our pockets nor create one new job, and probably would help to eliminate jobs.)

For our part in the Progressive Labor Party, we will attempt to organize on every level of working-class struggle for the historic demand of the shorter work-week. We will help in organizing rank-and-

file caucuses wherever we work and in whatever union we are members of, to give leadership to, and unite, workers around this issue, and to throw out the misleaders who would prevent us from gaining a decent life.

We in PLP, while seeing this demand as a tremendously unifying one for the entire working class, will always try to point out that it will **not solve** the problems we face as workers, but only alleviate them and encourage us to fight even harder against the bosses to **eliminate them altogether**. Since it is capitalism and its drive for profits off the backs of workers that is the CAUSE of all our problems—unemployment, racism, job insecurity, lousy medical care, slum housing, prison-like schools, speed-up, and all the rest—the only way to really end all these problems is to get rid of the system that spawns them. That means overthrowing the bosses' government—their state power—and installing a workers' government. Replace the dictatorship of the bosses with a dictatorship of the working class—that's the only way we'll ever prevent our hard-won gains and quest for a decent life from being taken away. That's why workers need—and will support—a revolutionary communist party.

We support the demand for a shorter work-week because it will make life a little better for ourselves as workers, and because it will unify us for the further battles ahead. But once we win this demand, we know the bosses will always try to take it out of our hides some other way, as they always do. With a shorter work-week, it might be a little harder for them, but that means they will fight harder against it, and offer all sorts of sweet-sounding things to divert us from it.

We will learn in the course of this great struggle that capitalism will never give workers, and our allies among students and intellectuals, a decent life. And we will be better prepared to take the steps to wipe out this profit system that causes untold pain and death to the working class.

Let us "mobilize as One army, under One flag—the banner of the international working class—fighting for One immediate aim; a six-hour working day..."

Let us, in the words of August Spies, light "a spark" that will start the "flames to blaze up," flames that the ruling class can never extinguish, in a fire that will burn the sores of capitalism, profits and bosses from the face of the earth. ■

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

American Federationist, May 1894

Boyer, Richard and Morais, Herbert: *Labor's Untold Story*; 1955

Commons, John R. & Associates: *History of the*

American Labor Movement; 1918-1935

David, Henry: *History of the Haymarket Affair*; 1936

Federation of Organized Trades: *Proceedings of 1884 Convention*

Foner, Philip S.: *History of the Labor Movement in the U. S.*; Vols. 1, 2, 3

Foster, Wm. Z.: *The Great Steel Strike and Its Lessons*; 1920

Haywood, Wm. D.: *Bill Haywood's Book*; 1929

Labor Research Association: *History of the Shorter Work-Week*; 1942

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick: *Communist Manifesto*; Pre face to 4th Edition, 1890

Rastell, Benjamin: *History of the Cripple Creek District*, Bulletin of the U. of Wisconsin, #198

Spies, August: *His Speech in Court and General Notes*; 1887

Swinton, John: *John Swinton's Paper*; March, April, May 1886

U. S. Dept. of Commerce: *U. S. Book of Facts*; 1971

Yellen, Samuel: *American Labor Struggles*; 1936

Rank-and-File Caucuses for Workers' Power In Trade Unions

TODAY U.S. WORKERS FACE A STEPPED-UP assault on our lives by a ruling class* intent on squeezing every last dollar of profit out of our labor. With their economy in a crisis, these bosses are moving to shift the burden of that crisis onto our backs. They are using their government to freeze our wages, cut budgets that already provide inadequate services to millions of workers, lay off workers as unemployment continues to rise, cut welfare (even as they force millions onto welfare because there are no jobs), and continue to raise prices, rents, transit fares and everything else needed by workers to survive.

Particularly hit hard are black, Latin and Asian workers who are the last hired and first laid off, forced into the lowest-paying, least secure and hardest jobs and who suffer double the unemployment rate of white workers. These millions of minority-group workers provide a source of super-profits for U.S. bosses and the racism that sets this up is also used to split the workers' potential for unity needed to fight back.

The working class's main organization to try to meet this assault has been the trade union. At one time, in the 1930's, many of the unions really represented the interests of the rank and file and fought militant battles for higher wages, shorter hours and job security. This was especially true in the CIO, which was organized and led by communists. In fact, that was how the big, trustified industries—steel, auto, electrical, maritime and many others—first won union rights and the benefits that went along with that.

COMMUNISTS OUT...SELLOUTS IN

However, by the 1940s the ruling class succeeded in getting the communists kicked out of the union leadership and a long trail of sellouts was begun. The unions have come under the control of piecards

who use them to make a cozy spot for themselves, working with the bosses and the government to hold workers in check. These sellouts have become what we know as unions today because the rank-and-file workers have been unable to organize to control our main weapon—the shut-down of production—and create our own leaders, throwing these others out. The "union" is that group who has the organized power to shut off the flow of profits and bring production or services to a standstill in order to force the bosses to come across on our demands. Right now the present crop of union leaders stand in the way of the rank-and-file exercising this power while they themselves live high off the hog, wheeling and dealing with the bosses.

WORKERS DO NOT TAKE THIS SITUATION LY-ing down. Leading up to—and since—the wage freeze, large groups of workers in steel, auto, telephone, railroad, government services, and many other areas have defied the bosses, their government and the union misleaders and struck against the assault on us. Hundreds of thousands of black and Latin workers have rebelled in the ghettos against racist cops and fought for jobs, decent housing and schools, etc. But all of these wildcat walkouts and rebellions, while winning some immediate gains, have been "one-shot" offensives. None have had consistent planning by an organization carrying out



Rank-and-File seamen challenge 'King' Joe Curran

*The ruling class is composed of the owners of the big monopoly corporations—GM, Ford, GE, AT&T, etc.—and the big banks like Chase Manhattan, First National City, Bank of America, etc.—who use the various levels of government to protect their class interests—profits—and keep down workers. They control the two-party system, the press, TV, radio, movies, etc. The only way workers have ever made any advance is by fighting them.

and consolidating a drive for real power. At the point of production, none have had the goal of actually taking away the power of the bosses' union flunkies and putting it in the hands of the rank and file, who then truly become the union.

The fight against the workers' enemies is not a "one-shot" fight. It is a struggle for power, both over our day-to-day class interests—higher wages, shorter hours, better working and living conditions—and for the long-range goal of state power* to prevent the ruling bosses from taking back whatever gains we make.

ORGANIZED STRUGGLE NEEDED

Anything the working class has ever won in its own interests has been achieved through organization, whether it be the 8-hour day and shorter work-week, long and successful strikes or the actual unionization of the mass production industries. Workers are always involved with small, lower-level struggles, usually one-shot fights around day-to-day grievances, harassment, contract violations, threatened layoffs, unsafe working conditions, etc. However, no sooner than one fight is made, and even won, the boss turns around and attacks on another front, taking away any gains.

To not only maintain gains won through class struggle, but to plan against inevitable counter-attacks by the boss, a permanent, organized group is needed both to make plans for immediate struggles and to reach out to, and unite with, other workers with the goal of winning power at the point of production—becoming the real union. Such a group is a caucus or workers' rank-and-file committee. A caucus is a stable group of workers united around a common set of demands, an organization that fights those opposed to its demands—the boss and his union lieutenants—and makes plans to carry out these fights, assigning its members specific responsibilities.

To really represent rank-and-file class interests, a caucus's guiding principles should include:

- 1) Demands in the interests of all workers.
- 2) Unity of all workers against all enemies (the bosses, union sellouts, scabs and stoolpigeons within the workers' ranks, etc.) in an ever-widening area. This means fighting racism against all minority-group workers, fighting the special exploitation of women, and fighting for class solidarity;
- 3) When the best interests of the workers conflict with the bosses' laws, "ground rules," contracts or "legal procedure" already laid down, a fight must be made to break these rules, since they are opposed to the best interests of the workers, just as the bosses and their union lieutenants break any and all laws, rules or agreements whenever it

*By state power we mean control of all governmental levels, including the military, courts, jails, police, etc.—all of which, under Socialism, would replace the dictatorship of capitalist bosses with the dictatorship of the working class. Workers would run the government and bear arms to enforce workers' rule.

suits their best interests.

Within a strategy of achieving a measure of power over the ability to shut down production, and becoming the union, these guiding principles will determine the tactical approach to such questions as union elections, grievance procedure, the contract, etc. These things, in and of themselves, are not good or bad. It is how they are used by one class or another that is important.

If the boss is overloading a worker, which is also violating a contract rule, then a broad fight can be made to "defend the contract." But if contract procedures bar a militant fight, stating that one must "file a grievance" to settle the issue (which may take years to resolve), then militant action—a slow-down, work stoppage or even wild-cat strike—over-rides the contract (since, in such a situation, "using the contract" is helping the boss). Similarly, if union misleaders have connived with the boss to put things into the contract which hurt the workers, a militant caucus should feel free to break the contract to enforce the workers' best class interests, just as the boss breaks the contract every day in the week when it suits his (profit) interests.

RUNNING FOR UNION OFFICE

Running for union office is another tactical question to be determined by the three guidelines. The rank and file usually looks for leadership to workers' caucuses that carry out militant programs, not to the official union leaders. The rank and file's immediate desire is to throw out the corrupt officials and put the caucus in power, to be better able to fight the boss. Once the caucus launches such a campaign, it must do so with the understanding that, if it wins, it will not—and cannot—function under the "ground rules" followed by the old leadership. Rather, it must follow the principles which won it the respect of the majority of workers. Inevitably this will put the new leadership and the mass of workers they represent into sharper conflict with the boss and with the higher union misleaders, a battle for which the caucus must be prepared before-hand.

IF THE NEWLY-ELECTED LEADERS CONDUCT this kind of battle, it will change the union from one that acted as an agent of the boss to one that acts in the interest of the rank and file. If the workers and their militant leadership now have it within their power to shut down production, they become the union, no matter what franchises are handed out by the international bureaucrats. If this kind of militancy and power does not enable the rank and file to also become the union in name (the international, acting for the boss, might expel it if it couldn't break it up), it will still be the union in actual fact, since it will have the power to shut off the flow of profits. Therefore, it is with the caucus-led rank and file with whom the boss will have to deal, not with his lieutenants in the international whose power over production is zero in the face of a militant, organized rank and file.

The union, its offices, contracts and procedures are not permanent agents of the boss. They are weapons in the class struggle which the bosses now control, for the most part, but which—at one time or another—may or may not be used as weapons of the workers. The guiding principle must still be: what is in the best interests of the workers at a particular time: what will unify the most workers to strengthen the fight against the boss.

Should the workers elect the caucus to union leadership—and thereby enable the rank and file to become the union—the struggle is not over; the real battle has just begun. Now, with the workers having a better chance to wage a real class struggle in their own interests, the class enemy—the bosses and their flunkies—will counter-attack even harder. Since the caucus includes the most effective leadership of the workers, some of whom may become union officers but **most of whom won't**, it is extremely important that the caucus **not** disband because it has taken union power. The continued existence and growth of the caucus will be one of the factors against the newly-elected officials going over to the bosses' side or being bought off by the higher union sellouts.

CAUCUS AIM: POWER OVER PRODUCTION

If the caucus does win and follows the guiding principles outlined earlier—which means sharp battle on every grievance, harassment, bad working conditions, as well as for shorter hours, higher pay and job security—it is inevitable that the workers and their leaders in the caucus will be attacked by both the boss and the defeated union flunkies, along with their international masters. They may even succeed in ousting the rank-and-file elected officers, or putting the local into "trusteeship." Then the caucus would have to organize an actual

shut-down of production, assuming it had that kind of power among the workers.

The caucus must exist and branch out **under all conditions**. Again, the main object is not to solely get elected to office, but to fight in the best class interests of all the workers, with whatever tactics prove useful.

ONCE WORKERS TAKE POWER OVER THEIR immediate situation through such a caucus, attacks will come even more sharply than during the initial struggle—first bribery and then harassment, the carrot and then the stick. Since rank-and-file caucuses and trade unions operate within the capitalist system and don't have goals which go beyond the system; and since the bosses still hold state power, it is difficult, if not impossible, for the rank and file to withstand the attacks to come without understanding the necessity to "go all the way," to fight to overthrow the bosses' system—and their state power—completely.

The rulers will throw troops, jail terms, injunctions, etc. at these rank-and-file fighters, to break them if bribes don't do the trick more easily. Communists and their ideas see beyond the bosses' profit system, to a society of workers' state power (not just trade union power), which will enforce workers' rule and workers' ownership of production, and will eliminate bosses as a class that can take away hard-won gains. This is a revolution for socialism.

COMMUNIST LEADERSHIP NECESSARY

Because communists see the class struggle not as an isolated fight for immediate gains but as a long-range fight for state power, they more easily can point out the profit motive behind all the ways bosses attempt to split workers—white against black and Latin, men against women, young against



New York phone strikers storming Manhattan streets in display of working class strength

old, employed against unemployed, native-born against foreign-born. Communists expose the fraud of the two-party electoral system as another way the rulers hold onto their state power. Communists lay bare the role of the state as an instrument of the ruling-class power, not as some "neutral" to be "swayed" by workers or bosses. When cops beat up strikers, it's not because the cops are "bad guys" (although they may very well be); it's because they are there to do a job to protect the class that holds state power.

COMMUNISTS JOIN, HELP ORGANIZE AND lead rank-and-file caucuses in industries in which they work because they recognize the working class as the revolutionary force that can change all these things. Workers' labor produces everything of value. Therefore, workers should control all decisions concerning how everything gets produced and distributed, and should reap ALL the fruits of that production, not have to give a chunk of it to exploiting bosses. So communists fight for both the immediate needs of the working class from which they spring and also the long-range goal of workers' state power and ownership of the means of production. Communists see rank-and-file caucus struggles as sharpening the battle against the bosses in which the lessons of how the workers can "take it all" can be learnt.

Bosses recognize this role of communists and fear it like the plague. They will do all in their power to isolate communists and communist ideas from the rest of the working class, using censorship, arrests, jail and execution. This is especially true in the trade union movement and at the point of production where profits start or stop. Even when communists are not the strongest revolutionaries—as in the CIO in the 1930's—the ruling class is afraid workers will learn, in joint struggle with communists, how to overthrow their system. The rulers waged an all-out battle to reverse the workers' gains of the Thirties, ousting communists from the unions (partly due to their own shortcomings). Since then the trade union movement—as far as fighting for workers' class interests is concerned—has been going downhill.

GOVERNMENT NOT NEUTRAL

But communists now—in the Progressive Labor Party—represent the Left in rank-and-file caucuses and work among them, absorbing the experiences of the working class, learning from it, and bringing their communist ideas of Marxism-Leninism to workers for their consideration and adoption as their own. And then, amid this class struggle, more workers join the revolutionary party. This spells death for the capitalist class.

Since the mass of workers—the Center—are now controlled by the Right (the labor fakers), and the bosses want to keep it that way, they spread all sorts of lies about the Left. But the experience of the class struggle proves otherwise, which is why workers selected communists as their leaders in

the 1930s—these communists were among the best fighters for the immediate gains of the workers. A caucus of Center workers that includes communists—the Left—will be stronger and better-equipped to deal with their enemies, especially because communists do not limit the struggle to just this system, its laws and ideas. Therefore, one of the first attacks against such a coalition of the Center and Left in a caucus is an anti-communist one, to split the coalition and move the mass of Center workers to the Right where the bosses and their labor flunkies want them.

The job of the Center and Left is to unite to defeat the Right and fight in the best class interests of the mass of workers, to learn from every victory and defeat, to win workers away from the Right (the bosses' ideas) and strengthen the Left - Center coalition for a bigger offensive at a higher level against the bosses.

The main ways the rulers have of defeating rank-and-file-led organizations are either to keep them "free" of communist ideas which put forward the overthrow of capitalism and mass struggle against the bosses, or to push capitalist ideas hard enough to cause communists to "go sour" and lose sight of the necessary goal of workers' state power. For the mass of workers to make gains—and try to keep them—it is absolutely necessary that they work



Wives and families of strikers picketing hated Ma Bell

with and defend communists among them, as long as the communists, the Left, are giving leadership in the best interests of the working class.

COMMUNISTS IN PLP BELIEVE THAT THE ingredients for workers' state power are contained in daily class struggle of workers for immediate needs. A program for a Left-Center coalition, for a rank-and-file caucus fighting for power at the point of production and in the trade union movement, could include some or all of the following:

A PROGRAM FOR ACTION

AGAINST THE BOSS: a fight for a shorter work week with a big pay boost—thirty hours work for forty hours pay, or any variation thereof; a fight for higher wages—smash the wage freeze; strikes over grievances if the boss violates the rules; against no-strike clauses in the contract; two-year maximum contract length; ironclad protection against discrimination for black, Latin and women workers; labor unity, especially between rank-and-file movements.

FOR A BETTER UNION—democratic rank-and-file control over all decisions of the unions, absolute membership power over ratification of contracts; an all-embracing shop steward system, always elected by the steward's crew; no union official to be paid a higher salary than the average of the unit that elects him; specific campaigns to organize the unorganized and the unemployed within the realistic possibilities of each level of the

union; no split on strikes by one-at-a-time local back-to-work movements within national companies; locals to be run by committees and officers from the shop; all negotiating and policy committees to have a majority of rank-and-filers on them.

AGAINST RACISM—smash the bosses' tool that divides workers and prevents them from fighting in their class interests; upgrading and preferential hiring of black and Latin workers into jobs denied them because of boss-inspired and union-supported racism, thereby reducing the bosses' ability to break the workers' strength; support for the inclusion of militant, class-conscious black and Latin workers in all levels of union leadership; support for and unity with black caucuses fighting for class demands against the boss; defense of black and Latin people in the ghetto.

AGAINST THE BOSSES' GOVERNMENT—reputation of the "national interest" and all state-invoked wage freezes and "guidelines" as a bosses' tool; smash all strikebreaking, union-busting laws; fight the shoving of the cost of city services onto the workers through the profiteering of banks (unity between Government and non-Government workers against the common enemy); no support of ruling-class parties or candidates; no submission of contract disputes to arbitration or other "neutral" Government boards. Unity of all sections of the working class around a militant, class struggle line should be the guiding principle that governs every short- and long-range action of any group of workers. The eventual goal must be a national rank-and-file movement that will unify the workers as a class and sweep the labor fakers out.



Men and women kept scabs out with fighting mass picket lines during Puerto Rico telephone strike.

STUDENTS & REVOLUTION

DURING THE PAST DECADE STUDENTS HAVE been an important force in this country against the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam, against racism on and off the campus, and have been increasingly supporting striking workers. And students have fought hard around immediate campus issues: against ROTC, tuition raises and racist harassment, among others. Millions of students exposed the Big Lie of U.S. capitalist society—that it was “free and equal.” The facts of life contradicted this notion. U.S. rulers were imperialist abroad and anti-working class and racist at home. Students saw the rulers’ underlying fear was the upsurge in the revolutionary movement here—especially ghetto rebellions—and all over the world.

The realities of life—as opposed to what is presented in texts and in class—also helped expose the role of U.S. education and the universities. Countless thousands recognized that the schools were brain factories, designed to perpetuate the bosses’ ideology and to provide the technicians and apologists required to operate the political and economic system of the ruling class. Students found that the trustees were big businessmen and industrialists. They were directors of big oil companies, United Fruit, Chase Manhattan Bank (Rockefeller), big government advisors, and local and national politicians. The myth of the ivory tower was blown to bits by the exposure of the university’s role in society and its deep association with the rich.

THE U.S. WAR OF AGGRESSION IN VIETNAM brought this fundamental view into sharp focus. Millions of students justly rebelled against this bosses’ war; seeing that it was only making profits for the rich. And millions of young workers and students were being impressed into the ruling-class army to kill and be killed to make more money for the rich. Millions demonstrated against the war. Students and others also saw that the universities were **PLANNING** the war on many levels: ROTC, recruiters and defense researchers were **EVERYWHERE**. From 1968-70 there were countless battles on many campuses against these manifestations of the war.

WORKERS’ REVOLTS CRACKED BOSSES’ HOLD

As in the development of all movements, there is a process which occurs. An accumulation of experiences helped break the ideological hold the

bosses had over students. The anti-war movement was preceded by a number of important things:

- The movement by many black people against racism, unemployment, bad housing, police harassment, was a very decisive factor in this process. Previously, students were taught that black people were “happy with their lot.” But black rebellions proved this a lie. Not only were black people—especially workers—dissatisfied, but they were ready, willing and able to destroy this system which caused their oppression. They also led many white workers and students in direct conflict with the government: the 1970 postal strike, the 1967 Newport News shipbuilding strike, the Detroit and New Bedford rebellions, GI revolts in Vietnam, Germany and the U.S.

- In the early sixties an armed struggle by coal miners in Hazard, Kentucky rocked the country. These miners, mostly white, showed that workers weren’t going to sit by passively while their unions and pensions were destroyed by union “leaders” and company bosses. And they weren’t going to twiddle their thumbs while their hard-earned standard of living was destroyed. Students rallied all over the country to support the Hazard miners.

- In the same period two groups of students broke the U.S. bosses’ travel ban to Cuba. Students wanted to observe the revolution in Cuba, and defy imperialism. The government couldn’t stop them. At this time the Progressive Labor Party was formed. Since the “Communist” Party of the USA had long since abandoned a revolutionary outlook and turned the people away from the fight for Socialism, and the dictatorship of the proletariat, a party was needed to bring revolutionary ideas and organization to many struggles. Day-to-day struggles on the job or on campus weaken the bosses’ ideological and material hold on people, but they usually manage to take it back in some way—by raising prices, increasing taxes, etc. A movement must be built that understands workers have real power. All bosses must be thrown out! Working people can set up a system which provides for their needs, and where there is no exploitation of others.

- Soon after the travel ban was busted, many thousands of students were influenced by the tremendous battles of the Vietnamese people and by the development of socialism in China, especially the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. This combination of events at home and abroad influenced the student movement in a leftward direction.

CAPITALISM A CLASS SOCIETY

THOUSANDS OF STUDENTS WERE AND ARE questioning the electoral system. What could be the difference between the war-making, strike-breaking, racist Republicans or Democrats? Many students began to understand that society was a class society—although taught there were no classes. They learned through life’s experiences that there were two classes. One was the ruling class, represented at school by the administration. This class owned and operated the basic wealth of the country

to make profits. The other major class was the working class. Through workers' labor, all wealth is produced. In school we are taught that the way things are produced and wealth is created is by "investment," and ability to use investment to "create" the means of production. What we observed and learned is that the ruling class makes profits by exploiting the labor of others. And the products of this labor, in a large measure, are profits.

We saw further proof of this in the ruthless intervention by the bosses and their armed forces to break black workers' rebellions. We saw as many as 500,000 foot soldiers at a time in Vietnam to protect U.S. bosses' interests in Asia. And we continually see various forms of strike-breaking by the bosses. These take the form of injunctions, use of the National Guard and the police, laws like Taft-Hartley, the wage freeze, etc. These things—in addition to owning the labor leaders—help the bosses to exploit the fruits of workers' labor.

In addition, the government has used a variety of tactics to keep the student movement from completely breaking out of the framework of bourgeois society. Their main weapon is to use the liberals and fake radicals to lure students into electoral campaigns. "Keep 'em off the streets," is the politicians' and the bosses' slogan. Currently a herd of politicians from McGovern to Lindsay are being used in this way, like E. McCarthy was used in the 1968 Presidential election. Now, even the voting age requirements have been lowered. This was blatantly aimed at sucking the youth into the two-party system. When this doesn't work, they don't hesitate to use coercion as they did in slaughtering many black students who were attacking the system—Jackson State, Orangeburg, and Texas A&T. Then there was the murder of students at Kent State, because of a militant demonstration against ROTC. Also, many students have been jailed when they struck back against war, racism and oppression.

INTERNATIONAL SELLOUTS SLOW STRUGGLE

THERE IS INTENSE CLASS STRUGGLE ALL over the world. But now some of the leaders of the international communist movement have sold out—most notably the north Vietnamese leaders and the leaders in Moscow and Peking. Just as they once gave tremendous inspiration to movements around the world when they fought hard against the imperialists, now they have the effect of slowing down the struggle when they entertain, negotiate, and make political, military and economic deals with those same bosses.

The U.S. rulers will try to exploit these weaknesses and reversals in the communist movement, to halt the spread of rebellion among workers and on the campuses. When the north and south Vietnamese leaders went to the bargaining table in Paris to negotiate away the courageous efforts of the Vietnamese people, the anti-war movement in our country and around the world was used as an

Herrnstein



appendage to help make a deal. Nixon's visit to China, and the Chinese entrance into the UN, helps perpetuate the myth that U.S. imperialism isn't so bad, nor is the UN. Previously, the Chinese Communists characterized U.S. bosses as "worse than Hitler," and the UN as a "tool of the imperialists." These acts not only create illusions but they undermine militant activity around the world. (See Nov. 1971 PL magazine for fuller treatment.)

WORKERS AND STUDENTS ACT AGAINST RACISM

ALL THIS IS A PART OF THEIR PLAN—BUT it's not enough. Workers and students around the country have been showing by their actions that they are rejecting racism. White campus workers at

Temple University honored a strike by mostly black workers, even though it was in defiance of their contract and local leaders. Many students at Harvard have been involved in a fight to kick the racist Professor Herrnstein off campus as have others in California with the racists Jensen and Shockley. These things hit the bosses where it hurts!

The most significant strategy the bosses have on the campuses is to push anti-working class and racist ideology. Bosses are fearful, based on past experiences, that their days are numbered if workers and students unite. As we pointed out, this is a serious possibility. Students **did** respond to black rebellions, the war and to workers' struggles. Because U.S. bosses are weaker politically and economically, they attack workers harder. Unemployment, especially among minority youth, is high. Welfare budgets have been cut drastically. Money for schools, hospitals and housing is being slashed. All the conditions of life for workers, especially minority-group workers, grows worse.

The government, afraid of the mounting strike wave, intervenes more openly in workers' struggles

in order to defeat them. The wage freeze (actually a wage **roll-back**, as prices, taxes, et al, continue to soar), Nixon's use of the National Guard in the postal strike and his invoking the Taft-Hartley Law to force longshoremen back to work all show this intervention. And Rockefeller's slaughter of the heroic Attica prisoners also reveals that the bosses will go to any lengths to secure profits.

In order to justify big attacks against workers now, the bosses have launched an ideological offensive on campuses all over the country. Their offensive is racist and anti-working class. They are going to use everything in their arsenal to split the students from workers, and to split students along racial lines. They are afraid of the historic impact of a massive worker-student alliance.

THE CAMPUSES ARE BEING FLOODED WITH a raft of new nazi-like "theories" about the "inferiority" of minority people and workers. The general line of this garbage is that you are automatically stupid if you are a worker, and more



stupid if you are a minority worker. These "psychologists" and "socialists" try to give authenticity to these lies by using pseudo-scientific rhetoric and trumped-up statistics. They claim workers' "genes make them stupid." This big lie is being pushed by Jensen, Herrnstein, Eysenck, Goldberg and many others who follow their ideas. If Hitler were alive today, he'd give them the Iron Cross, and congratulate them for keeping up his work.

Students, now more than ever, are confronted with a crucial choice: Do we ally ourselves with the bosses (especially in electoral forms), or do students take the side of the working class which built **EVERYTHING** in the first place? Alliance with the bosses means more racism and working-class oppression. It means we would become the teachers who fight parents' and students' attempts to organize for the things they need. We might become nurses and technicians who would oppose hospital workers' fights for better wages and working conditions. Do we ally with the administrations and professors who justify racism and oppression in society? Following the lead of the bosses means death and destruction. This was true in Vietnam. To ally with workers means progress. For, no matter what the difficulties of this alliance, it is **ONLY THE WORKING CLASS** which has the strength to crush the parasite boss class, and bring socialism. We see the bosses doing a great deal to prevent a worker-student alliance. Their ideological offensive is to prevent unity and to sow the seeds for a more general attack on the working class. And all signs of the rapidly deteriorating economy point to this. We have learned and we are learning that workers are not going to take these attacks lying down. The class struggle is sharpening. **THE QUESTION OF THE DAY IS: WHICH SIDE ARE YOU ON?**

AS IN ALL FIGHTS NEUTRALITY MEANS BEING on the side of the bosses. In other words the bosses are content if you don't bother them. They are not worried by an escape into clouds of

individualism and personal satisfaction. Nor is their greedy profit boat rocked by use of drugs, mysticism or cynicism, which claims that "no one is any good."

Millions paid with their lives in Vietnam because U.S. workers and students didn't intervene earlier. Failure to fight imperialism is equal to surrender. **REMEMBER THE RESULTS FOR THE GERMAN PEOPLE AND THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD IN ALLOWING AND FOLLOWING THE NAZI MASTER RACE THEORIES.** Tens of millions died in order to crush Nazism. We have accumulated enough experience by now to start a counter-offensive against these Nazi theories.

U.S. campuses must be flooded with a wave of exposures and actions against every manifestation of anti-working class, anti-communist and racist ideas. OUR ANSWER MUST BE LOUD AND CLEAR: STUDENTS TAKE THE SIDE OF THE WORKING CLASS!

OUR PROGRAM CAN AND MUST BE:

1. ATTACK RACIST IDEAS—

- A. In class, whenever they are raised;
- B. Mass action to ban racist textbooks;
- C. Campaign to fire racist administrators and teachers through petitions, forums, rallies, sit-ins. The main object should be to have as broad a group of workers, students and teachers as possible;

2. FIGHT RACIST PRACTICES—

- A. Fight racist training programs;
- B. Fight racist pay differentials;
- C. Unity with campus workers;
- D. Fight budget cuts;
- E. Fight harassment of minority students and workers;
- F. Support workers' strikes;
- G. Fight police harassment on and off campus;
- H. Cops off the campus;
- I. Support for ghetto rebellions.

"SDS—A Profile"

SDS: A Profile,

by Alan Adelson; Charles Scribner's & Sons
N.Y.C., N.Y.; \$10.00

Very rarely does a book appear which deals rationally and almost accurately with the "New Left movement," or any aspect of it. SDS by Adelson, though limited in its scope, fits both of the above-mentioned categories.

Most of the recent spate of books dealing with Left politics are either poorly sensational; lies and distortions; or characterized by omissions. We suppose there are a few bucks in the "New Left" scribbling game; and we are sure this author had money in mind when he wrote the book. But, unlike the others, it is hard to believe this was his sole or even main motivation.

This book deals with the last few years of SDS. It explores the differing trends within the SDS over the last few years. And it tries, based on limited information, to draw some lessons based on those different ideas. In the introduction, Adelson summarizes this point clearly. He says; "Bombings are out, no matter why you do it. For a while a group of SDS leaders was heading the organization in that direction. But a great many of the members disagreed. A classical left conflict developed between those who said you should build a movement by involving others and those who said forget about mass movements—we can do it ourselves. One faction wanted to link SDS' efforts with the power of industrial workers. The other said that's old hat—youth culture's the thing."

Ironically, many of the older SDS leader types

now claim that workers are the main force to ally with if the country is to witness any move to the Left. Recently, at the founding convention of a group called the New American Movement (NAM—an unfortunate set of initials), Staughton Lynd and other SDS originals—who previously claimed that "there is no working class in this country," or there "isn't much of a working class because of automation," or that "the old industrial working class is moribund" and that the "new working class made up of petty professional like teachers was key," etc.—now claim they won't "make a move unless the industrial workers are involved."

Well into the book the author makes the following point: "The New Left never really had an ideology. It just thought it did. . . . SDS' history has been a reluctant but inexorable rediscovery of the Old Left's doctrine. . . . But those now in the organization are deeply convinced the trip had to be made. . . . The three R's for SDS began with reform, led to resistance, and have unofficially ended at revolution."

Basically, what PLP tried to do within SDS, in addition to helping build it was to propose a strategy which could result in the changes SDS members wanted to see in U.S. society. The basic PLP premise is that unless students ally with workers around mutual issues and vice-versa, important changes, let alone revolution, is impossible. The author develops this point at some lengths in various parts of his book:

"It's clear to SDS that students alone have almost no power. They can launch an electoral crusade



Worker-student alliance in action: General Electric Strike, 1969-70

like the McCarthy campaign and even maybe have it win. But all that becomes irrelevant once you decide it doesn't matter who's running the system as long as it's keeping a few people very rich and most people relatively poor. SDS has generally concluded that the workers must control the means of production. For that to happen, the small cluster of wealthy people now in charge will have to be overthrown. Since they won't go willingly, it's going to take a fight. . . . The Worker Student Alliance was an utterly logical program for Progressive labor to bring to SDS. The Party's primary conviction is that the revolution will only come from a victorious fight by the workers against the 'bosses.' The obvious program then for PL's student arm is to have it ally with workers."

A number of myths are leveled by the author: One is that the SDS leaders of several years ago were heroes and the "people's choice." At one point he says: "Mark Rudd had a hard time keeping up with his image. In fact, from the time the news media settled on him to satisfy its hunger for personalities and spokesmen, the pressure must have been incredible for him. Rudd's indecision during the Columbia Rebellion was well known to everyone around the campus, but Mark was presented matter of factly in the news as a striking figure of revolutionary bravado—which he had fallen far short of portraying convincingly in person."

Over the past decade the ruling class, through the media, has settled on countless other "leaders" who suited their needs, both image-wise and politically. People in revolutionary politics would do well to keep this in mind. Revolution, not play-acting, is the business at hand.

In another striking passage Adelson does a good job in capturing the sickening frustrations of the Weathermen group. Their malaise developed mainly because they had no long-range strategy based on alliances with workers or anyone else. Therefore they were completely isolated. All they had left was to believe their press notices. He says, "The Weathermen held their 'Days of Rage' in Chicago on schedule. Under the new slogan, 'Smash the Glass of the Ruling Class,' they featured several mad dashes through the streets, smashing in car windshields and beating people—not rich people or police or store owners, but just anyone—with clubs. . . . Then in December they held what was billed as a 'War Council' in Flint, Michigan. Rudd and Dohrn told of the thrill of fighting in the streets. Mark added that street fighting was probably kid stuff compared to the exhilaration that a person must feel from 'killing a pig or blowing up a building.' Mark's old friend from Columbia, 'John Jacobs, known as JJ,' postulated: 'We're against everything that's good and decent.' And to prove it, Bernardine Dohrn astounded everyone by trying to make revolutionary heroes out of Charles Manson and the rest of the 'Tate Eight,' . . . dig it says Bernardine. First they kill those pigs; then they ate dinner in the same room with them; then they shove a fork into a victim's stomach! Wild!"

A number of other lies, myths and illusions are put to rest by the author's coverage of the conven-

tion of SDS in which the "famous" split took place. This event was pictured in the bosses' press and in the fake Left-type press as PLP minority deliberately coming to the convention to split the organization. And that PLP featured racism as its main tool. Adelson, to his credit, sets the record straight:

"But it was obvious to everyone that PL was going to be able to have its 'Smash Racism' program adopted by the convention. The RYM faction didn't even have a specific anti-racism proposal to present. . . ." The author then describes the cheap attempt by RYM leaders to exploit their Panther friends at the convention to attack PLP.

This attack on PLP was answered by Jeff Gordon, then the PLP student leader: "Gordon spoke calmly. He obviously wanted things to calm down. 'The PLP will not be intimidated out of SDS', he began, to cheers of his caucus. 'The Party supports the Panthers on many things,' he said, 'but on many others it offers criticisms 'in a constructive and comradely fashion.' PL is in support of the people of the world who are fighting against imperialism and for self-determination. But he said, those fights would only succeed if they ended up in establishing socialism."

"He attacked the existing SDS leadership, the RYM faction, which he said had found itself and its ideas obviously defeated and so, in desperation, had used the racist ploy of hiding behind the Black Panthers to cover RYM's own bankrupt position. The hall began rocking to the bellowing WSA chant of 'Fight Racism.' Up near the podium the desperate RYM leadership gathered to find a way out. . . .

"Bernardine Dohrn kept arguing with Mike Klonsky who was physically trying to hold her back. She suddenly broke away from him and came shouting to the P.A. system: 'Some of us are going to have to decide whether our political principles allow us to remain in the same organization as people who hate the Black Panthers and deny the principles of self-determination. . . . 'She was clearly calling for a split in SDS. Rudd had no trouble deciding which side he was on and fell in right behind her. Klonsky, looking very troubled with the whole business, followed Bernardine too. . . .

"'We've been in the next room for twenty-four hours discussing our political principles,' she cried out. . . . 'We declare that all members of the Progressive Labor Party, the WSA, and anyone else who does not support these principles, are objectively racist and counter-revolutionary. WE DECLARE THEY ARE NO LONGER MEMBERS OF SDS!' The convention couldn't believe it at first. People started laughing. The defeated RYM faction had come back to declare that it, the minority, was ousting the majority."

After reviewing the paths of the Weatherman and the WSA since the convention, the author concludes, "History had been upheld again. Like every other terrorist group before them, the Weathermen discovered you can't accomplish anything without tremendous support from the people. It's what the 'pigs' back in SDS had been trying to tell Bernardine and others all along. But if the Weathermen do come out into the open to campaign politically again, they'll

find their bombings created a society that's a lot more reluctant to listen to them than before they went under."

Near the end of his book Adelson gives some of the various experiences students have had in trying to develop the WSA. Generally, he gives a overly positive picture of this work. While the work is positive, there is still a long, long way to go. Additionally, Adelson makes a useful criticism of PL's work in SDS and among all students. "Part of the problem was that Progressive Labor, with its narrow and highly advanced concept for what really makes revolution, had moved from a position of leadership of a sect of SDS to running the whole organization. And in the process it hadn't broadened or even adapted its original program to make it more applicable to the massive organization as a whole...."

Perhaps one of the biggest weaknesses of the book is that it doesn't place the development of the SDS within the developments of the time. Nor does the book attempt to deal with the revulsion SDS'ers had of traditional revisionist politics of the Communist Party. Most militants within the student movement of the '60s looked on the CPUSA as a political leper—and rightly so. Naturally, students tended to keep communist politics at arm's length because the only prior examples were the CPUSA and SWP. In any event this is the author's first book; in the future, if he sticks to this type of writing, he will uncover much more of the past, present

and future of the communist movement in our country.

To the author's great credit, the book is easy to read. As for the publishers, they have virtually made it certain that the \$10 price tag will greatly limit its circulation. That is too bad, because the book deserves reading and consideration.

Finally, the coming SDS convention at Harvard this Easter, will tell something about the development of the student movement. The press is only too happy to yap about the decline of student activity on the campus. It is more than happy to speak of the "death of SDS." While SDS has many problems—let it be known to all that SDS lives. And, in some sense, it is stronger than ever, because it is firmly rooted and active in the fight against racism and in support of the workers. This had been the stumbling block that the student movement had floundered on before.

Hundreds of SDS actions on this front have occurred, and are happening now on campuses across the nation. The press is not too noisy any more about these SDS activities. Perhaps they are looking for "leaders" like the Rudds, Rubins, et al to re-emerge again. The media would like to establish images in their behalf once again. But we think the student movement has gone beyond letting the bosses pick their leaders or their groups. The coming SDS convention will certainly indicate whether the student movement is alive or dead. WE SAY IT IS ALIVE AND KICKING AND STUDENTS WILL PROVE IT.



Boston, Mass: Demonstration at British Consulate, protesting Irish massacre

sds new
left
notes



**HARVARD,
MARCH 30
- APRIL 2**

FIGHT RACISM -- ALLY WITH WORKERS!

Reprinted from SDS new left notes

COME TO THE SDS CONVENTION

YOU ARE INVITED! to the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) National Convention over Easter (from Thurs., March 30 to Sun., April 2) at Harvard in Cambridge, Mass. At this convention, hundreds will get together in small workshops and large plenary meetings to hash out the over-all thrust and day-to-day details of struggles on campuses all over, fights against racism and other forms of oppression.

Those who run this country continue the war, they oppress women more & more, they slash school budgets, give workers layoffs, worse conditions, terrible housing, higher prices and frozen wages. While things are getting worse for all of us, any kind of oppression you can name hurts black & other minority people the most. In order to justify this especially harsh treatment, and to keep people of different races from uniting and fighting to improve their conditions, the powers-that-be are encouraging in every way the spread of racist ideology. As we see it, they are trying to use the schools to develop, teach & legitimize racist ideas to provide a nation-wide base for a racist movement. Thus a whole crop of "respectable" and often famous racist "experts" are creeping out into daylight. From Jensen at Berkeley to Herrnstein at Harvard, they are pushing the idea that blacks and other minority groups are culturally or genetically inferior to whites. In fact, they argue that minority group people are (either for genetic or cultural reasons) basically a criminal group. They either imply or state,

outright, that these "criminal" elements must be isolated, watched carefully, and repressed - for the safety of "society as a whole." They are given prestigious and high-paying jobs in the schools. (Herrnstein, for instance, is head of the Harvard Psych department.) They virtually wallow in government grants. More and more, their theories are made into law. (Thus some of Banfield's proposals are the basis of Nixon's notorious Family Assistance Plan.) And they are built-up continually by the press. Their ideas are spread far-and-wide in very slick texts and reprints of their articles. Their books (especially Banfield's The Unheavenly City) are taught in schools in every area, in order to give racism a new, scientific image, to justify the terrible, day-to-day oppression of black and latin people. This is tremendously dangerous. Whenever governments want to launch a racist movement, they start in the universities. If they can just win the fight for racism there, they can then point to the "educated people," the "neutral and scientific community of scholars" and claim to be acting on what "so many of our social scientists, people with no political axe to grind" have uncovered "in the pursuit of Truth."

--- So what if blacks live in slums? They like it, Banfield says.

--- Minorities are on the bottom because we live in a meritocracy, says Herrnstein.

--- Take these welfare kids away from their parents, cries Roger Freeman.

--- We've got to fight this racism in the schools where it's getting justified, where the theories are being spread, and stop it dead! That's what more and more students and faculty are saying. And SDS agrees.

SDS, the militant, nation-wide student organization, is an important part of the fight against oppression and racism. It's an organization of ALL students - black, white, latin, American Indian, and students from other countries too. It's dedicated to fighting all the ways the schools are used against the people - like this new campaign of "expert" racism. We want to unite students with working people and professionals, and with other militant groups too.

The press loves to boast that the student movement is dead. It's alive and fighting back! SDS is in the forefront. A real weakness in the student movement has been lack of organization. Building SDS more, spreading it further and strengthening its ties with other fighting groups can help improve the struggle. At this time, there are struggles against racism and other abuses going on all over - as you can see by looking at this issue of New Left Notes. We want to move the fight forward. That's why this SDS NATIONAL CONVENTION is so important. It means a NATION-WIDE organization to help lead these struggles.

At the convention there will be resolutions around the war, oppression of women, fighting

the budget cuts in the schools and - what many feel is key - stopping the racist offensive. We want everyone to come. Everyone, whether

they are in SDS or not, will play a role and make a contribution. There will be plenary sessions with the whole group. But we want to stress workshops to discuss, in detail, what needs to be done and how to do it. Anyone can draw up resolutions. As much as possible, workshops will be lead by people who've been involved in various struggles.

ANYONE, STUDENT OR NOT, WHO WANTS TO FIGHT OPPRESSION SHOULD COME! High school students and teachers, factory workers, college teachers, campus workers, medical workers and GIs and vets - aren't we all shafted by these attacks? Some groups and individuals who are not members of SDS are already endorsing the NATIONAL CONVENTION. Like GRITA, the latin students' group at Brandeis. A group in England who are fighting the infamous racist Eysenck (author of The I.Q. Argument) will send representatives. We hope there will be people from Canada, Puerto Rico, Finland, Japan, Germany, Mexico and other countries as well.

We hope we'll see you in Cambridge.



TEMPLE UNIVERSITY - This picture shows part of a tremendous strike battle against the University's racism this past October. The strike was started by 300 campus workers, members of IBUE (International Brotherhood of University Employees), an independent union organized by the rank-and-file after they kicked out the union bureaucrats in Local 69. Led by minority students, thousands of students supported the strike for better wages, conditions and job upgrading. Temple spent many thousands of dollars trying to break the strike. Cops, a court injunction, scabs, and the University overlords were DEFEATED by the unity of the people against racism. The strike was victorious and the worker-student -alliance at Temple still grows.

a liberal diversion from struggle

The film **LITTLE BIG MAN** depicts events, some imaginary and some historical, leading up to the Battle of Little Big Horn (1876) in which General George C. Custer and his cavalry troops on a "search-and-destroy" mission in Montana were surrounded and wiped out by Sioux tribesmen. "I knew the Indians for what they was, and I knew Custer for what he was," claims the old man in the nursing home (Dustin Hoffmann) who narrates the film as his personal memories.

On the surface, this claim would appear to be true. **LITTLE BIG MAN** is a new-style "realistic" Western, as opposed to the old-style stereotyped kind. It shows the cavalry's brutality against the Indians with all the vividness of Vietnam TV footage. And it sympathizes, although in a "sentimental" way, with the Indian's armed struggle.

In other words, **LITTLE BIG MAN** is in the tradition of so-called "honest realism" of the best bourgeois artists. Yet it is precisely such realism that shows (far better than the crude propaganda of the John Wayne variety) the limitations of all art produced under and for capitalism, regardless of the skill and intelligence of the artists. Bourgeois realism can depict the horrors of our society, but not the source of these horrors or the path to liberation.

For instance, **LITTLE BIG MAN** shows the cavalry killing women and children. But why did this killing take place? The movie's explanation is as weak as that of liberal critics of the Vietnam war. The troopers, it is said, were racist brutes. Custer, it is said, was an egomaniac. "The white man," says an Indian chief in the film, "has no moral sense." Yet, this is dealing only with social effects, like the killing itself, not with the causes.

The real cause was 19th century capitalism which, in its quest for profits, expanded throughout the earth to gobble up the resources and territory of all pre-capitalist societies, enslaving or exterminating the people of these societies. This robbery helped the bosses accumulate enough wealth to build their giant 20th century industrial complexes. **Custer and his army were puppets of this process.** Everything they did on the American frontier—just like everything General Abrams and Co. are doing in Vietnam today—was the result of orders from the bosses' government in Washington. The bosses wanted the Indians' land. To get it, they had to kill the Indians. Custer's personal quirks had little to do with this policy. When he bungled the job, the government sent other generals to finish it with "proper efficiency."

This process is no big mystery. It has repeated itself again and again throughout the world since Custer's time. In Brazil today, a "guerrilla" government is using poison, machine guns, and dynamite

to exterminate jungle tribes—so that Nelson Rockefeller and Chase Manhattan Bank (who have bought up the tribal lands) can start mining operations. In Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia the process is proceeding on a somewhat larger scale. Surely the directors and stars of **LITTLE BIG MAN** (being "educated men") are aware of all this. But if they tried to put it in the film, the millionaire producers and financial backers would have stopped them.

Yet the movie's dishonesty goes deeper. When Custer's men wipe out Little Big Man's tribe, the latter goes off in the wilderness to brood by himself and to plot a purely individual act of revenge against a single individual enemy (Custer, **not the forces behind Custer**). The movie focuses on this isolated act of Little Big Man, who operates alone like the hero of a spy thriller, while neglecting something of far greater importance: the mass of Sioux tribesmen preparing **TOGETHER** for their heroic offensive at the Little Big Horn. If the movie had shown the latter, it would have been shedding light on how workers and oppressed peoples can fight back today—something else that the millionaire producers would never have allowed. Thus, when the final battle is shown on the screen, the audience gets the impression that the victory over Custer is due mainly to the psychological outwitting of Custer by Little Big Man (who has wheeled his way into the general's entourage) rather than to the heroism and careful preparation of the Indian tribes.

The struggle of the tribes against U.S. capitalism is defined in a misleading way, as a struggle of "Red Man" versus "White Man." The common interests of the Indian tribes with the oppressed black and white workers of the U.S. is never shown. In historical context, one can't say this is **nationalism** since the Indian tribes were not class societies and hence had no "national bourgeoisie." But in the context of today, this film **builds** nationalism since it contains **no concept whatsoever** of oppressed peoples uniting across national or ethnic boundaries.

(There was plenty of **opportunity** for making this point, since more than half the film is spent in depicting white society and a variety of its "social types." Yet what types are chosen? A gunfighter, a cop—Wild Bill Hickock—a one-eyed swindler, an alcoholic bum, a prostitute, a preacher, and "Indian scouts." In other words, a **zoo** of all the parasites of frontier society. **WE ARE NEVER SHOWN ANY WORKERS OR SMALL FARMERS**—the people who, even in the 1870's, were the overwhelming majority of the population, and who had objective interests opposed to capitalism.)

When the Indians charge over the hill at Little Big Horn, the movie audience cheers them as "a quaint race fighting a heroic, last-ditch battle."

The essential fact has been obscured—that Little Big Horn was an opening battle of a larger struggle, the struggle against capitalism in the American West. Although the Plains tribes were soon crushed after Little Big Horn, this larger struggle against capitalism continued to grow. One year after the defeat of Custer, U.S. railroad workers struck from coast to coast, including the Western territories; and militant general strikes (which revolutionary socialists helped to lead) closed down St. Louis and Chicago, the “gateways to the frontier.” Within a mere decade, the sound of gun-fire between super-exploited miners and company thugs and militiamen

would resound through the same Rocky Mountains where the Sioux had trapped Custer

The descendants of the Indians who fought at Little Big Horn are now, most of them, part of the working class. They can be proud of this past victory, but it does not belong “exclusively” to them, any more than the victory of the Flint Sit-down Strike in 1936-37 belongs “exclusively” to auto workers. Little Big Horn, Flint, Harlem in 1964, South Brooklyn in 1971—all are part of a common heritage of struggle of the entire working class in America—black, brown, red, and white—and, indeed, of workers all over the world. ■

A CONSUMER EDITION OF WOMEN'S WEAR DAILY

PUBLISHED BY FAIRCHILD PUBLICATIONS, INC.

More Firsts for Cardin: Moscow — and Even Minsk

PARIS (WWD Cable) — Designer Pierre Cardin has scored another first. He will sell ready-to-wear to Russia.

“I am the only one to have such a fashion contract,” said Cardin, who looked tired, but happy, after a month of traveling which took him from Copenhagen to Iran to Moscow to New Delhi.

New Delhi was a particularly important stop since Cardin's Russian collection will be made in India and shipped to the Soviet Union through Handicrafts & Handlooms Export Corp., an Indian Government-sponsored firm for which Cardin has been designing fabrics, scarfs, ties and shirts on an exclusive basis for four years.

CARDIN'S first collection for the Russians will number 15 pieces and consist primarily of dresses. They will go on sale next month in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Vladivostock and Minsk.

When he was in Moscow, Cardin found himself relatively impressed with the way Russian women look.

“It is like any big city in the world,” he said. “You see women of all sizes. I had the impression the younger ones are very fashion con-

scious, but fashion is something they lack there.”

Quantities have not yet been established, but deliveries will be “enormous,” Cardin said.

“The first shipment will probably run to almost 3 million pieces. With quantities like that, prices will certainly be very reasonable.”

ACCORDING to a spokesman for HHEC in New York, Cardin's dresses will retail from about \$20 to \$100.

Cardin fell in love with the Indian fabrics from which his collection will be made.

“The Indian fabrics are extraordinary,” he said. While he was in New Delhi, he worked with the Indians on a new fabric which will be called Ghandi Cotton — with a Cardin label attached.

The move marks yet another “first” in the career of the innovative French couturier. He was the first of the major French designers to expand from couture into rtw. He was the first to move successfully into the men's wear fashion industry. And he was one of the first couture designers to produce and sell clothes successfully on a mass basis to the American market.


THE CLASS STRUGGLE RAGES INTERNATIONALLY AS WORKERS TAKE MATTERS INTO THEIR OWN HANDS....



New York City phone strikers attack \$50 billion imperialist monopoly A. T. & T. during 7th month of walkout, while....



...Brothers in Puerto Rico mass in front of Ma Bell in San Juan prior to closing company tight there.



Montreal workers hurl metal barricades at cops head-on as 15,000 fought in support of locked-out newspaper workers.



Members and friends of Progressive Labor Party ringed bosses' servant Nixon as he emerged from convention of AFL-CIO sellouts, in Miami Beach, Nov. 19, 1971

Mix McCarthy, Kennedy, Humphrey, et al...

Recipe for Racism

I read the article in PL Magazine (Vol. 8, #2) about Senator Eugene J. McCarthy and his financial backing. I found it quite interesting, being a former member of McCarthy's vaunted "National Staff." My travels for "Clean Gene" took me to Wisconsin, Indiana, Nebraska, Oregon, New Jersey and New York. Throughout the campaign McCarthy's racism and corruption (and the racism and corruption of liberals in general) became clearer to me—not so much in his official pronouncements but in the way he had his staff operate.

I would like to explain how racism was used by the liberals in general and McCarthy in particular, something the article in the last issue neglects, as well as show the futility of elections, again from my campaign experiences. In order to do this I have to provide some background information on Gary, Indiana.

STEEL TOWN

The Presidential primary and the campaign work for it took place in April and May of 1968. At that time Gary's population of approximately 168,000 was about half white and half black. Over in Chicago, where I grew up, Gary had the reputation of being a tough, racist town. There was a lot of truth to that. Racism was pushed a tremendous amount there, for very basic reasons.

The whole of Lake County, Indiana (Gary, East Chicago, Hammond and Whiting) is a heavy industrial area. Inland Steel employed 27,000 steelworkers in East Chicago; U.S. Steel employed over 40,000 in Gary. Further to the east was Bethlehem Steel. In Whiting there were the huge Standard Oil refineries. Youngstown Sheet and Tube was big, as were the railroads and trucking companies. This industrial complex continues on into the vast industrial areas of Chicago, containing a very large concentration of industrial proletariat.

In order to keep this huge mass of workers down, to prevent them from fighting for better wages and conditions, against layoffs and eventually for a revolution, the bosses of U.S. Steel and the other giants used racism as their main trump card. Every day in every way racism was thrust down the workers' throats.

First of all, the black community in Gary is neatly fenced in by the interstate highway to the South, the railroad tracks to the North, and the city limits to the East and West. (In Whiting we were told that black people "better stay off the streets at night.") The whole community, except for a small

black middle class, was a slum. The rebellions that had wracked the other cities had not fully erupted here, but the potential was still there. Those black workers who could get jobs were assigned to the meanest and toughest jobs at U.S. Steel and Inland Steel. The whole force of racist oppression and exploitation was present in Gary.

HATCHER SAVES THE BOSSES

Back in 1966, Gordon Hatcher launched his campaign to become the first black mayor of Gary, Indiana. He wanted to run as a Democrat. As millions of black working people were taking to the streets in militant rebellion, Hatcher came forward to play the electoral game. He was to be the answer for the black revolution! As soon as the bosses realized the potential in a campaign like this, they threw their weight behind him.

In order to carry out this scheme the bosses realized they had to sacrifice one of their own crew of cut-throats. Gary and all of Lake County had a very strong Democratic Party, political machine (very much like Mayor Daley's in nearby Chicago). It's job was to fix voting machines, silence opposition and use a generous amount of bribery and terror to enforce their will. (Machines like this normally serve the bosses' interest. As long as the graft and terror doesn't interfere with the big bosses' overall strategies, they will allow them to exist pretty much unhindered. When it suits their purposes, the big bosses will smash these machines and build new ones.)

In Gary, the old-line Democrats were opposed to having Hatcher run for Mayor. Their own racism was pretty deep. Since this interfered with getting Hatcher elected, the machine was resolutely smashed!

CRUSADERS

Robert Kennedy and Hubert Humphrey were two liberals who realized the importance for the ruling class of Hatcher's campaign. They actively campaigned for him, and they brought in over a million dollars, nationwide press coverage (*Newsweek*, *Time*, *N.Y. Times*, Walter Cronkite, etc.). Kennedy's forces built a very powerful "counter-machine" and greased it well with money, which paid for bribing election officials, buying votes in the community, promises of patronage jobs, etc.

The politics of the campaign for mayor told black

people that the way to get what was rightfully theirs was through elections. A black mayor "would understand the needs of the people and do what was best for them." This was the typical liberal line during a period of advanced class rebellions going on in the 60's. "Don't fight—Vote!"

To counter this, the old faithful Democratic Party machine whipped up racism among white workers. Since the machine was on the way out, they figured the best way to fight back was to win as many white workers as possible to overt racism. The Kennedy/Humphrey/Hatcher forces, of course, never countered this because both they and the old machine had the same line on racism, in essence: it's black vs. white and not workers vs. bosses.

By election time, racism had been built up among white workers and a lot of illusions about elections had been built up among black workers. (Hatcher forces led a voter registration drive to get more black people to vote.) The "official" results (who knows what kind of vote-fixing went on with all that money flying around) showed that voting went strictly along race lines, except for one area of Gary, the Miller section.

The Miller area is a very well-to-do residential area where the bosses of U.S. Steel, middle management and other top flunkies live. This high income group threw its votes to Hatcher. It was enough to barely tip the scales for him. (He won by less than one per cent.) Gordon Hatcher became the first black mayor of Gary.

This was a major victory for the bosses at U.S. Steel. The workers had become more divided through racism and the black workers, temporarily, had been won over to voting, and diverted from mass rebellion. And, as the events of the next two years proved, a black mayor is the same as a white mayor. Neither can serve the people. U.S. Steel runs Gary and Hatcher could serve them best at that time.

1968 PRIMARY IN GARY

It was April 1968. The anti-war movement was beginning to surge on college campuses, much of it led by the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Working people were starting to exert their influence against the war by strikes. The rebellions after Martin Luther King's assassination had wracked the U.S. It was in this political situation that the Indiana primary took place. The contestants were Robert Kennedy, Eugene McCarthy and Roger Branigan (Indiana's governor, a stand-in for Hubert Humphrey).

Robert Kennedy's main political role throughout the '68 campaign was the same one he performed in '66-'67 when he helped Hatcher get elected; build illusions among minority workers, win them away from mass rebellion and back into voting. His campaign received incredible publicity in minority communities. He also played on his brother's "record on civil rights" to win the sympathy of black people.

Branigan was the person around whom the old Democratic Party machine was regrouping to try for a comeback. (The old machine was never complete-



"...AY, HERE'S THE SMELL OF THE BLOOD STILL. ALL THE PERFUMES OF ARABIA WILL NOT SWEETEN THIS LITTLE HAM..."

ly smashed. After Hatcher's victory, they used every chance they could to get back in. The '68 primary was the big chance for them, since almost all offices were up for election.) A small splinter group from the machine, however, joined with Senator McCarthy.

McCarthy's main role was to win over the college students to working within the system. He was not above pushing racism, however, to further his own ends, as we shall see.

After serving an apprenticeship in the ghetto area of Milwaukee, Wisconsin; I was tabbed to be part of

the Gary team. The leader of the pack for the whole of Lake County was Tony Podesta (who later surfaced as a secondary leader in the National Moratorium Committee along with Sam Brown, another McCarthy hot-shot). Podesta received college credit from MIT for doing this campaign work, as did a large number of McCarthy's staff. The man in charge of Gary itself was Art Schantz. He had spent time in Southeast Asia as part of a University of Michigan team under the auspices of the Agency for International Development and the CIA. Several SDS members at the Chicago campus of the University of Illinois had been won over to joining McCarthy's Gary staff. So there I was, a college student operating under crippling illusions about the way the system works in the midst of a group of "big shot politicians."

HOW TO BE A BIG SHOT POLITICO

Living on the enormous sum of \$5 a day salary plus a room in the Gary Hotel, we got down to business. Canvassing routes were set up, advertising was bought, canvassers were recruited from the college campuses, literature was furnished, leafletting was done and housing was furnished. I had a lot of "busywork" to do, but after a while our main job was to put forth a political line to the canvassers, who in turn were to put it forth to the "public."

At the Saturday morning briefing sessions for canvassers, McCarthy's line on racism came across like this:

Canvasser: What do we say about McCarthy's record on Civil-Rights?

Big Shot Politico: Well, Gary's a pretty racist town, you see, and we're interested in building a movement that stops the war, gets the negotiations going. So we want to talk to workers, especially white workers, about how bad the war is, you know, inflation, their kids are dying in it and so on. When you go into a ghetto make sure you talk about how McCarthy really thinks racism is bad and voted for all the major Civil Rights bills. We'll have to talk about it there because Kennedy is in pretty good with them.

Canvasser: You mean we aren't to talk to white workers about civil rights or racism?

BS Politico: Well, if they ask you, tell them the Senator is for civil rights. But don't bring it up, you know; racism is pretty deep here and talking about it just makes it worse.

There's a lot to be learned from this dialogue. First of all, McCarthy knew very well who benefited from racism. Since many members of the ruling class contributed to his campaign (see PL, Vol. 8, #2), McCarthy knew what they needed. U.S. Steel at the north end of town needed racism to keep its profits high. So McCarthy would never confront it. He contented himself to jabbering about moving black people to the suburbs and a "new civil rights for everyone."

Secondly, McCarthy built the idea among the thousands of canvassers who were opposed to the war and racism that white workers were hopelessly racist and that they were the problem. Many honest people who came to these Saturday morning briefings were obviously disgusted at McCarthy for this.

At a time of tremendous working-class rebellions and growing student rebellions, the liberals had succeeded in the following (all in the interests of the bosses):

1. McCarthy won over some SDSers and thousands of other college students to the electoral process. He was also trying to win them to racism. The presence of CIA operatives at various levels of leadership in the McCarthy campaign helped in the planning of this. (See previously mentioned article for more on CIA influence in McCarthy's campaign and in the student movement.)

2. Kennedy was building illusions among minority workers about elections. Since the liberals' basic line was that white workers loved racism, Kennedy succeeded—partially—in pitting black against white workers.

The bosses at U.S. Steel must have laughed up their sleeves! What more could they ask?

SMASH RACISM!

The kind of thing that brings pleasure to bosses' hearts occurred one night while I was sitting in a coffee shop near downtown Gary. I was thinking about a lot of the bullshit that was going on in the campaign. Just then a butcher knife fight broke out between a black dishwasher and a white steelworker. It almost ended in a tragedy but other workers stopped it. When I told my fearless leader, Tony Podesta, about it, all he could say was "lock the door"!

That same week I was handing out leaflets at U.S. Steel at a shift change. Thousands of workers were walking out—black and white—side-by-side. It was slowly dawning on me what potential power there was if these guys were united and not split apart by racism. McCarthy had no answers at all. It wasn't until a year later, at the SDS National Convention in Chicago (June, 1969), where I was first introduced to the Progressive Labor Party, that I understood who pushes racism and why.

The tremendous drive for profits by U.S. Steel (and the other companies) are the cause. Hatcher's campaign, the Kennedy-McCarthy "race"—all of that crap had only one result: divide the working class so they could not fight back, so they would fight each other with butcher knives. A force of 40,000 steelworkers could be awesome. The bosses at U.S. Steel would last only a few seconds!

BIG-TIME POLITICS

Many people think that they can vote in socialism. (The old Communist Party USA is one group that pushes this. They worked with both Kennedy and McCarthy back in 1968. In Oregon, where I worked with longshoremen in the primary, they asked me to join the CP.) Whoever believes in winning social-

ism by voting is operating under very terrible illusions about the nature of this country's ruling class.

While we were in Gary, we were told to be on the look-out for vote fraud. The old Democratic Party machine was very adept at fraud, bribery and terror. Ever since they were ousted in the Hatcher campaign, they had been planning a comeback. Their first step was to get back control of the Democratic Party from Hatcher. This meant their candidates must win the primary elections in 1968.

Contrary to the Hatcher mayoral campaign (when



Kennedy and Humphrey worked so hard for him), no big-time liberal politicians came to Hatcher's aid in '68. Apparently he was no longer that important for the bosses. Even though he wasn't up for re-election, he was going to lose all of his "power." Kennedy, McCarthy and Humphrey remained aloof from many of the local campaigns, especially this one. Nevertheless, they had a big impact on local events. Their lack of backing is just as important in determining outcomes as their active support.

"PEACEFUL CHANGE"

The machine operated like this:

1. Payoffs: Voters were given \$5-\$10 to do a little leafletting, postering etc. All clerks and election officials were bribed.

2. Honest poll-watchers were beaten and/or arrested for the day.

3. Voting machines were fixed.

4. Courts paid no attention to charges of fraud since the judges owed their positions to the machine.

5. When necessary, outright terror was used (guns, muggings etc.)

The day of the election brought another surprise for me. McCarthy gave the order to have all guns removed from his staff to avoid any messy publicity that would scare off the college students or give his campaign a bad name. This order was directed at the small fraction of the old machine that had joined his campaign. These guys came into the office where I was working and put their guns down on the table in front of me. They said McCarthy was a fool. "You can't win around here without muscle," one of them said. "Already two of your boys have been roughed up." It was true. Two of our poll-watchers had been given a "going over" by goons from the old machine. I didn't realize things were so rough!

"THE MAN FROM LA MANCHA"

Some people think that recent investigations into fraud and bribery of civic officials show that the federal government and its leading politicians care about the people. These investigations are a sham! True, some people will go to jail, but the ruling class will always sacrifice some of their flunkies if it fits into their overall strategy. (As the Hatcher campaign showed, the bosses ousted their machine when they needed to.) The following example from election night in Gary shows the full corruption of ALL of the liberal candidates.

All of Gary's precincts have voting machines. These allow for quick tabulation of results. Most elections can have the returns in and counted within two hours. Election night in the '68 primary was different. Eight hours after the polls had closed fully 20% of Gary's precincts had not yet reported. This meant that the old Democratic Party machine had gotten back into power and they were fixing all of the local elections.

What was the response of crusader McCarthy? What did the flaming liberal Kennedy do? Did they

immediately expose the corruption and fraud in Gary? No! Their concern was strictly for themselves and the class they represent.

Kennedy headquarters called McCarthy headquarters and the following game plan was agreed upon to get the Presidential returns released:

1. 200 Federal marshalls had been put up in Gary hotels and motels for the evening. They were brought in at Kennedy's request. We feared something like this might happen, so he was prepared to use the government if he had to.

2. We jointly called the County Clerk—the machine head—and told him that all of the returns would be seized by the marshalls in ten minutes if the results weren't given to us for the **Presidential election**. They were warned that Kennedy would smash their machine once and for all if they crossed him.

Within five minutes the Presidential returns were phoned to us personally by the County Clerk. The **local returns**, however, **were kept until dawn**. It took them that long to figure out a reasonable way to fix the results.

This shows how really corrupt Kennedy and McCarthy were. They only opposed graft and terror when it interfered with them personally or with the general strategies of the ruling class. Probably many current trials (such as those in New Jersey) came about because these petty stooges crossed someone higher up. Their own greed carries them too far! We should note, however, that **even if** Kennedy and McCarthy had blown the whistle on these clowns, nothing would have changed for the working people of Gary. Nothing had changed under Hatcher, so there was no reason to expect things to be different now.

There was a tremendous effort in the ruling-class press to portray McCarthy as the "honorable, honest man" from a "humble background." His real-life practice was that of a scheming politician (like all the rest). He didn't oppose racism—he pushed it. He didn't oppose imperialism—he wanted to negotiate about it with the revisionists. He didn't oppose corruption—he was corrupt himself. So what was he going to do? Nothing but be a mouth-piece for the ruling class.

Considering what went on in Gary in the short period of 1966-68, it's fairly easy to conclude that significant social change can never occur through voting. All of the events in this period showed that it was the decisions that best served the bosses that carried the weight. Workers only have power when they organize themselves with communist ideas!

Voting will be upon us again in the '72 elections. We should not be drawn into this bosses' trap. No matter what liberal cheerleader the bosses trot forward—whether it be McGovern, Kennedy, Muskie, McCloskey or the new Democrat, Lindsay—we should expose them for what they are: tools of the big bosses. As the economic situation gets worse or stays at a low level, the bosses will be looking for someone to try to win workers and students away from rebellion and revolution. We must oppose this!

Two years after I quit the McCarthy campaign I joined the Progressive Labor Party. In some of the past issues of CHALLENGE-DESAFIO I have seen articles about the steelworkers of Gary. Great! The growth of the PLP among the steelworkers of Gary will spell the doom of the bosses of U.S. Steel, their political machines, their bribes, their terror, their racism and their capitalism.

—Al Tumillillo

Drugs: The U.S. Government is the Biggest Pusher of All

I.

It was the winter of 1943-44 and Hermann Goering was panicky. His morphine supply was running short. The Gestapo chief and other addicts in the High Command knew that the Allies' push would cut off all remaining outside sources of narcotics to the Nazis. The leading researchers down at I.G. Farben, the chemical cartel, were working feverishly to develop some kind of synthetic morphine that would feed the habits of their frantic bosses. When at last they achieved success, they honored their Fuhrer by naming the new drug after him: Dolophine, after Adolph; Dolophine, which is still the trade name used by Eli Lilly & Co. for the brand of Methadone Hydrochloride it sells to American dope addicts.

Today, this achievement of fascist depravity is being issued quite legally in daily doses to nearly 30,000 very strung-out men and women by the government of the United States of America. In return for the hand-out, all the U.S. ruling class asks is complete obedience and guaranteed profits.

A paranoid pipe dream dreamt up by some obscure and malevolent revolutionary? Take another puff, friend! This intentional poisoning of our brothers takes place seven days a week in Methadone Maintenance Centers in at least 20 cities from east coast to west. It's all part of the government's mock "War on Drug Abuse"—a war which, like all wars declared by the imperialist powers, is designed mainly to enrich the warmakers. The rulers of America are waging this "war" in order to divert huge profits being racked up by private consortiums of foreign criminals into their own already bulging pockets.

II. ONE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:

Heroin has been a major source of death and addiction (and fat profits, too) in black and brown ghettos for the past 15 years, at least since Korea. But drug treatment has hardly been a government priority until very recently. There is something to the often heard opinion that the politicians never gave a damn about what "smack" was doing to working-class kids so long as it was confined to the ghetto. But with the bloom and wilt of the flower children during the past five years or so, hard drugs have suddenly broken out of the working class and the petit bourgeoisie is up in arms.

In affluent Marin County outside San Francisco in sunny California, cops are driving young addicts direct to the local drug treatment centers. Ghetto addicts—black, brown and white—have always gone to jail. And no one ever gave a damn.

Dope has always been used on the most oppressed as a means of diverting potentially rebellious energies into channels of impotence and death. This has always been the position of the revolutionary Progressive Labor Party. True, some so-called "revolutionaries" (the Weathermen and the Yippies) have refused to concede this and continue to champion the use of drugs as a way of "bringing the system to its knees." But more and more young people are coming to understand what dope is really all about. The Panthers for example now recognize that "dope is genocide" and the slogan "Goddamn the Pusherman" is a part of their arsenal.

What the Panthers and others have tended to overlook is how the ruling class has used dope to pacify the militancy of all working-class people, white and black. The spread of heroin addiction among many GI's in Vietnam is just the most recent example. A century ago throughout New England and other industrial sections of the country, opium was readily available, and legal too, in all working-class communities. Overworked, exhausted men, women and children, fed up and dissatisfied with having slaved ten to fifteen hours a day in the most miserable dungeons for a few cents a day had a choice: organize... Or get high. For those who wound up with a habit at that time, there were no treatment centers...

III.

The cry "Goddamn the Pusherman" is a sure sign that today the people are angry enough to deal with the problem of dope addiction. Working people see their sons and loved ones go off to fight wars in the defense of huge corporations and come back with \$100-a-day heroin habits. They see their brothers and sisters unable to find jobs but always able to find the pusher. They see the cops getting paid off to turn their backs on the big dope dealers. They know how dope is poisoning their communities and they are angry. And it is the anger of the people that is the real reason for the politicians' sudden epidemic of concern.

As usual, the bosses have an ulterior motive.

(Continued on page 54)

Newsw eek


JULY 24, 1967 50c



“Marijuana: the Pot Problem” has been selling magazines for years. Now Heroin is making the front pages (see next page). Compare these two cover stories three years apart...

With tens of thousands of GI's carrying \$200-a-

day heroin habits home from Vietnam, no one knows precisely how many people are shooting junk from coast to coast. Statistics on grass are little better. The consensus probably averages out to be at least one half the population below 25 having smoked a little.



Whatever the figures; so much money is being made on pot that it looks like legalization is a certainty once the government can figure out how to placate the liquor industry, subsidize the cigarette industry and weave a solid tax structure around the

sale of packaged smoke. Growing your own or holding untaxed grass will probably still be highly illegal. Getting high has always been O.K. with Uncle Sam so long as money can be made on it and the people kept "in their place." After all, keeping oppressed people oppressed is his main business.

They recognize that dope means big profits all ways for them. The legalization and sale of soft drugs is going to take it in. And the so-called "treatment" of these unfortunate thousands who get hooked on the hard ones means both long term cash-on-the-barrelhead contracts and a whole lot of brainwashed zombies on the streets of America if the ruling class plays its cards right.

In America, the pharmaceutical industry, the medical profession, the administrators of government, the police and finance capital are all party to a conspiracy which makes the Mafia look like a street-corner pusher in comparison.

More paranoid rhetoric out to discredit the "democratic" process? Well, just take a glance at **Forbes** magazine, April Fools Day, 1970 which has a lead story mouth-watering at the takes realized in the dope trade last year. It very simply says this honored bastion of Wall Street: buy ten kilos of pure opium for \$350 in Turkey or Iran (both countries run by U.S.-appointed puppet regimes), process and package the dope at minimal cost in France. Turn it over for \$500,000 in the heart of N.Y.C. By the time it's been stepped on fifty times into a million

little \$5 bags, the profits will run into the thousands of percents. "A plague yes—but it's an industry." That's a quote, man.

The article goes on to analyze the market: the average user in New York City is spending \$35 a day to keep his habit going. Multiply this by 100,000—the estimated number of addicts in that city—and you get \$3.5 million a day. That figures out to \$1.5 billion a year! (Some estimates of heroin addicts in N.Y.C. run as high as 160,000 to 250,000.)

It's no wonder that the price of processed heroin on the world market is nearly twice that of gold. American imperialism is getting itchy for a share of the gravy. Dope sales should be right up there on top of **Fortune's** annual profit listings, alongside General Motors and Standard Oil. The only trouble is that it's been hard to convince the people to accept its legalization. So what's their plan? Run the foreigners out of the market-place. Let the State take over the distribution of dope. Cover up this blatant scheme of wholesale poisoning with a white-wash job called "Drug Treatment." You still think it's a paranoid's nightmare? Well it's happening today—all over America.



The Challenge Corps: a teen-age organization that fights drugs

IV.

Methadone Maintenance as a solution to heroin addiction is the result of work carried out at Rockefeller University and Beth Israel Hospital in New York City by Drs. Marie Nyswander and Vincent Dole. City, state and Federal grants were pumped into this project at a record rate in response to the angry cries of millions of working people who are demanding that the government do something about dope in our neighborhoods and schools.

The situation in New York City is particularly critical. Over 100,000 to 250,000 addicts—many of them teenagers. Hundreds of kids dead each year due to overdoses or bogus dope. Millions of dollars in thefts—many of them committed by addicts against their own neighbors just to keep their habits going. Jail costs skyrocketing because of the rising cost of housing an increasing number of addicts busted behind stealing and dealing. Two million people on welfare, including thousands of dope addicts who are unemployed and unemployable. Rockefeller, Lindsay & Co. have had to act fast to quell the swelling rage of the people.

Methadone is their answer. The idea is to take the wind out of the sales of the heroin pushers by pushing Methadone on the junkies. It's cheaper. And it's legal. And it's just as lethal...

Nyswander and Dole can rest easy in their plush East Side offices. Both have made their reputations behind Methadone Maintenance. Research grants, prizes, awards, speaking engagements and their colleagues' accolades are their reward for getting the heroin monkey off the junkies' backs. And putting the methadone gorilla in its place. Dole is a product of Stanford and Harvard and like all liberals, feels pretty good about his "humanitarian" contributions. Nyswander's been around the dope scene a long time, first at Lexington (the federal "rehabilitation" prison) and Bellevue Hospital in N.Y.C.—most of the time on five-figure salaries.

Both knew exactly what the end result of Methadone Maintenance is—the extended addiction of thousands of treatable addicts! It's all part of a calculated plan of containment.

Actually, the big money in methadone is going to the manufacturers. The major stockholders in corporate giants like Ely Lilly & Co. and Merck, Sharpe, & Dohne, two of the nation's most lucrative drug houses (see box) really are taking in the rewards. As producers and wholesalers of their own brands of methadone, they and their sidekicks in the pharmaceutical mob are into a gold mine. A kilo of methadone hydrochloride costs roughly \$150 to put together. The mark-up is at least 300% to start. Remember there is no research cost—the Nazis took care of that. And one thing about the methadone business—the demand and the volume have always got to be there. Hundreds of thousands of unwilling customers have got to have it every day for the rest of their lives. The owners of Coca Cola are running a corner candy store next to these guys!

But the big winners in this sweepstakes are not just the doctors or the drug companies but the Lindsays and the Rockefellers and Nixons and the rest of the ruling class as a whole.

The job of government under capitalism is to control the great masses of people in such a way that the maximum amount of profits can be wrung from them without inspiring their resistance. Although the vast majority of drug addicts are doped into obedient submission by their habits, they are not totally under control of their government. The great drug monopolies do not yet dominate the profit mechanisms from the street sale of dope. In addition, commercial enterprise loses millions each year to dope addicts—both from what addicts steal and the outlay necessary to guard against these thefts. Moreover, the dissatisfaction of the people at what dope is doing to them is fast rising to a

(Continued on page 57)

VIETNAM WAR


A century ago, the British in a desperate effort to maintain their "sun-never-sets" empire, introduced opium into China. The imperialist effort to enslave millions of Chinese workers and peasants through dope addiction resulted in the resistance known historically as the opium wars. Today the opium wars are coming home to imperialism and the people who live in its heart-land, who are angry and frustrated with the tragic consequences.

A day doesn't go by without a new scare headline about ex-GI's walking the streets with \$200-a-day habits. Or some politician—all politicians bear a heavy responsibility for turning on these thousands of new addicts—crying for money and public support for "drug treatment." And what will this treatment consist of? You guessed it! Nixon's recent appointment of Dr. Jerome Jaffe as front-man for this massive whitewash campaign is a sure sign that methadone is going to be the main method of

"treatment." Dr. Jaffe is an old time Methadone researcher.

And with every other crisis facing working people in America, the press has made an instant problem out of a situation created by the ruling class a long time ago, and, typically, the ruling class has responded with an instant "solution." We should not be fooled by the military's phony promises of "amnesty" and "detoxification." Imperialism always discards its victims.

GI's returning from Vietnam are going to find America in the midst of a serious recession. Unemployment and repression are on the rise. And there's plenty of dope available on the streets and lots of methadone being given away at the clinics. This is the only response the rulers have to the critical problems of the great masses of people: Lull them to sleep or beat them over the heads. The only solution to drug addiction must be to smash this system and its chains of slavery which bind us all.



Early morning scene outside Abbett's United Biologics Blood Bank on San Francisco's Mission

Street. These bloodsuckers will pay a \$15 bonus if a skid row donor gives twice in a single week.

point which could get beyond control. This then is the primary political function of methadone: to control the people. But the profits that can result by implementing such a system of control—while a by-product of the original intention—are not to be snivelled at.

V.

Currently about 30,000 addicts are enrolled in public Methadone programs. In New York City, it's being dispensed in at least 37 centers in the five boroughs. Other cities have set up their own programs along the same lines. Ghetto community groups are operating methadone centers in a number of communities. The Federal government is deeply involved in operating Washington, D.C. facilities. At least half a dozen V.A. hospitals are already in the methadone maintenance business—and Nixon is asking for 30 more veteran-oriented clinics.

Given the present growth rate, there soon will be close to 100,000 enrolled in open methadone programs around the country. That's not all; an undetermined number of privately-operated clinics are also dispensing methadone. Private physicians are giving it to any patient who walks in the door and claims he's got a drug habit. There is so much loose methadone today in any given American city that you don't even have to sign up with your nearest neighborhood creaker to score.

What does this all mean? Just that a very powerful and new kind of dope has hit the streets. And no one is very sure about what it can do to the user. You see, the government still has methadone classified as an "experimental" drug ("investigation" in their jargon). The same classification was given to Thalidomide, a "downer" which resulted in the birth of thousands of deformed children. This isn't to say that methadone is going to turn out the same way, even if the Food and Drug Administration is permitting its wholesale distribution to an unprecedented number of guinea pigs.

VI.

When shot up like heroin, methadone gets you high—although there is no "rush," no initial burst of exhilaration. When taken orally in large enough amounts, methadone can also get the user loaded. And like heroin, when the dose is massive enough, it can kill. Five methadone overdoses were reported this past March in Washington, D.C.; two more in Flushing, New York this June. But the main similarity that methadone carries to the original is that it is highly addictive—more so even than heroin, some users say. Several acquaintances who tried to get off it cold turkey told me the same story: bone and joint aches were so excruciating that kicking heroin seemed like kid's play.

The highly addictive qualities of methadone are not denied by any of the experts in the field. "It's just one of the problems" they have to "iron out." Experiments by Dole and Nyswander in trying to bring addicts off of methadone have been dismal failures. We can get them down to 25 mg. a day but

after that we are in trouble," Dr. Benj. J. Primm of Bedford-Stuyvesant's Addiction Research and Treatment Corporation told the **Village Voice** (June 10, 1971). Dr. Bob Zalinsky who runs a methadone program in Minneapolis reported at the recent National Heroin Symposium that of eleven people in his program who did kick methadone two were dead, five were in jail, three were using either heroin or methadone and only one addict was still "clean." The conclusion is, either stay hooked on methadone, or die. Methadone is a very heavy string to cut.

What does methadone do for the addict to warrant its growing use as a universal remedy? Mainly, it has the property of "blocking out" a heroin high. This means that the addict who is on methadone will get no satisfaction from using heroin. The only drug which satisfies his craving for opiates is methadone. One "fix" of methadone will hold an addict for approximately 25 hours. Then he has to do it all over again.

In order for methadone to have this dubiously beneficial effect on the addict, the addict must be stabilized at between 90 to 120 mgs. per day. This is an extremely high degree for any drug, particularly for one that no one really knows much about. It appears, however, that even this much methadone a day isn't really going to sustain the addict over the long haul. Evidence is beginning to turn up that addicts who have been hooked into programs for upwards of four years are now demanding higher and higher doses to ease their daily opiate craving.

VII.

The word **opiate** is made bold for a reason. Methadone does not block out the desire to use all drugs, just the desire to use heroin. Heroin and methadone are both opiates. Methadone is totally synthetic while heroin is derived from an organic base (the poppy).

This complex of drugs was originally developed to eliminate pain—morphine being the first opium-based drug that was put into practice. When morphine was found to be highly addictive, the Germans came up with heroin as an alternative "wonder drug." And when heroin was found also to be addictive, dialaudin was developed. And so down the line, to methadone. The main effects of the use of all **opiates** are, 1) Ambulatory narcolepsy and 2) unquenchable addiction.

Amphetamines (speed) on the other hand have the opposite psychic effect: they "pep" the user up. In between these extremes are the "mind-blotters"—grass, alcohol, "downs" (barbituates). And then there are the hallucinogens—LSD, TSP, Mescaline, etc. and mind-blowers which can turn the user into an instant "visionary."

Although these drugs all produce different kinds of mental distortion, their effect is generally the same. Escape from objective reality, a reluctance to change one's objective reality no matter how harsh it is, a total indulgence in one's own individualism, a shirking of responsibility to the larger society outside one's head.

People use drugs because it is easier to get loaded



*Our hat's off to
PHOENIX HOUSE
for their efforts in finding
solutions to a serious problem
of our modern society so that
man can walk in dignity.*

Nathan's SINCE 1916
FAMOUS INC.

Nathan's—a favorite gathering place for addicts in N.Y.C.'s Greenwich Village—absolves its conscience with an ad in the Phoenix House publica-

tion REACH OUT. Below, the Monsanto Chemical empire tries to look good with a donation to the same magazine.

Monsanto and Phoenix House....

The Chemistry is Right!

criteria for enrollment—and such administrative headaches as licensing, multi-program enrollees etc. have sent the politicians scurrying for other solutions. Some liberals, decrying the hypocrisy of the whole set-up, just want to dispense free heroin.

The main difficulty to be ironed out in instituting “heroin maintenance” programs is control of the heroin market. Once this is accomplished, the cost of the two drugs will be about the same—if you control the market, you control the cost. This is no idle fantasy. A straight-out deal with the Turkish and Iranian bourgeoisie could result in direct U.S. control of the heroin market, since these two countries allegedly account for 80% of the raw opium used for U.S. heroin. Steps in this direction have already been taken. In late June, the U.S. Government announced agreement with Turkey to ban all “private” opium production after 1972, thus giving the Turkish puppet rulers direct control over the annual poppy harvest. Oddly enough this move coincided with Mayor John Lindsay’s announced experiment of dispensing free heroin to 500 New York City addicts.

VIII.

Defenders of methadone maintenance have developed elaborate rationales for its expanded use. The medical one is perhaps the most interesting. Drug users suffer from some kind of metabolic imbalance says Dr. Nyswander. Methadone somehow magically restores this balance. Precisely the nature of this imbalance and its cause has never been clearly established. That does not seem to matter to the Food and Drug Administration which has approved the massive use of methadone. There is money in it. And it keeps addicts on a string controlled by the State. That is reason enough for pouring methadone into the ghetto.

“Methadone is to drug addicts what insulin is to diabetics,” claims Nyswander. But the use of insulin itself is open to some question. Evidence collected among Yemenites who were moved from various Middle Eastern countries to Israel indicates that diabetes is the result of poor nutrition. Given the proper diet, the disease could be wiped out. But rather than dealing with the prevention of diabetes, bourgeois medicine addresses itself to control. Thus, insulin becomes the only alternative for the diabetic—and a few huge pharmaceutical companies sock away the profits from its booming sales.* Insulin, like methadone, is a good example of how a capitalist society “cures” its sick—by addicting them to expensive drugs at a large profit all the way down the line, from the drug store to the doctor to the pharmaceutical trusts. The bosses care only about the health of their bank accounts.

But “see what methadone has done for the poor dope addict,” its supporters clamor. It rehabilitates them. Makes them employable again. Their arrest records dry up. They get off welfare. The taxpayers are thankful for methadone. Rich folks are happy—their plush apartments aren’t getting ripped off any more by drug-crazed junkies. Just look at the figures! A 95% success rate; 75% em-

ployment. And it only costs 12¢ a day.

But the statistic game is rigged. Most of the information invariably comes strictly from Nyswander and Dole from papers they have written and studies made of their programs. For example, in 1969 a Columbia University team headed by Dr. Frances Rowe Gearing put together an evaluation which ran into the tens of thousands to produce (and glowed with reams of success stories). This report was eventually made the basis for the expansion of the New York City program from \$2 million annually to a proposed \$15 million in 1972.**

The main flaw in the Columbia University evaluation was that the figures and facts quoted were garnered from folks employed in the methadone program themselves. Many of them were on methadone and dependent upon a good report to maintain both their jobs and their habits!

Methadone maintenance perpetuates itself in the same way that all government-funded community agencies do. As more and more addicts graduate into the hierarchy of various programs, they gain a stake in the continuance and growth of their own administrations, not unlike the myriad federal anti-poverty programs. In its own way, methadone maintenance is a shining example of how reform operates under a system where the machinery of government is used to suppress the legitimate desires of the people for a better life.

The crisis of drug addiction is a direct result of the frustration and alienation felt by most working class people under capitalism. People use dope because their jobs are unbearable (if they have a job), because they are forced to go to schools in which nonsense is the only subject taught or to spend years in the army which is the most hated institution of imperialism everywhere in the real world. Thus, the system becomes responsible for creating a problem that demands a solution which cannot be solved without changing the system itself. The result is always a phoney trick-bag like methadone maintenance, designed both to let the system white-wash itself and boost its control on the people by expanding its bureaucracy and machinery of repression into previously uncontrolled areas.

In plain terms, this means we now have a whole army of methadone-saturated soldiers (it could be

*Insulin was originally patented as a trademark of Squibb which also manufactures Lifesavers and Lanvan perfume. Squibb’s pharmaceutical division netted \$310 million in 1970. Other drug firms also manufacture anti-diabetic drugs such as Upjohn’s Orinasse, the biggest selling oral diabetic remedy. Those drugs are sold at enormous profits to diabetics who must use them daily in order to stay alive!

**Proposed by Rockefeller despite the fact that he’s also proposed to cut back the state budget in every other area of so-called health “care.”

100,000 in number by 1972) captained by thousands of doctors, psychologists, social workers, evaluators and assistants, all with a stake in perpetuating addiction to methadone—in the name of “health care for the people”! It’s entirely accurate to observe that more people are living **through** drug addiction than dying **from** it. But it’s hardly solving the problem, brother . . .

IX.

One must admit that methadone has gotten thousands of addicts out of the streets and into the clinics at least once a day. In fact, Dr. Dole has said that “methadone-maintained addicts have an 80% chance of becoming socially acceptable citizens.” But what Dole thinks is “acceptable” is very open to question by millions of the world’s working

(Continued on page 64)

ANOTHER BAND-AID!

The Nixon administration recently announced a major “breakthrough” in the treatment of heroin addiction, so-called “antagonist” drugs which cause the addict to become violently ill whenever he uses heroin. The two main “antagonists” being tested are Cyclazocine (Sterling Drug) and Naloxone (made by Endo Labs, a subsidiary of Du Pont). In May ’71, representatives of various research teams for those laboratories and other testing institutes appeared before Congress in a bid for a \$3 million subsidy to expand their activities.

Both of these “antagonists” are opium-based drugs and would require poppy cultivation to be manufactured in quantity. Cyclazocine is still considered a high-risk drug as its use can precipitate severe (and possibly lethal) withdrawal symptoms if the user is not free from dope.

Heroin “antagonists” require constant clinic visits because the addict is always free to use heroin once his system is clean of the “antagonist.” The side effects of the drugs are often so disagreeable that any addict motivated enough to keep his appointment at the clinic would probably be strong enough to kick dope without the aid of these painful crutches. In addition, with both heroin and methadone readily available, no drug addict is going to submit to “antagonist” treatment of his own free will. This kind

of solution to drug addiction is going to have to be court-ordered and the great majority of those receiving “antagonists” will have to be locked up in order to insure that it is given at regular intervals.

Actually, “antagonists” have been used for the past ten years as “tracer” drugs in Nalline units of various police departments. Nalline is used to test paroled addicts to see if they are still using. A former addict describes his painful experience with Nalline: “(the doctor) gives a shot and tells me to sit down and wait 30 minutes . . . this is where the fun begins. No matter how long you have been off heroin and no matter how much you’ve forgotten about it, as soon as that Nalline hits you, you remember exactly what it tastes like . . . I feel all the symptoms of heroin but nothing like a high . . . I want to go out and get loaded so bad I can hardly stand it . . .” (**Drugs on the Tenderloin**, published by the Central City EOC in San Francisco)

It’s clear that “antagonist” treatment is hardly the kind of program which is going to attract any noticeable number of addicts. We should recognize this “breakthrough” for what it really is—a publicity stunt perpetrated by Nixon and his henchmen to calm down the indignation of millions of Americans, angered by the toll the aggression in Vietnam has taken among returned GI’s strung out on dope . . .

"THERAPEUTIC" COMMUNITIES

The alternative panacea to methadone maintenance is the Therapeutic Community, chains of small self-contained communities which regard the use of any dope—from alcohol to occasional tobacco—as being a cop-out solution to a drug problem. This approach argues that people become drug addicts because of personal weaknesses. Although racism and exploitation can help to highlight a flawed personality, the only real "cure" is within the addict to change and not the system (which is considered "beyond help").

Striving for personal self-perfection is the only way to alter the craziness of the outside society, say these people. The main technique for achieving this discipline is a mix of gestalt psychology (the Encounter Group, the Synanon Game) and a highly controlled and hierarchal community. Alienation, inability to relate to others, manifestations of psychic fear, are all confronted daily in a controlled setting so that together the members of the community can get at the roots of each others' personal problems.

Therapeutic communities incorporate many healthy approaches to dealing with drug addiction. They recognize and define the alienation which class and race oppression cause working people to feel. They try to deal with instances of isolation and selfishness which cripple so many potential fighters against the system. In Encounter sessions, addicts learn responsibility towards each other by accepting and giving the kind of astringent criticism that can really help a person to re-order his personal life. And the use of artificial crutches—be it methadone or Chesterfields—is constantly shot down as the coward's way out.

On the other hand, cultism, defecation of the community hierarchy, the demand for uncritical loyalty and the promise of personal self-gratification give these programs the pie-in-the-sky aspect of assorted Sunday morning storefront churches and religious sects.

The grandpappy of all the therapeutic drug communities is Chuck Dederich's Synanon. Synanon has served as a model to 50 or so other parallel communities which have sprung up across the country during these past five years of drug epidemic. It has graduated innumerable directors, counselors, etc. into similar programs. Dederich is not particularly happy to see his graduates leave Synanon. In fact, he has structured Synanon so that it has no "re-entry" stage and is entirely self-contained. The Grand Guru feels that anyone who dares to leave his program is doomed to character disorder and disaster on the outside. Although Dederich's

view's on "splitting" the program are extreme (a person who leaves is called a "splittee"), this kind of elitism and reluctance to train people to deal with the real world are characteristic of all therapeutic communities.

Synanon cultism finds its parallel in all other therapeutic communities. The official uniform at Synanon is striped overalls. Each day begins with the "Synanon Prayer." Houses are divided into different tribes (the dao tribe, the zen tribe, etc.). Synanon residents dance the Hoopla, attend religious festivals like the Periodic Trip and the annual Cop-out (modeled on the Last Supper). Every aspect of life at Synanon seems to have some ritual attached to it. "Synanon is our religion, our universe," says the wife of an ex-heroin-shooting New York cop to a **Good Housekeeping** magazine reporter (Honest! you can read all about it, Oct. 1970).

Louis Yablonsky, one of Synanon's chief apologists, wrote in his defense of the program, **THE TUNNELBACK**, that an absolute democracy can afford to have no outcasts. Yablonsky agrees with Dr. Dole's methadone "socially-accepted-citizen" scale of values. Only, he views the "alternative" society as a better one to adjust to than the one out there. Synanon works diligently to make sure that there are no "outcasts" among its residents. Every member is constantly tested in his devotion to the program.

Although critics of Synanon have occasionally attacked this enforced faith as "Maoist thought reform," nothing could be further from the truth. Therapeutic communities are hardly Marxist communes. The content of daily life is all conformity to a bourgeois morality. Be a good citizen. Do your own thing. Don't rock the boat. You can be anything you want to be, if you set your mind to it.

Actually Synanon is no longer concerned only with drug addiction. Several years ago, Dederich closed down Phase I of his complex and declared The Alternative Society. Dope addicts now entering the program generally have to come up with \$1,000 entrance fees. Dederich & Co. are out to expand their empire which now includes beachfront property in Santa Monica (the old exclusive Delmar Beach Club), Tomales Bay, California and other choice parcels in downtown Oakland and San Diego.

At its last public unveiling three years ago, Synanon owned \$4 million in real estate and physical equipment, was taking in \$1 million yearly through the operation of a mail order gift business and a string of service stations, in addition to the \$2.5 million annually it takes in from parents and friends of its 8,000 members. Not bad for a "non-profit", tax-free enterprise.

These kinds of vested interests are the reason that politics—the politics of changing the class relations in this society to put working people in control—are anathema to the folks at Synanon. The Dederich bunch and other leaders in the “therapeutic world” basically like the way the rulers run things now, although they may yearn for a little more “empathy” between the various cliques at the top. Reid Kimball, Synanon’s second-string emperor, thinks that peace (at any price) could be obtained by taking the gang down at the UN and the whole U.S. senate on a sensitivity trip. “Think what that would accomplish,” Kimball once told the last issue of the **Saturday Evening Post**.

This type of non-aggression treaty with an oppressive society is not just confined to Synanon (which has made the whole outside world off-limits). Promises of success in a dog-eat-dog society are dangled before the ex-addict in just about every therapeutic community.

At Phoenix House in N.Y.C.—one of the most “successful” programs in the country—the philosophical indoctrination promises that the ex-addict can be “anything he wants” once “he’s gotten his head together.” This is outright fraud. You can’t be anything you want in a racist and corrupt society like America—especially if you’re brown or black or born into the working class, which is the case for the overwhelming majority of Phoenix house residents. While it is true that selling your soul to the ruling class might boost you up a notch or two on the “success” ladder, it still does not buy your heart’s desire. The ruling class is not giving it away free of charge. The fact is that they will use any means to keep what is theirs now.

At one Phoenix House in Manhattan’s East Harlem, an ex-addict who had become involved with the Young Lords was asked to leave the program. Another was turned out because of his association with the Panthers. In the Fall of 1968, politics split the Daytop Program in N.Y.C. right in half. While the fact that director David Deitch (a Synanon “split-tee”) had pictures of Fidel and Che on his walls are hardly a test of his revolutionary commitment, the Board of Directors was able to oust him on this basis. That’s a pretty good indication of how afraid the hierarchies of these programs are of political involvement.

One of the reasons for this all-consuming paranoia is that most of these programs are dependent in one way or another on the bosses for funding in order to survive. Not unlike the annual poverty program free-for-all, therapeutic communities regularly cut each others’ throats for access to public funds. Every few weeks, or so it seems, you

can see directors of various programs embroiled in open controversy on educational TV about “success ratios” and the respective merits of their own techniques. The competition gets so absurd that programs spend months dreaming up the cheapest publicity stunt.

Last year, for example, Dr. Judianne Denson Gerber of Odyssey House (whose bag is mainly younger addicts) appeared before a televised legislative hearing tearfully pleading for funds—with a twelve-year-old addict she had lured out of the South Bronx for the day, pressed up against her breast. This kind of gimmickry has to make you wonder about the effectiveness of these programs.

It is impossible to give actual figures about which House is doing best. The number of people who actually finish the 18-month to two-year programs do not reflect the number who have “split” during the process. Perhaps 50% of the addicts enrolled actually leave drugs behind (at least for a while), but that’s a guess. The programs are difficult to adjust to, confining because of tight facilities and stringent regulations, and not at all geared to older addicts with families, many of whom leave in the early stages of the therapeutic process.

Yet the flaw central to the therapeutic community is not the low success rate but the net result—which boils down to the trading of one addiction for another, not unlike methadone maintenance. Although the members of these communities strongly reject the use of “alternative drugs,” their dependency on the therapeutic “family,” and particularly on a strong central authority figure, is equivalent to psychological addiction. “If I have a good time, they have a good time,” Synanon dictator Dederich once boasted. This kind of enforced dedication makes it much easier to keep the residents “in their place” and psychologically tied to automatically-run therapeutic communities.

It’s also the main reason that very few “graduates” actually ever leave a program with the blessings of the management, especially to venture forth and do battle with a system which has created the problem of drug addiction in the first place. Tying people so tightly to a programmed “therapy” has the same effect as tying them to methadone treatment for a lifetime. Just as many kids are dying of overdoses or rat poison in their veins. Just as much dope is out there on the streets. Just as many rats bite just as many babies. Just as many people stay subjected to class and race oppression. Society does not change. The “ex”-addict, rather than becoming involved with fighting for a just way of life in his own community, is put on ice in “therapeutic communities,” psychologically addicted to a set of fake premises and treacherous promises.

people who find the capitalist system at the very least "unacceptable." Dole's attempts to "permit" addicts to take their rightful place in a society built on race and class oppression are only further examples of how imperialism enslaves working people under the guise of reform.

Check out the following example of Dr. Dole's rehabilitation success. At a Harlem clinic with 77 patients (63 of them non-white), 45 patients were working at full-time jobs (at least one was a film editor, at least one was a messenger boy); 32 others, the rest, were either in job training or waiting for "counseling help." Since these two categories are largely cover-ups for the fact that the country is in the grips of a full-scale recession, let's just say about 40% of these rehabilitated addicts were out of work, hanging around the clinic waiting for appointments with "employment experts." They haven't made it yet into Dr. Dole's definition of social acceptability.*

But the most revealing aspect of this mini-survey is not the unemployment rate but the number of these people who did find jobs. There are few enough jobs out there for anyone as the recession peaks—unless you want to be some kind of a cop or a bill collector. So how did 45 "non-white" addicts out of a Harlem Methadone clinic come up with jobs? It's simple. Bosses are always on the lookout for workers who are so tied down, either financially, physically or emotionally, that they can never make a move to fight for better conditions. Methadone-maintained employees fill this bill perfectly. They go to work faithfully every day on a glass of Tang (methadone is mixed with tang in the daily dosage) and a block of dope. They feel good and do not make any trouble for the man. If they did, their daily fix might just be lifted from them.


One condition the Justice Dept. has attached to granting a license to any methadone program is that the individual addict's "dossier" be made available upon request by the FBI. Big brother is on top of the monkey on your back. Oh, go on you say. Bosses are against dope. They're square. Dope is hip. You get fired if you are caught with dope. The ruling class drinks martinis. It really does not matter very much how the man gets his kicks. The main thing is that he knows that dope is a weapon to be used against the people. And he uses it.

At one Manhattan phone company facility in the East Seventies, management knows exactly who's using and who is not. The addicts who sell to other employees snitch their fellow workers out in order to maintain their jobs. The bosses will keep junkies on the job just so long as they can perform their work functions—and junkies have the incentive to perform their functions well because they need the money to keep their habits going. At this installation, when things get tight and pressure is put on the workers, the junkies work a little bit harder, never objecting to the politics of their bosses. This

*One of Dole's strongest supporters, Barry Ramer, M.D. who runs the Methadone program for the San Francisco Department of Public Health, once defined a "socially acceptable" citizen as one who goes to work, votes, and pays his taxes.

isn't exactly hip if you can define "hip" as being attuned to the needs of the people.

Dope addicts spend a lot of time off by themselves, isolated and in the corner, generally unable to interact and relate to "squares." Since the vast




26 years old...and still going strong

When you consider that 95% of today's most serious pain relievers are fast-acting drugs, you'll understand why Gelusil's gentle, soothing action is so effective. 26 years of effective relief. A relief which has brought comfort to millions of people in every part of the world. And, that's why you can rely on Gelusil to relieve the "aches" of rheumatism, headache, toothache, neuralgia, and all other pains. Each major drugstore, hospital, and pharmacy carries Gelusil.

GELUSIL

Feeling down? Take another pill! Americans are constantly assaulted with drug escape propaganda for every conceivable ill, from dandruff to manic depression. When Richard Nixon told the AMA's 1971 convention that one in every five Americans dropped a mind-altering drug of some kind last year and complained how tens of amphetamines and barbituates found their way into the illegal market last year, he was not just talking off the top of his head. As lawyer for Warner-Lambert (along with Chief Justice Department executioner John Mitchell), Nixon made a pile defending this company's conspiracy to push dope on the American people. Warner-Lambert's "ethical" drug division—Warner-Chilcott—is the main U.S. importer of German-made codeine. Meanwhile, the parent company will sell you everything from Gelusil (see ad) to Listerine, Bromo Seltzer, Roloids, Chiclets and Cool-Ray Polaroid sunglasses.



PARKE-DAVIS

for a better tomorrow

..... Recently, Warner-Lambert (the 98th largest corporate con-man in the nation) announced merger plans with Parke-Davis, the thirteenth largest drug outfit and the manufacturer of the nation's hottest selling narcotic

cough syrup (Cesanyl), sold mainly to dope addicts over the counter. Feeling down and oppressed? Don't fire the system. Just drop another pill! The bosses will feel a lot better if you do...

majority of working people are "squares," this pretty much makes for non-involvement—dope addicts are involved only in their habits, and consequently in themselves. In any kind of struggle situation, where it's necessary for people to pull together drug users usually become a particularly obedient and status quo force.

When a strike or a rebellion is brewing, drug users are very often divisive elements serving the interests of the ruling class either as stoolies or voices for surrender. After all, how is an addict supposed to get to the cop man or the nearest neighborhood methadone maintenance center seven days a week if there is a rebellion in the streets all around him. Threaten to cut him off and he will do anything to get those who are fighting back for a

decent way of life to quiet down. Even stool on the —his own brothers.

Don't think the State doesn't figure this into their future emergency planning. But don't get the impression that addicts are the main enemy. This warning has been written to advise everyone involved (and everyone is involved, most of all the addict) of the social and political treachery surrounding methadone, and, for that matter, the use of any and all kinds of dope. It is absolutely necessary that those of us who have come to the understanding that capitalism must be destroyed and replaced by a system where exploitation of man by man no longer can exist, that we communicate to our brothers and sisters who are strung out on dope the correct

(Continued on page 69)



***a trim waistline!
assist with
'METHEDRINE'[®]
brand
METHAMPHETAMINE
HYDROCHLORIDE**


Her once unruly appetite is now tamed with 'Methedrine'...an easy way to help control food craving and "hunger pains."

Side effects: Insomnia may occur if taken later than 6 hours before retiring. The usual peripheral actions of sympathomimetic amines (vasoconstriction and acceleration of the heart) are minimal and little noticed on low or moderate dosage.

Contraindications and precautions: Should not be used in patients with myocardial degeneration, coronary disease, marked hypertension, hyperthyroidism, insomnia or a sensitivity to ephedrine-like drugs. Moderate hypertension in the obese is not necessarily a contraindication since it may be relieved as the overweight is reduced.

'Methedrine' brand Methamphetamine Hydrochloride: Tablets—5 mg., scored.

Complete literature available on request from Professional Services Dept. PML.

 **BURROUGHS WELLCOME & CO.**
(U.S.A.) INC., Tuckahoe, N.Y.

For a trimmer waistline, just do up some Speed! "Methedrine" is the tradename of Burroughs Wellcome's gift to the American people. Along with CIBA (makers of Ritalin—a type of speed popular among educators), Burroughs Wellcome is one of the top foreign drug companies operating in the United States. No wonder! Speed is big money, not only on the street but in the schools and the U.S. Army as well.

The June 24, 1971 San Francisco Chronicle car-

ried a story about GI's strung out from dropping "cartwheels"—20 mg. dextroamphetamine pills—before going into combat. Some ex-soldiers are returning to the U.S. with long-term runs of up to 300 mg. of speed a day! During World War II, Methedrine and other methamphetamines were regularly used by the American and British airforces and more recently astronaut Godron Cooper popped some speed on his way to the moon over international TV (see the Tang ad page).



**On their 56th morning in outer space,
three men will drink Tang.**

And then check Skylab's solar array wings one last time and set the instruments on their module towards home.

This will come true. In less than 3 years, man will actually learn to live for extended periods of time in the first manned space station.

And Tang will be on board. The same instant breakfast drink that's on your kitchen table. Orange-flavored Tang with more vitamin C than orange juice. Nutritious Tang.



For breakfast tomorrow.

GENERAL FOODS TRADEMARK FOR INSTANT BREAKFAST DRINK.

General Foods has made it big with Tang. Not only does this "instant breakfast" fly to the moon but it also gets mixed into the methadone of more than 30,000 addicts a day: Could be that with consumer-prodded FDA investigations under way on a variety of GF products (Awake? Orange Plus, Toast 'Em Pop Ups, cyclamate-saturated Koolaid) Tang might prove to be, in the end, more harmful than methadone.

Actually this giant food outfit (it's the 45th largest corporation in the country) has little to fear from

the government. Its board of directors includes two former cabinet secretaries: Texas oil millionairess Oveta Culp Hobby, Eisenhower's new appointee and LBJ's Commerce Department head John T. Connor. Connor was, for 10 years, president of Merck (a leading producer of methadone) and currently heads Allied Chemical, the nation's 91st largest conglomerate. Also on General Foods' board of directors: William T. Murry of McKesson-Robbins' Foremost, another big drug firm, and Henry Ford III, who runs his own government.

THE FDA: HOW TO POISON THE PEOPLE

The Food and Drug Administration is the federal agency responsible for overseeing the distribution of methadone. The FDA, which still lists methadone as an "investigational" drug, has 30,000 guinea pigs walking around on the streets of America. This is not surprising for an agency which has a long history of aiding and abetting unscrupulous drug and food manufacturers at the expense of the people.

The food industry is the largest retail business in the country. The drug industry has the highest rate of profit. The FDA is a creature of these two industries, which, by law, it is supposed to regulate. Only under a corrupt political and economic system like capitalism could this situation exist. Only under a system of "free enterprise" ("free" for the rich) could so many dangerous drug and food products be permitted to flood the market without adequate testing or labelling precautions. The drive for profits is king under capitalism. And the FDA's job is simply to stay out of the way when the competition goes down for the consumer's buck.

The FDA has traditionally been run by puppets appointed right out of the industries they are supposed to govern. The current commissioner, Charles Edwards, held a high-salaried position with the Chicago-based consulting firm of Booz Allen & Hamilton prior to being handpicked for the FDA post. It is no coincidence that three members of the board of directors of Abbott Laboratories are also associated with the same firm. Nor is it any coincidence that one of Edwards' first acts was to allow cyclamate producers to re-classify their products as "drugs" in order to allow their continued sale in your local supermarket. Abbott Laboratories is one of the largest producers of cyclamate products, and since 1950 it has conspired with FDA officials to block release of tests which show conclusively that cyclamates cause cancer in rats.

FDA officials ferry back and forth between the food and the drug industries and their government "front." The Abbott deception has a long history. Back into the mid-sixties John T. Harvey was the closest adviser to the commissioner. His brother is still a high-ranking official with Abbott Laboratories.

Or take the case of Henry Welch, who, from 1960, was head of the FDA's Antibiotic division while at the same time editing three phony medical journals financed largely by Parke-Davis, a leading manufacturer of antibiotics. One of the present commissioner's first appointees was special assistant Larry Pilot who came directly to the administra-

tion from a three-year stint with the American Pharmaceutical Association. Charles Edwards himself was a lobbyist for the American Medical Association for a number of years.

The FDA is simply a rubber-stamp for the industries it is intended to "watchdog." The examples of its complicity with outfits like General Foods and Abbott Labs to literally poison the American people are too numerous to list. Here are some examples of how the conspiracy operates:

The primary testing procedure for new products is to allow the companies which have developed it to test the product themselves at "independent" laboratories—which are usually operated by the same companies. That's how food and drug products are tested!

When pressure is put on the FDA to take action against a product, the FDA asks industry to play the game of "self-regulation." For example, when the FDA was asked to ban the herbicides 2-4-D and 2-45T which have caused birth deformities in defoliated areas of Vietnam, who got called in to regulate their usage but Dow, Monsanto and Hercules—the manufacturers!

The FDA hardly ever takes any kind of punitive action against the larger manufacturers. For example, in 1969, at the peak of the uproar about pesticides, the agency made over 5,000 suggested labeling changes to the various producers, **not one of which was ever enforced.**

The FDA is dedicated to glorifying American industry at the expense of the people's health. Here's a quote from an FDA fact sheet: "Today's scientific knowledge, working through food laws to protect consumers, assures the safety and the wholesomeness of every component of our food (and drug) supply...!"

Is there any question, then, why cancer-causing chemicals like cyclamates are still being sold in your local supermarket? Is there any question why an additive like monosodium glutamate, which is also suspected of being carcinogenic, is still being mixed into baby food? Is there any question why at least two and a half million thalidomide pills were distributed to 20,000 unsuspecting patients before the FDA made any decision about permitting their distribution? And can there be any question as to why an unproven untested drug like methadone is today being handed out in massive doses to 30,000 human guinea pigs on the streets of America? Only under a profit-hungry blood-thirsty system like capitalism could the people's health be so blatantly violated. And only under such a system could an agency like the Food and Drug Administration be erected to sanction this violation.

treatment for this whole society: revolution)—the establishment of socialism. If methadone is all about slavery, then it's our job as revolutionaries to point the way to emancipation.

X.

Turning dope addicts into "socially acceptable citizens"—obedient slaves faithfully carrying out their masters' orders—is methadone's main function. So it is no accident that most methadone centers function right in the heart of the most oppressed communities. Why not? That's where the highest percentage of drug addicts are. It's also where the most oppressed and potentially most rebellious forces in any given city live. In order to drug these potential forces for revolution, it's absolutely necessary that the ruling class work from within.

Probably the most highly-studied and widely-praised methadone program in the country outside of Dole-Nyswander is the black-run addiction Research and Treatment Corporation in the heart of the nation's largest ghetto, Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant. ARTC was run in 1971 on \$2.6 million in state, city and federal money, in addition to outside research grants at Yale, Harvard, and Columbia. One of the largest programs in the New York system, with over a thousand addicts enrolled—90% of whom are black—ARTC is the government's primary pilot program for the ghetto. As a part of the final solution, it's not unique.

In the Manchester ghetto of Pittsburgh, Pa. the chief distribution point for heroin used to be on Central Avenue right across the street from the Police station. Now more than 200 addicts are being served right out of Black Action, Inc., a black-operated methadone center right in the heart of the ghetto.

The November 1970 **EBONY** carried an article showering praise on the project. **EBONY** is published by Johnson Publications, Inc., one of the nation's most successful examples of "Black Capitalism." Black Action, Inc. is also helping to build black capitalism. For \$20 a week, addicts can buy their dope straight from a few black doctors (who in turn buy their dope from wholly white-owned conglomerates). Instead of putting their muscle into destroying racism, the rats, roaches, high rents, unemployment, malnutrition, genocidal health "care" and police terror, the community is bull-shitted into championing an organization dedicated to maintaining the addiction of hundreds of black workers—at a tidy profit to themselves and much to the comfort of the minds and pocket-books of the ruling class, of course.

Most employees and participants in programs like the one run by ARTC or Black Action, Inc. or the Crispus Attucks clinic in the Denver ghetto or the San Antonio Free Clinic in the barrio of that teeming Texas city, are honestly concerned with fighting dope—because they understand how dope is destroying the will of their own community and class to fight back. Because they know from daily experience what kind of riches the financial kings of this country suck out of the ghetto behind dope every

day of the year. That is what makes those who profit from "drug treatment" programs particularly vicious—whether it's a Methadone-based program or any other kind of treatment program which consciously misdirects the fighting spirit of the people.

In Harlem I've heard about a group that breaks a pusher's leg when they catch him in the neighborhood. If the pusher happens to be black, they break both his legs. While I think pushers, both black and white ought to receive equal treatment (and the biggest ones strung up side by side), this approach has to be admired. It shows us, more than any other direction, the fighting spirit of the people. And most of all, it depends upon them too. Not upon administrators or alternate chemicals or gestalt psychology (see Box on Therapeutic Communities), but upon the wrath of the people, their desire to be free.

XI.

Unfortunately, most programs rely on the rulers rather than on the people for their ammunition. In Baltimore, for example, there are at least 10,000 addicts in the ghetto of one of the nation's most blighted cities. Man Alive Inc. is another black-run program. Like its counter-part, it re-employs many methadone users in the program (mainly to screen the urine of methadone enrollees for heroin traces). As in other cities too, methadone was first resisted by the local powermongers. The Baltimore AMA fought its funding, one reason being the use of paramedical assistants in the clinic. But, like Medicare—which the AMA also at first violently resisted—methadone maintenance was re-evaluated as acceptable when the profit potential became evident to the guardians of the local medical profession.

In New York City, methadone maintenance was first rejected for operation in the city prison system. Then came 1970's monumental jail rebellions, led mainly by black and brown prisoners. Suddenly, the then jail Commissioner George McGrath saw the light and instituted programs designed to keep prisoners quietly strung out and under control of the administration if they wanted their daily fix. The methadone program on Rikers Island, for example, is not set up to "help" addicts "kick" their habits since most addicts have had to kick cold turkey at the infamous Tombs before they can be processed into the program.

Out on Rikers, anyone is eligible to obtain methadone, whether or not they come into prison with a habit. Commissioners like McGrath and his partners-in-crime (including John Lindsay) ought to be strung up by the people for this conscious act of enslavement against thousands of potential revolutionaries.

In San Francisco where I live, methadone programs have met with little resistance from the local authorities. It is now being dispensed at three separate city health department centers and at one private outlet—Fort Help. There are perhaps 20,000 heroin addicts in the city with at least 5,000 more ex-GI addicts expected to flood the area in the next year. The clinics operate under a \$121,000 federal grant and matching city funds, given to Dr. Barry

THE BIGGEST MAFIA

The so-called Cosa Nostra is small potatoes compared to the drug industry. **Fortune's** 1971 industrial listings gave the drug companies the second highest return on stock and sales and the third highest increase in profit. Over the past three years, total sales for the drug industry have topped \$30 billion! The trick is to keep the profits billowing in while at the same time appearing truly concerned with the health and welfare of the citizenry.

Here's a brief look at three of the biggest dope dealers in the USA. **ELI LILLY:** Net sales of \$592 million in 1970 (up \$55 million from '69). Manufacturers of **DOLOPHINE** the most popular type of methadone; also producers of **SECONAL** ("reds"), **TUINOL** ("christmas trees"), **SODIUM AMYTAL** (another dangerous barbituate); also **DARVON**, an alleged painkiller which accounts for 10% of Lilly's sales (recent testing indicates that the drug is less effective than aspirin). Lilly also produces sizeable quantities of Morphine and Codeine; also manufacturers of animal, garden products. Purchased **Elizabeth Arden Cosmetics** in 1970; **Creative Packaging** and **Eleance Packaging**, wholly-owned subsidiaries. Lilly owns 13 plants in the U.S. and Puerto Rico with warehouses in eight cities and sales offices in 43, employing a total of 18,400 workers; owns 40 subsidiaries in 25 countries with considerable Puerto Rican holdings. Based in Indianapolis, Lilly's "detail men" (salesmen) are some of the pushiest in the business, keeping tabs on students all the way through medical school; finally presenting them with doctor's bags and whole libraries on graduation—in return for prescribing preferences.

MERCK: The second largest pharmaceutical house (behind Pfizer). Net sales in '70 of \$747,561,870 (compared to \$677,448,882 in 1969). Until recently produced heavy quantities of methadone (ME 52); at least eight distinct tranquilizers including **ELAVIL**, **TRIAVIL**, **SOMNOS**, **VIVACTIL**; also a leading producer of geriatric drugs which are gouged to elderly patients at huge mark-ups (Merck's brand of cortisone sells at a 1000% mark-up) and produces over 1000 products including **CALGON** and **SUCRETS**. U.S. subsidiaries include **Calgon Corp.**, **Baltimore Air Coil**, **Havens International** (water reclamation system), **Merck Foundation** (a tax dodge set up to "aid disadvantaged youngsters") 18 domestic plants; at least 41 foreign subsidiaries in 30 countries; \$19 million invested abroad last year with considerable South African holdings. Always closely connected to government administration, former Merck President (10 years) John T.

Conner was LBJ's Secretary of Commerce, now is president of Allied Chemical.

ABBOTT LABORATORIES: \$457.5 million net sales in '70 (up \$54 million from previous year). One of the two largest U.S. producers of speed under the tradename **DESOXYN** and **DESBUTAL***; also a major producer of **Phenobarbitol** and tranquilizers such as **Hermenyl**. Abbott's **Sucaryl** was the original cyclamate product. Abbott, which is the nation's largest producer of cyclamate products, knowingly conspired with the FDA for 20 years to cover up the artificial sweetener's possible cancer-causing effects. Other trade names include: **Bayer aspirin**, **Similac**, **Murine**, **Lensine**. Subsidiaries include **United Biologies** of San Francisco and Los Angeles. These laboratories are actually skid row blood banks which specialize in sucking the life from the poorest working people (see photo). Net assets broken down continentally—Latin America; \$24 million; Europe and Africa: \$23.6 million; Pacific-Far East: \$13.8 million; Canada: \$8.2 million. Abbott runs "drug abuse" programs, projects for "disadvantaged youths" in North Chicago and Puerto Rico.

The combined assets of the three corporations listed above runs well over \$3 billion. Their three boards of directors are interlocked into the following institutions of imperialist domination: General Electric, Ford Motors, American Airlines, Borg Warner, Trans World Airlines, American Sugar, Household Finance Corporation, Campbell Soup, Kennecott Copper, Braden Copper, International Harvester, International Paper, U.S. Pipe and Foundry, U.S. Gypsum, American Chain & Cable, Montgomery Ward, Central Soya, Morgan Guaranty Trust, Glow Co., Radio Free Europe, Pullman Co., Indianapolis Power and Light, Indianapolis Water Co., Illinois Bell, New Jersey Bell, Illinois Power Co., Diamond Plastics, B/G Feeds, Mercer Inc., Mutual Life, the American Medical Association, Scribner & Co., S.C. Johnson, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Boy Scouts of America, Franklin Realty, six minor banks, the People-to-People program, Northwestern University, National Business Council, Chicago Railroad Terminal Authority, the Atlanta Symphony Guild, The Salk Institute, and innumerable hospitals and medical schools in ten different states.

One more little known fact: Five per cent of all patients in American hospitals are being treated for ailments resulting from the side effects of prescription drugs. These figures constitute a major epidemic!

TV's "untouchables" have nothing on these guys.

*Second only to Smith Kline & French's *Dexidrone* and *Benzo-drene*.

Ramer, one of Dole and Nyswander's protegees. Ramer's reputation as an "expert" has been made on manipulation of hundreds of addicts here in San Francisco.


The city clinics are always jammed up with junkies waiting on their methadone, many addicts arriving hours early because they have nothing else to do. In checking out the methadone distribution outlets in town, I've run into the same faces, addicts moving around from center to center, using phony names and scoring extra-large methadone doses daily in order to either get high or, more often, to trade the methadone off for other drugs. Any system that offers addiction to one drug as a "cure" for addiction to another has this problem built into it.

Fort Help is the other Methadone outlet in the city, a privately-run program aimed at "solving special problems" under the direction of Dr. Joel Fort, another alleged "expert" on various types of addiction. Fort is raking it in at Fort Help: \$20 a week for methadone and urine analysis from at least 100 addicts, many of them Chicano (Fort Help is based at the southern edge of the local barrio). This "humanitarian" doctor buys his methadone from Merck at \$490 a kilo. Figure it out from there: he's got 100 addicts strung out on 700 milligrams a week. At \$20 a head, it figures out to about a 5,600% profit. That is better than importing the real stuff from the CIA. And it's legal, too.

On March 31, and April 7, 1971, a guy walked out of the West Side Clinic on Manhattan's West

96th Street, one of the most thoroughly dope-saturated streets in all America, with 560 milligrams of methadone. It cost him \$30 (it cost the clinic \$1.25). The purchaser—who happened to be a *New York Times* reporter—showed no one at the clinic any I.D. at all and had no proof whatsoever that he was a dope addict. When the *Times* broke the story (Sunday, on the front page), the clinic's director, Dr. M. Rafiq Jan began asking his clients for their social security numbers. Fortunately, directors of other methadone clinics in the city (frightened at being bad-mouthed themselves) finally pushed the FDA into closing Dr. Jan down. According to the *Times*, Dr. Jan had been planning a string of 50 similar private methadone centers in the New York area. Drug treatment is certainly a "growth industry" (*Harpers*, June, 1970).

"Autopsies conducted over the last two years indicated that at least 20 non-addicts have died from methadone poisoning." Non-addicts. That's a quote from the same *New York Times* article above (April 18). No one really knows how many people have overdosed on methadone since most apparant overdose cases are automatically attributed to heroin. One thing's for sure. There's a new killer loose in our neighborhoods. It's cheap. And the government is pushing it, too. You still don't believe it? Richard M. Nixon just appointed one of methadone's pioneers—Dr. Jerome Jaffe—as number one narcotics man in the country. Why?



Drug Education in the schools is a combination of "scare" techniques, like this scene from an

"educational film," and liberal rap sessions about "good" drugs (grass) and "bad" drugs.

XII.

A lot of folks find the above hard to swallow. The government actually encouraging the addiction of hundred of thousands of its own citizens? That's absurd! Sure this system needs some repair, but to argue that there is a conscious plan to introduce methadone into working-class communities to enslave a potentially revolutionary sector? Quite possible. Remember methadone isn't the only legal dope being dispensed at public facilities in America.

A heart-rending howl went up last year when the news broke that amphetamines were being prescribed to some children (mostly black) in the Omaha, Nebraska school district. This HEW-subsidized experimentation hasn't been halted despite the protests. Approximately, 300,000 kids are getting fixed every day with speed, tranquilizers and anti-depressants down at the schoolhouse. And a recent government study says four million more could "benefit" from this treatment. The rulers' policies of pushing dope on the most oppressed people is shown in the fact that three times as many black children are receiving this "medication" as white kids.

Ever since the story first hit the front pages, every major school system in the country has admitted complicity in the dispensing of these drugs to so-called "hyper-active" children. All kinds of "expert" opinion has been cited as justification. "Ritalin's a safe drug . . . it keeps kids in school," claims Columbia University pediatrician Dr. William Langford. This same kind of hyperbole was used by CIBA, Ritalin's European manufacturer

(Ritalin, incidentally, is banned in some European countries) in a recent seven-full-color-page nationwide medical journal advertising campaign.

Another liberal educator, Careth Ellingson, author of "The Showdown Children," has compared the use of these drugs to the use of "insulin for the treatment of diabetes" (*Saturday Review*, Nov. 21, 1970). Haven't we heard this same garbage about methadone before?

The government is pushing these drugs on allegedly "hyperactive" children. Mrs. Ellingson characterizes these children as being "driven by an internal tornado." When you tear away the imagery, what she's talking about is controlling rebellious children (see CHALLENGE box) by any means necessary—kids who rebel at the vicious lies and racist lessons they learn in the ruling class's classrooms.

It is the job of school administrators to maintain "peace" in these same classrooms, and prescribing dope helps to make the job easier. Besides, the profits rolling into the drug companies behind heavy authorized use of amphetamines, ritalin, deaner and raudixin, tofranil, aventyl, etc. are "good for the health of the economy." And, if this government is prepared to hook little children like this, can you have any doubts about what it plans to do to the people with methadone?

XIII.

So if this is all true, how come no one's trying to stop them? Where are the liberal muckrackers to rake up a little muck? Why don't the reform demo-

CASUALTIES OF AN IMPERIALIST WAR: The VIETNAM VETS

In 1969 there were three reported deaths from heroin overdoses among U.S. troops in Vietnam. In 1970 the reported number rose to 26. Last year the total was probably tripled. High-level estimates on the number of GI junkies in and out of Vietnam run from 30,000 soldiers to 25 per cent of all American forces. This isn't just a recent phenomenon; these figures have been building for years.

Even though most of the headlines have focused on Vietnam, it's not the only hot spot. At least one in ten GI's stationed in Europe is using dangerous drugs, congressional investigators reported last May. Stateside statistics are just as grim. Sen. Hughes' Alcoholism and Narcotics subcommittee recently revealed testimony from an unnamed general who complained that dope addicts were stealing an unprecedented amount of military goods to support their habits. "Today you have to secure your arms' rooms and supply rooms on a scope

that you never had to do before . . ." he was quoted as saying. The U.S. Army never really got down on dope until it started to cost the generals a lot of annual appropriation money!

Drug use in the army is symptomatic of deep dissatisfaction among GI's with their forced enslavement in an institution which is organized solely for the protection of the corporate interests running America. With GI rebellions popping off everywhere, from Fort Dix, N.J. to Long Binh, Viet Nam, military strategists in charge of keeping the troops in line have long sanctioned the use of dope. For years, the CIA-run Air America charter freight lines has been running raw opium out of Burma and Laos with the cooperation of every Southeast Asian military and political hack around. Nguyen Cao Ky, Vietnam's second-string strong man, allegedly takes in \$35,000 weekly as protection money against the prosecution of dope traffickers in Saigon.

crats take out ads in the **New York Times**? How come Dr. Spock and Ralph Nadar aren't calling for "congressional investigations"? The answer's in the nature of liberals. Liberals aren't interested in much more than making this system look a little better. Band-aids like methadone can do that. The problems associated with dope call for a much more radical solution than these front men for the ruling class are prepared to come up with.

In order to stamp out drugs and drug addiction, we're going to have to involve working people of all colors in a concerted effort to overthrow a system which licenses the wholesale use of all kinds of drugs in order to make oppression seem a little less oppressive. We're going to have to involve young and old working people in an effort to destroy Capitalism and establish a system which strives to serve the people, not to alienate and isolate and dis-

card them and then offer them a pill so that they can feel better about being thrown away. This new way of life is called Socialism and only a revolution—a violent wrenching away of the power in the State from the few who rule us now—is going to bring such a system about. And Dr. Spock, Ralph Nader and the rest of the liberal lunch bunch aren't really very interested in revolution.

Let's face it. Drug addicts are the victims of a society which exploits and oppresses people because of the class they come from and the color of their skin. Drugs are a weapon of the rulers because they keep a person chained to a life of permanent scuffling. Divided and out of touch and immobilized from ever changing the objective conditions of oppression. As long as dope is on the scene, a lot of good potential fighters are going to be lost to the struggle for a just society. It's not a coincidence that the

DRUG MIS-EDUCATION

A neighbor of mine, age eleven, came home from school the other day and told me all about where opium grows and how it got smuggled into the USA by shady foreigners. When I asked him if he knew what opium was, however, I drew a blank. This kid's brother and sister are both dope addicts and have gone to jail for it. The drug "education" teacher never bothered to tell him that opium gets processed into heroin somewhere between the Middle East and the city's streets. I suppose she felt a little uncomfortable about getting down to the nitty-gritty with a kid who sees it every day. This is what the Board of (Mis) Education is trying to pass off as "drug education."

The main problem is not an embarrassed teacher or two but the school system itself. Any institution that feels comfortable about drugging grammar school kids with experimental "mood alterers" is not going to do anything about the most mood-altering dope of them all—heroin. Heroin can tame even the most rebellious student into submission, if need be. And if controlling rebellious students is the main job of school administrators, then the schools which they administrate aren't really going to teach our kids anything about dope except where to score for more. All the phony drug education films, "heart-to-heart rap sessions," high school crash pads and glow-in-the-dark decals won't whitewash the school system's complicity in the dope trade.

Whose going to teach our kids that drugs are used against working people? Not the schools, that's for sure. Not the communications media either. Since Art Linkletter's daughter jumped out of a Hollywood window behind a bad LSD trip, old Art has been barnstorming the country at \$2,000 a night, preaching cleanliness next to godliness. It hasn't changed a thing except Art's bank account.

TV commercials with Rod Serling in the starring role aren't going to do the trick. (Serling also sells Anacin and pushes his Famous Writers School on the other channels.) And thirty-second warning shots on FM radio by customs officials pleading

with young people not to smuggle dope into the country doesn't exactly point out how dope is one of the biggest guns in the bosses' arsenal.


Anti-dope songs have had no effect whatsoever. Neither has Richard Nixon's declaration that dope is Public Enemy Number One which is what most young people, coincidentally, consider Richard Nixon to be. Even Jesus Christ hasn't lent very much oomph to the ruling class's "educational" campaign—Billy Graham's been pretty much of a flop when he tries to warn young people that they are fooling with mortal sin. Sure, it's true that the Jesus Freaks (Teen Challenge for example), the Hare Krishnas and Elijah Muhammad have reclaimed and/or saved the souls of some potential addicts, but is their form of addiction any better? The worship of whatever godhead has never yet, in the history of man, altered the oppression of the many by the few. After all, religion is "the opiate of the people."

The only way to really educate young people about dope is to teach them the truth about the capitalist society and how it must be changed to one in which the people and not profits are primary. "Drug education" is best served by turning kids into revolutionary thoughts and action. Groups like the Challenge Corps, organized with the help of the Progressive Labor party in many cities across the country, which fight against the twin evils of racism and drugs are the kinds of organizations which can best deal with the dope trap.

The kids on our block and in our own homes are beginning to understand that they live under an oppressive and tyrannical system. They're beginning to understand, too, that dope is a wrong solution to this oppression. That dope is not a way out of a society designed to squeeze the maximum sweat and blood of profit out of every worker. That you can't escape from the man when he's making money selling you dope and then treating you for its effect by selling you more. That the only alternative is to change the system into one where no man can ever oppress another. To fight for socialism. That's what real drug "education" is all about.

biggest dope pushers are also the biggest capitalists—and these pushers are not about to retire from the business voluntarily. It is up to the people themselves to wipe these oppressors out. And along with the oppressors, the system which they represent

too, so that together we can create the kind of society in which people are so busy serving other people that they won't have to turn to individual escapism in order to mitigate the pain of alienation and rejection. ■



You paid \$3.22 for the average prescription in 1960.

By 1969*, that price had gone up to \$3.68.

A 14.3% price increase, right?

Wrong.

The 1969 prescription is about 1/4 larger than the average prescription of ten years ago.

So, when you measure the amount of medicine received, the price really hasn't gone up. It's gone down. According to a recent independent research institute study, the same quantity of medicine costs less today than it would have a decade ago.

What makes it an even better value is the fact that today's medicines have been improved and are more effective. That means shorter illnesses, fewer and shorter hospital stays.

The dollar you spend for prescription medicines is a good value, and getting better all the time.

For more information, write for "Key Facts", Department GH06, Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 Fifteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

Dr. A Dale Console, ex-head of Squibb once remarked to the Kefauver Hearings on drug industry abuses that "the pharmaceutical industry is unique in that it can make exploitation appear a noble purpose." In this ad, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association—which represents 140 drug companies (accounting for 90% of the nation's drug business)—tries to con consumers into shelling out more for less. One method used: charge more for a trade-marked drug than one sold under its generic

(pharmaceutical) or chemical designation.

The 1960 Kefauver Anti-Trust Hearings, which showed how some companies were making up to 700% profit per pill, made little difference to the American people. Influential industrialists like Spencer Olin of the Olin-Mathieson combine (of which Squibb is a subsidiary) contribute heavily to both parties for protection. Standard & Poor's 1971 Industrial Survey puts it this way: "Health care is one of the most profitable of U.S. industries."

the CIO 1937 to 1950

"Trade unionism is the conservative movement of our time. It is the counterrevolution... It is also a complete repudiation of Marxism."1 (Tannenbaum)

"And the (Communist) Party... must bear in mind... that they (the trade unions) are, and long will remain, an indispensable 'school of communism' and a preparatory school that trains the proletarians to exercise their dictatorship..."2 (Lenin)

In attempting to analyze the 1949 expulsion of the eleven Communist, left-led unions from the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), the preceding quotes offer an interesting context in which the analysis can take place. Was the expulsion inevitable? Did it merely reflect the obvious according to Tannenbaum? Could Lenin have been so utterly lost? Or, on the other hand, did the expulsion result from the faulty ideological understanding and resultant bad practice of the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA)? Could Tannenbaum's seemingly correct prediction of the "repudiation of Marxism" have been a result of the weaknesses within the CPUSA rather than a vindication of his theory? Or, from another point of view, the expulsion, per se, may prove nothing. That is, that there is no evidence to conclude that the expulsion of the CP meant the end of communism in the trade union movement, for it could simply be the logical outcome of the CP's failure to master Marxism-Leninism.

This paper will examine the nature of the CP and attempt to prove that the weaknesses of the CP were the primary factor that led to their expulsion from the CIO (and that of their "fellow travellers"). If the hypothesis is proven correct, we can deduce no more from it than the fact that Lenin may not have been wrong in his analysis. Such a deduction, however, certainly has far-reaching implications for working men and women of all countries.

Before proceeding to the main position of this paper, it may be fruitful to clear up a misconception that might have arisen from Lenin's quote. Communists would agree with Tannenbaum that the essence of trade unions are reactionary. In fact, no less a communist than Karl Marx stated: "They (trade unions) are fighting with the effects but not the cause of those effects."3 The essence of trade unionism, which implies an acceptance of capitalism, is reactionary. Rather than trying to "cure the malady"4 they offer a form of organization which can aid the working class in coping with this

malady. Therefore, they cannot be considered to have a progressive essence. The difference between Tannenbaum and the communists arises with the ideology of **dialectical materialism**. The communists believe that, with the introduction of and adherence to the science of Marxism-Leninism by the masses, the trade unions can be turned into their opposites. That is, the economic battles with the capitalists will become secondary and "abolition of the wage system"5 will be the cry. So, the predominance of a conservative leadership (both organizationally and politically) in the trade union movement can be viewed in two ways. Vis-a-vis Tannenbaum, the present leadership is reflective of the motive-force of the movement6 and represents the only possible direction; or, vis-a-vis Lenin, the conservative leadership has been able to develop because of the "bourgeois ideology" within the ranks of the Communist Party7 and can be reversed under the leadership of true communists.

In 1937, one year after the birth of the CIO, William Z. Foster, a leader of the CP, in addressing an audience of the Young Communist League, said: "It is not enough to support the CIO, we must become the leaders of these movements."8

Given the fervor of the labor movement of the late 30's, the "class solidarity" and denunciation of the "red-baiting" and other divisive tools of the bosses, the CP had made significant gains in the short space of one year. By 1938, it was estimated that 40% of the CIO was under at least "significant control" of the CP.9 Labor leaders who years later engineered the ousting of the CP from the CIO, played a significant role in building its strength during this period. Walter Reuther provides a typical example in a speech to a United Automobile Workers local in 1937:

So now the bosses are trying a new stunt: the red scare... They pay stools to go whispering around that so-and-so, usually a militant trade union leader, is a red. They think that will turn other workers against him... No union man worthy of the name will play the bosses (red scare) game. Some may do so through ignorance. But those who peddle the red scare and know they are doing so are dangerous enemies of the union.10

Other leaders such as Joseph Curran, M. Hedely Stone of the National Maritime Union (NMU); Albert

J. Fitzgerald, Julius Emspak, and James J. Matles of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America (UE); Michael Quill of the Transportation Workers Union (TWU); and many others were associated with pro-CP forces in the late 30's and early 40's.

On the political front, the CP vacillated like a yo-yo. From 1936-1939, they supported the Roosevelt administration as representing a victory over monopoly capital; from August, 1939 through June, 1941, they turned around and attacked this administration as having capitulated to the reactionaries by entering into the Lend-Lease Program with Great Britain and in other ways following an imperialist, war-mongering position. From July, 1941 to the end of the war, the CP fully supported Roosevelt and all other "anti-facist" forces. Because most of these positions were fairly popular amongst large sections of organized labor, the CP was able to maintain its base throughout these flip-flops. The only ill-effect they suffered was amongst the rank and file who admittedly felt a little foolish when such contradictory positions were offered in such rapid succession.¹¹ Whatever antagonisms were developed toward the CP amongst rank and file CIO'ers, due to changes in the line, it is safe to assume that these antagonisms would be somewhat greater amongst the pro-communist CIO leadership. By virtue of their positions and the public stand they would have to take, vacillations in Party policy would have been more uncomfortable to tolerate.

Throughout the war years, the CP policy of "no-strike pledges—all out for the war against facism," was a little too patriotic for some union leaders. In 1944, members of the United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees Union went out on strike against Montgomery Ward because of the company's refusal to abide by an order of the National War Labor Board. Not only did the CP denounce this strike, they went one step further when Harry Bridges of the ILWU told Montgomery Ward that they could transfer the work orders from the struck plants to the St. Paul plant which was an ILWU local.¹² After an investigation into the affair, the National Headquarters of the CIO reaffirmed their support for the Montgomery Ward strikers and in that way, dealt a severe blow to the "militant-left" cover of the CP.¹³ John L. Lewis' feelings of "growing weary of these fakers" (CP and pro-CP forces) had a prophetic ring as the World War II drew to a close.¹⁴

After World War II, the divisions within the CIO became more expansive. Pro-communist and anti-communist forces became more and more polarized as the hostility between the United States and the USSR increased. The question of CIO support for the Marshall Plan was the focus around which the different forces grouped. Additionally the pro-communist forces backed Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party in the 1948 election.

With the passing of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, and Truman's actions to veto the bill, the national CIO sought to support Truman in the upcoming

election. The CP, however, was out to back Wallace and build the Third Party. Running against Truman was Republican Governor Dewey. The non-pro-communist forces on the executive board of the CIO correctly reasoned that support for Wallace (who had no chance of winning) would split the Truman vote and further chances for Dewey getting elected. Any less than the traditional Democratic Party support would have proved particularly injurious to the fight for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Mike Quill, of the Transport Workers Union, who split from the communist camp, specifically because of the CIO's backing of Wallace, brought the issue to the floor of the CIO's 1949 convention:

Here he was (Harry Bridges of the ILWU) on strike (September-November, 1948) on the West Coast, his membership walking the picket lines for some 67 days, the Employers Association were waiting hour by hour for Dewey's election, and what was Harry doing? Harry was peddling the Wallace vote up and down the state of California, and had Wallace gotten a few more votes in a few key states we would have Governor Dewey as President of the United States today.¹⁵

When the Eleventh Constitutional Convention of the CIO convened on October 31, 1949, there was no doubt in anybody's mind as to what would happen. On November 1, 1949, George Baldanzi, secretary of the constitution committee, urged the body to accept the amended constitution of the CIO, which was to read:

No individual shall be eligible to serve either as an officer or as a member of the Executive Board who is a member of the Communist Party...¹⁶



CIO organizes steel workers, Homestead, Pa., 1936

Before the debate began, Albert J. Fitzgerald, national secretary of the UE, the third largest union in the CIO, representing 500,000 workers, led his 17 member delegation out of the convention hall. Secretary Baldanzi went on to propose further amendments to the constitution:

The Executive Board shall have the further power, upon two-thirds vote, to revoke the Certificate of Affiliation of or to expel or take any other appropriate action against any national or international union or organizing committee the policies and activities of which are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party... 17

The Committee on Resolutions further recommended the UE and United Farm Equipment and Metalworkers of America (FE) be expelled from the CIO on the grounds that:

We (the CIO) can no longer tolerate within the family of the CIO, the Communist Party masquerading as a labor union (e.g. the UB and the FE). 18

In addition, charges were brought against ten international CIO unions for following the program of the CP. Investigative committees were established by President Murray. All but one of the unions were subsequently expelled. 19

Twelve years had passed since William Z. Foster had announced to the Young Communist League the CP's intention of becoming the leadership of organized labor. The response of the CP leadership to the proceedings of the 1949 CIO convention made very clear some of the most serious weaknesses which eventually led to its ignominious defeat. We shall return later to examine the proceedings.

MAIN WEAKNESS: RIGHT OPPORTUNISM

The weaknesses of the CP were so numerous and so varied that it is difficult to point out which among them were of primary importance. Upon close examination, however, the party's crass "right" opportunism, failure to concentrate on the rank and file union members and failure to put socialism (the dictatorship of the proletariat) forward in a mass way, appear to be at the root of all their bad practice. While practice follows from theory (and thus, the basis for bad practice can be found in theoretical shortcomings) it would be more productive to scrutinize the practice of the CP rather than focusing abstractly on their ideology.

As was pointed out earlier, during World War II, the line of the CP was "all out for the war against fascism." They backed Roosevelt as well as all other "Patriotic" forces to the hilt. However, they made absolutely no class distinctions between big business and working class forces. Such a line in practice inevitably led to backing the forces of reaction (big business). The CP did not involve itself in the fight for black liberation (for that would divert the war effort); they attacked the coal mine and Montgomery Ward strikes as being "fascist-oriented" because they halted production and thus hindered the war effort.

In later years the CP was self-critical of its role during the war of not protecting the living standards of the working class. 20 While this is true, it is far short of the mark. Their opportunist conception of "national unity" and their failure to fight racism created incorrect illusions about the nature of big business. The capitalists fought against Hitlerism to protect and expand their policy of imperialism. The working class fought out of a desire to fight fascism, which is the most vicious form of exploitative capitalist rule.

These contradictions were all brought out in a huge attack by the anti-communists at the 1949 CIO conventions. Joe Curran of the NMU spoke from the floor of the convention hall in favor of the "anti-communist" clause. Sounding more "left" than the CP, he spoke of his reaction to the five year "no strike pledge" that was pushed by the CP during the early part of 1945:

They (the CP) came in and proposed that we adopt a policy that there should be no strikes after the war... I knew, as a trade unionist, that when the war was over, the same employer who was working with me across the table to win the war was going to go back to the old tactics of fighting us at every turn of the road when we sought an extra dime. So how could I pledge with him that he would deal in good faith after the war was over, how could I pledge no strikes after the war? 21

Walter Reuther then attacked the CP's failure to fight racism:

They (the CP) pose in America as the only true champions in the fight against racial prejudice and discrimination. The record on that score is also clear, that during the war, when we fought in our union in shop after shop against discrimination, they said, "Go easy boys, go easy. We will wait and fight that out after the war is won." 22

Had the CP fought to clarify the differences in goals of the working class and big business, had they fought to organize for the war effort independent of the Sewall Avery's and the J.P. Morgans, they would have strengthened their forces and heightened the class consciousness of all working men. The CPUSA tailed behind big business, submerged the politics of the working class forces, and created damaging illusions about the nature of capital. All of which resulted in a set back for the kind of consciousness which had built the CIO.

The CP did not stop at submerging their politics in uniting with big business; it also submerged its working class politics in dealings with top labor officials. John L. Lewis provides a more than adequate example: Lewis had always been an avowed anti-communist although he quite opportunistically used the strength of the CP to help build the CIO. It was reported that in the early days of the CIO, Lewis had fired a CIO official upon learning that he was a member of the CP. 23 It was obvious, even to the CP, that Lewis, as well as Murray, Reuther & Co., were merely using them to build

the CIO and that when the opportunity arose they would be dumped. Throughout the war years and even as late as 1948, these men were never attacked by the CP as being anti-communist, they were never criticized for their liberal or conservative politics which were contrary to the interest of the working class.

In October of 1948 French coal miners, under the leadership of the French CP, went out on strike and met massive repression. A number of workers were shot and killed by the French Army which had been called in to break the strike. Lewis, in a letter to William Green of the A.F. L. attacked Pres. Truman and the Marshall Plan because Marshall Plan money was being used by the French govern-

better than to see the CP smashed.

Another key weakness of the CP was its failure to concentrate its work among the rank and file members. In a criticism of Earl Browder, expelled former General Secretary of the CP, W.Z. Foster correctly points out this mistaken policy:

Browder, with no mass union organizing experience and no talent for an appreciation of such work, preferred to maneuver opportunistically with top union and political leaders. 25

Browder thus set the course for the party. All of the CP's best men and women fought to become officials within their respective unions. In that way they could work with other officials to set a pro-



The sit-down strike sparked the organization of the CIO in the 1930's

ment to shoot French coal miners. It is of importance to note that Lewis complained **only** because the workers were "his own kind," i.e. coal miners. At any rate, the President of the French Labor Federation attacked Lewis for criticizing the Marshall Plan and reminded Lewis that the Federation did not support this strike because it was communist led. Learning this, Lewis made no further comments. In spite of the fact that Lewis complained merely because it was coal miners (as opposed to other workers) who were being killed, and he stopped complaining after he found out it was a "communist-led" strike. On November 1, 1948 the CPUSA praised Lewis by stating his "actions hit the Marshall Planners like a thunderbolt."²⁴ What crass opportunism! Rather than attacking Lewis for his narrow craft chauvinism and unbelievable anti-communism, Lewis is praised by the CP in order to win wider support for their fight against the Marshall Plan. It becomes easy to see how the CP dug its own grave. They went out of their way to praise labor leaders who would have liked nothing

gressive course for the union. However, in order to attain positions of union leadership, it was necessary to "play down" politics. While a vast majority of the rank and file would support "left" officials, it was too much to ask for support of an open communist. The best cadre the party had were forced to play a reformist role as union leaders.

In addition, they could not carry out day-to-day work amongst the rank and file since they were in a positions of leadership. The burden of day-to-day work—organizing in the shops, carrying out the party's line to the masses—fell on the shoulders of the lesser-skilled cadre. Whatever contribution these lesser-skilled cadre could have made was seriously curtailed by the disastrous position taken by the national committee of the CP in 1939. W.Z. Foster who had correctly pointed to Browder's opportunism, displayed his own ineptness in the following:

As an example of the Party's co-operative spirit, (in building the CIO) in 1939 it liquidated its system of trade union fractions and

shop papers. The party's trade union fractions—educational groups of communists in the local unions (read: party cells organized to carry out the mass work of the party)—were dissolved to end all fears that they were formed for the purpose of controlling the unions. The Party's shop papers, which had performed invaluable services in the initial stages of the CIO campaigns, were also given up for the same general reasons.²⁶

How could party work be carried out among the rank and file if there were no disciplined collectives to meet and discuss the work; to carry out criticism and self-criticism; to improve their work; and to meet collectively to discuss how the party line could be applied to their particular situations. The answer is simple. It couldn't and it wasn't. The party was thus rendered so ineffective it might as well have ceased to exist as far as the rank and file union members were concerned.

Another point should be made in connection with the above hari-kari practice of the CP. Was not the CP "red-baiting" itself? Wasn't it saying, in effect, that in order to build the CIO the Communist Party should stop its work with the rank and file? What other impression could a union member have?

Hand in hand with the party's opportunism and their lack of rank and file organizing went their failure to attack anti-communism or to put communism forward as the social system that the masses should fight for. The latter was far and away their main weakness. For example, at the 1949 convention of the National Maritime Union, Joseph Curran, President of the NMU and one of the leaders in the anti-communist camp of the CIO executive board, put forward a constitutional amendment to bar communists from the NMU. After Curran spoke for five minutes of the horrors of communism, and how the CP was wrecking the CIO, Dow Wilson (at that time a CP'er) responded by saying:

Yes, you have your right to be anti-communist, and I will defend your right to be anti-communist, but for Christ's sake, don't be anti-union!²⁷

At the CIO convention in 1949, Reuther, Murray, Quill, Mazey, Rieve and others spent hours attacking the CP and communism, in support of the resolution to bar communists from leadership, saying such things as:

We are all aware of the fact that there exists within the CIO a small but noisy minority, apparently wired for sound and advocating policies and principles that are contrary to the best interests of the labor movement of the United States, and particularly to the CIO.²⁸

The CIO will no longer be run by a goulash of punks, pinks and parasites.²⁹

Last year when 16,000 members of the International Oil Workers were on strike in California...people came out on the picket lines purporting to be members of the CIO, showing dues cards, paid up dues cards in the CIO organization, extending the left hand

of fraternity to our people while their right hand was plunging into the backs of those workers the dagger of communism...³⁰ They (the CP) formulate their own policies without exception, not upon the needs of American workers, but upon the needs of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.³¹ In the countries where the Communist Party has had their time of reign, where they seized political power, what has happened to the free trade unions? They have been destroyed, their leaders have been murdered and thrown into prison camps...³²

What was the response of the CP to these attacks? Did they say once that the CP stands for the American working class? Did they defend the policies of the Soviet Union or point out what they considered to be the positive aspects of the Soviet Union? Did they in any way defend the theory of communism and the dictatorship of the proletariat? Harry Bridges' response was typical of all the CP spokesmen:

Now you have the false whiskers, communism. It is the issue we have argued about for the last 18 months, and that is no opposition in the CIO, no minority opposition.³³

Even Ben Gold, the militant leader of the Fur and Leather Workers Union, the only member of the CP to stand on the floor of the convention and admit his party affiliation, echoed Bridges' capitulation to anti-communism:

We fought for a long number of years for our rights and you cannot deprive my Union of these rights. It is not a problem of Ben Gold; the problem is much deeper. You cannot cover it up by raising the question of communism.³⁴

But as hard as they tried to avoid it, the issue remained crystal clear to everyone at the convention:

When Harry Bridges says communism is not the issue here—Harry, you are lying like hell and you know you are.³⁵

Communism was the issue. The failure of the CP to put communism forward in a mass way, to win people to fight for communism, made it relatively simple for the anti-communists to engineer their expulsion. Had the CP attempted to win the masses of workers to a communist outlook they might have had a base within the CIO which might have prevented their expulsion.

In discussing the convention and its political importance, the CP, in its organ, **The Daily Worker**, continued to ignore the major issue; the issue of communism. There were no articles on the significance of the convention and what it meant to the workers of the U.S. and the international workers movement. There was no evaluation of the reactionary role of anti-communism in the trade union movement. Albert J. Fitzgerald, President of the expelled UE and member of the CP, gave the following "incisive" analysis of the UE's expulsion:

Walter Reuther's resolution expelling the UE

from the CIO proves UE's charge that the CIO leadership abandoned trade unionism for politics. 36

On November 4, 1949, the following headline appeared on page 6 of **The Daily Worker**, a headline which summarized in nine words the three major weaknesses of the CP which allowed for their expulsion:

"UE SUES TO BAR SPLITTERS FROM USING UNION'S NAME." First, it displays the crass right opportunism of the CP. Somehow they were going to have adjudicated the anti-communist onslaught they suffered by putting their case before the courts of the ruling class—those people who had the greatest stake in anti-communism. Second, no attempt is made to involve, much less rely on the rank and file in the fight for control over the UE. Finally, the point stressed by the CP was that they were "splitters," not anti-communist splitters, merely splitters.


In evaluating the practices of the CP, it is vital to note that it was the party leadership which was responsible for the party's failures, not the rank and file. Rank and file CP'ers were among the most militant fighters for their class and in spite of the policies of their leadership, played a leading role in organizing and striking against their bosses.

Furthermore, it is important to keep in perspective the reactionary role of the right-wing leadership of the labor movement. While the CP was rife with weaknesses, the right-wing anti-communist CIO leadership can in no way be considered to be

the champions of the working class. An unfortunately typical example of this was the strike of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, in Gloversville, N.Y. in 1949-1950. Locked out over a wage dispute, IFLWU organized a strike. The Tanners Association first tried red-baiting to break the strike. This was unsuccessful. Then on August 25, 1949, a meeting was held—attended by the Association, "loyal employees," and organizers of the AFL United Leather Workers Union. "The meeting mapped out the plan for the AFL to enter the picture and break the strike." 37

When the AFL-Tanner schemes were rejected by the workers, the Tanners turned to the CIO, who readily complied. With their aid in setting up a company union, the Tanners Assn. called for a return to work. Labor historian, Philip Foner describes that day:

On the day of the "return to work" a reign of terror gripped the cities of Gloversville and Johnstown. Some three-hundred club-wielding police, deputized thugs and goons took over the two cities and held it in a strikebreaking seige. Most shameful of all, at the very same time, national CIO representatives (one of which was Allan Haywood, CIO—Vice President and Executive Board member) were joining hands with the deputized goons, with union-smashing employers, anti-labor politicians, and the boss-controlled press in an effort to smash this bitterly-fought strike. 38



Roosevelt called out
3,000 soldiers of the
15th Infantry to face
No. American Aviation
strikers, June 1941

The CIO leaders urged the strikers to return to work, organized scabs to break through the lines and then immediately signed them into the CIO Textile Workers Union. "The national CIO had granted charters to scab shops where conditions won in 17 years of struggle were eliminated." 39 As a result, the CIO was finally able to break this strike.

At this point we can return to the Lenin-Tannenbaum debate, mentioned at the beginning of the paper: Are unions by definition reactionary or can they be schools of communism?

After examining the role of the so-called "Communist" Party in the thirties and forties, several relevant facts are brought forth:

1) During the early part of the 20th century,

unions served as fairly effective tools of the working class.

2) The CP was anything but communist. Its rotten policies of class collaboration, of opportunism, its failure to fight capitalism and its state apparatus, its failure to fight for socialism, and its failure to fight racism and anti-communism represented a mockery of the principles of Marx and Lenin.

Therefore, there is no historical basis for rejecting Lenin's analysis of trade unionism. Commitment, the experience of the CPUSA does not provide the basis for accepting Tannenbaum's characterization of trade unionism as the complete repudiation of Marxism. It remains to be seen what the role of the trade union movement would be like under the political leadership of a true communist party. ■

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Frank Tannenbaum, *A Philosophy of Labor*, p. 3.
- 2 V.I. Lenin, *Left-wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder*, p. 41.
- 3 Karl Marx, *Value, Price and Profit*, p. 27.
- 4 *Ibid.*, p. 28.
- 5 *Ibid.*
- 6 Tannenbaum, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
- 7 Lenin, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
- 8 Max M. Kampelman, *The Communist Party vs. the CIO*, p. XI.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- 10 *United Automobile Worker*, Special Convention Edition (1937) in "Report on the State of your Union."
- 11 Some historians feel that this shifting of the line, back and forth was one of the CP's more serious errors. However, I would tend to doubt that since the CP did not lose much strength before the end of World War II when these shifts in the line occurred. *Not a tactical, but an ideolog. question.*
- 12 Kampelman, *op. cit.*, p. 33.
- 13 Jack Barbash, *Labor Unions in Action*, pp. 212-4.
- 14 Saul Alinsky, *John L. Lewis, An Unauthorized Biography*, p. 311.
- 15 *CIO Proceedings, 1949*, p. 273.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 240.
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. 288.
- 18 *Ibid.*, p. 302.
- 19 Kampelman, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-2.
- 20 William Z. Foster, *History of the Communist Party, USA*, pp. 408-21.
- 21 *CIO Proceedings, op. cit.*, p. 260.
- 22 *Ibid.*, p. 268.
- 23 Alinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 154.
- 24 *Daily Worker*, Nov. 1, 1948, p. 8.
- 25 Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 348.
- 26 *Ibid.*, p.
- 27 Erie Johnson, "The Assassination of Dow Wilson," in *PL*, July-August, 1967, p. 25.
- 28 *CIO Proceedings, op. cit.*, Mike Quill, p. 274.
- 29 *Ibid.*, O.A. Knight, p. 242.
- 30 *Ibid.*
- 31 *Ibid.*, Walter Reuther, pp. 267-8.
- 32 *Ibid.*, p. 269.
- 33 *Ibid.*, Harry Bridges, p. 252.
- 34 *Ibid.*, Sen. Gold, p. 244.
- 35 *Ibid.*, Mike Quill, p. 273.
- 36 *Daily Worker*, November 3, 1949, p. 11.
- 37 Philip S. Foner, *The Fur and Leather Workers Union*, p. 669.

38 *Ibid.*, p. 671.

39 *Ibid.*, p. 672.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alinsky, Saul, *John L. Lewis, An Unauthorized Biography*, G.P. Putnam's Sons: New York, 1949.
- Barbash, Jack, *Labor Unions in Action*, Harpers Bros: New York, 1948.
- Congress of Industrial Organizations, *1949 Proceedings of the Fifth Constitutional Convention*, CIO; Cleveland, Ohio, 1949.
- "Daily Worker," Communist Party, USA, November 1, 1948. New York.
- "Daily Worker," Communist Party, USA, November 3, 1949. New York.
- Foner, Philip S., *The Fur and Leather Workers Union*, Nordan Press: Newark, N.J. 1950.
- Foster, William Z., *History of the Communist Party, USA*, International Publishers: New York City, N.Y., 1952.
- Johnson, Eric, "The Assassination of Dow Wilson," in *Progressive Labor*, vol. 6, #1, July-August, 1967, Brooklyn, N.Y.
- Kampelman, Max M., *The Communist Party vs. The CIO*, Frederick A. Praeger: New York, 1957.
- Lenin, V.I., *Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder*, Foreign Languages Press: Peking, 1965.
- Marx, Karl, *Value, Price and Profit*, Foreign Languages Publishing House: Peking, 1954.
- Tannenbaum, Frank, *A Philosophy of Labor*, Alfred A. Knopf: New York, 1952.
- United Automobile Worker*, Special Convention Edition, 1937.
- Works referred to, but not cited:*
- Fifteen Labor Leaders, *Why I am in the Labor Movement*, Special Report, #20, National Planning Assn: Washington, D.C., January, 1949.
- Foster, William Z., *Misleaders of Labor*, Trade Union Educational League: USA, 1927.
- Jacobson, Julius, ed. *The Negro and the American Labor Movement*, Anchor Books - Doubleday & Co.: Garden City, N.Y., 1968.
- Marx, Karl, *Wage-labour and Capital*, International Publishers: New York, 1933.
- Rayback, Joseph G., *A History of American Labor*, Mac-Millan Co.: London, England, 1966.
- Saposs, David J., *Left Wing Unionism*, International Publishers: New York, 1926.

Reprinted from the *New Left Review*

The Ceylonese Insurrection

Fred Halliday

In April 1971 a revolutionary insurrection exploded in Ceylon. Unanticipated by imperialism, and unexpected by revolutionaries elsewhere, sections of the rural masses rose in organized rebellion against the very government they had voted into power in the previous May. This upsurge marks a totally new phase in the hitherto relatively tranquil history of the Ceylonese state. But the insurrection also has an importance far beyond the coasts of Ceylon itself. A brief resumé of the political situation in which it exploded will indicate its astounding and unique character. The government against which the people rose had come to power on a verbally 'anti-imperialist' and 'socialist' platform, and included representatives of the pro-Moscow Communist Party and the ex-Trotskyist Lanka Sama Samaj Party. It was generally regarded in imperialist circles as a dangerous and dogmatically left-wing régime. Secondly, the resistance to this government did not take the form of fragmented and spontaneous resistance, nor of organized strikes, nor even of initial low-level guerrilla actions: it assumed the form of a widespread armed insurrection, the most advanced and most complex form of anti-revolutionary combat. Moreover, the organization which led this insurrection, the *Janata Vimukthi Peramuna* (People's Liberation Front), had an extremely unusual political origin and formation: it had developed as a split on the left from a pro-Chinese Communist Party. After working in clandestinity for five years before emerging in the election campaign of 1970, and after a further year of public work subject to constant harassment, it was able to marshal thousands of insurgents against the Bandaranaike régime. Finally, the international line-up of support for the Ceylonese Government represented a wider and more advanced degree of international counter-revolutionary intervention than has been seen anywhere else to date. Within a few weeks of the outbreak of the insurrection, the Ceylonese bourgeois State had received military aid from the us, Britain, Australia, Russia, Yugoslavia, Egypt, India and Pakistan; and economic aid and political approval from China.

The Ceylonese insurrection was also strategically of great significance for the revolutionary movement in Asia as a whole. In the past twelve months, Great Power rivalry in the Indian Ocean has been on the increase, while popular wars in the Gulf (Oman) and Eritrea have consolidated and advanced. The Ceylonese insurrection came a month after the defeat of the invasion of Laos, and coincided with the popular resistance to Yahya Khan in Bengal. It thus formed part of creeping social conflagration throughout the Asian continent and represented the opening of a new social revolutionary front, in between East Asia and West Asia, at a nodal point where the economic and strategic interests of imperialism had previously appeared to be secure. It is not yet possible to give a full analysis of the Ceylonese events of this year: they are still too close. What follows is an attempt to grasp the specificity of recent Ceylonese history, and the nature of the present economic and social crisis in the island, which gave birth to the JVP and the astonishing insurrection of April 1971.

The Advent of Colonialism


Ceylon is a small tropical island, of some 25,000 square miles, separated by a narrow defile of water from the Indian subcontinent. It is divided into different regions by both topography and climate. The whole coastal rim, and the northern and eastern interior, form a flat lowland; in the south-centre, however, a high massif rises sheer above the plains to dense, forested peaks of over 7,000 feet. Overlapping this division is an extremely sharp climatic contrast between a triangular

wet zone in the south-west corner of the island, with heavy rainfall, fertile land and irrigated cultivation, and a dry zone haunted by drought and scrub, which occupies the whole of the north and east of the island. In the early pre-colonial epoch, much of this was watered by extensive hydraulic systems, and formed the homeland of the Ancient Sinhalese kingdoms which vied with the Tamil states in the far north of the island. The network of tanks, dams and canals had, however, fallen into disuse and decay well before the arrival of European conquerors; and, as a consequence, the centre of Sinhalese culture and society had shifted southwards to the highlands of Kandy in the south-west. It was in the latter zone that cinnamon was collected wild in the jungles: this spice became the first object of Portuguese plunder in the 16th century.

Ceylon underwent a longer historical experience of colonization than any other country in Asia. It bears the marks of this past—some 450 years of European domination—to this day. The Portuguese invaded the island in 1505, and rapidly conquered the coastal lowlands, isolating but not subjecting the Kandyan kingdom in the fastnesses of the south-central highlands. They established a rudimentary but effective trading control over the island, exploiting it for the collection of wild cinnamon, of which Ceylon then had a world monopoly. In the succeeding 150 years they also succeeded in converting a relatively high proportion of the Sinhalese population in the south-western coastal strip, centred on Colombo, to Catholicism, thereby dissociating them both culturally and economically from the Sinhalese in the beleaguered Kandyan uplands. A singular mark of the Portuguese impact on the low-country Sinhalese was their mass adoption of Lusitanian names. To this day, De Souza, Perera, and Gomes proliferate in the south-west: a phenomenon whose only parallel in Asia is to be found in the Philippines, where the Spanish monastic *frailocracia* achieved an even more spectacular success in formally converting and hispanizing the indigenous population. Portuguese rule, however, came to an end in 1638, when the Dutch seized their territories in the island in collusion with the Kandyan nobility, during the long Ibero-Dutch wars of the 17th century. The new rulers developed and modernized the economic system bequeathed to them by their predecessors. The Dutch cinnamon economy was now based on organized plantations, in which production was rationalized and yields increased. The blockade of the unsubdued highlands was tightened, and the social and political system of late Kandyan feudalism gradually disintegrated within the ring of Dutch forts and settlements which surrounded it. Holland was not interested in mass conversion of the local population, given the more pronouncedly particularist and racist character of Protestantism: but it did introduce the peculiar system of Roman-Dutch law which has survived in the island down to the present.

The Plantation Economy

Another 150 years later, Ceylon underwent its third European conquest. Once again, it fell to a new colonial master as a by-blow of international conflicts within Europe itself. The formation of the Batavian Republic in Holland in 1795, ally and client of the Directory in Paris, led to a British attack on Ceylon as part of England's world-wide counter-revolutionary and imperialist offensive against the French Revolution and its sequels. Kandyan feudalism collaborated with the British expeditionary forces as eagerly and short-sightedly against the Dutch, as it had with the Dutch against the Portuguese. Once the Dutch had been evicted, London proceeded to complete the unfinished work left by Amsterdam. In 1815, the British fomented a revolt by the Kandyan aristocracy against the last Kandyan monarch and marched into the uplands to depose him at their request. Two years later, when the same nobility rose against British rule in a fierce rebellion in which their villagers participated heroically, they were crushed by the occupiers they had themselves invited into their remote redoubts. Subsequent risings in the 1820's and in 1848 were soon stamped out; a communications network was constructed to end the old inaccessibility of the uplands; and for the first time, colonial rule now covered the whole length and breadth of the island. The military and political preconditions had now been laid for a massive economic transmutation



On this map of Ceylon the diagonal shading indicates areas of insurgent activity. The central massif is represented by dots and the main roads by straight lines.

Tea - rubber - coconut

of the island. In the 1830's, coffee was introduced into Ceylon, a crop which flourishes in high altitudes. Speculators and entrepreneurs from England swarmed to the new conquered uplands, and expropriated vast tracts of forest on the higher slopes of the Kandyan valleys from the villagers who had traditionally used them as common lands for fuel and fruit-gathering. The right to seize this land was 'purchased' from the British State at nominal prices: it was then cleared and converted into enormously profitable coffee plantations. The Kandyan villagers refused to abandon their traditional subsistence holdings and become wage-workers on these new capitalist estates. Despite all the pressure exerted by the colonial State, they could not be broken into the mould of a plantation proletariat in the 19th century. British imperialism thus had to draw on its limitless reserve army of labour in India itself, to man its lucrative new outpost to the south. An infamous system of contract labour was established, which transported hundreds of thousands of Tamil 'coolies' from Southern India into Ceylon for the coffee estates. These Tamil labourers died like flies, both on the journey itself, and in the nightmarish conditions of the early plantations.¹ Nearly 1,000,000 were imported in the 1840's and 1850's alone: the death rate was 250 per 1,000. The decimation and super-exploitation of this class founded the fortunes of British imperialism in Ceylon. The creation of this vast immiserated mass not only generated the surplus-value pumped regularly home to London: it divided the oppressed population of the island as well, allowing the colonial state to manipu-

late and exacerbate ethnic antagonisms between Tamil and Sinhalese in a classic strategy of divide and rule. The coffee economy collapsed in the 1870's, when a leaf disease ravaged the plantations. But the economic system it had created survived intact into the epoch of its successor crop. In the 1880's, tea was introduced on a wide scale and soon had ousted coffee completely. The main social alteration to which this led was not in the structure of the labour force, which remained as before composed of contracted Tamil coolies, but in the nature of the entrepreneurial units.² Tea was more capital-intensive and needed a higher volume of initial investment to be processed. The result was that individual estate-owners were now supplanted by large English consolidated companies based either in London ('sterling firms') or Colombo ('rupee firms'). Monoculture was thus increasingly capped by monopoly within the plantation economy. The pattern thus created in the 19th century has remained essentially identical ever since: Lipton and Brooke Bonds rule the Ceylonese massif down to this day. The only significant modifications to the colonial economy were the addition of a rubber sector in the foothills below, and the enlargement of coconut cultivation in the coastal region near Colombo. These three crops, in descending order of importance, henceforward dominated the island's commercial agriculture.

¹ E. F. C. Ludowyk, *The Story of Ceylon*, London 1967, pp. 195-9.

Ceylon's Ethnic Divisions

The import of Tamil labour levelled off in the 20th century, leaving a social and ethnic configuration in Ceylon which has fundamentally determined the subsequent character and course of class struggle there. It can now be summed up as follows.² 70 per cent of the population are Sinhalese. They are concentrated in the south and centre of the island, and are themselves divided into 'low-country' and 'Kandyan' Sinhalese, according to their region of residence and date of conquest by European colonialism; the latter were naturally much less deeply affected than the former, and have preserved traditionalist superstructures (religion and kinship) more jealously. The bulk of the Kandyan Sinhalese are subsistence peasants, cultivating rice in small plots in the upland valleys. Colonial rule, however, by no means wiped out the traditional ruling class which had squeezed this peasantry with its oppressive exactions before conquest. A grasping neo-feudal stratum of aristocratic and clerical landowners, chieftains and monks, retained sizeable holdings and dominated village life, which was steeped in reactionary Buddhist superstitions. This stratum was recruited in the upper Goyigama caste and wielded immemorial local power. Keeping to its paddy estates, it did not participate much in the cash-crop agriculture established by the British. The low-country Sinhalese, by contrast, who outnumbered the Kandyan Sinhalese by some 3 to 2, had been exposed to three centuries more European rule: their social structure was consequently far more hybrid. While many subsistence villages remained relatively untouched, large numbers of low-country Sinhalese were inducted into the coconut and rubber plantations, while others formed the nucleus of the urban working class that developed in Colombo and other ports in the island. At the same time, the commercialization of coastal agriculture by the British created new opportunities for the privileged, who had long acquired some of the basic skills for profiting from colonial rule, under the Portuguese and Dutch. Thus low-country landowners participated on a significant scale in the development of the rubber sector, and rapidly dominated the coconut zone. A business élite based on local commerce burgeoned in Colombo. Many of these wealthy and powerful low-country Sinhalese were recruited from the Karawa caste (originally linked to fishing, and hence well below the Goyigama in the caste scale), and were Roman Catholics with Portuguese cognomens. They sedulously imitated and parodied the culture and customs of their British overlords. They were flanked by the small community of descendants from the Portuguese and Dutch themselves, the 'Burghers', who formed an arrogant Eurasian minority in the towns.

The Tamil population of Ceylon, for its part, is even more divided than the Sinhalese. Numerically, it is equally distributed between the so-called 'Ceylon Tamils', who are overwhelmingly the majority community in the Northern Province of the island, and extend in strength down the east coast, and the so-called 'Indian Tamils', who are clustered on the plantations of the central massif. The 'Ceylon Tamils' are those who have resided in the island from its earliest history—indeed, since before the Christian epoch. They form a compact rural society in the north, concentrated mainly in the Jaffna peninsula; this society is organized along rigid caste-class lines. The peasantry was not affected by plantation encroachments, and ekes out a living from arid soil under the pressure of the exploitative higher caste groups. A trading stratum benefiting from proximity to southern India has long been entrenched in Jaffna. The Hindu landowners and businessmen maintain a tight social control of the population by a network of communal influences and organizations. Together with the richer peasants, they provided many of the recruits to the island civil service created by the British, who deliberately promoted a Tamil influx into the colonial bureaucracy and police in order to batten down the danger of rebellion by the Sinhalese, who constituted the majority of Ceylon's inhabitants. The 'Indian' Tamils, on the other hand, existed in another geographical and social world

altogether from the 'Ceylon' Tamils. They formed, as has been seen, a solid mass of captive wage-workers in the central massif, the rural proletariat which produced the bulk of the country's wealth. Given the superimposition of a tea and a rice economy in the Kandyan uplands, these Tamil workers (by the mid 20th century permanent inhabitants of Ceylon, of course) co-populated the massif with the Kandyan Sinhalese peasantry; on its eastern flank, however, where plantations were created out of dense jungles without previous Sinhalese settlement, in some districts they constituted a very large majority. The Tamil rural proletariat does not share village residence with the Kandyan peasantry: it is located in barrack-like 'cooly lines' of its own, usually on hills above the level of the Sinhalese hamlets below.

In the early decades of this century, Ceylon—'Jewel of the Indian Ocean'—had become indeed a polished gem in the treasure-trove of British imperialism. It was not only a highly prosperous plantation economy. It was also, largely because of this, one of the most smoothly and easily governed colonies in the Empire. The British were able to use the ethnic divisions of the island, crystallized in the pattern of the labour force, to defuse any threat of serious struggle for independence.

A basically bipolar system of the Ceylonese type was much more malleable for this purpose than the polyethnic mosaic of India proper, where the sheer multiplicity of regional and linguistic groups cancelled their diversity out to some extent, and created the space for a genuinely nationalist movement against British rule (eventually, of course, itself split by Gandhi's reactionary confessionalism, but even so preserving a trans-ethnic character). Tamil-Sinhalese antagonisms were much easier for English Governors to manipulate. Moreover, the British had at their disposal a uniquely subservient and pliable local élite from both groups, formed by three centuries of European colonialism before they themselves had even arrived in Ceylon. The landowners and traders of Colombo and Jaffna were not only already inured to obeying white overlords. They had no independent sources of capital accumulation such as the much more powerful merchants of Bombay and Calcutta had in India, with its far more developed pre-colonial industries and its much larger post-colonial domestic markets. The result was that no equivalent to the Indian Congress Party ever appeared in Ceylon. The indigenous bourgeoisie simply basked in the sunshine of Edwardian imperialism and complacently mimicked its masters. It did not even produce a single political party before Independence—surely a record even in the annals of the Commonwealth.³ The British themselves paid the best tribute to the matchless obsequiousness of the bourgeoisie—Sinhalese and Tamil—when they voluntarily granted Ceylon universal suffrage in 1931, before any other colony in the Empire, and without a single group in local political life having asked for it! Such was the docility of the fawning parliamentarians of the Legislative Council and the seeming passivity of the masses. (The Conservative MP co-responsible for this happy stroke unabashedly evoked the example of Disraeli's coup in granting the Second Reform Bill of 1867 in Britain.)⁴ Even after the establishment of universal suffrage, no party system emerged: rich notables and dignitaries were elected to the Legislative Council as individuals, and there acquired the 'training' necessary for eventual transfer of administrative responsibility to them.

A Socialist Party

In the last years before the Second World War, however, a small group of Marxist intellectuals appeared on the paralysed political scene in Colombo. In 1933, they formed the LSSP, which campaigned against the imperialist oppression and exploitation of Britain, and attacked the grovelling complicity of the Ceylonese bourgeoisie with it. It elected two members to the State Council in 1936; more significantly, its agitation gradually started to arouse sections of the plantation workers and peasantry. A sudden upswing of class struggle in the rural regions coincided with the onset of the Second World War. The LSSP,

² B. H. Farmer, *Ceylon—A Divided Nation*, London 1963, *passim*.

³ Ludowyk, p. 246 and S. A. Pakeman, *Ceylon*, London 1964, p. 155.

⁴ Pakeman, p. 126.

which had hitherto been a loose organization grouping all tendencies on the left, now split: a minority which supported Stalin was expelled and the Third International was denounced from positions similar to those of Trotsky in early 1940. In consequence, the LSSP did not follow the path of class-collaboration with the British pursued by the Indian and other Communist parties once Germany had attacked the Soviet Union. It denounced the British military build-up in Ceylon during the war, and intensified its efforts to mobilize the exploited classes in the towns and countryside against the colonial power. The result was a mounting series of strikes and riots on the plantations, which created panic among the estate-owners and tea companies. Threatened both by the LSSP's uncompromising hostility to its war effort in Asia, and by its political awakening of the Ceylonese masses, British imperialism acted swiftly to cut off the possibility of a national liberation movement under the party's leadership. The LSSP was dissolved in June 1940, and its leaders jailed. Ruthless suppression of underground resistance followed. Many of the LSSP leaders subsequently succeeded in escaping to India during a Japanese air-raid, where they transferred the centre of gravity of their activities during the rest of the war. Incipient mass radicalization was thus repressed before it achieved a durable political form in Ceylon.⁵

Thus, after the war, Britain was able to arrange a leisurely 'transfer of power' to a Ceylonese oligarchy that had scarcely even feigned an independence movement against it. The prospect seemed an extremely fair one for neo-colonial stability. Ceylon was not plagued by over-population of the Indo-Pakistani type. It had less than 8,000,000 inhabitants, whose per capita standard of living was by now well above that of the subcontinental mainland. During the war, its traditional rice imports from Burma had been cut off; to prevent the danger of social unrest in time of war, the British were obliged to establish an official rationing system and to fix the price of imported rice at State cost somewhat below its market levels, while simultaneously guaranteeing prices for domestic paddy producers. The practical result was a welfare system of subsidized rice, which was continued after the war when world prices rose considerably. A complementary characteristic of the British legacy was the exceptionally high level of education in Ceylon—again rendered possible because of the small size of the island and therefore the comparatively modest cost of a school system to imperialism. Literacy was thus some 65 per cent in 1945—an extremely high figure for Asia at that time. The social and political significance of both these mechanisms—very atypical for any colonial or ex-colonial country—are evident: they reflect an unusual capacity of the State to control the population by peaceful mystification rather than physical repression. Budget allocations expressed this Ceylonese peculiarity dramatically: as late as a decade after independence, State expenditure on food subsidies and social services, including education, was no less than 10 times that on the armed forces. The latter were to remain miniscule by comparison with the norm in the so-called Third World, some 4,500 men in 1962.

Family-Bandyism

It was this apparently tranquil land which the British handed over to the Ceylonese oligarchy in 1948, after the latter had hastily formed the United National Party. The UNP was duly installed in office, after elections under a special British-made Constitution, replete with a 'Defence Agreement' which gave Britain a naval base at Trincomalee, an airfield at Katunayake, and training control of the embryonic Ceylonese Army, which was liberally stocked with British officers. The provincial bourgeoisie of Jaffna had created its own ethnic party, the Ceylon Tamil Congress, which collaborated with the UNP government. The opposition was provided by the re-emergent LSSP (itself temporarily split into two wings), which affiliated to the Fourth International but now found itself sealed off from the plantation workers by a separate 'Indo-Tamil' communal organization sponsored by the British: its base was henceforward mainly in the urban working class of Colombo and the island's small trade-union movement. The UNP régime which now presided over the first eight years of inde-

pendence was one of unbridled, old-world reaction. The Prime Minister and symbol of the 'best of the British tradition' was Don Stephen Senanayake, a plutocratic landowner whose fortunes were derived from the graphite mines on his inherited estates, and whose political style was a comico-repulsive replica of the English ruling class. Senanayake's régime was run by a family clique whose corrupt nepotism had few parallels anywhere else in the world, outside perhaps the feudal monarchies of Saudi Arabia or Ethiopia. Thus D. S. Senanayake himself was not only Prime Minister, but Minister of Defence and Minister of Foreign Affairs; his son Dudley Senanayake was Minister of Agriculture; his nephew John Kotelawala was Minister of Commerce; his cousin J. R. Jayawardene was Minister of Finance; while another nephew, R. G. Senanayake, subsequently became Minister of Trade. The only prominent member of the UNP Cabinet not integrated into this nexus of 'family-bandyism' by kinship to Senanayake Senior was S. W. Bandaranaike, who held the important portfolio of Local Administration. The government's first and most fundamental act was to rush through the infamous 'Ceylon (Parliamentary Elections) Amendment Act No 48' of 1949, which at one stroke disenfranchised the totality of the 500,000-strong Tamil plantation proletariat of Indian origin. Bandaranaike was later to be fond of calling Ceylon the 'Asian Switzerland', because of his allegedly neutral foreign policy. In fact, no soubriquet could have been more appropriate. For the Ceylonese bourgeoisie, like the Swiss, had now succeeded in excluding the central core of the working class which produced the bulk of its surplus-value from the political framework of the nation altogether: Ceylonese capitalism, like Swiss, was to be built on the backs of 'foreign' workers with not even the most elementary formal rights of citizenship within the country. The UNP régime thus in advance rendered totally impotent any parliamentary perspective for the Ceylonese left, and set rolling the avalanche of rabid Sinhalese chauvinism which was to crash over the country in the next decade. After this basic achievement, the Senanayake government did very little: virtually no new economic development was promoted, although the Korean War boom temporarily hiked Ceylonese export prices to record heights.

In 1952, Senanayake died—appropriately enough, from a riding accident during a mock-English equestrian outing. A violent tussle between his son Dudley Senanayake and his nephew John Kotelawala ensued for his succession. Lord Soulbury, the English Governor-General, arbitrated in favour of the son, much to the chagrin of the nephew. Dudley Senanayake's premiership, however, was cut short by the first major social crisis after independence. World rice prices had rocketed because of the Korean War, to a point where the traditional rice subsidy alone took 20 per cent of the total budget. Faced with sudden economic difficulties, the younger Senanayake slashed the rice subsidy, stopped school meals and hoisted rail and postal charges. The left, led by the LSSP, promptly mobilized the masses to resist this direct attack on their standard of living. A day of civil disobedience or *Hartal* was called, backed by a general strike launched by the main non-communal trade unions. The popular response was overwhelming. The government thereupon panicked and deployed the Army to suppress the movement. The result was to radicalize a peaceful protest into armed clashes in which there were numerous casualties. In the absence of serious planning or leadership, the *Hartal* was crushed. But the younger Senanayake was badly damaged by the crisis, and had to resign. His swashbuckling cousin Kotelawala took over the premiership. The rice subsidy was partially restored, and various foreign policy initiatives were undertaken to brighten Ceylon's image abroad (entry into the UN in 1955); but by now the political isolation of the UNP—widely dubbed the 'Uncle-Nephew Party'—and the hatred of the masses for its super-anglicized landowner and comprador oligarchy was manifest.

In 1956 Kotelawala called a general election. The UNP was now for the first time confronted by a major bourgeois rival, led by Solomon Bandaranaike—the Sri Lanka Freedom Party. Bandaranaike, an original pillar of the UNP, had hoped to succeed the elder Senanayake before the full extent of the latter's 'family-bandyism' became apparent. Dis-

⁵ G. J. Lerski, *Origins of Trotskyism in Ceylon*, Stanford 1968, pp. 222-5 and 233-5.

grunted by the preferment of the younger Senanayake and Kotelawala over his head, he had seceded from the UNP in the early 'fifties. Bandaranaike was of virtually identical social background to the Senanayake clique. He was the son of a low-country owner of vast lands in the Western Province, who had been the Maha Mudaliya or 'Chief Native Interpreter' to the British Governors in the previous century—the top ceremonial position of the tame local aristocracy in the 19th century. He was married to the daughter of one of the highest Kandyan chiefs. Bandaranaike's aim was to propel himself into power by building a political machine that could defeat the UNP. He saw his chance with the growing unpopularity of the Kotelawala government. The increasing social radicalism of the rural masses could be used as a battering-ram for his own ambitions. Naturally, Bandaranaike could not mobilize this discontent for anti-capitalist goals: to do so would have been to contradict the very reason for existence of this big bourgeois. At most, he offered the masses the watery palliatives of a few municipal nationalizations (port and bus companies) of the sort that any self-respecting advanced capitalist country had accomplished long ago, and the termination of the defence agreement with Britain. But into this otherwise feeble potion he mixed one searing toxic, to make the heads of the masses swim until they could no longer see their real class enemies: religious and racial chauvinism. Posturing as the champion of Sinhala Buddhism against 'alien' and 'privileged' elements in Ceylonese society, Bandaranaike feigned an attack on the low-country Christian élite behind the UNP while in fact delivering rabid demagogic thrusts against the Tamil working class and peasantry. He himself was a turn-coat Anglican who had adopted Buddhism, so furthering his political career: he now whipped up religious frenzy against the non-Sinhala population in Ceylon by denouncing their sinister 'usurpations' of the central role that Buddhism should play in national life. The very name of his party was a confessional programme in itself. 'Sri Lanka means 'Holy Ceylon' and designates precisely the messianic chauvinism that is inseparable from Buddhism in the island. For religiosity and racism cannot be dissociated in Ceylon: the local brand of Therevada Buddhism claims, much like Judaism, that the Sinhalese are a 'chosen people' and that Ceylon is their sacred island, divinely elected to its unique historical and spiritual destiny by Buddha himself. This wretched mystification naturally excludes the Tamils and other minorities from any equal role in national life. Bandaranaike thus campaigned raucously for 'the exclusive use of Sinhala as an official language' in Ceylon—again ostensibly attacking English while in fact suppressing Tamil. The banner of 'Sinhala Only' rapidly mobilized the rural notables in the Kandyan uplands, in particular. Bandaranaike was able to rally the landowners, monks, teachers and ayurvedic physicians in the villages of the massif against corrupt 'cosmopolitan' and 'foreign' influences. This stratum had been comparatively by-passed by the UNP, and now struck out vigorously for an increased share of power. Much the most important component of this group was the Buddhist *sangha* or monastic orders. These Buddhist orders were everywhere large landowners in their own right, and exercised great ideological sway over the Sinhalese villages. It so happened that the year 1956 was the 'Buddha Jayanti'—or 2,500th anniversary of Buddha's decease and death-bed consecration of 'Sri Lanka': the UNP government had already allocated massive State funds to celebrate this mythical event. In a climate of frenzied clerical fervour, a formidable phalanx of Buddhist monks or *bhikkus* was formed into *Ikkath Bhikku Peramuna* or 'United Monks' Front, at the behest of the ambitious and unscrupulous Venerable Mapiitigama Buddharakkhita Thero.⁶ Buddharakkhita controlled the key Kelaniya temple and had been a founder member and patron of Bandaranaike's SLFP since its inception in 1951. Swarms of his acolytes now criss-crossed the island urging the population to 'be ready to sacrifice your life for the Restoration of Buddhist Ceylon'; innumerable bonzes virulently anathematized the 'Westernized' Kotelawala and his UNP. Buddharakkhita himself lavishly dispensed the ample funds of the Kelaniya temple in a personal tour by chauffeured limousine, for this

holy cause. He was later to state that his own contribution to Bandaranaike's campaign was of the order of 100,000 rupees.

Swept along on a tide of foaming clericalism and racism, laced with 'anti-imperialist' cant, the SLFP won a massive triumph in the general elections of 1956. In no sense whatever was the victorious party more 'progressive' than the UNP—nor did it represent the 'petty-bourgeoisie', as was often alleged abroad. Bandaranaike and his entourage were big bourgeois indistinguishable from the Senanayake clan. The SLFP organization did rest on a more traditionalist and Kandyan-oriented sector of the propertied classes than the UNP: paddy-owners, for example, predominated over plantation-owners in its parliamentary ranks—in other words, the rural interests behind it were at this date more linked to rice than to rubber or coconuts.⁷ But these were no less malignant or reactionary in their exploitation of the poor peasantry and landless labourers. The Buddhist *sangha* gained enhanced corporate power. The urban Karawa businessmen and merchants who had previously backed the UNP financially without participating in its political leadership now simply switched their funds to the new régime in exchange for similar pay-offs. From this point of view, the SLFP was simply the alternative party of the Ceylonese bourgeoisie. However, there is no doubt whatever that Bandaranaike had succeeded in capturing, canalizing and *confiscating* the deep frustration and wrath of the impoverished rural masses, both Low-Country and Kandyan Sinhalese, which had been accumulating against the old order represented by the UNP. The function of his rabid clerico-chauvinist demagoguery was precisely to *divert* the pent-up anger of the poor against their class brothers of another ethnic group: the Tamils. Moreover, it was precisely the prior historical absence of a genuine nationalist movement against the British which permitted a belated intoxication of the masses in a pseudo-nationalist movement against the Tamils. Bandaranaike's party thus appropriated and perverted both the gathering social crisis in the countryside and national sentiments bottled up under the English and never released against them. This is what gave it its false dynamism and mass energy, and made the SLFP potentially a more dangerous enemy of the workers and peasants than the discredited Uncle-Nephew Party itself. Events were to show this conclusively within a short space of time.

Once in office, Bandaranaike promptly rammed through a 'Sinhala Only' Bill. He also terminated the Defence Pact with Britain and nationalized the Colombo Port Authority and Omnibus Company. But these measures were strictly a side-show. No agrarian reform, needless to say, was implemented, despite pre-electoral promises to this effect. Meanwhile, the reactionary ideological concoction of 'Buddhist socialism' served to distract the masses and stoke up chauvinist hostility against the Tamil communities. The logical and predictable result of this propaganda was a wild anti-Tamil pogrom in May 1958, which wreaked a terrific toll on the minority throughout the island. After this achievement, the government moved on to muzzle the urban working class by passing the Public Security Act in 1959, the most savagely repressive law in the whole arsenal of Ceylonese bourgeois legislation, specifically designed to crush strikes and demonstrations by the oppressed wherever necessary; it was liberally used by both the UNP and the SLFP in the years to come. This, however, was to be the culmination of Bandaranaike's career. For the very forces of clerical chauvinism which he had unleashed and manoeuvred with such calculation now had no further use for him. Buddharakkhita had come to be known as 'Buddy Racketeer' as he in his turn honeycombed the SLFP organization and built up a private financial empire from his luxurious air-conditioned flat behind the Kelaniya temple. Thwarted in one of his crooked deals over a government rice contract and impatient with the slow-down in the anti-Tamil drive after the riots of 1958, Buddharakkhita ordered the execution of the politician he had helped so decisively to loft into power. Like a South Asian Dollfuss, the diminutive Bandaranaike was gunned down by a hired monk on his own verandah in September 1959—victim of the clerico-chauvinism he had himself promoted and symbolized.

A brief period of parliamentary confusion followed. Then in June

⁶ D. E. Smith (ed.), *South Asian Politics and Religion*, Princeton 1966, pp. 490-9.

⁷ Marshall Singer, *The Emerging Elite: A Study of Political Leadership in Ceylon*, Cambridge, Mass. 1964, pp. 85-87.

fresh elections were held. Leadership of the SLFP, in the best traditions of the UNP, now devolved on to Solomon Bandaranaike's closest relative—his wife Sirimavo Bandaranaike. It was she who now presided over another electoral victory and a new five-year government. Scarcely any new policies were implemented, however. The immobilism of the Sirimavo Bandaranaike régime was accompanied by a second flowering of 'family-bandysism'. Her nephew Felix Bandaranaike became the key figure in the Cabinet, controlling the critical Ministry of Finance, and the Parliamentary Secretaryships of External Affairs and Defence; while her cousin William Gopallawa was made Governor-General two years later. Working-class unrest soon erupted in a sequence of demonstrations and strikes throughout 1962, by dock and transport workers and others. Then, in 1963, a broad trade-union front hammered out a common programme of 21 demands of an economic, but anti-capitalist, character and started to engage mass struggles for it. Seriously threatened for the first time by an opposition to its left, the Sirimavo Bandaranaike régime reacted by offering to co-opt the LSSP into its government in exchange for a few token concessions. This manoeuvre was aimed at breaking working-class resistance by buying off and integrating the most important section of its traditional leadership. It was successful. The LSSP accepted Sirimavo Bandaranaike's offer and was forthwith expelled from the Fourth International. The LSSP, in its origins a courageous vanguard in struggle against the British, had degenerated into a standard reformist organization. Its political principles and will had been submerged under the torrent of pseudo-radical chauvinism that marked the rise of the SLFP, and it had now become only the miserable ruins of its former self. Henceforward it abandoned any vestige of socialism and decorated a ferociously rightist and obscurantist bourgeois government, by doing so accepting the Sinhalese suprematism of the Bandaranaike clan to boot. It was promptly set to work strike-breaking for the régime in late 1964. A small minority of genuine revolutionary militants had broken away from it to form the LSSP (R), headed by the trade-union leader Bala Tampoc, secretary of the Ceylon Mercantile Union. The major achievement of the Cabinet was the notorious Sirimavo-Shastri Pact, which henceforward legalized the mass deportation of Tamil workers to India.

The coalition SLFP-LSSP government, however, lasted only eight months before defects from it led to its defeat. New elections were held in January 1965. They resulted in a come-back by the UNP, which reconquered enough of the rural vote to form a new government, and to underline the interchangeability of Ceylon's two main capitalist parties. Now under Dudley Senanayake's leadership once again, the UNP outdid even the SLFP in professions of Buddhist zeal and was not far behind in neutralist piety. The whole calendar was reorganized to make the Buddhist Polya holy days the (irregular) rest days of the week henceforward. Humble applications to the World Bank produced modest loans; the Italian ENI was induced to finance an oil refinery. Much more important, the UNP systematically suppressed the wage-demands and social protests of both the urban and rural masses, reducing the rice ration and cutting expenditure on education. Using the Public Security Act passed by the SLFP six years earlier, the UNP ruled for no less than 3½ years of its 5 years of tenure under emergency regulations. By the end of this time, the Ceylonese masses were in a mood of unprecedented and nation-wide dissatisfaction and militancy.

The Economy in Crisis

For during the late 1960's Ceylon's neo-colonial political and economic structures were, silently, starting to come under critical pressure. There were three general indices of this situation: Ceylon's sinking export income, growing foreign debt, and escalating unemployment.

As the most recent census (1963) indicated, Ceylon has a distinct urban working class, but the majority of the population are employed in the rural areas, in agriculture and in rural handicrafts.

TABLE I
Occupations

Agriculture, forestry, hunting, fishing	1,682,000
Handicrafts	416,000
Power and Hydro-power	9,000
Mining	9,000
Manufacture	313,000
Construction	85,000
Trade, Banking and Insurance	289,000
Transport and Communication	138,000
Others	494,000
Occupations Inadequately Described	175,000
Total	3,610,000

Since 1963 there has been no significant alteration in the relative proportions shown by the census.

Throughout the 1960's the share of industry in GNP remained almost constant, rising from 12 per cent to 13 per cent (at constant 1959 factor cost prices); the major source of income continued to be services and agriculture.

TABLE II
GNP at 1959 Factor Cost Prices*

Sectors	Amount (Millions of Rupees)		
	1967	1968	1969
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	3,040	3,248	3,321
Manufacturing, mining, quarrying, electricity, etc.	1,104	1,206	1,288
Construction	351	446	527
Trade, transport and other services	3,731	3,999	4,299
Gross Domestic Product	8,226	8,900	9,435
Net factor income from abroad	-44	-39	-65
Gross National Product	8,181	8,861	9,370

Yet this dependence on primary agricultural products was far greater for export earnings than for production as a whole. Nothing was done to lessen this dependence and the Ceylonese masses suffered increasingly from declining export prices and rising import costs. In 1967, a typical year, total exports were Rs. 1,660 millions: of these 63 per cent (Rs. 1,061m.) came from the export of tea, 17 per cent (Rs. 282 m.) from the export of rubber and 10 per cent (Rs. 167 m.) from the export of coconut. In other words, 90 per cent of all Ceylon's export earnings came from the exports of three primary products. Throughout the 1960's the income generated by these exports steadily fell.

TABLE III
Loss of Import Capacity Due to Change in the Terms of Trade
(1959 Base).

	In Millions of Rupees			
	Tea	Rubber	Three Major Coconut Products	All Products
1960	-31.9	+37.3	-26.0	-10.6
1961	-36.9	-24.5	-90.3	-150.6
1962	+1.4	-13.3	-79.6	-81.9
1963	-133.7	-55.7	-65.1	-241.8
1964	-156.0	-93.7	-84.4	-315.8
1965	-211.8	-103.5	-12.0	-308.9
1966	-317.7	-145.3	-44.6	-505.3
1967	-419.2	-190.1	-54.7	-667.1
1968	-484.5	-261.7	-17.7	-783.8
1969	-545.7	-193.8	-49.7	-810.7

* Central Bank of Ceylon, Annual Report for 1969.

As import prices rose over the same period, Ceylon came to have a growing foreign exchange deficit. The deficit rose steadily, from Rs. 95 m. in 1957, to Rs. 349 m. in 1966, to Rs. 744 m. in 1969.

The political reasons for this degeneration were clear enough. Ceylon's economy was controlled by a coalition of imperialist firms and a local bourgeoisie parasitic on, and participant in, this exploitation. The precise workings of this relation can be shown by an analysis of Ceylon's major export, tea.⁹ 35 per cent of all tea estates (comprising 29 per cent of all tea-growing lands) are directly owned by British ('sterling') firms, such as Liptons and Brooke Bond, while British capital is also strongly represented in the Ceylon-registered 'rupee' firms that own another 30 per cent of the estates. But these crude ownership statistics understate foreign control of Ceylonese tea since its marketing is almost entirely in the hands of foreign, mainly British, agency houses. British capital controls the buying, pricing, marketing, shipping and insurance of Ceylonese tea. In 1967 69 m. lbs. of tea were sold by the agency houses at Colombo auctions, and another 110 m. lbs. were sold at the London Auctions in Mincing Lane. Only 8 m. lbs., under 2 per cent, were sold directly by Ceylon to foreign purchasers. Ceylon's subjection to imperialism is also shown by the markets for its tea: the major buyer is the UK (35 per cent in 1968, 30 per cent in 1969), followed by the US (7 per cent in 1968, 10 per cent in 1969), Australia (8 per cent in both years) and South Africa (7 per cent in 1968, 6 per cent in 1969). The only major purchaser not an imperialist country is Iraq (9 per cent in 1968, 8 per cent in 1969).

Ceylon's continued dependence on its traditional primary exports and the vested interest of the ruling class in these commodities thus had an inevitable concomitant: growth in Ceylon's foreign debt and hence in external political control over the island. The surplus for investment, and for financing the foreign trade deficit, has had to come from foreign loans and running down Ceylon's foreign exchange reserves.

TABLE IV
Ceylon's Foreign Debt 1955-69¹⁰

1955	205.0
1960	293.7
1965	489.3
1966	548.8
1967	739.3
1968	1074.3
1969	1375.5

Yet this foreign credit was used only to a very limited extent to check the deterioration of the economic situation as a whole. Industrial production did not rise as a percentage of total output, while imports of consumer goods, in particular food, continued to rise. For example, in 1970 Ceylon spent more just on importing chillies than she earned from tourism, and rice, (a Ceylonese crop) formed 15 per cent of all her imports. Over two-fifths of Ceylon remains tropical forest, and the potentiality exists for the island to become a net exporter of foodstuffs: at the moment they make up 53 per cent of her imports. The existing relations of production have been such that Ceylon's foreign exchange position has continued to decline, together with its internal economic situation, while direct foreign political control through the IMF and other imperialist agencies has correspondingly increased.

This overall deterioration was reflected in the rise in domestic unemployment—itsself highlighted by two additional factors that generated intensified popular reaction to it. These were the steep rise in population and the extremely high literacy level in Ceylon. In 1946 Ceylon had a population of 6.6 millions; by 1970 it had almost doubled to 12.5 millions, and the population density had risen from 263 persons per square mile in 1946 to 336 in 1970. At the same time, the average age of the population had fallen steadily so that by 1971 8.5 millions out of a total of 12.5 were under the age of 35. This rise in population has re-

flected the high standard of public health, and a developed set of public services which is also, as has been seen, reflected in the education system. Ceylon, with free primary and secondary education, today has the highest literacy rate of any capitalist country in Asia after Japan—80 per cent by official figures. There are 5,000 primary schools and 5,000 secondary schools, and nearly everyone under 35 has had both primary and secondary education. Every year 100,000 new school leavers come onto the job market. Yet, in contrast with this extremely advanced level of education and welfare services, average per capita income in 1971 was \$132. Moreover, the ruling class was not only failing to develop the economy but was throwing increasing numbers of young Ceylonese out of work. Unemployment, even by official accounts which report only the registered unemployed, has risen constantly.

Official estimates for the last two years suggest an accelerating rise. An estimate for early 1971 spoke of 585,000 out of work, out of a total available labour force of 4.4 millions.¹¹ In his October 1970 budget

TABLE V
Unemployment¹²

1945	21,336
1950	65,122
1955	71,010
1960	151,092
1965	199,655
1966	238,901
1967	257,070
1968	276,339
1969	341,286

speech N. M. Perera had, more realistically, stated that: 'It is roughly being estimated that the number of unemployed people in Ceylon, at the moment, adds up to 700,000.'

The Rural Sector

The economic crisis has been felt most severely in the rural areas. Agricultural production is dominated by four crops—the three export crops (tea, rubber, coconut) and rice grown for domestic consumption. In 1968 tea was grown on 597,490 acres, rubber on 674,539 acres and coconut on 1.2 million acres. Rice lands covered 1,742,469 acres. Productive relations within these different sectors are quite varied. In the tea sector the dominant form of landownership is the *tea-estate*, where over 80 per cent of the labour force are Tamils of Indian origin. In 1968 only 17.8 per cent of tea lands were owned as small-holdings by Ceylonese farmers; 29.14 per cent were owned by British companies, 25.93 per cent by Ceylonese companies and 24.15 per cent by Ceylonese entrepreneurs. Rubber and coconut lands, on the other hand, were held more by individual Ceylonese small-holders, and coconut in particular was known as the 'small man's crop' since over 70 per cent of all coconut-producing lands were held in units of 20 acres and under. Small-holding is even more predominant in the rice-growing areas.

The different sectors have reacted in distinct ways to this evolution. The Tamil workers on the plantations are not peasants, but rural proletarians: their history and situation has already been discussed. Today they still remain isolated in communal and semi-company unions, set apart from the rest of the Ceylonese population. On the other hand, the proletariat in the peasant sector are ex-peasant farmers, or the descendants of these, who have become landless through the gradual development of capitalism in the countryside, and by demographic or economic pressures on the land. Within the peasant sector are to be found all the gradations of a society of peasant-owners in decomposition, with pre-capitalist forms of coercion deployed by the

⁹ Ferguson's Ceylon Directory, 1970-1.

¹⁰ Central Bank of Ceylon, Annual Report for 1969.

¹¹ Le Monde, June 18th, 1971.

¹² ibid.

strengthening class of propertied peasants to consolidate their position and displace the weaker peasantry. In the late 1960's 30 per cent of the peasants were landless labourers working on the plots of other peasants as sharecroppers. As the gradual dissolution of this non-plantation sector proceeded in the 1960's, successful capitalist farmers were able to expand by buying land from indebted peasants and hiring those they expropriated.

Thus in the two and a half decades from independence to the 1971 insurrection, there was no agrarian reform, while foreign loans were used to finance the import of consumer goods and the building of costly public works. The concatenation of rural crisis, unemployment and high literacy can be seen very clearly in the official estimated figures for early 1971. The total number of unemployed was estimated to be 581,000; of these 460,000 were in the rural areas, 230,000 were under 19 years of age, and 250,000 were aged from 19 to twenty-four; 167,000 of these had been to secondary school or university.¹³ The contradiction between the vital needs and aspirations of the unemployed educated youth of Ceylon and the structural limits of Ceylonese capitalism had reached explosion point.

Little echo of this developing social crisis was to be heard in the Colombo Parliament. Ceylon's parliamentarianism was regarded in bourgeois circles at home and abroad as an index of its 'developed' political status: in fact, it represented its extreme backwardness, the failure of its ruling class to evolve an even token anti-imperialism and the chasm that separated an imported and imitated political system from the real life of the Ceylonese people. During the 1960's both ruling parties were forced to take superficial note of the economic dangers to this system, and proclaim measures that pretended to check them. Ambitious plans for industrialization and import substitution were announced; foreign borrowing rose and selected businesses were occasionally menaced with 'Ceylonization'. But the comprador character of both the UNP and SLFP naturally precluded any substantial moves to challenge Ceylon's dependence on imperialism. A liberal Ceylonese economist, writing in 1968, described this situation in measured, if euphemistic, tones: 'All political parties affirm that among their principal objectives is that of economic development. But neither of the major political parties who contend for power has put up a programme which the electorate may either reject or approve. In consequence elections have been fought on considerations other than the overtly economic. One may conjecture here that this attempt to belittle or even ignore the seriousness of the consequences that follow from a slow rate of economic growth follows from a failure of leadership. This hypothesis is, on the face of it, denied by the eagerness with which each government has taken to economic planning. In 1946, while Ceylon was still a Crown colony, the Board of Ministers published the *Post-War Development Proposals*. In 1954 the Government published a *Six Year Programme of Investment*. In 1958, the Government issued a *Ten Year Plan*. It may be said without prejudice to the authors of these publications that planning has consisted of little more than good intentions, providing employment opportunities for a few men who read economics at the university. Good intentions, however, are a dozen to the penny, and one looks hard for leaders who convert these good intentions into programmes of action.'¹⁴

The United Front Government

Oblivious of the deepening crisis within the whole structure of Ceylonese rural society, the UNP campaigned for the general election in May 1970 on the platform of its 'economic achievements': it claimed that it had reduced rice imports from 600,000 tons per annum to 300,000, won Italian co-operation in constructing an oil refinery outside Colombo, and reached agreement with the World Bank on finance for the Mahaveli hydroelectric scheme. In fact, as has been seen, unemployment had been soaring and rice imports had been cut by

reducing domestic consumption. Against the UNP, a so-called 'United Front' of the SLFP, LSSP and the pro-Russian CP had been formed, with a programme of vaguely reformist promises (restoration of the rice subsidy, control of the export-import trade, 'Ceylonization' of selected businesses, and so on) burnished with rhetorical references to socialism. Desperate for alleviation of their condition, the Ceylonese masses turned once more—for the last time—for the SLFP and its allies on the 'left'. The illusions of the exploited and oppressed workers and peasants found a tumultuous, if temporary, expression in a landslide electoral victory of the SLFP-LSSP-CP coalition, which won 125 out of 151 seats (the SLFP took 90 alone). Popular enthusiasm and expectations were at their height as the returns came in: crowds in Colombo marched on the Lake House combine, newspaper stronghold of the plutocracy, and attempted to sack it within hours of the announcement of the poll results. In the interior a spontaneous occupation of big estates followed the United Front victory.

Yet, within five months, the British *Daily Telegraph* was reporting that: 'Ceylon's popular mood has slumped drastically from euphoria and hope to dismay and discontent. Seldom can Ministers have had to disappoint their followers so unkindly, backtrack so rapidly and pigeon-hole promises so irreverently.' It went on, however, to comment on the 'heartening' fact that 'the new Ministers, thought largely armchair Marxists or doctrinaire Socialists wedded to untried and antique economic dogmas, have shown an unexpected readiness to temper their ideals with reality'.¹⁵

The SLFP were the dominant force within the coalition: they held 19 of the 23 Cabinet posts, while the Communists held one and the LSSP held three economics posts; the 'socialists' were there to provide left cover. It is clear that the coalition programme, even if implemented, would not in itself have altered the crisis inside Ceylon. What is certain is that the new Bandaranaike government was unable to make even a pretense of carrying it out. Before the election, the SLFP-LSSP-CP had promised to reverse the rise in unemployment: its rate of increase accelerated after the election victory and, in his October budget, LSSP leader Perera announced that unemployment was now estimated at 700,000. They had sworn to restore the rice ration to the 1965 level—but they did so at a price nearly three times higher than they had promised. They were committed to 'Ceylonizing' some of the tea estates, but in October Perera announced that: 'We have agitated for the nationalization of the tea estates for the past 40 years. After assuming office, I realize that it is not advisable to do so now.' The Coalition had promised to nationalize foreign banks—this plan was also shelved. They had said they would curb the power of the reactionary Lake House press combine; but nothing was done.

In foreign policy, the Bandaranaike government took some easy measures that involved little material cost and won it left approval: it suspended links with Israel, and established diplomatic relations with North Korea, North Vietnam and the Provisional Government of South Vietnam. But although preaching anti-imperialism, it continued the Rs.10 million worth of tea exports to South Africa, and soft-pedalled even at the wretched Lusaka conference of 'non-aligned' countries. The coalition had promised to expel US Ambassador Strauss-Hupé, named by the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a CIA associate and vetoed as Ambassador to Morocco; he remained US Ambassador to Ceylon. The UF had attacked the UNP government for capitulating to imperialist financial agencies; yet Perera's first trip abroad as Minister was to the IMF meeting in Copenhagen, and in April 1971 he signed a letter of intent, the sixth since 1965, to arrange a stand-by credit. In his October 1970 budget speech Perera had promised to reveal the contents of future letters of intent: the terms of the April 1971 deal were kept secret. Moreover, the UF had committed itself to ending co-operation with the World Bank in the Mahaveli River scheme, because this gave the Bank a determining say in Cey-

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ 'Why Ceylon Needs Foreign Aid', by G. Uswatte-Aratchi, *Asian Review*, Vol. 1, No. 2, January 1968.

¹⁵ *The Daily Telegraph*, October 27th, 1970.

lonese government expenditure and in the import of capital goods. This co-operation still continued.

The Emergence of the JVP

JVP

Such a blatant record of apostasy and complicity with imperialism was bound to have serious consequences on the workings of traditional political mystification in Ceylon. In their economic despair, the masses had turned to the established left and to the SLFP; but the extreme seriousness of the crisis prevented either Sirimavo Bandaranaike's lachrymose hypocrisy or the fake left of Perera and Keuneman from retaining control, or of meeting the real challenge that came from a force that had broken with the paralytic structures of Ceylonese parliamentarianism and was in direct contact with the exploited. This challenge came from the *Janata Vimukthi Peramuna* (People's Liberation Front). The JVP originated in a split from the pro-Chinese Communist Party in 1965, when it criticized the Party for concentrating too exclusively on urban work and for ignoring the Ceylonese peasantry in the non-plantation sector. It had begun its political life on the basis of two theoretical premises, which had evolved out of its critique of the pro-Chinese Communist Party and of the other parties of the established left. These were: (i) that there was no independent national bourgeoisie in Ceylon, and (ii) that the non-plantation peasantry were the 'main force' of the Ceylonese revolution. Both Communist Parties and the SSP held that the Bandaranaike clan represented a progressive national bourgeoisie which was to be supported in its fight against imperialism. The JVP attacked and denounced this myth: 'In order to understand the nature of the SLFP, it is necessary to analyse the nature of the national bourgeois class that it represents. This is a weak and vacillating class which has no independent social status. On the one hand it was created by the imperialists and as such has affiliations to them. On the other hand when they feel threatened economically and socially by the imperialists they become "socialists" and raise their voices against imperialism. This empty cry of socialism is born out of pure opportunism. It began with Bandaranaike and is still continued by the SLFP . . . In a neo-colonial system like Ceylon it is characteristic of the national bourgeois class to form, in the final analysis, a united front with the imperialists. In a neo-colony the capitalist system is maintained to cater for the needs of the imperialists. Therefore it follows that the national bourgeois class, by protecting capitalism in Ceylon, is in fact supporting imperialism. In the short run the national bourgeoisie leans on the oppressed classes in order to gain political power. But in the long run they get support and sustenance from the capitalists and imperialists . . . It is not possible to fight imperialism through a parliament which was set up by the imperialists. But the national bourgeoisie of this country is not prepared to wage extra-parliamentary struggles against the imperialists. In this context anyone who thinks that he can achieve socialism through aligning with the national bourgeoisie is either a fool or an agent of the capitalists.'¹⁶

The JVP's second main thesis concerned the non-plantation rural sector. For it was there that the process of economic decline in the sixties was most clearly felt, and where there was the largest number of young unemployed. The JVP argued that there were three basic revolutionary forces in Ceylon: the urban proletariat, the plantation proletariat and the non-plantation peasantry. The urban proletariat were historically the most combative and best organized. However, 'the urban sector is controlled and organized under reformist leaders. These leaders have continuously fooled the masses with revolutionary rhetoric and have abandoned them at the moment of decisive struggle. As a result of its disenchantment with a reformist leadership, which has allied itself with the coalition government, the urban proletariat is now waging continuous struggle and is seeking an alternative revolutionary party'. The JVP considered the Tamil plantation proletariat to have fallen victims to the chauvinism of the SLFP and its allies, and hence to have become immured in a defensive communalism of its own:

this fundamental revolutionary force was thus politically cut off from the other exploited classes within Ceylon, both in the town and in the country.

For the JVP the 'main force' of the Ceylonese Revolution, because it formed the overwhelming numerical majority of the population, was the peasantry in the non-plantation sector. Contrary to the theses of the reformist parties, the JVP argued that this sector was now effectively capitalist, although broken remnants of feudal relations of production undoubtedly remained.

'Neo-colonialism prevails in the country today. According to existing social relations there is a capitalist system here. Ceylon is a capitalist society designed to fulfil the class needs of the foreign imperialists and their allies. There is no feudalism in our country today. Only a few remains of the old feudal system are to be found . . . The capitalist economic system has swallowed up the fertile lands in the up-country and wet-zone areas, thus creating a great shortage of land for the Ceylonese people . . . Liptons, Brooke Bonds and other white imperialist companies own thousands of acres; 90 local families share one acre. . . . The so-called left-wing leaders of our country have said that the peasantry is not revolutionary, and that they are against socialism. These leaders will never understand the problems of Ceylon. Due to a failure to analyse the problems of the peasantry scientifically and accurately, there has been no attempt to establish a worker-peasant alliance nor any move to unite the entire oppressed class and to work towards a socialist revolution . . . It is only socialism that could permanently liberate the up-country landless peasant, the peasant in the wet zone whose crops are being constantly destroyed by the floods, the dry-zone peasant who is the victim of droughts, the agricultural labourers, chena (slash-and-burn) cultivators and share-croppers.'¹⁷

In its period of clandestine maturation the JVP also developed a third thesis that was fundamental to its politics, the thesis that in Ceylon armed insurrection and not guerrilla war was the appropriate form of revolutionary combat. This developed partly from an analysis of the geographical and demographic structure of the island, a small densely populated area with a relatively weak repressive machine. But it also expressed an instinctive rejection of the reformism of the established left, and a straightforward enthusiasm for the most immediate militant alternative. It was this thesis, not very explicitly formulated but latent in the formation of the party, that guided its revolutionary strategy in the confrontation that began when the JVP emerged publicly in early 1970.

The JVP spent its first five years concentrated in the rural sector. JVP cadres gave classes in political thought, divided into five categories, and these political lecturers often hid themselves behind curtains, while speaking, to avoid police detection. A leading militant later described the experience of breaking with the sclerotic practices of the orthodox reformist parties and discovering the life of rural Ceylon for the first time. 'During this time groups of revolutionaries, disillusioned with all established political parties, met to discuss the future of Ceylon and how to establish a true socialist government. We discovered in the course of our discussions that there wasn't a true Marxist-Leninist party, or a revolutionary party, or a party for the poor masses in the country. We realized the urgent necessity to mobilize the people to establish socialism in Ceylon . . . Our discussions lasted several months. We decided it was necessary to visit the villages with the intention of explaining to the people the causes of their oppression. We went to the villages and spoke with the people and convinced them of the correctness of Marxism-Leninism. In the villages we also studied thoroughly and deeply the difficulties and problems of peasants, workers, students, fishermen and even street-hawkers and unemployed young men and women. We went all over the island and met the poor masses . . .'¹⁸

¹⁶ 'The SLFP—The Agent of the National Bourgeoisie', *Vimukthi* No. 7, December 20th 1970.

¹⁷ 'The Peasantry is the Main Force of the Ceylonese Revolution', *Vimukthi* No. 4, September 30th 1970.

The JVP first emerged publicly during the election campaign of early 1970. The incumbent UNP government claimed there was a plot against it, and arrested about 12 young people suspected of connections with the JVP, including their public leader Rohan Wijeweera. They were accused of being 'Che Guevarists'—a term they have never applied to themselves—and also of being CIA agents. The JVP at this stage supported the SLFP-LSSP-CP programme and hence the opposition parties committed themselves to releasing the JVP internees if elected; even at this stage, however, the coalition was very wary of the JVP and it took the new Bandaranaike government two months, till July, to release the JVP supporters arrested by the UNP. For a brief space of time the JVP now enjoyed relative political freedom, and was able to publish its paper *Vimukhti*, and hold public meetings unimpeded. At this stage, the JVP consistently reminded the government of its pre-election promises. In particular, the JVP pressed the following demands: the nationalization of the plantations and land reform; the expulsion of all imperialist political and cultural agencies; the nationalization of banks and agency houses; the implementation of all measures promised in the election campaign. They were demanding the implementation of a programme that was socialist in practice as well as in words. The government in reply refurbished the old accusations first coined by the UNP régime. The JVP were 'CIA agents'—according to the SLFP, the LSSP, and the pro-Moscow Communist Party with one voice. The JVP retorted by presenting its own independent position. The first issue of *Vimukhti* (August 1st 1970) carried an editorial stating the JVP was 'pledged to liberate the people of Ceylon from oppression and exploitation' and 'to solve the problems of the unemployed youth of the country'. It added: 'We certainly wish to destroy British and US imperialism, and Indian expansionism and capitalist anti-revolutionary plots. But we do not want to destroy any socialist programme that the government wishes to carry out.' On August 10th the JVP held its biggest public meeting to date, in Colombo, at which Wijeweera was the main speaker: 'We will continue to support the government if they progress towards socialism. They will receive all our support, but if they fail to reach the socialist goal, then we will do so,' he declared.¹⁹

But the political situation was already changing rapidly. During August the armed forces announced that they were taking special measures to prevent JVP supporters from staying in, or entering, the army. The size of the police force was raised by 55 per cent. Young people were being arrested in rural areas, while JVP meetings were everywhere harassed. The army and police further set up a special 'Counter-Insurrectionary Unit' to co-ordinate their work, of which a subsequent ornament was Peter Keuneman, leader of the pro-Moscow CP. In September government forces shot dead two workers on a plantation at Keenakelle, and a strike was ruthlessly broken and several trade-union militants sacked at the Velona textile plant, one of Ceylon's biggest factories. In October Perera announced his first budget, containing an all-round retreat from the coalition's original economic policy. After the September strikes, the JVP declared: 'The government's socialism is socialism as practised by big company owners. This is why the government has used the police force to break up the strikes.'²⁰ The October budget it denounced as 'the same medicine in a new bottle'.

From August 1970 onwards, the JVP faced a difficult strategic problem: how to attack the government, by moving carefully enough not to outpace the disillusion of the masses yet fast enough to hit before the government struck at it. Ultimately, the JVP had to prepare for a violent seizure of power after the masses were prepared and before the bourgeois State could strike it down. As the government discredited itself, the JVP rapidly grew in popular strength. Vast crowds of many thousands were now regularly drawn to its public meetings of explanation and denunciation. Yet this process also alerted Ceylonese reaction to the danger which was building up for it, and impelled it ever

faster towards general and outright repression. This posed problems of pace and of preparation of an extremely difficult character for the JVP in late 1970 and early 1971.

Throughout these months, the JVP was warning the masses of a possible government attack, while it prepared its own organization and sought to build contacts with the plantation proletariat and the unionized urban workers. Hitherto, it had concentrated its efforts in the Sinhalese peasantry of the centre and south of the island. By doing so, it had won a firm base in the very strongholds of rural traditionalism which had provided the SLFP with its mass electorate: indeed it was soon to become apparent that the JVP had its greatest support in precisely those regions where the SLFP had scored its largest victories at the polls in May 1970. Naturally, this conquest of its home terrain alarmed the Bandaranaike clique intensely. However, this same fact also underlined the great limitation of the JVP's organizational work hitherto. Its political success was so far mainly confined to the Sinhalese peasantry, and among them especially rural youth. It had therefore not yet overcome the structural division of the exploited classes in Ceylon into two hostile ethnic communities. Given the dark history of Sinhalese chauvinism from the late forties onwards, it was absolutely essential for any vanguard aiming to achieve a socialist revolution in Ceylon to break down this division decisively and create class unity between the Tamil and Sinhalese masses. The very success of JVP mobilization in the Sinhalese central and south-western countryside thus also held a latent danger—that of the particularism which had been fostered and manipulated by the Bandaranaikes and the *sangha*. The deep rural radicalism of the Sinhalese peasantry that had been distorted and confiscated by 'Buddhist' demagogy was now for the first time finding an authentic expression; but for it to consolidate into a socialist consciousness, a class juncture with the Tamil rural proletariat and the urban working class was indispensable.

The JVP thus now became increasingly conscious of the urgent need to extend its base to the urban and rural proletariat proper. To this end, there were contacts with the two revolutionary nuclei which already existed in the urban working class and among the Tamil plantation workers: the LSSP (R) led by Bala Tampoe, and the Young Socialist Front led by Ilanchelian. Tampoe was secretary of the large clerical-workers union, the Ceylon Mercantile Union, which has some 35,000 members and wields great economic power because of its strategic control of the port in Colombo. The YSF was a new group of Tamil revolutionaries which had emerged in struggle against the traditional communal unions of the plantation workers led by Thondaman and Aziz, whose extreme reactionary character had hitherto been an insuperable obstacle to radicalization of the tea-workers. Thondaman is actually a large plantation-owner himself, who has been made a 'distinguished citizen' of Ceylon for his work on behalf of the ruling class. The birth of the YSF was thus one of the most vital and hopeful developments in Ceylon for many years: it co-operated with the LSSP (R) and was very close to it politically. A convergence of all three organizations could thus lay the ground-work for achieving the central goal of class unity between all the exploited in Ceylon. In November 1970, the JVP, LSSP (R) and YSF organized a joint mass meeting at the Keenakelle estate, where two workers had been shot by the police in September. The speakers included Wijeweera for the JVP, Tampoe for the LSSP (R) and Ilanchelian for the YSF. In February 1971, the JVP held another mass rally in Colombo itself, attacking the Government's policies and demonstrating an increasing audience among the urban proletariat.

By March the economic situation was cascading towards disaster, and the JVP was winning more and more popular influence every day. Its success now posed an imminent threat to the SLFP-LSSP-CP coalition government and the local and international interests it represented and protected. The government thus decided to strike first. On March 6th there was a demonstration outside the US Embassy, by the Mao Youth Front, an ultra-left organization led by Dharma-ekera. In the course of it a policeman was killed. The JVP had nothing whatever to do with this demonstration outside the US Embassy, which it promptly de-

¹⁹ Interview with the president of the Deshapremi Student Front of the JVP, in the *Ceylon Sunday Observer*, August 23rd 1970.

²⁰ 'We will support Govt. but want results, says JVP leader', *Ceylon Daily News*, August 11th 1970.

²¹ 'If we are Proscribed ...' *Vimukhti* No. 4, September 30th 1970.

nounced: it was either a deliberate government-organized provocation, or a confused mêlée used by the government as a pretext to attack its opponents. At all events, the government now moved against the jvp. On March 16th, the cabinet announced that a jvp 'plot' to overthrow the government had been discovered, and declared a State of Emergency. A dusk to dawn curfew was imposed, and the police and army were given full powers of arbitrary arrest and disposal of casualties without informing the relatives of those killed. Sirimavo Bandaranaike went on the radio to broadcast an 'appeal' to the Ceylonese people for 'vigilance against terrorist groups'. By March 26th the government had announced the arrest of 'about 300' people suspected of connection with the jvp, and reports of discoveries of arms caches were broadcast almost daily.

The objective of this all-out attack by the government was to destroy the jvp as a political organization, and eradicate its influence in Ceylon. It was intended to catch the jvp head-on, before it or its allies had yet built a coherent base among either the Tamil plantation workers or the urban proletariat. For it was the fusion of these three exploited classes into a single revolutionary front that would have inevitably spelled the end of capitalism in Ceylon. It was above all to preempt this menace that the Ceylonese bourgeoisie now struck out viciously at the newly created vanguard that was threatening to bring this about. The jvp was consequently put in a grave dilemma. It had put down strong roots among the low-country and Kandyan Sinhalese peasantry, and it had a nation-wide youth cadre. But it had not yet achieved any real penetration of the Tamil proletariat, and had only embryonic contacts and links with the urban working class. Organizational convergence with two revolutionary forces already working in these sectors was under the way, but not yet consolidated. In principle, it was thus obviously premature to make a direct bid for State power at this stage. But on the other hand the government's offensive threatened to annihilate the jvp as an organization if it did not resist and hit back. It had been prepared by years of clandestine work, and had learnt from the lessons of Iraq and Indonesia that a party is only revolutionary if it is prepared to defend itself when attacked.²¹ There was a debate inside the jvp after the government's wave of arrests and imposition of the State of Emergency. Two main strategies were defended: armed insurrection or protracted guerrilla warfare. The protagonists of armed insurrection swung the decision within the jvp leadership, arguing that the longer the jvp waited the more time the government had to crush them. The party therefore gave instructions to its militants for a counter-attack.

The Armed Insurrection

On the night of April 5-6th, three weeks after the declaration of the State of Emergency, police stations in different parts of the island were assaulted by jvp cadres in groups of 25 to 30. It appears that one group attacked prematurely on the night of 4-5th, since on April 5th the government announced that a police station at Wellawaya in Uva Province had been attacked on that night and imposed a curfew in five administrative districts (Badulla, Kandy, Moneragala, Amparari and Nuwara Eliya).²² The jvp's weaponry in these attacks was entirely home-made: they had to get their first modern equipment by seizing these government outposts. The aim of this first attack seems to have been to capture a stock of modern arms, and to consolidate in a liberated region of the interior, blocking communications across the island and providing a base for a second offensive. On this first night

²¹ *Vimukhti* No. 5, November 1st 1970, carried an article 'Lessons from Indonesia' which contained the following assessment: 'The communists had not accepted the fact that the strongest weapon of the neo-colonialists was anti-revolutionary action. Thus they had not prepared or organised themselves to face such a situation. In short, their mistakes were: the lack of understanding of the nature of the enemy, mouthing parrot-like the sayings of Chairman Mao but neither understanding them nor applying them in practice, and failing to arm the oppressed classes to fight against the national bourgeoisie. Due to these mistakes, the communist party had no power to avert the right-wing coup. Those who sacrificed their lives in Indonesia have taught us a lesson which should never be forgotten.'

²² *Financial Times*, April 6th 1971.

several police stations fell, and the government soon evacuated many more: at the height of the insurrection between 90 and 100 police stations had been abandoned or had fallen to the jvp. The government's first announcement spoke of attacks on 25 police stations, but this may have understated the number of attacks on that night and they certainly remained silent about subsequent attacks. Later in April a truer picture emerged: 'the government, which had earlier said only about 25 posts were attacked, now says more than 30 were captured and held for several days by the insurgents. In at least nine areas of the countryside covering hundreds of square miles, the rebels maintained control uncontested by government forces.'²³

The government's immediate response to the situation was to panic at the prospect of an insurrection in Colombo itself, and it temporarily withdrew its forces to hold the capital, trying to calm the situation by issuing confident announcements. On April 6th the curfew was actually reduced, and a day later the Minister of Defence and Internal Affairs announced that the armed forces had achieved 'complete control' and were mopping up a few areas of resistance. But on April 8th a clearer picture began to emerge from government announcements: it was revealed that the insurrectionaries had set up road blocks at Warakapola and Kegalle on the main Colombo-Kandy road, and that the air force was attacking jvp positions on a strategic bridge at Alawwa. The next day the government imposed a 24-hour curfew throughout Ceylon and foreign newspaper reports spoke of 80,000 to 100,000 insurgents challenging the government. While these figures were almost certainly exaggerated they reflected the intense alarm that had seized ruling class circles when the extent of the rebellion became apparent.

On April 9th Sirimavo Bandaranaike made another characteristic broadcast in which she informed the Ceylonese people that the jvp was the tool of 'big money, diabolical minds and criminal organizers'. A terrorist movement, 'hatched in secret', had launched a surprise attack on the Ceylonese way of life. There was no hint in this speech that the insurrection had any social or economic basis whatsoever. In fact, it immediately became clear that the jvp had both mass support and a far-reaching organization in the south-centre and south-west of the island, and the insurrection covered almost the whole of the Sinhalese countryside. It is clear that the overwhelming bulk of the fighting was performed by units of armed youth, often including many members in their teens. The core of the insurrection seems to have been formed by 10 administrative districts where the army were given full control on April 12th:²⁴ these were Kagalle, Matale, Kurunegala, Anuradhapura, Matara, Polonnaruwa, Galle, Hambantota, Ambalangoda and Katunayake. On April 10th AP reported from Kegalle police station that it was 'the only one in a district of 700 miles not yet burnt down or abandoned in the face of a Cuban-style insurgency by an estimated 80,000 rebels'.²⁵ Later in the month it was revealed that the jvp had held and administered two sizeable towns in the Southern Province, Elpitya (50,000 population) and Deniyaya: liberated in the initial onslaught, they were only reoccupied by government forces on April 23rd (Elpitya) and April 25th (Deniyaya).²⁶

Western press reports, our only source so far, have stressed that villagers welcomed the jvp and gave them supplies and information. 'There is no doubt that the villagers are sympathetic to the young rebels. They were all received in a friendly manner by the local population.'²⁷ Even a British tea-planter, whose estate was occupied by the jvp for three weeks, stressed their political formation and precise intelligence.²⁸ The tea plantations in the highlands seem to have been relatively unaffected, but in Colombo there was definite, if limited, supporting action by a jvp underground network. On April 11th the government announced that all but one of the Governing Board of the Ceylon broadcasting corporation had been sacked: a jvp network had been uncovered, using the obituary and Listeners' Choice programmes

²³ *New York Times*, April 25th 1971.

²⁴ *The Guardian*, April 12th 1971. Other reports spoke of only six such districts.

to send out coded messages to the militants in the field. A day later there was an attack on the runway of Katunayake Airport, where military supplies were being flown in.

In the tempest of the April crisis, while JVP units were manoeuvring and fighting in the hills, the precarious hold of the government on the working class began to falter. Allegedly loyal trade unionists were sent to the provinces to guard police stations—but many had to be withdrawn rapidly because they developed sympathies for the JVP. Moreover, the government introduced new and unprecedentedly repressive labour laws on April 21st, banning the distribution of handbills and posters within employers' premises without the prior permission of the capitalists concerned, and imposing penalties for absenteeism and late attendance at work—a clear attempt to force JVP militants to return to work or to expose themselves by their absence.²⁹ The government also conducted a systematic purge of the educational system, by summoning all teachers to report on pain of dismissal if they failed to do so. 25% of those who did show up were arrested. But the most striking index of the fearstricken isolation of the Ceylonese bourgeois stratum was a government decree calling up reserves and recruiting new police and soldiers, which specifically excluded recruitment of anyone under the age of 35. A new regiment, the *National Service Regiment*, was recruited on this basis. There could be no more damning sign that it felt the whole of the country's youth to be in opposition to it. The very measures taken by Ceylonese capital to suppress the JVP only underlined the reality of its mass strength.

'We Have Learnt Too Many Lessons from Vietnam'

By the end of May, after extremely fierce fighting and continual re-deployments by the JVP, the government had temporarily driven the insurgent groups back into the upland forests and re-established its control over the rural interior. There are two aspects of the government's counter-offensive that stand out: the extreme savagery of the repression, and the extraordinary line-up of international allies that rushed to Sirimavo Bandaranaike's aid. During the initial government counter-attack in Kegalle, around April 17–20th, the first reports began to appear of summary executions. Sandhurst-educated, Lt.-Col. Cyril Ranatunga was quoted as justifying the execution of his prisoners: 'We have learnt too many lessons from Vietnam and Malaysia. We must destroy them completely.'³⁰ Another officer was quoted as saying: 'Once we are convinced prisoners are insurgents we take them to the cemetery and dispose of them.' The government subsequently denied this, but in later weeks hundreds of bodies of young men and women were seen floating down the Kelaniya river near Colombo, where they were collected and burnt by soldiers: many were found to have been shot in the back.³¹ René Dumont, in Ceylon during the insurrection, estimated that 8,000 people had been killed.³² What is clear is that the police and armed forces launched an indiscriminate attack on the peasant population as a whole. The *Washington Post* reported in early May that an army major had even welcomed the insurrection: 'We have never had the opportunity to fight a real war in this country,' he was quoted as saying. 'All these years we have been firing dummies, now we are being put to use.'³³ In fact, the army panicked. 'Ceylon's outnumbered and unprepared police force and army have resorted to mass arrests, torture, executions and other terror tactics in attempting to put down young well-organized armed insurgents.'³⁴ *Le Monde* correspondent Decornoy gave the following picture: 'At Galle, in the south, we saw three "terrorists" who had just been arrested and whom the police were taking away. A local inhabitant remarked: "They will be killed tonight, and their bodies will be thrown into the river". The police, traditionally hated and today used without reserve by the "progressive" government,

are openly compared to Duvalier's "tontons macoutes" and their crimes have shocked the population. Here are some examples . . . At Kataragama, a village in the south, a girl was stripped and killed on the spot. At Akuressa, two young people were shot in front of the inhabitants and left to die, but only did so later, when their bodies were burnt. At Kosgoda, corpses were left hanging in public for several days. At Kandy, a lecturer in geography was so savagely beaten that he died in hospital; a history student was tortured for two days. At Bandaragama a young man was beaten up and the sole of his foot was cut open and covered with pepper. Another young man, while on a road outside Colombo, was arrested, tortured and left to the red ants. What is the point of going on?'³⁵ By mid-June the government announced that it had arrested no less than 14,000 young people and were holding them in detention camps: the leaders would be tried and the rest would be 'rehabilitated' through education and work.

The Theory and Practice of Neutrality

This government repression carried through in April and May received powerful support from an unprecedented bloc of international allies. The Sirimavo Bandaranaike government had shown that its domestic 'socialism' was a feeble fraud: its reaction to the April insurrection revealed that its foreign policy was equally bogus. When the State of Emergency was first declared in March, sections of the imperialist press expressed doubt as to whether it was really justified by the importance of the JVP and suggested that the real reason for it was that the coalition government wished to smother popular criticism of the deteriorating economic situation. Then, after the insurrection had begun, the same press adopted a tone of triumphant arrogance. While enthusiastically supporting the régime's requests for arms, the *London Daily Telegraph* told its readers that: 'It seems absurd in many respects that Britain should be supplying arms for Mrs Bandaranaike's irresponsible and bankrupt government', and concluded by saying that 'if she has not learned her lesson it must be hoped that the people of Ceylon have done so'.³⁶ A week later, while warning of the danger of the Russian presence in Ceylon, the *Telegraph* did not miss the opportunity to belabour 'the egregious and self-righteously non-aligned Mrs Bandaranaike'.³⁷ *The Times* headlined its editorial 'Ceylon can learn from the shock',³⁸ while the *Sunday Times'* Frank Giles was equally jubilant: 'For the present', he wrote, 'one's thoughts turn to the extraordinary situation in Ceylon and Mrs Bandaranaike's spectacular demonstration of the theory and practice of neutrality. Of course we ought to wish her well, but I just hope she knows what she is about.'³⁹

Sirimavo Bandaranaike, of course, knew very well what she was about. In January she had demurred from the British government's policy of selling arms to South Africa, during the Commonwealth Conference in Singapore, but she had always continued Ceylon's trade with South Africa and the first supplies of foreign arms she received in April were flown by Air Ceylon Trident from the British base in Singapore. These initial supplies consisted of small arms stored in Singapore, and the first consignment arrived on April 10th—four days after the start of the insurrection. On April 13th the British government announced that it had received a request for helicopters, and had agreed to supply Ceylon with six Bell Jet Rangers: as Britain had none of these herself

²⁹ *International Herald Tribune*, April 20th 1971.

³⁰ *New York Times*, April 25th 1971.

³¹ *Nouvel Observateur*, May 23rd 1971.

³² *Washington Post*, May 9th 1971.

³³ *New York Times*, April 25th 1971.

³⁴ *Le Monde*, June 16th 1971. Decornoy's series of four articles on the insurrection, beginning with *Le Monde* of June 16th, give a forceful account of both the rising itself and the subsequent repression.

³⁵ *Daily Telegraph*, April 14th 1971.

³⁶ *Daily Telegraph*, April 21st 1971.

³⁷ *The Times*, April 21st 1971.

³⁸ *The Sunday Times*, April 25th 1971.

³⁹ *Evening Standard*, April 12th 1971.

³⁰ *The Guardian*, April 24, reported the reoccupation of Elpitya; the *International Herald Tribune*, April 26th, reported the recapture of Deniyaya.

³¹ *Le Monde*, April 30th 1971.

³² *The Times*, May 4th 1971.

³³ *Financial Times*, May 6th 1971.

she bought them from the us for Ceylon, at \$100,000 a time.⁴⁰ The us also flew in supplies of helicopter spare parts. Meanwhile both India and Pakistan were sending in arms and counter-insurgency experts to Ceylon. On April 13th 'at least four Indian warships' were reported patrolling off Colombo harbour, and on April 14th six Indian and two Pakistani helicopters arrived in Ceylon. India was alarmed at the prospect of revolution just off her shores,⁴¹ and Pakistan sent aid in return for the landing facilities provided at Katunayake airport after India blocked direct flights between Pakistan and Bengal. On April 21st Australia announced that it too would send arms to Ceylon, following the lead of Britain and the us. The Soviet response was equally prompt and enthusiastic. On April 17th an Air Ceylon Trident was despatched to Cairo, via Karachi and Bahrain, to collect a consignment of nine tons of Soviet weapons from stores in Egypt,⁴² and on April 20th four Antonov transport planes arrived from Tashkent with 63 Soviet technicians and helicopters packed in crates.⁴³ On April 21st Antonovs brought six Mig-17s for assembly in Ceylon.⁴⁴ The Soviet pilots refrained from flying combat missions against the jvp and agreed only to train Ceylonese pilots—for some future insurrection, perhaps. On May 6th the Soviet Union announced that it would also send 20 armoured cars.⁴⁵ Yugoslavia, loyal to a fellow 'non-aligned' country, supplied mountain artillery which was reported by *The Times* to have been particularly useful to Lt.-Col. Ranatunga in his counter-offensive in the Kegalle region.⁴⁶

As if this consortium of suppliers was not enough, Ceylon also received emergency economic aid from China, in the form of a Rs. 150 million interest-free loan, announced on April 26th. This loan constituted a direct and express support for the Ceylonese counter-revolution: it was accompanied by a personal message from Chou En-lai to Sirimavo Bandaranaike giving a blanket blessing to her capitalist government in its suppression of the popular rebellion led by the jvp. This abject document faithfully repeated the language of Colombo officialdom about the jvp.⁴⁷ In fact, not even the most rabid imperialists were pretending that the jvp represented 'a handful of persons'. References to Mao Tse-tung merely figure as an ideological cover for the naked great-power opportunism of the Chinese intervention. One of the most basic principles of Marxism and of Leninism is that when the masses rise, revolutionaries support them, even if their action is adventurist, as Marx did over the Paris Commune and Lenin did over the July Days. In fact, far from solidarizing with the oppressed, the Chinese government went out of its way to congratulate and aid their oppressors—in company with the USA, USSR, Britain and India. Chou En-lai's letter was released in Colombo on the same day as the ceremony in which the Chinese Ambassador signed the new loan to the Bandaranaike government and publicly applauded the 'happy coincidence' of this occasion with the first anniversary of the coalition's tenure of power. Thus did Chinese diplomacy celebrate the grim date of a year of uninterrupted betrayal

⁴⁰ The official British statement on these supplies was made in Parliament on April 22nd, in reply to a question of dubious spontaneity from a Conservative MP. This was the third occasion within six months when a British-trained and armed army had attacked a popular movement with intense savagery: in September 1970 the Belouin army of King Hussein (the former 'Arab Legion') had launched a genocidal assault on the Palestinian resistance; in March 1971 the Pakistani army had murderously attacked the whole people of Bengal. A few months afterwards, the Sandhurst-trained Sudanese Army launched a fourth such massacre in the Sudan. British imperialism, which prides itself on the tranquillity of its domestic politics, has nothing to concede to other imperialisms when it comes to neo-colonial brutality. The continuing killing in Ireland is a further reminder of the violence bequeathed by the British.

⁴¹ On April 16th the Indian paper, *The Hindu*, wrote: "This is the first time since Independence that Indian defence personnel have been sent out to help a friendly neighbouring country in distress, barring India's participation in the international peace-keeping operations under the auspices of the United Nations. . ."

⁴² *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Hindu*, April 18th.

⁴³ *Daily Telegraph*, April 21st 1971.

⁴⁴ *The Hindu*, April 22nd 1971.

⁴⁵ *Financial Times*, May 6th 1971.

⁴⁶ *The Times*, April 22nd 1971.

and repression for the Ceylonese masses. The cynicism of the Chinese collusion with Ceylonese capital may be judged from the fact that Chou En-lai's letter was carefully concealed from the Chinese people themselves. The Chinese press, indeed, has censored all news about the mass upsurge in Ceylon, no word of which has been published in China. Symbolically, in a map of 'the excellent situation in the world', published in *Renmin Ribao* on May 22nd 1971, there is an emblem for mass action in India, but nothing whatever for Ceylon.

Conclusions

Any full assessment of the Ceylonese insurrection will have to wait for information on the internal development of the jvp and the long-term results of its impact on Ceylonese politics. But certain effects are already clear. The insurrection was an ambitious and highly organized attempt to seize state power: it failed to achieve *this* aim. After three weeks of widespread military activity, the courageous Ceylonese revolutionaries were driven onto the defensive. Thousands of militants were killed, wounded or arrested; an unknown number of Ceylonese youth not directly part of the jvp were also killed. The jvp organization was severely hit. It is possible that such a blow could set the revolutionary movement in Ceylon back for some years and demoralize or terrorise the masses who rose enthusiastically to support the jvp; although, as will be seen, there are good reasons for doubting whether this will in fact be its effect. The insurrection has also alerted and hardened the Ceylonese régime and its international allies: it has 'revolutionized the counter-revolution' in Debray's phrase. Quite apart from the direct military aid given in April, imperialism will now redouble its vigilance; in July the Bandaranaike régime announced that it was studying a plan to raise the police force from 12,000 to 18,000. There is no doubt that political and military organization will be more difficult in the future than hitherto.

Nevertheless, the Ceylonese insurrection was in no sense a putsch. Despite a superficially 'blanquist' character, owing to its apparent suddenness, the rising was a popular insurrection in which a vanguard organization led the impoverished rural masses against a capitalist state. Why did it not succeed? No revolution can be 100 per cent sure of success, so the fact of its temporary defeat is not in itself proof that it should not have been attempted. But the insurrection was launched in conditions and in a form that limited its chances of success and validated the strict Leninist insistence on the necessary pre-conditions for a successful socialist insurrection. First of all, at the *political* level, the jvp seems to have had a loose and unsystematized internal structure. It was not a Leninist party; there were loosely coordinated factions within the leadership, reflecting different groups that had fused in the jvp at the beginning, and the relationship between these factions and the base was imprecise; so far as is known, the jvp had never held a national congress and had no elected officials. Moreover, there was an internal tendency towards adventurism as a spontaneous reaction at once against the predominance of parliamentarist reformism in Ceylon and out of the realization, blinding to a generation reared on the bromides of the Pereras and Keunemans, that the achievement of socialism ultimately demanded armed struggle. This tendency was strengthened by the sense of imminent government repression in the period after August 1970, when it seemed that the jvp militants

⁴⁷ The text of the Chinese letter, published in the *Ceylon Daily News* of May 26th, is printed elsewhere in this issue. It was reported in June that Chou En-lai, in a conversation with Ceylonese Ambassador to Peking I. A. Karannagoda, had disavowed the 'Guevarists' and had criticized the political practice of Guevara himself. "The Ambassador said the Chinese Premier was surprised that the Left-wing Government was being attacked by 'revolutionaries'. Chou added: "Who can we support in Ceylon except Mrs Bandaranaike?" (*Morning Star*, June 21st 1971 quoting a Reuter report from Colombo.) The Chinese provision of economic aid to Ceylon could in isolation have been seen as part of legitimate state policy, a continuation of China's earlier economic aid to Ceylon. But the letter to Bandaranaike giving explicit political support and the timing of the loan leave no doubt that Chinese policy is of another character altogether.

might well be struck down 'in their beds'. The experiences of Indonesia and Greece seemed the relevant warnings. The result was that after a debate within the jvp, the decision was made to hit the government with an armed insurrection rather than a protracted guerrilla war, and to strike immediately after the State of Emergency.

On the *military* level, the jvp was also at a disadvantage. It could not have avoided the birth of the international consortium of arms suppliers that developed. But its work among the armed forces, an essential Leninist precondition of insurrection, had been hampered since August by careful government screening. Thus there was no significant weakening of the police or army during the rising. A case of 18 naval cadets going over to the jvp was reported;⁴⁸ but a counter-revolutionary army can always sustain a certain level of *individual* desertion—it is only decisively crippled by mass desertion, or by the mutiny and loss of whole units. In Ceylon, the army appears to have gone into battle unimpaired. The jvp was also weakened by its lack of independent arms supplies: the traditional revolutionary practice of acquiring arms by winning them from the enemy is adequate for protracted guerrilla war, but the rapid escalation involved in an armed insurrection puts a great premium on acquiring sophisticated weapons very rapidly, and this does not seem to have been achieved in the first few days of the jvp offensive.

The last, and much the most fundamental, of all its handicaps was that the jvp did not have the necessary *social* base for a truly nation-wide insurrection. It was solidly implanted among the low-country and Kandyan Sinhalese peasantry of the central massif and the south-west. But it was only just developing links with the Tamil rural proletariat and the urban working class. The communal and reformist leadership of these two classes had not yet been really undermined. Thus when the insurrection broke out, the jvp quickly found itself penned within the south-central foothills and the north central dry zone, where the bulk of the actual fighting seems to have been done by rural unemployed youth. Moreover, the lack of a revolt in Colombo was fatal to the chances of the rural rising, because it allowed the State to deploy the full panoply of its military apparatus in the countryside after the first few days. The seclusion of the plantation workers meant that the central productive branches of the economy of the island were not affected by the insurrection. These twin basic absences probably doomed the rising to short-term defeat independently of any other factors. The attitude of the urban working class to the insurrection is not yet entirely clear: sections of it were probably confused and misled by their reformist trade-union leadership. The preventive government measures recounted above prove that the potential proletarian sympathy with it was nevertheless very great. But the jvp urban cadre was still too weak to be able to mobilize this into effective actions. This was in contrast to the Great Hartal of 1953, in which urban and rural movements co-ordinated spontaneously; it was also in contrast to jvp theory, which called for a three-way worker-rural proletariat-peasant alliance, in which the peasantry would be the 'main force'.

The jvp has nevertheless shown that armed insurrection is a real and possible form of revolutionary struggle in colonial and ex-colonial countries today. Debate since 1945 about revolutionary strategy has tended to concentrate *either* on various forms of protracted guerrilla struggles (liberated areas *vs.* mobile *focos*, urban *vs.* rural groups) *or* on a critique of parliamentarist reformism on the one hand and elitist military putsches on the other. Despite and through its defeat, the Ceylonese insurrection has re-emphasized the possibility of armed insurrection, 'the highest form of political struggle',⁴⁹ under definite and carefully prepared conditions. The insurrection led by the jvp suffered from

political, military and social limitations, which after a month of the utmost self-sacrifice and heroism led to its defeat. Unconditional solidarity with the rural poor and their vanguards, who fought with the most primitive weapons against the massive might of the Ceylonese bourgeois State and its array of international allies, is an absolute duty of all revolutionaries elsewhere. A critical Marxist balance-sheet of the insurrection does not contradict but reinforces this solidarity. The socialist revolution has no need of falsehood and euphemisms: it has confidence in the truth. The history of the international working class is rich in cases of successful revolutionary movements living through defeats and learning from them. There can be no doubt that the *lessons* of the April insurrection are being studied and assimilated by the underground in Ceylon today. A long hard task of preparation and consolidation now confronts the jvp and its allies: but it has proven itself to be a genuine vanguard of the masses and has shattered the parliamentarist veil that has hung over Ceylon for fifty years.

The Ceylonese insurrection of April 1971, like the French revolt of May 1968, was unexpected by revolutionaries and counter-revolutionaries alike. But Marxists can never accept the concept of 'surprise'. Mass explosions cannot occur without a long previous history of silent oppression: the very unexpectedness of such an event is itself a contribution to the violence of the subsequent outburst. The jvp was able to win deep popular support because it expressed the underlying crisis of the Ceylonese society itself—a crisis that was ignored by the political parties that dominated the island's life and concealed by the wide cultural and social gap that divided the palsied philo-British oligarchy of Colombo from the urban and rural masses. This crisis has not disappeared since the insurrection: it has deepened. Despite injections of foreign aid, there is little likelihood that the Bandaranaike government will be able to reverse the decline of the economy, added to which is the over Rs. 100 million worth of damage caused directly by the rebellion. There is no prospect of halting the remorseless rise in unemployment, the growing pressure on the land, or the increasing disaffection of the younger generation. Systematic terror and demagogic appeals to the country's 'misguided' youth by the SLFP-LSSP-CP government will not win back the masses who followed the jvp into rebellion. It was the insurrection that gave authentic voice, for the first time since independence, to the real crisis of Ceylonese society.

It is for this reason that the jvp's rising will reverberate, again and again, throughout the island even after its suppression. For there are some spectacular defeats which from the very moment of their consummation are already secret victories, because the time in which they occurred and the spirit with which they were fought lead to a sudden political awakening far beyond themselves. Their hidden effects can act like a depth-charge for wider and wider layers of the exploited masses, within a very short space of time. The Ceylonese insurrection of 1971 has every chance of being such a turning point. For its most important lesson of all is that, in Ceylon, the masses have a revolutionary character. Despised, exploited and manipulated by their traditional 'leaders', the rural poor of Ceylon surprised the world and their own domestic enemies by the ferocity of their revolt. They have written another heroic chapter in the history of the Asian and world revolution. All revolutionaries throughout the world must hope that the present lull will be followed by an even greater and successful storm.

⁴⁸ *Daily Telegraph*, May 6th 1971.

⁴⁹ A. Neuberger, *Armed Insurrection*, NLA London 1970, p. 25. Chapter 2, 'Bolshevism and Insurrection', presents the Leninist position on insurrection.

Below is the complete text of Chou En-lai's letter to Sirimavo Bandaranaike, dated April 26 1971 and officially published by the Ceylonese Government a month later. The text has not been readily accessible internationally, thus giving rise to uncertainty as to the letter's existence or authenticity. For these reasons, NLB is printing it in full and as a document. The Chinese Government has not questioned the version released in Colombo. There can be no doubt as to its accuracy.

CHOU EN-LAI'S MESSAGE TO SIRIMAVO BANDARANAIKE

'I am grateful to Your Excellency and the Ceylon Government for your trust in the Chinese Government and your friendly sentiments towards the Chinese people. The friendship between China and Ceylon is in the fundamental interests of the two peoples and can stand tests. The Chinese Government and people highly treasure the friendship between our two countries and no one with ulterior motives will ever succeed in trying to sow discord and sabotage our friendly relations.

Following Chairman Mao Tse-tung's teaching the Chinese people have all along opposed ultra 'left' and right opportunism in their protracted revolutionary struggles. We are glad to see that thanks to the efforts of Your Excellency and the Ceylon Government, the chaotic situation created by a handful of persons who style themselves 'Guevarists' and into whose ranks foreign spies have sneaked has been brought under control. We believe that as a result of Your Excellency's leadership and the co-operation and support of the Ceylonese people these acts of rebellion plotted by reactionaries at home and abroad for the purpose of undermining the interests of the Ceylonese people are bound to fail.

We fully agree to the correct position of defending state sovereignty and guarding against foreign interference as referred to by Your Excellency. The Chinese Government and people admire this and firmly support Ceylon in her just struggle towards this end. As Your Excellency is deeply aware the Chinese Government has consistently abided by the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, has never interfered in the internal affairs of other countries, and is also firmly opposed to any country interfering in other countries' internal affairs, and particularly to foreign reactionaries taking advantage of the opportunity to carry out armed intervention. I would like once again to reaffirm this unshakable stand of the Chinese Government.

In the interests of the friendship between China and Ceylon and in consideration of the needs of the Ceylon Government, the Chinese Government in compliance with the request of the Ceylon Government, agrees to provide it with a long-term interest free loan of 150 million rupees in convertible foreign exchange. We would like to hear any views which Your Excellency might have on this matter. We are prepared to deliver a portion of the loan in May and sign a document on it. As for other material assistance, please let us know if it is needed.'

Ceylon Daily News, May 27th 1971

*Just Out:
The PLP-LP...*

*Progressive
Labor Party's
Revolutionary
Record of
Songs born
in struggles
of Working
People.*

Power ^{To} The Working Class



These songs were composed by working people and sung at the Progressive Labor Party May Day celebration, May 1, 1971.

Progressive Labor Party, Box 808, B'klyn, N.Y. 11201

Send me copies of the PLP LP

Record Cassette

@ \$2.50 per record or \$3.00 per cassette

Enclosed is a donation of \$..... for PLP.

Name (please print) _____

Number & Street _____ Apt. _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

armed forces include SSAN, unit, station, zip, MOS

I want more information about PLP. phone _____

My industry or school _____

I am employed unemployed

CHALLENGE

The Revolutionary Communist Newspaper

February 17, 1972 Vol. 8, No. 17

PROGRESSIVE LABOR PARTY

10¢

Walkout Looms over
Speed-up at Key
GM Vega Plant PAGE 5

World-Wide Workers' Struggles Hit Nixon Freeze, U.S. Imperialism in:

STRIKE WAVE!

Puerto Rico's Phone Workers Cut Down Ma Bell; Women Take Lead PAGE 3

Solidarity Spreads to Mexico, Canada on W. Coast Docks PAGE 2, 5, 6

Lynn-GE Wildcats Expose Anti-Communist Sellouts PAGE 4

Canadian Air Controllers Fight for 30-Hour Week PAGE 3

Arco Oil Workers Burn, Shoot Scab Trucks PAGE 7

S. African Miners Shut Off Gold Supply PAGE 6



**IRELAND: GENERAL STRIKE AGAINST BRITISH
COULD DEFEAT IRISH BOSSES, TOO.**

On Jan. 30, workers demonstrated against British imperialist control of Northern Ireland. British bosses reacted the way most bosses do on the way down—they murdered 13 men, women and children. Irish workers answered with a massive general strike.

As we go to press, (Feb. 1), Londonderry—where the demonstration was held—is shut down tight. Across the rest of Ireland airport and telephone workers are refusing to handle anything connected with England. Bus drivers and dock workers have also gone out. In Dublin, protesters tried three times to burn down the British embassy. In Belfast, the English army has been shot at repeatedly. Students are demonstrating all over the country in support of the fight against British rule.

What power exists in the hands of Irish workers—of ALL workers! If Irish workers wield this might against ALL bosses—Protestant and Catholic, Irish and British—they could take over Ireland and run it in the interests of the working class. A general strike that unites masses of workers, shuts down production and the flow of bosses' profits, is a major step on the road to workers' power.

Once the masses of workers direct this strength, under the leadership of a communist party, towards smashing the bosses' state power altogether, then we can construct a socialist society without exploitation, slums, unemployment, racism and all the ills capitalism has brought to Ireland and the world. ALL power to the Irish workers!

Irish women tell off British troops during recent confrontation in Northern Ireland.

PP. 3,5

SDS Convention to Spur Anti-Racist Fight