

ON WAR AND PEACE

15pp

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Pages</u>
I. THE RULERS	1
II. THE JAPANESE MASSES HAVE THEIR SAY	1
III. ATTITUDES TO WAR	3
1. Communists and Fellow-Travellers	
2. The Two Wings of Trotskyism and the Two Poles of Capital	
3. Johnsonism and the Objective Pull of the World Economy	
IV. NEW PASSIONS AND NEW FORCES FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETY	10
1. The Cuban Revolution and What Happens After	
2. Marxist Humanism and the Release of the Creativity of the Masses	

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*          \*          \*

Draft Resolution On  
WAR AND PEACE

I. THE RULERS:

The U-2 plane incident has put an end to the grand illusion that there never would be a nuclear war.

The whole world shuddered, not because the summit was like the little man who wasn't there, but because the Big Two were there, facing each other with daggers drawn. There was no room for any in-between.

In contrast to all other innumerable threats of war, this time the two nuclear-armed powers were themselves in the arena. The fate of civilization hung on the words of two wilful old men.

For some forty-eight hours the world stood still while Khrushchev, the war-mongering bully, changed into Khrushchev, the affable exponent of "peaceful co-existence."

Of all the millions this turn of events caught off balance none were more drab looking than the petty bourgeois intellectuals who had been so busy looking into their own empty heads that they labeled our epoch as "the end of ideology". Even their superiors had no use for these well-paid non-ideological ideologues, and they turned to other well-paid discoverers of a "National Purpose." The vast multitudes, however, no longer took the avowed purposes of their leaders seriously.

Nor did the outpouring of articles on National Purpose make a dent in the propaganda barrage which did get world attention -- Khrushchev's and Mao's statements. Only pompous self-styled "opinion-molders" could have been fooled by the alleged differences between Khrushchev and Mao on the "inevitability" and "non-inevitability" of capitalist wars. What was involved, however, was the question of timing; no small question in a nuclear age. But other than the rulers on either side of the Iron Curtain will decide this life and death question.

II. JAPANESE MASSES HAVE THEIR SAY.

At the opposite pole from the contenders for world power on both sides of the Iron Curtain, and distinguished as unmistakably from the double-tongued oratory were the tens, twenties and even hundreds of thousands of Japanese who spoke unequivocally the single word, "No!" to their own government; "No!" to America; "No!" to any war.

The utter nonsense and infantile wishful thinking that prompted Eisenhower and the American press to label this elemental outpouring of Japanese people as "Communist-inspired" or "Communist-directed" or "Communist-paid" are proof of one thing and one thing

only -- the utter impotence of the Administration and the paid press in face of the total opposition not only of Japan but of the peoples of the world against the never-ending machinations of the rulers planning nuclear annihilation.

In an age that had been through World War II, the Korean War, the Suez adventure, and all other innumerable skirmishes leading to World War III, these demonstrations, initiated by the youth, but soon involving labor, political parties (the overwhelming majority of whom are Socialist and only an insignificant number Communist) as well as non-party people from professors to housewives, established something new:

1. In the land of Hiroshima and Nagasaki the people showed their opposition not only to nuclear war, but to any war. They thereby established the opposition to war on a more principled class basis than the great demonstration of 100,000 in London whose slogans had centered against nuclear war.

2. They were not bound by any pre-conceived notions of the means, violent or non-violent, by which activity the masses strove to take destiny into their own hands.

3. Whatever democracy they "learned" from America, they gave back in a most original form by stopping Eisenhower's visit. They annulled by popular consent, if not in rigged legal fact, the American-Japanese Security Treaty.

4. The Japanese demonstrators opposed their own government. But they were not only against Kishi. They were for socialism.

5. They disclosed that in their land of "boom", the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. The "higher standard of living" means in fact that there are no less than 10,000,000 unemployed, while the average woman factory worker's wages are thirty dollars monthly.

6. Finally, it is clear beyond the peradventure of any doubt that these demonstrators have no intention of stopping their activities with any single victory, much less with merely having had wishy-washy Eisenhower cancel his visit, and the wily Kishi "promise" to retire. The TV screens were full of reports of how total the aspirations of these people were: they wanted nothing short of an entirely new social order, a totally new way of life.

There has never been a greater need to be not only against capitalistic wars, America-Japanese or Russian-Chinese based, nuclearly armed, or otherwise, but for a new society. In face of the spontaneous anti-war mass movement, the disarray among the Marxist groupings makes the need to spell out what this "for" means especially urgent.

### III. ATTITUDES TO WAR.

1. Communists and Fellow-Travellers. So harrifying is the idea of any nuclear war, so anxiety-ridden are the people, that the hollow Communist talk of "world peace" is sufficient to get a considerable following among non-Communists and even some anti-Communists. The petty bourgeois intellectuals, the leadership of various anti-war groups seem especially adept at hearing the peaceful co-existence cooing of Khrushchev, and at being deaf to the missile-happy rocket rattling Khrushchev. Even when he announces he will violate neutralist Austria to throw rockets at missile base granting Italy, there is silence on the part of the anti-war exponents. In insular England, for example, one British anti-Communist non-violent war resister justified his silence on the Russian nuclear threats and the Warsaw Pact, as against his loud opposition to American missile bases and NATO, by pompously saying: "You know very well that the enemy is in one's own country. I am British so it is up to me to fight my bourgeoisie. I leave to the Russian and East European proletariat the fight against their rulers."

A favorite slogan with Communists everywhere where their vested state-capitalists interests are not at stake, that traditional slogan, "The enemy is in your own country," really means, the enemy is in your own country "provided that the country is not Russia or China, or 'The People's Democracies'". Unfortunately this conception guides not only their actions but those of fellow travellers, Trotskyists and innocents alike.

This slogan is used by the Communists not only to trap the unwary. It is a trap for all who want to be trapped because they cannot conceive that the masses themselves will construct a new social order. Their whole being is permeated with the conception that unless the proletariat is "led by The Party", the revolution will not succeed. They have put blinders on themselves to assure their not seeing that proletarian revolutions in Eastern Europe did not succeed precisely because the Party was there "to lead" and crush the revolutions.

As history has so often showed, many of these self-styled anti-war leaders will, on the eve of war, run for cover, to their own bourgeoisie. But there are others who will go to jail or even die for the grand illusion and the callous attitude of their fellow men under totalitarian regimes. How could it be otherwise in our nuclear age of absolutes when not only revolution and counter-revolution are interlocked but so is life and death? The fellow traveller is not the only one who gets sucked into the whirlpool of Plans to break up the totality of the world crisis — the plan for economic growth, the plan for peaceful co-existence, the plan for disarmament, the plan for peace, and above all, the plan — the blueprint "to lead." So was the Marxist theoretician, the very one, who, ever since the death of Lenin, was the symbol of the fight against Stalinism — Leon Trotsky.

2. The Two Wings of Trotskyism and the Two Poles of World Capitalism. Long before Japan opened for the Trotskyites the great revolutionary opportunity, when there was nothing new on the horizon but the miserable puppet states of Europe "to stand for" Communism, the Trotskyists had made their unprincipled choice.

For the anti-Stalinist movement, the tragedy of World War II was that the logical heir to the traditions of Marx and Lenin, Leon Trotsky, had shackled it with the slogan of defense of Russia without once sensing the treachery inherent in defending a state-capitalist society just because it had arisen from the Russian Revolution and "therefore" was still "a workers' state, though degenerated". While there was thus no polarizing force for the developing revolutions, the counter revolution did have a new, a bedazzling form — "Communism" that is Soviet Russia.

The holocaust of the World War II raged and ended only to create the foundation for World War III. The fact that Eastern Europe was given to Russia by consent of the Allies didn't inhibit the Communists (where they were not in power in Western Europe) from using the slogan "The enemy is in your own country", to gain mass support.

The inadequacy of this great traditional slogan for our epoch has never been more evident than in the world today, beginning with the Korean War where both wings of Trotskyism "took sides" even as they are doing now on the U-2 plane incident. It would appear that those who claim to be Marxists have forgotten what a class stand means and how not to say to warring capitalists, "A plague on both your houses."

In August, 1951, the World Conference of the Fourth International met and abandoned all pretense of being anything else but stooges for the Kremlin and Stalinism. Its manifesto said: "The transformation which the Stalinist parties might undergo in the course of the most acute revolutionary crises may obligate the Leninist vanguard to readjust its tactics towards these parties."

The Stalinists have only to beckon. "But this in no way relieves the proletariat from the task of building a new revolutionary leadership."

The more the Trotskyists recruit, the more they can bring over to Stalinism.

They are prepared to mobilize the workers of the world to join the Stalinist war-camp unconditionally:

"The World Congress of the Fourth International greets the workers, peasants and soldiers of the U.S.S.R. and of the 'Peoples' Democracies.' It assures them of complete and unconditional support by the whole world-wide revolutionary movement in the coming war against

the restorationist efforts of the international bourgeoisie. Defense of collectivized property, planned economy, and of the workers' states, even though deformed and degenerated, is an imperious duty of the world proletariat."

So that the war between the Kremlin and Washington is a war of "classes," and if the Russian state wins, the working-class not only in Russia but elsewhere, has won a victory. No wonder the slogan, "The enemy is in your own country" has become so inadequate to meet the changing times. This is true both where Russia is the direct oppressor as in Eastern Europe, or as China/Tibet, as well as where these two state-capitalist giants only aspire to rule. Take Japan. Far from creating the foundations of a new society, Trotskyism is dragging the movement into totalitarian Communism.

Here is the most industrialized country in the Orient, with mass labor unions and socialist parties and the youth that is daring, revolutionary, uninhibited by the corrupting factional strife of the late Comintern days. Not only uncorrupted, but so openly opposed are they to Communism that they were expelled from the Communists and the leaders openly stated that the only reason they weren't doing something more against America is that they didn't wish that "bureaucrat Khrushchev" gloating, for they certainly opposed him as much as they opposed Eisenhower.

It is for these revolutionary masses that Trotskyism raises a folded banner.

At the same time, the other wing of Trotskyism (Schachtmanites), which has since merged with the Social Democracy, lined up with the other pole of world capitalism — America — and that "in the name of" Lenin! Nothing will substitute for Schachtman's own perverse verbiage. In the New International of August 1951, Schachtman wrote:

"To maintain political opposition to the war is correct. To continue to prosecute the class struggle is correct. But to prosecute the class struggle in such a way that it would clearly 'imperil the military position of the government, even to the point where it may be defeated by the enemy and lose the war' — that, in the conditions of the Third World War, would be disastrous to the working class and to socialism.

"Instead, socialist policy must be based upon the idea of transforming the imperialist war into a democratic war, that is, adopting broadly the view put forward by Lenin in 1917, with all the changes required by the differences between the situation then and now, and working for its adoption by the labor movement as a whole."

This treacherous type of being "for" Lenin is perfectly acceptable to the State Department, as was seen by the fact that its plane scattered over Korea during the Korean War a propaganda leaflet

which had been jointly signed by Shachtman and the Socialist Party he had not yet joined. This informed the Koreans that Russia and China were "not socialist." If the leaflet did not specify that America was "not capitalist", it was only because the State Department did not need their support for themselves but only against the "common enemy."

### 3. Johnsonism and The Objective Pull of the World Economy.

The disarray in the Marxist groupings to the point of sheer lunacy belongs to J. R. Johnson who blandly announces: "It is agreed that the socialist society exists. Then we have to record the facts of its existence." \* \*

Often his longwinded, formless pamphlet, "Facing Reality", reduces the great discovery of an existing "new society" to where it means no more than the elements of the new society. The new society cannot, can not be reduced to mean that merely the elements of the new society. The elements of the new society are always inherent in the old. Whether it is the bourgeois society within the feudal order, or the workers under capitalism, the elements are present for the overthrow of the existing society. To say that the new society already exists is to make nonsense out of the need to overthrow the existing society. This is either harmless gobblodygook or it is treacherous gobblodygook, as was seen when Johnson suddenly declared that "the new" British Stewards could, just by saying, "No", stop the hand of the bourgeois preparations for war."

It is the double-tongued foundation for running when the going gets tough. Just as Shachtman was not content to support an imperialist war, but insisted on doing so, "in the name of" Lenin, Johnson does so "in the name of" the socialist society, which "it is agreed, exists."

Which existing society is he supporting? "Aye, there is the rub."

While no proletarian revolutions succeeded, following World War II, a successful, a new, state capitalist society did evolve out of a popular revolt against the corrupt compradore bourgeois rule, that is to say puppet regime, of Chiang Kai Shek.

As the revolutionary scene shifted from the Asian states to the African colonies, we were not with the other new phenomenon of a continent gaining its independence, which had no native bourgeoisie. At the same time, the masses, uncorrupted by the old radical political parties, rose to full historic stature in the African revolutions. Though it was bloodily put down where it had begun in the French Cameroons during the war — the attempt of the masses to a man to take destiny into their hands — permeates the African Revolutions today in their reshaping of the map of the world. Here the "hundred

\* See the Discussion Bulletin on Johnsonism.

\*\*Facing Reality by Grace C. Lee, J. R. Johnson and Pierre Chaulieu

schools of thought" did and do contend, including a sort of hybrid between Marxist Humanism and Jesuit apologetics for De Gaulle.

Genuine as these revolutions are, however, they came into being in a certain world context --the world of state capitalism, of Automation, of nuclear power, the world that is divided into two power blocs fighting for the same thing: world domination, and are willing to risk nuclear annihilation to attain it. This terrifying fact has produced a "neutral bloc".

The fact that, if you disregard the human cost, the State Plan accomplished more for industrializing a country than did private capitalism exercises a strong pull on the newly emergent leadership in the newly independent underdeveloped countries.

The "neutral bloc" has had its successes. First it compelled Russia, which had stayed aloof from the whole "Point 4" programs by the US or by the UN, to enter the race "to help the underdeveloped countries". Then, playing off one power bloc against the other, the Afro-Asian countries were successful in compelling aid to their countries from both power blocs. Their very success produced a capitalistic reckoning.

At this stage of development of automated, atom-energised world capitalism, the State Plan is as great a confinement as is the national boundary.

100 years ago Marx showed that if capitalism reached its ultimate stage --concentration and centralization of capital "in the hands of one single capitalist corporation or one single capitalist"-- all the contradictions of capitalism would intensify; none would be solved. As so much of Marx's abstract analysis, this has become so concrete in our age that one just has to look to see. If, before World War I, imperialism's division of the world into five major blocs was already so unsatisfactory to the rulers that they embarked on a world war, consider the "plight" of world capitalism now when, instead of taking in super-profits from colonies, they have to pour money into them "to keep them from going Communist." Whatever advantages the State Plan has over private capitalism, having the world as its scope is not one of them. Russia could not compete with America in the ambitious Marshall Plan "to stabilize Europe." But, as America, so Russia had "to give" to keep in the race in Afro-Asian countries, and it is not hard to compete with the miserly "Good Neighbor Policy" in Latin America. All this money pouring out and, profit-taking or "profit-less" capital is "limited" to the exploitation of "one's own" proletariat who are in constant rebellion against their conditions of labor.

From the capitalist point of view, private or state, there is an imperative urgency for a single power to dominate the whole world which will, of necessity, include totalitarian control over "their own" workers. On both sides of the Iron Curtain that is exactly what the rulers are aiming at.



The "deterrent" of nuclear war which might annihilate civilization altogether has its limitations. So has "neutralism". So has pacifism.

If any there are who have the fantastic illusion that some "fall-out shelter" exists for the mind, as it supposedly exists for the body, to live through a nuclear war and remain "to represent civilization", extinct civilization, they belong in Mao's camp. He alone is mad enough to welcome nuclear war. Before this no barbarian ever was diabolical enough to dismiss humanity by hinting that now there was the type of weapon available that would leave alive only some twenty million Americans, fifty million Russians and three-hundred million Chinese. And Mao is not unaware of the fact that they are still dying in Japan - fifteen years after America dropped the very much "milder" A-bombs.

Nothing, however, deters Johnson, the discoverer of the existing socialist society from including in a chapter pompously entitled "The New Society; New People; New Nations" the following: "Mao Tse-Tung and his fellow revolutionists built a party and an army in strict relation to their objective environment and the need of self-preservation".

That this objective environment is precisely what transformed these revolutionists into state capitalists leaders they now are long before they had power escapes the attention of our discoverer of new societies. He continues with a straight face:

"If China has gone the way of Stalinist totalitarianism, it is because, faced with the implacable hostility of US Imperialism, and even more poverty-stricken than the Russia of the October Revolution, it has had no choice but to follow the pattern of its Russian ally."

This is not only the rewriting of history to fit the opportunism of a line that considers the "Neutral Bloc" will stay the hand of nuclear war. Nor is it only the cheap adventurism of an individual "going a little bit mad". Johnson's political positions, such as they are, are the result of the strong objective pull of the world economy which of necessity drags into its wake part of the Marxist movement.

It has always been so. It was so when Marx was alive and was compelled to attack the British trade union leaders who abandoned the Workingmen's International Association at the world-shaking birth of the Paris Commune. It was so when World War I brought about the collapse of the Second International and Lenin had to go deeper and lower into the proletariat and into the national struggles to unfurl the Marxist banner there.

It was so when World War II disclosed not only the logic but the actuality of Trotsky's "defense of the Soviet Union" to do to aid and abet Russian Communism, counter-revolutionary Russian Communism,

and the Johnson-Forest Tendency had to analyze state capitalism not only as a Russian phenomenon nor even only as the new stage of world capitalism but as producing new forms of workers' revolt, the only force that could create a truly new society.

It was so when war clouds over Formosa pulled Johnson from Forest. War has always been the decisive question in the development or collapse of a Marxist grouping. This was the first time, however, that one who made pretenses to being a Marxist substituted for the Leninist position on the National Question, the hodge-podge dished up by Wkrumah.

The Leninist position on the National Question is among the richest heritages we have. The three great historic precedents have never been more valid than today. Lenin hailed the Irish Revolution both for itself and as the "bacilli" to bring on the proletarian revolution. Lenin supported the Sun Yat Sen Revolution and helped establish a party on Marxist foundations in China. Finally -- and this is the most applicable to our own age -- there is the magnificent document of the Second Congress of the CI, where the colonial revolutions are deemed to be of such world-shaking importance that true internationalism, insists Lenin, would require a successful proletarian revolution to subordinate itself to them if world capitalism could be overthrown from the East instead of the West.

In place of these great historic precedents we witness the sorry spectacle of Johnson, the co-founder of the state capitalist tendency, prostrating himself before Wkrumah. "In one of the most remarkable episodes in revolutionary history, he (Wkrumah) single-handedly outlined a program, based on the ideas of Marx, Lenin and Gandhi..." (p.77).

Gandhi, it turns out, was not only "a political genius, one of the greatest of our times", and not only did he introduce "a new dimension into the technique of mass struggles for national independence" but "perhaps for more."

Those who know Johnson and his predilection for opening a dozen tiny holes through which he could crawl out to escape the consequences of his stands will easily spot the escape hatch in the "perhaps" of the "perhaps for more".

People who break openly with Marxism and join state capitalism are open enemies and can be fought. What we have to be aware of are those who do so in the name of Marxism and the "socialist society." We have to beware of them in the most literal sense. \*

\* Like the daring young man on the flying trapeze who flies through the air with the greatest of ease, this cheap adventurer has flown "above" the class camps when it came to a defense of his co-founder of the state capitalist tendency.

The only real service that the Johnsonites can render the existing society is to take care of the Marxist Humanists in the working class movement. That will be their function.

#### IV. NEW PASSIONS AND NEW FORCES FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETY.

No successful proletarian revolution issued from World War I but World War II did smash the British Empire to smithereens and "Not all the king's horses nor all the King's men can ever put Humpty-Dumpty together again." Not only did India, where the mass revolt against British rule was carried on for decades, win its independence. Even a purely military revolt, like Nasser's, gained sufficient popular support to wrest independence from British rule. The same disintegration of empire occurred in France, in Japan, and now America is being challenged in Latin America as well as all over the world.

Asia, Africa, Latin America are aflame.

1. The Cuban Revolution and What Happens After. The Cuban Revolution stands in danger of becoming transformed into its opposite.

It would be a great tragedy if Russian (and/or Chinese) Communism totalitarianism or, more precisely state capitalism, would succeed in enchainning the great mass movements against private capitalism. We saw how the Trotskyists stand ready to help the Communists do precisely that. They are of no consequence, however.

Ever since the Russian Revolution had not extended itself beyond its borders, while within its borders the first workers' state had been transformed into its opposite - a state capitalist society - the question of the epoch became: "What Happens After? Are we always to be confronted with a new bureaucracy, even after we have a successful revolution?" Those who refused to confront the question, such less answer it were of necessity left behind by the mass movement. How could it otherwise when the counter-revolutionary role of Russian Communism was, with World War II, not only used internally against its own proletariat, but in an imperialist manner externally? This was true when the Red Army stood outside the gates of Warsaw and let the Nazis crush the Warsaw Soviet. The direct counter-revolutionary role of Russian Communism when it itself put down the Hungarian Revolution was done before the eyes of the whole world. Even the Trotskyists had to draw the line there, but when it came to applying this lesson to the Cuban Revolution they conveniently forgot this counter-revolutionary role of Russian Communism. But it is not through them that Fidel Castro was led to Communist state capitalism.

The Cuban Revolution is in danger of being transformed into its opposite, of having the struggle to reconstruct society on new, socialist beginnings led into state capitalist channels because the potty bourgeois leaders which have come to head the spontaneous move-

ment thought all that was needed for the new society to emerge was to throw out the old corrupt government, without once posing the question, "What Happens After?"

That is of consequence as we can see when we listen to Fidel Castro shouting over all TV screens, "Those who are against Communism are against the Cuban Revolution."

The Cuban Revolution has accomplished the greatest revolution in Latin America when it not only threw out the corrupt Batista clique but expropriated the American monopolist holdings, and thereby could develop a revolution in agricultural relations. In giving land to the landless and diversifying the crops, it did so, however, not through self-functioning committees of the producers, but through the instrumentality of the state.

We rightly hailed the Cuban Revolution as opening a new era in Latin American independence from American imperialism. But we were not silent about the built-in weakness in the July 26th Movement that could be fatal to the Revolution — its isolation from the urban proletariat. This was so before the revolution was successful. It was so at the point of its success when he demanded that the Havana proletariat give up its arms, that July 26th Movement and only the July 26th Movement directs the military. It was so when a trades union congress offered proletarian demands to the new Revolutionary government which were not met. When the Congress showed its critical attitude, Castro called it a "madhouse". It is then that he turned to the Communists whose administrative mentality is like his own. As we see, more than fighting the hated Yankee imperialism draws Fidel Castro to the Communists. It is the administrative mentality of the age of state capitalism which thinks the Plan can do everything. Instead of extending the revolution so that the population to a man runs production and the state, Castro has found it much easier in his swing away from Yankee imperialism, to go to Russian-Chinese state capitalism, and, for an unfolded Marxist banner, to enshrine the July 26th Movement which was founded on quite other principles. Fidel Castro may think that by choosing Russia against America he is choosing the "winning side." He should ask himself: the winning side of what?

The Cuban Revolution did not extract Cuba from the vortex of the world economy. Latin America, India, Africa, Asia — all the economically underdeveloped nations cannot reach full industrialization so long as world capitalism exists. They will perish for lack of capital whether industrialization is offered them by the totalitarian State Planners with their quickie frightful cost of human lives, or at the tortoise pace of private capital and its prolonged frightful cost in human lives.

The apologists for allegedly profit-loss state capitalism calling itself Communism may find it useful to point to the lush

profits of American monopolists — and lush they are in mass. But in ratio to the needs of an ever expanding capitalistic economy they are quite inadequate. That is precisely the mark of our age, as Karl Marx had predicted a hundred years ago when in Volume III of CAPITAL he developed how "The greatest barrier of capitalism is capital itself."

The lush profits cannot rebuild the economy of the world.

The theoreticians of "free enterprise" may turn their heads from the millions of unemployed and misery still extant in the industrially advanced lands in order to spout nonsense about "the higher standard of living the masses enjoy under the free enterprise system". But even they admit that on a world scale the poor have gotten poorer and the rich richer.

Two-thirds of the world is hungry and without adequate shelter and clothing. Which world order other than capitalism, private or state, produced this state of affair? Which are the powers that are nuclearly armed and willing to risk the annihilation of civilization to perpetuate their rule?

It is true that, just as the Communists are cynical enough to parade under the banner of Marxism, so they are the only ones adroit enough to conduct their war propaganda under the banner of "World Peace." But, if not the petty-bourgeois leaders, the masses are mature enough to know there can be no peace so long as there is state capitalist exploitation. The millions in Africa who are gaining their freedom and are faced with the problem, "What Happens After?", have shown that they do not wish to be drawn into the titanic struggle between the two power blocs fighting for world domination.

What we pointed out in the Preface to the Italian edition of **MARKISM AND FREEDOM** (now coming off the press) applies hundred-fold to Cuba:

"The genuine Italian Marxist can learn much both from Marx who fought the vulgar Communists of his day, and from Lenin who fought what he called the ruling Communist's "passion for bossing". This founder of the Soviet state was also its severest critic, inventing the new words, such as "communios" (Communist lies) with which to express his criticisms.

Without avail he warned the last Congress of the RCP he attended: "History proceeds in devious ways", and that the Communists must listen to "simple class truth of the class enemy" when it writes that the Soviet Government "has taken the road that will lead it to the ordinary bourgeois state."

Lenin was adamant on one point: the masses, not only as action but as reason would create a new society on totally new foundations. Either that, that is to say, either the population to

a man runs production and the state or you get "a return backwards to capitalism".

This is no longer merely a question of becoming entangled in the world market as in the days of World War I. Nor is it the question of centralization of capital as it extended over a continent, as Nazi Germany found out when it did force the centralization of European capital in World War II. Just as Hitler centralized for the purposes of world domination, so the planned economy of Russia won only the right to contend with America for world domination.

THE ERA OF STATE CAPITALISM NEEDS ELBOW ROOM, MORE ELBOW ROOM THAN A DIVISION OF THE WORLD AMONG BIG POWERS CAN GIVE IT. THAT IS WHY TWO WORLD WARS HAVE BEEN FOUGHT AND A THIRD IS IN THE OFFING. IF DECREPIT CAPITALISM IS TO CONTINUE TO LIVE, IT IS ONLY AS A WORLD ORDER. THAT IS EXACTLY WHY IT CANNOT SURVIVE. ONLY THE RELEASED CREATIVE ENERGIES OF THE MASSES CAN CREATE WORLD ORDER.

2. Marxist-Humanism and The Release of the Creativity of The Masses. It is no accident that Marxist Humanism has been brought out from the arena of philosophic disputes and made into questions of the day both in Hungary, in the heart of Europe, where they were industrializing according to the State Plan, and in the Mali Federation in French West Africa, where they are facing the question of industrialization within a French technological-political complex. These are not exceptions to the rule, but the direction everywhere.

There is no doubt whatsoever that nowhere on earth is it a more pressing question than where it is least possible to express it -- Communist China. The fact that Mao was compelled to unfurl the banner of "Let a hundred flowers bloom. Let a hundred schools of thought contend", as well as the early demise of the campaign, because Mao found he could not use it to his purposes, are proof of the actualities and aspirations of the Chinese masses. He had to destroy it brutally and with such speed as not to have a single loaf left to hide the naked force.

The fact that Mao now parades as the "great revolutionary" interpreter of Lenin's inevitability of capitalist war theses shows, not an adherence to Leninism, but a compelling need to cover up the unending series of barracks he dares call "Communes." A people who have made three great revolutions in a single lifetime -- in 1919 against the Manchu dynasty and for the Sun-Yat Sen Republic; in 1925-27, against the Kuo Min Tang and for an aborted proletarian revolution; and, finally after twenty-three years of defeat, Japanese occupation and mass starvation, repeat this revolution against Chiang Kai Shek -- is not a people that will countenance Communist totalitarianism forevermore.

The millions throughout the world, sick and tired of oppression, exploitation, misery and war, have no intention whatsoever of rushing to their own self-destruction like lambs or to be led to Communist slaughter like sheep.

There is no place on earth now where the youth is not out to reshape this world they had not made from the exploitative ground up into the war-directed space explorations—~~to~~ reshape it into a world free of exploitation and war, a world worthy of human architects.

In Korea the struggle may appear to be "only" the question of fighting against rigged elections. In England it may appear to be "only" against nuclear war. In South USA it may appear to be only for the right of Negroes to be served at segregated lunch counters. In South Africa it may appear to be "only" against the hated pass system. But if the old radicals and the non-ideological ideologues know no better, the bourgeoisie does. The ghost of Hitler in the horrible shape of Verwoerd's South African white supremacist government doubts not for a moment that what is really involved is the end of their rule and full freedom for the South Africans.

The millions of unemployed in America as in Japan are fighting for more than a job, even as the greater millions on the job are questioning more than wages. The opposition to capitalism has gotten its clearest expression in Japan where they are openly expounding a socialist society. But even in America, in seemingly quiescent America, when it is not in the throes of the continuous Negro struggle for freedom, or beset by local and national wildcats, the question that is the warp and woof of Marxist Humanism — the abolition of alienated labor, that is to say, the reunification of mental and manual labor — has been posed. Confronted with Automation in a way that Europe is not yet faced with, the American worker is asking: Why should science be allowed to do all our thinking for us when it cannot even put a man to work, although it will soon send him up to the moon? Can't the division between brain and brawn be abolished?

Whether in one's country or internationally, the urgency of the times demands the unequivocal opposition both to private capitalism and state capitalism, whether led by America-Great Britain-French Axis or by Russian-Chinese Axis. It demands the full unfurling of the Marxist Humanist banner, without bowing, either to an alleged neutral bloc or to pacifism.

Nothing short of the full reconstruction of society on truly human beginnings can bring peace to the world.

We need not change a word of the anti-war position we announced in 1957:

"Preparation for war against Russia tomorrow is all-out war against the American workers, today, tomorrow, and the day after. That is why the point is not who throws or will throw the first stone, especially when that first stone will be the H-bomb. The point is: are you with the people struggling for a totally new way of life or with capitalism fighting to perpetuate itself, although it has long since outlived its usefulness. At the same time, so universal is the feeling against the war that even the rulers play the game of peace and disarmament conferences. That cannot therefore be what distinguishes us from them. Private or state capitalism will spare nothing to keep itself on top and the worker at the bottom. Armed with the H-bomb and the missile, they are ready to destroy civilization itself rather than allow the new working class society to emerge.

"What does distinguish us from them is not what we are against, but what we are for. To the barbarism of the war we pose the new society, but the old radicals also say they are for a new society. Indeed, they would want it -- IF you would give it to them on a silver platter on which all workers kneeled, asking "to be led". What they all forget is that a new society is THE human endeavor, or it is nothing."

Then, to pinpoint what is new in our position as distinguished from others, all others, not only Communist state capitalism, private capitalists and their varied fellow travellers, but also from Trotskyists and Johnsonites, we bold-faced the new in our anti-war stand, as follows:

"IT IS THIS: TO ACHIEVE A TRULY HUMAN LIFE, WE MUST NOT ONLY BE WITH THE WORKERS BECAUSE THEY AND ONLY THEY OPPOSE THE WAR TO THE END, BECAUSE THEY AND ONLY THEY ARE THE FUTURE SOCIETY, BUT ALSO BECAUSE WE DO NOT SHIFT TO THE SHOULDERS OF THE WORKERS WHAT IS OUR TASK, THE THEORETIC CLEARING OF THE GROUND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETY ON NEW BEGINNINGS."

The unfurling of the Marxist Humanist banner means the kind of organization of one's thinking from which action follows, action that will merge with the spontaneous self-activity of the masses to establish on this earth a society on truly human foundations where the population to a man will run production and the state and thus hold destiny in its own hands.

\*\*\*\*\*