where most of the shareholders own a minority of the shares while a few of the big ones own most of them.

MR. M.: Young man, you talk like a Utopian dreamer. The reason you don't understand Socialism is because you don't know anything about dialectics. You should read Lenin's theoretical works. What you are talking about is something for the distant future. My government is too busy building socialism now to argue on philosophy.

The superintendent and the FBI men were relaxed now and enjoying the debate. Soc was obviously just a safe type of crackpot and it didn't look like Mr. Mikoyan was trying to stir up revolutionary sentiment among the workers.

SOC: Pardon me, Mr. Mikoyan, that brings up another question. I thought Soviet Russia had a class-less society. That's what Mr. Stalin always called it, yet you keep referring to your "government." I understand from my studies that governments exist as expressions of economic interests of a ruling class, against the interests of a ruled class. Why does Russia have a government then? How can the working class be the ruling class if there are no other classes in your society?

MR. M.: What you don't understand, young man, is that there are people even in the Soviet Union who would want to see our country revert to capitalism. There must be a government to suppress these elements and anyway we must have a state so long as we are surrounded by capitalist powers. *Mr. M. spread his hands in disgust as he shrugged his shoulders. Soc's fellow workers looked him over with pity and scorn. Even they knew enough to understand that Russia is an example of socialism.*

SOC: I should have thought, Mr. Mikoyan, that if Russia were genuinely socialist, that if a genuine attempt were being made to introduce a class-less society that not only would opposition in Russia have vanished by this time but that the workers of the world would have long since arisen in their might at this example and that world capitalism would be dead by now. I guess this must be a reflection on the backwardness of the workers of the world, and those pro-capitalists in Russia. Why most of us are under the impression that the workers in Soviet Russia cannot even organize in union activity.

MR. M.: You are truly a dreamer! But, as you can see, a large percentage of the world certainly has followed the Soviet example and have introduced socialism — Poland, Hungary, China, Yugo. . . ., pardon me, I mean Rumania and so on. And it is certainly not true that the Soviet workers have no union organization. They have the Constitutional right of collective bargaining.

SOC: Collective bargaining! How is this possible? I thought the workers owned everything in your country? Who do they bargain with?

MR. M.: Young man, I see it's a waste of time to explain socialism to you.

SOC: Oh I think I get it all right. A socialist country is one in which wage-labor and capital exist only it really isn't wage-labor or capital because the workers really own everything. Some of them like to be kidded into believing they are better off by receiving large incomes which they can't do anything with it except to spend and invest. There is a class-less society even though there is a government and the workers, although they really own everything, also enjoy the right of bargaining with one another over how much wages they are to receive . . . .

Just then, a Soviet Socialist intercontinental ballistics missile came through the roof and I fell out of bed.

HARMO

THE SOCIALIST

Official organ of

Socialist Party of Ireland

12 issues $1.00 — 6 issues 50¢

Lit. Agent: 11 Faneuil Hall Sq., Boston 9

"SPARTACUS" AND POLITICS

In the Dutch journal Spartacus, for April 26, 1958, an article from The Western Socialist* dealing with the Little Rock situation and the Negro problem in the United States is reviewed and dissected. Inasmuch as Spartacus does not take a socialist position, certain points of difference crop up and the reviewer asks some questions which are loaded with a genuine misunderstanding of the scientific socialist analysis on the achievement of a classless society.

The crux of the problem seems to be that although the reviewer apparently read the article in question, he could not have paid too much attention to The Western Socialist as a whole or he wouldn't have suffered such a case of literary indigestion.

The first statement of the Little Rock article which seems to raise the temperature of our Spartacist friend sets forth the proposition that the working class will not be ready for a classless society until they "have put an end to the influence of the mythology of racial difference." The reviewer seems to be not too sure of the validity of this statement; in fact thinks it might even be possible that "race discrimination will be abolished under capitalism."

There is no question with us about the possible "abolition" of this type of discrimination under capitalism. It is unconstitutional in the United States, has been outlawed in the U. S. S. R., is a "crime" in Great Britain and no doubt is not *officially* tolerated in many other countries. Yet it exists universally and neither capitalist governments nor minority nationalist organizations and other capitalist groupings have ever found it very difficult to stir it up when it could be of use to then. Nor is it true that the Negro question is not "directly a class problem." The greater plight of the Negro workers, discrimination by the capitalist as a whole, exploited by white and colored capitalists alike, may be hidden by the false feeling of solidarity they are made to feel with one another—solidarity on a group basis — but the greater struggle exists despite all attempts to hide it.

Granting that the working class will act as a class in its own interests but how can workers unite on a class basis when they do not understand that the tie which binds them is much more important than the superficial "racial" and superstitious differences which divide them? We cannot picture a working class uniting for socialism while still under the influence of racial and religious mythology. Our picture of a socialist society is certainly not a group of ethnic "Soviet Republics" but rather a world society of sane men and women.

What really jars the Spartacus writer, however, is our insistance on a majority of class-conscious workers, understanding the implications of socialism and demanding it. And he proceeds to ask some pertinent questions.

"Does he mean a majority determined by the number of seats in the parliament?" and he goes on to enlighten us by referring to the "different European socialist parties which gained the majority in the parliament. And he continues, "did the situation then also result as the writer meant?"

No doubt realizing that he has raised a "straw-man" for us to knock down he proceeds to knock it down himself with the next question:

"Or does the writer mean that he does not see the European socialist parties as being real socialism?" Of course this is what we mean and we agree most certainly with the Dutch Labor Party (P. V. D. A.) which, according to the Spartacist "sometimes claim that the American Democratic Party in the U.S.A. carries a similar

★ Cont. on page 19

*Big Issue at Little Rock, No. 5, 1957.