

# VANGUARD NEWSLETTER

Published monthly by independent revolutionary socialists

Editors: Harry Turner, Hugh Fredricks, Robert Davis

P. O. Box 67, Peck Slip Station, New York, N. Y. 10038

Vol. 2, No. 8 Price 10¢ (\$1.00 per year) Labor donated September 1970

Contents: The Armed Struggle In Jordan .....	p. 75
The Arab-Israeli Question	
--Another Exchange .....	76
The Arab-Israeli Conflict:	
--A Differing Analysis .....	77
A Reply To Comrade Robins .....	82
Inflation and the Economy	
--A New Expansion? .....	86
Trotskyism Today:	
--Evaluation of A Series .....	88

## THE ARMED STRUGGLE IN JORDAN

At this writing, the military government in Jordan under King Hussein has launched an armed attack against the Palestinian Arab commandos.

The besieged guerrillas, still withstanding the shells and tanks which have taken a toll of thousands of dead and wounded--civilians and guerrillas--are in imminent danger of being destroyed, with the survivors ending in "the concentration camps and execution chambers of a Suharto". (VN, March 1970, p. 23), as we forecast.

The US and Israel threaten military intervention should Hussein's government be endangered by the Palestinian guerrillas or by the intervention of Syria, Iraq and/or Libya in support of the guerrillas.

The Soviet Union is, also at this writing, attempting to maintain the status quo ante in Jordan, wishes to preserve Hussein while also ensuring a more readily controlled guerrilla movement--one which will serve the Soviet and Middle Eastern bureaucrats in improving their positions vis-à-vis American imperialism, but which will neither raise the banner of social revolution nor embarrass it by adventures which produce a confrontation with the US.

As Trotsky has taught--especially

in connection with the defense of the Soviet Union--in an increasingly complex situation in which changes in the proportions of its varying components take place--a class line is absolutely essential for the revolutionist.

As against Hussein and imperialist intervention, we defend and support the Arab commandos, regardless of what the military Bonapartists and the Soviet bureaucrats do or fail to do in their defense.

As in the case of petty-bourgeois revolutionists in this country, whose individualistic and anarchistic tactics not only do not advance class consciousness and the social revolution, but actually impede it, who we defend against the capitalist state, so too the Arab guerrillas. We oppose their conception of a national and peasant-guerrilla road to socialism, the so-called "Arab Revolution", and tactics such as "sky-jacking" or the holding of hostages on the basis of ethnic or national criteria, but we also defend them against their ruling classes, and most certainly against

imperialism.

However, we do not simply defend. We also pose our program, and in so doing, disclose the class essence and program of the commandos.

The Bolsheviks in the Russian Revolution called upon the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries to break with the liberal bourgeoisie with whom they were in coalition, and to form a workers and peasants government. So do we also say to the Arab commandos, changing what has to be changed: You are engaged in armed struggle against the rulers of Jordan. You are supposed to be socialists, Marxists and Leninists. Call upon the masses, not only in Jordan but in the Middle East as a whole--including the Jewish masses--to take the path to social revolution against their military-bureaucratic and capitalist ruling classes. Call upon the workers to form factory committees and to take control of production. Call upon

the workers and peasants to form Soviets and to then proceed to the nationalization of large-scale industry, the land, commerce, banking, transportation and communication.

If, however, your struggle is directed merely for the purpose of installing a variant of the present Jordanian ruling class, or else a military Bonapartist regime on capitalist foundations, a regime of "national unity" committed to a continuation of the war against Israel, then you are not socialists at all, but rather petty-bourgeois nationalists--as we have maintained--just as the Mensheviks and "S.R.'s" were in reality not socialists but petty-bourgeois liberals with a socialist phraseology.

Unfortunately, the Bolshevik party, which could teach such a lesson and to which the masses could then turn, still does not exist, and must yet be constructed, in the Middle East and elsewhere.

#### THE ARAB-ISRAELI QUESTION - Another Exchange

✓ We publish once again a response by Comrade Robins, which further defines his disagreements with our position on the Arab-Israeli question, together with a reply by one of the editors, Robert Davis.

✓ In addition, although we do not intend to go into every aspect of every point raised by Cde. Robins, it is the opinion of the entire editorial board that a further reply and an amplification of our views is necessary, in the light of developments, since our last issue was published in late July.

✓ Lenin made the following observation in State and Revolution:

"...the substitution of eclecticism for dialectics...gives an illusory satisfaction; it seems to take into account all sides of the process, all trends of development, all the conflicting influences and so forth, whereas in reality it provides no integral and revolutionary conception of the process of social development at all."

✓ Lenin's remark sums up what we believe to be at the heart of our differences with Cde. Robins on the Middle East. We believe that ours is the "integral and revolutionary conception", and that he, in the name of dialectical materialism has in fact adopted an eclectic viewpoint. A formal adherence to dialectics cannot guarantee against eclecticism. It will be recalled that Plekhanov, the founder of Russian Marxism, whose contributions in the struggle against Narodism and to Marxist philosophy are enduring, became a social-patriot during the first World War.

✓ Cde. Robins attributes what he sees as our errors to a well-intentioned amateurishness, to a mechanical application of Lenin's policy, that the struggle against one's own capitalism is the lesser evil, of not addressing our program "to the Arabs at all", of having omitted an "objective evaluation" of economic, social and "'superstructural' factors such as cultural heritage, politics and the state".

✓ We invite our readers to review

the seven sections of the Arab-Israeli series which appeared in VANGUARD NEWSLETTER between our January and July-August issues, to determine the accuracy of these charges.

[We are also accused of the arbitrary selection of factors from the "cloth" of history, of failing to discuss anti-Jewish atrocities committed in "Arab-speaking lands", of having dealt "almost entirely with the abuses of the victorious Israelis", and of "blindness to cultural 'peculiarities'".

[Cde. Robins refrains, however, from asking the question which must be posed whenever a really serious political disagreement takes place among revolutionists, that is, what social forces do the contending sides reflect?

[We believe that Cde. Robins has made the question of the survival of Israel and the Jews his primary focus, and then on this basis, has attempted to find arguments from the arsenal of Marxism to bolster what we can only consider to be an adaptation to petty-bourgeois nationalism.

[We believe that he ignores causal relationships, and the role of Zionism in "transforming the centuries old peaceful relationship between Arab and Jew into a bitter hatred..." (VN, June 1970, p. 52). See "The Arab World Today", Morroe Berger, Anchor Books (pps. 237-9).

As we have stated, Zionism was from its very inception, an overt enemy of the Arab masses. In establishing a semi-theocratic capitalist state dependent on American imperialism for its survival, it, in concert with "every major Jewish political force" committed an act

of national oppression against the Palestinian Arabs. In 1967, it compounded this oppression by a military occupation of Arab territory, thereby further enflaming Arab national passions. It is these actions which set the stage for "pogroms, persecutions, frame-ups and beggaring of Jews in Arab-speaking lands".

[Although we are as concerned as Cde. Robins for the survival of the Jews in Israel and elsewhere--we are concerned to prevent the genocidal slaughter of any people --we do not proceed from a national but from an "integral and revolutionary conception". The Leninist and Trotskyist position on the national question is not addressed to national states but to their masses; it does not pose even-handed demands in situations of national oppression to the masses of the oppressor and oppressed nations; it does not seek national solutions per se, but rather the unity of the masses of both oppressor and oppressed nations for the social revolution, to which the fate of Jews and Arabs in the Middle East is tied.

[Our standpoint is the Permanent Revolution. What Cde. Robins has not understood--as his intimation that we propose the return of the land to Arab landlords indicates--is that the demand by the Jewish masses for the return of the Palestinian Arabs, the development of confidence in the Jewish masses as "brothers in the struggle against class oppression" (VN July-August 1970, p. 73) by the Arab masses, the unity of the Jewish and Arab masses leads directly to the socialist revolution against their respective ruling classes.]

#### THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT: A Differing Analysis - by Harold Robins

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER advocates a proposal for settling the Arab-Israeli warfare in an apparently judicious fashion.

The comrades believe this is possible if the Israelis invite back to Israel the more than one million Palestinian exiles, and return their former properties.

The editors foresee some diffi-

culties in convincing the Israeli workers to undertake such a course, but they are of the opinion that no other road is open for healing the wounds of nationalism and of uniting the working class of both nationali-

ties for the undertaking of a socialist transformation of the productive forces of the Middle East.

While we are in strategical agreement on the matter of class unity for the transformation of the productive forces, we are in sharp tactical disagreement with the editors concerning their proposal for return of the refugees to Israel.

The editors' proposal, let us note, would be welcomed by the now dispossessed Palestinians, formerly the owners of property taken over by victorious Israelis. Before things go much further, we may yet see the Kremlin intervening with just such a proposition. We must draw some sociological conclusions overlooked by the editors.

For a million of the propertyless refugees returning in a propertyless condition to a new propertyless set-up in what is now Israel, there would be a return to the homeland, but the old problems of grinding poverty would go with them. There is no possible way that the Israelis could provide a viable economic place for this immense influx of refugees. Soon the refugees would have little reason to rejoice in their return. Instead of the feeling of brotherhood among workers projected by the editors, the refugees would very soon take up the national struggle with the aim of driving their Israeli "brothers"--workers and all--into the sea. And, from a much improved tactical position, the arms of the fedayeen would now be available to them. Excluding a change of mind and heart by the Israelis, could there be any other result possible from such a course?

An analogy from the trade union arena is in order here. Negro nationalists and many of their well meaning white friends commonly demand in justice to the Blacks, that job preference be given to them until the industries and unions have their just and proper percentage of Black workers. We can agree with this intent. But we must ask, will a struggle over who gets the inadequate number of jobs, resolve the nationalistic and class differences, or can they only be resolved by an

expansion of jobs, such as would be provided by a shorter workweek? So we reject quack idealistic cures, and demand instead the introduction of the shorter workweek which we have reason to believe would provide enough jobs for all. We know that only in the fight of all workers, no matter what their color, for a chance to work and to live, can class solidarity replace nationalistic divisiveness. And one must proceed from similar considerations in dealing with resettlement peace plans for the Middle East.

Imperialism opened up the area for capitalist development by both immense and small investments related to the exploitation of vast oil resources in the area and in North Africa. It is clear that the refugee camps of the Palestinians provide capitalism with a reserve army of labor for the oil industry and the expanding economy. But the record is also clear, that capitalist development in this area, long marked by pre-civilized societies with miserable, primitive economies, does not and cannot absorb the Palestinian refugees. As a result, the unemployed, hopeless de-classed refugees are recruited as fedayeen, sent to raid and kill Israelis, who are themselves former refugees from capitalist countries, and Palestinians who remained in the homeland. History thus shows us quite specifically to what conditions contemporary capitalist development leads.

The development of the productive forces of the Sinai, and further, of the Middle East, can only be resolved for humanity in this area on a socialist basis. In such a development, it is possible to settle the national and social questions of the Palestinians and of the Middle East on a more viable progressive economical basis, and to eliminate the horrible refugee camps by resettling the refugees in self-help communes in new communities for the development of the resources of the Sinai, etc. The Israelis, the Arabs and others should aid this movement.

It would be nonsense to believe that the return to the homeland has

a more substantial appeal to the Palestinian refugees than resettlement in a new, more economically viable setup in the now empty Sinai peninsula. Only a socialist Israel could begin to mobilize resources for irrigation and for developing the mineral, fishing and agricultural resources of the Sinai, which served the ancient Egyptians as their principle source of mineral wealth.

We must conclude, therefore, that while the comrades are correct in advocating that the Israelis offer a welcome hand to resettlement of the Palestinian refugees, it must be equally clear that it would be a monstrous deceit and an empty gesture to bring them back to Israel to the inadequate economic circumstances prevailing there. To characterize the proposal of the editors for purposes of ideological identification, one must recognize that it is far closer to Christian socialism than to Marxist materialism. A correction is in order.

The Second Major Error  
of the Comrade Editors

The VANGUARD NEWSLETTER of July-August 1970, states on page 73:

"Our program follows from our premises. (my emphasis - HR)... Israel is a capitalist state, and not simply an 'outpost of imperialism'...the surrounding 'Arab' states are, not 'socialist' but also, capitalist states...the struggle against one's 'own' capitalism is the 'lesser evil'..."

Here too, good intentions replaced proper use of Marxian criteria and Marxist methodology, an error commonly committed by revolutionists, even by as great a Marxist as Rosa Luxemburg who, for example, condemned the replacement of the Russian Soviets by revolutionary commissars in the Russian Civil War of 1918-1919.

Lenin often referred to errors made by him and by his party during the course of the Civil War, and these were not small mistakes ac-

ording to Lenin, nor were there just a few of such errors. The best of Marxists are capable of serious errors in judgment. [Another example: Lenin in 1916 spoke of the state beginning to wither away after the revolutionists seized power. In fact, an opposite development took place under the particular circumstances wherein vast destruction of the already low level of the productive forces of Russia occurred] Judging from a long term perspective of historic development, Lenin like Marx correctly foresaw the withering away of the state as the accelerating progressive development of economic conditions put an end to social classes, exploitation and the old cultures of class society. There remains today reason to expect such an historic development. Yet, the real, episodic course of counter-revolutionary developments in Russia led to a strengthening of the repressive role of the state rather than to its withering away. Here we are only illustrating the fact that great Marxists too make serious errors. Evaluation and discussion of mistakes must be seen in proper perspective for the purpose of the most objective appraisal of differences among comrades who are in basic political agreement.

Misinterpret

Let us compare Marx's application of his historical materialist method with that employed by the editors so that we may re-examine our own understanding of Marxian method. Before that, let us examine the "premises" from which the "program" of the editors of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER follows. Among the premises underlying the proposal for the return of the Palestinian emigres and the return of the sequestered properties is the absolutely true charge by the editors that the Israelis committed anti-Palestinian acts and even a pogrom. The comrade editors, therefore, demand a brotherly attitude from the Israelis, restitution, an end to injustices and self-determination for the Palestinians. We have no disagreement with these comrades in principle. Their program, however, as we have tried to show, would not achieve the

desired result. Formal, hollow restitution would not improve the lot of the mass of Palestinians.

Omitted completely from consideration as premises and consequently as program is any consideration of the discrimination, pogroms, persecutions, frame-ups and beggaring of Jews in Arab-speaking lands.

One has a right to ask of these comrades why do you choose not to recognize these premises and to formulate no program dealing with these matters? No demands on the Arabs re the Jews? Isn't this a travesty by internationalists?

In addition, you will note in the quotation from VANGUARD NEWSLETTER, that Israel is a capitalist state (incontestably true!) and that the editors then mechanically state, "the struggle against one's 'own' capitalism is the 'lesser evil'".

Like Lenin's expectation regarding the withering away of the state, this proposition is abstracted from a concrete life and death struggle faced by all Israelis. Every Israeli worker knows that the Arab military triumph would cost his life and those of all Jews, as well as the lives of vast numbers of Palestinians.

The Palestinians are well aware of how the Egyptians treated the people in the Gaza strip. These Arab "brothers" were not permitted to resettle in Egypt or in any other Arab-speaking country except Jordan. Much later, resettlement was permitted for any workers needed in the Bedouin-dominated oil producing countries, where illiteracy was the norm. The capitalists recruited a new addition of workers who could read, write and perform some of the functions needed by modern transportation, communication and accounting enterprises. Nowhere do the "Arab brothers" fight for nationhood for Palestinians. It should be noted in this connection that the "Arab brothers" forbid even the imperialist powers to employ Jews in their legation personnel in Saudi Arabia, while the oil companies are required to co-operate in this anti-Jew policy in their employment practices.

In circumstances whereby they are threatened with extermination by the

armies of the military gangsters running the countries of the Middle East and North Africa, the Jewish workers would be simple-minded lunatics to follow the advice of the editors of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER. Let us examine the policy of Lenin in judiciously and correctly, but not mechanically, applying the policy of the "lesser evil".

During the latter part of 1917 in Russia, Kerensky and Company were leaders of the capitalist government, carrying on a social-patriotic war policy against the armies of Germany and her allies. Here the Bolsheviks as we all know applied the "lesser evil" and "fraternization of the workers" policies, calling for the overthrow of the capitalist governments, including those of Kerensky & Co. In September 1917, General Kornilov led a fascist-like counter-revolutionary army towards the capital, with the announced aim of overthrowing the Kerensky regime (his "lesser evil" policy), and of wiping out the Bolsheviks and their adherents. Without throwing overboard their "lesser evil" anti-capitalist program, the Bolsheviks quickly decided that the Kornilovites were "the main enemy" (the lesser evil of the time), and they mobilized the Bolshevik-controlled forces to "march separately but to strike together", to defeat Kornilov. They soon after took care of the unfinished business with the capitalist government of Kerensky.

These events occurred when the Bolshevik leaders were in hiding or in jail, charged by Kerensky & Co., with treason. One must learn a proper appreciation of the relationship of tactics to strategy. Our example must be the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky, who could never be accused of blind and mechanical subordination of tactical life and death reality to generalizations embodied in the Bolshevik program.

The closing days of the British Palestine mandate were marked by the employment of separate military forces by every major Jewish political force in Palestine. Striking separately and together, they won

the victory which established Israel as the main place of refuge for refugee Jews. These refugees were barred from entry into "free, liberal, capitalist" countries such as Britain and the US under Roosevelt. Barred almost everywhere, the refugees were forced to turn to Palestine, "to the traditional land of their forefathers". They flooded into the country, aided by the Jewish armed bands, and overcame the weak resistance of the British and Palestinians who tried unsuccessfully to bar their entry.

When, in a previous letter to the editors, I pointed out the rotten role of modern day liberal capitalists who held power in this epoch, the editors were less interested in evaluating the reactionary role of capitalism, and answered that the Zionists too were opposed to re-settlement of the Jewish refugees in the capitalist countries. As if the Zionists held power. One must be able to evaluate and weigh the power of various forces and not mix up as equals unequal factors and differing weights.

An objective evaluation is required of historical developments, economic factors, social factors related to the economic ones, and "superstructural", factors such as cultural heritage, politics and the state. Basically this is missing from the articles in VANGUARD NEWSLETTER.

The program of the editors is not addressed to the Arabs at all! More, how is one to interpret the blindness to cultural "peculiarities" which correspond to the varying stages of backwardness of Arab-speaking societies and of the Jews? What sort of analysis were we given? What does it have in common with basic Marxian considerations? It seems to me that comrades have abstractly twisted their presentation of "premises" and "program" to deal almost entirely with the abuses of the victorious Israelis. It appears that for the editors--history is made of selected "cloth".

On this matter of method, let us review the writings of young Karl Marx after he came to the conclusions embodied in his "historical

materialism". Writing in "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte" in 1852, Daniel DeLeon translation, Marx states:

"Hegel says somewhere that all great facts and personages recur twice. He forgot to add, "Once as tragedy, and again as farce... Man makes his own history, but he does not make it out of the whole cloth; he does not make it out of conditions chosen by himself, but out of such as he finds close at hand. The tradition of all past generations weighs like an albatross upon the brain of the living. At the very time when men appear engaged in revolutionizing things and themselves, in bringing about what never was before, at such very epochs of revolutionary crisis do they anxiously conjure up into their service the spirits of the past... Thus did Luther masquerade as the Apostle Paul; thus did the revolution of 1789-1814 drape itself alternately as the Roman Republic and Roman Empire; nor did the revolution of 1848 know what better to do than to parody at one time the year 1789, at another the revolutionary traditions of 1793-95... Thus at another stage of development, a century before, did Cromwell and the English people draw from the Old Testament the language, passions and illusions for their own bourgeois revolution. When the real goal was reached, when the remodeling was accomplished, Locke supplanted Habakuk." (pps. 9-11)

Here I am not cataloguing the effect of traditions influencing the Israelis in their return to the "Holy Land", although it is an obvious factor under modern circumstances different from their ancestors who were led by Moses some 30 centuries ago, nor to deal with the cultural traditions of the Palestinian Bedouin and Arabic-speaking peoples which constantly appear in the current conflict. I am only calling attention to the duty imposed upon anyone employing the Marxian materialistic conception of

history to deal with such matters and with such peoples.

It is precisely such "peculiarities" which distinguish Marxists from tyros. Comrade Trotsky long ago, in polemic with Stalin, correctly pointed out that it is not the general conditions of capitalism which must be dealt with by revolutionists, but it is rather the "peculiarities" which include the stage of development which it is imperative for revolutionaries to understand in working out a program for a victorious, popular--as contrasted with military-bureaucratic--revolution in any country. For this reason, Lenin and Trotsky correctly dealt with the "peculiarities" of Russian development and related the problems of winning the peasantry of Russia (a peculiarity in a capitalist society) for support of the

workers' state. In the advanced capitalist countries (except France) there is no peasantry having any social weight. In writing his "History of the Russian Revolution", Trotsky began with the fundamental considerations which he called "The Peculiarities of Russian Development". This great work by a great Marxist, employs a method which we must learn to use. Let us note in conclusion: we are faced here--and everywhere--when revolutionists intervene in trying to direct the conscious efforts of mankind towards the establishment of a socialist, class-less society, we recognize that everything evolved--has a past, a history. The art and science of revolution, i.e., tactics and strategy and their correct employment is only correct when it is the result of historical experience and law.

#### A REPLY TO COMRADE ROBINS - by Robert Davis

The question before revolutionary socialists in the Arab-Israeli conflict is: how is the unity of the masses, under the leadership of the working class, to bring about a socialist revolution in the Middle East to be achieved?

Our first objective is the clarification of our own ranks, so that we can fulfill a function as a vanguard formation.

Marxists will agree that the basic goal in the Middle East is the development of the area's productive forces, so as to make possible a high standard of living for the general population; that only the proletariat, the one consistently revolutionary class, in alliance with the peasantry, can resolve this problem through a proletarian revolution, and in a federation of workers' states within a world socialist order.

The stumbling blocks in the way of this solution are:

World imperialism, which exploits the oil and mineral deposits of the area, distorting its economic development.

Stalinism, which helps prop up the Nassers in the hope of holding back a workers' revolution, which attempts to maneuver with imperialism in this area and to make deals

at the expense of the Arab masses. Zionist Israel which relied on western help to build its economy and which is now a client state of American imperialism.

The military-bureaucratic formations, parading under the banners of "Arab Socialism", and attempting to use the state to industrialize on the basis of capitalist property relations.

The editors of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER and Comrade Robins are in general agreement with this analysis. Our basic difference is on the question of the refugees, which the editors believe to be the pivotal point in uniting the masses of the Middle East.

Cde. Robins explains in his first article, that the US and Europe did nothing to aid the Jews, and that they, therefore, had no other choice before them but Palestine. Was there another political alternative in the 1930's and in the post-war period?

Modern Zionism, originating at

the end of the 19th century, had as its goal the resettlement of the Jewish people in a Zionist state in Palestine. "A land without people for a people without land." It opposed the integration of the Jewish masses into the general population, and the unity of the Jewish workers with others in class solidarity. It could not play any other role than that of an auxiliary to the western powers.

The Trotskyist movement in the US demonstrated its proletarian internationalism, its concern for the fate of the Jews, by organizing the American Fund for Political Prisoners and Refugees in the late '30's under the call "Open the Gates!" It sought to construct a mass organization of various socialists, liberals, and trade unionists, to demand that the US grant asylum to the threatened European Jews. The Zionist leaders, for the most part, stood aloof from this movement.

It is not a question of whether or not they had state power. At that time, there were 4 to 5 million Jews in this country, many involved in trade unions, the professions and in assorted liberal organizations. Others had ties to the Socialist and Communist parties. There was wide sympathy on the part of millions of workers from different religious backgrounds. While no guarantees could be given, this campaign might have succeeded in saving many Jews from extermination. However, the Zionists and their allies refused to take part in the campaign, counter-posing instead migration to Palestine.

In the aftermath of the war, the revelation that 5 million Jews were destroyed by the Nazis horrified the world. Again, the question of a refuge for the Jewish survivors became acute. We believe that a massive campaign to open the doors of the western countries might have been successful. Again, the Zionists were concerned only with migration to Israel.

What is Israel today? A capitalist nation. What are the other Middle Eastern states, such as Egypt and Syria? They too are capi-

WIKI - It's a Capitalist

talist, run by military cliques. Does VANGUARD NEWSLETTER envisage a revolutionary solution to the problems of the Middle East via Nasser and Co.? Absolutely not, as stated in the series on this question. Nasser holds the workers and peasants down, while balancing between the major blocs. Under other circumstances, Israel would try to do the same. The question of the refugees has enflamed the Arab masses. It has, for the most part, produced the guerrilla movement which is used by the Arab governments, and which has now become a threat to those governments like Jordan, where a civil war is under way between the guerrillas and the army of Hussein.

It would appear that Cde. Robins' objections to the return of the refugees are based on two premises. First, that given the strong animosities between Arab and Jew, the two groups cannot live together. He, therefore, proposes that, for the present, each have their own communities, with the Israelis granting aid to the Palestinian exiles. Secondly, that given the present economic resources of Israel, she would not be able to support an extra million or more inhabitants.

But Marxists cannot accept as given the breaking of class unity by racial, religious or national hatreds. VANGUARD NEWSLETTER calls upon the Jewish workers to demand the return of the exiles, as the only way to overcome the antagonisms, and as one demand in a program for the Jewish and Arab masses.

The overriding issue is the taking of power by the workers and peasants and the overthrow of the Zionist state. In inviting the Palestinians back to take their rightful place in constructing a socialist society in the Middle East as part of a world socialist community, the ground is prepared for the elimination of national hatreds and suspicions.

An analogy with the US is in order. The racial cleavage in American society, a disunited proletariat, benefits the bourgeoisie.

The Black worker can learn to trust his white class brother who struggles against his special oppression in the rank and file bi-racial caucuses which we propose.

As we know from labor history, e.g., the formation of the United Auto Workers in Detroit, racial antagonisms can be overcome in class struggle.

In the mid-'30's, a large section of the labor force employed in Auto originated in the South, and were steeped in racist ideology. Many supported the fascist and violently anti-Negro Black Legion. Black workers had also been used in the past as strike-breakers. Yet, the union was able to organize the Auto industry, winning a decisive victory in a major industry, by convincing the workers that their economic interests required their unity, that all would suffer if the proletariat remained split along racial lines.

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER proposes neither a capitalist Israel, nor even socialism in one region. A social overturn in the Middle East would be a severe blow against imperialism. An important section of the world in which imperialism has heavily invested would be ripped out of its orbit. Its super-profits would no longer be available to sustain a labor aristocracy, to cushion the economic downturns and to maintain the social peace. The workers in the advanced countries would be brought that much closer to the question of overthrowing their capitalist ruling classes. The victorious proletariat in the advanced countries would send enormous amounts of capital equipment, technicians and other aid to help the underdeveloped regions throughout the globe to industrialize. Should the breakthrough take place first in Europe, as seems most likely, the proletarian revolution in the backward countries would immediately be on the agenda. The workers of the world would then organize a division of labor on a world scale, which would guarantee each individual an undreamed of abundance,

culture and fulfillment.

What of the Jew in the Arab countries? Before the advent of Zionism, the conditions of the Jews in the Middle East, while not idyllic (they were required to pay special taxes, etc.), were of a nature which enabled them to practice their religion freely, and to become prominent in commerce, trade, intellectual life and government. As the Zionist "solution" was implemented, and especially with the establishment of Israel, a violently anti-Jewish period was opened which has continued to the present. The program of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER poses the unity of Arabs and Jews for the social revolution against all capitalist and bureaucratic regimes, as alone able to put an end to national and ethnic hatreds, abuses and atrocities.

For 22 years, an endless cycle of escalation has led the masses into a swamp. The guerrilla activists, composed of intellectuals, students and other strata, use various means to change the situation, e.g., hi-jacking planes, holding foreign nationals as hostages, etc., except the correct one. Taking secondary features of the struggle, they ignore the main political approach. The resistance forces refuse to take the road of class struggle.

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER is taken to task for being mechanical in the application of Lenin's policy that the struggle against one's own capitalists is the lesser evil, for being guided by a formula abstracted from reality. We are then offered an example in "...judiciously and correctly, but not mechanically applying the policy of the 'lesser evil'", the Kornilov affair of September 1917 in Russia.

With the country engaged in an imperialist war, Lenin's policy was the fight against one's own capitalist rulers in opposition to the war as the lesser evil.

Kornilov, at the head of a "fascist-like" army, sought to overthrow the Kerensky government and annihilate the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks, relying on the masses, called for a united front of all

working class organizations, army committees and Soviets, to defeat Kornilov as the main enemy, while giving no political support to Kerensky. Interesting, but how does this example relate to Israel.

In 1948, the British mandate was coming to an end. The differing Jewish organizations had separate military forces in various parts of Palestine. They were able to defeat the Arab armies and take possession, not only of the area assigned by the United Nations but also, that part of Palestine set aside as an "Arab" state. In the process, over half a million Palestinians were driven out, and their places taken by Jewish refugees lucky enough to survive the Hitlerite terror. Again, how does the Kornilov example apply to this situation? Is Cde. Robins saying that the Arabs represent Kornilov, the Zionists Kerensky, and that the Jewish masses after winning a victory against the main enemy will resolve the problem in a Bolshevik manner?

The analogy will not hold. The February revolution, while bringing a weak bourgeois regime to power, also threw up a form of dual power. The Soviets, on one side, represented the workers and peasants. The provisional government, on the opposite side, represented the capitalists and landlords. The question which divided the ruling class was whether to rule through Kerensky or Kornilov, with the extreme right deciding on the latter. But all sections of the ruling class agreed that the Bolsheviks had to be eradicated. Why? Because the Soviets under Lenin and Trotsky's leadership represented the social revolution against capitalist property. Are we being told that in 1948 there was dual power in Israel? The reality there is of a once-persecuted minority having imposed its "solution" on a non-Jewish majority in order to transform it into a minority.

As to the present, even assuming that Israel is faced with extermination, what position should

revolutionists, here and in Israel, take to that threat? Is there an example from which they can learn? Yes, Europe in the summer of 1940.

At that time, Germany had conquered France, and had become the dominant power on the continent. England faced the Nazis alone. Revolutionary socialists were well aware of what a victorious fascism was capable. Hitler was determined not only to subordinate Europe to the German economy, but to dismember these countries, to turn Poland and Russia into colonies, and France into a semi-colony, to enslave and work to death millions of Slavic peoples, and to exterminate the Jews. Faced with this situation, did the revolutionary Marxists support England as a lesser evil? Most assuredly not!

The war was an imperialist conflict over the division of the world between the contending bourgeois camps. The revolutionary socialists, the Trotskyists, exposed the reactionary nature of the war, and pointed out who its real beneficiaries were. They took advantage of every shift in conditions to try to raise the level of consciousness of the masses to the need of replacing the rule of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat. They refused to subordinate the class struggle to the dictates of military policy. This war-time policy is only another name for the transitional program. Concretely, they showed how the policies of the ruling class had brought the English people to the brink of disaster; that the war was not being waged for democracy, but for profits. They called for the immediate nationalization of the means of production without compensation and under workers' control; for the arming of the masses under elected officers from trade unions and other organizations. They made clear that only under a workers' government could a real war of defense be conducted. They called for immediate independence of the colonies. They appealed to the German soldiers on a class basis to overthrow their bourgeoisie.

How does this example relate to Israel? The fact is inescapable that the continuation in power of the Zionist regime means the destruction of the Jewish people in Israel. The situation cries out for a proletarian dictatorship which alone can institute the necessary political and economic changes.

As in the second World War, revolutionary socialists in Israel and in the Middle East as a whole will also know how to pose the necessary transitional demands, e.g., the nationalization of industry under workers' control, full equality for all regardless of national origin, the free return of the refugees, the arming of the workers and peasants under their own democratic class organizations, a policy of

revolutionary fraternization with the armed forces, etc., to bring the Arab and Jewish masses to the realization that there is no way out but the social revolution.

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER has been able to present a program which is highly consistent, not only on this question but also, on the Negro question and other questions, because it is not mechanical but understands and utilizes the dialectical materialist method of Marxism in all of the complex and diversified conditions under which the class struggle is fought, in all of the "peculiarities" of development, in behalf of a firm revolutionary perspective, i.e., the unity of the working class for the social revolution.

#### INFLATION AND THE ECONOMY - A New Expansion?

The mood of the American ruling class is now beginning to shift from the gloom and foreboding over the state of the economy, which prevailed over the past few months, to one of increasing confidence.

As justification for its earlier "tight" monetary, credit and fiscal policies, the Nixon Administration has trumpeted the glad tidings that the national rise in the Consumer Price Index in August was a mere 0.2%, instead of the previous 0.4-0.6%. Inflationary "pressures" are, therefore, seen as "moderating".

The stock market, whose Dow-Jones index of industrial corporation stock prices declined to the 630's in May in the worst collapse since 1929, reflects this more optimistic outlook by its present average in the 760's, still some 220 points below its high in December 1968.

But the state of mind of the capitalist "investors" is still not euphoric. Many a cloud still darkens their horizons.

The continuing strike of the Auto Workers against General Motors is decreasing total production by an estimated \$1 billion a week. Other labor "difficulties", such as the imminent nation-wide railroad strike, is also expected to have a dampening effect on the economy in the last quarter of 1970.

The unemployment rate, now exceed-

ing 5%, is still expected to reach 6% or more in the near future. While it is hoped that greater unemployment will confer its "benefits" on the "business community" in the greater availability of a labor force ready to work at lower wages and at less desirable jobs, it is also feared that greater social "unrest" will ensue, particularly among the Black and Spanish-speaking workers and youth who will be most affected.

An important source of continuing unease within the ruling class is the lower projected rate of capital expenditure for 1971, along with the decreased expenditures for "defense" by the Federal government. Manufacturing industries are presently only operating at 78% of capacity.

As VANGUARD NEWSLETTER pointed out in its July-August issue, the problem of "liquidity" has also not been solved, i.e., the difficulties of giant corporations, such as the now bankrupt Penn Central, in raising "ready cash" to cover its short-term liabilities, and which almost produced a panic in the commercial paper, unsecured corporation "I.O. U." market, which could have un-

leashed a world-wide financial panic.

Nor has the continued deterioration of the US international balance of payments position, the increased ratio of imports to exports abated. US gold reserves have again fallen to little more than \$11 billion. The US became a debtor instead of a creditor nation in the past six months. Foreign banks are stuffed with Eurodollars which they are reluctant to exchange for gold, only for fear of setting off an international monetary crisis.

The worsening position of American capitalism has evoked strident warnings from the international bankers. The annual report of the International Monetary Fund finds that the American inflation threatens not only the "long-range stability and efficiency" of the US economy but also, to feed a world-wide inflation and the "sound functioning of the international monetary system". The annual report of the Bank of International Settlements called a world-wide recession "inescapable" unless the US brings its inflation under control. Both reports called upon the American capitalists to impose an "incomes policy", i.e., a wage-freeze on the workers, which will decrease "real" wages even further.

A trade war between American capitalism and its more-rapidly expanding capitalist rivals, e.g., Japan and Germany, still impends.

The Vietnam war has not been ended nor have the difficulties for the American "investor" in Latin America and the Middle East been resolved.

Why then the greater confidence in Wall Street? The mystery is easily solved. The Nixon Administration and the Federal Reserve System have reversed their "tight" money and credit policies. The "prime" rate, the rate at which commercial banks loan money to the biggest corporations, has been decreased to  $7\frac{1}{2}\%$  from the previous 8%, and the "business community" expects the "Fed" to cut its discount rate, the interest which it charges for loans to member banks. The easier money and credit policies, together with a large Federal budget deficit, are expected

to provide the necessary stimuli to take the economy out of recession, to again bring, if not a new "boom" in 1971, at least a period of decided economic expansion, and with it, increased corporation profits.

Not all is optimism within the ruling class, however. Some bankers and economists have expressed concern that the shift in monetary, credit and fiscal policies by the Nixon Administration and the "Fed" might result in an even greater inflationary wave, that the warnings of the international bankers might be confirmed, and that not only the US, but the entire world economy might be engulfed by a massive crisis.

Rosa Luxemburg, at the turn of the century, gave the classic answer to the first theoretician of "Marxian" revisionism, Edward Bernstein, in Reform or Revolution. Its validity is again being demonstrated against all capitalist prophets, who assume that capitalism can be made immune to serious crises by "timely" adjustments, that their system is eternal if given "good management".

Bernstein, anticipating today's soothsayers, held that capitalism could no longer suffer a general decline, that it had the capacity to adapt, e.g., the emerging giant cartels, the enlarged credit system, and new means of communication, and therefore, to overcome the contradictions which cause periodic financial and industrial crises, that the improved conditions of the working class demonstrated that Marxism required "revision", that its outlook must be transformed from revolutionary into "evolutionary".

Luxemburg pointed out that the cartels and enlarged credit system, by increasing productive capacity and facilitating exchange--also facilitating stock market speculation--did not prevent but only ensured more frequent and eventually sharper crises. The basic contradiction between capitalism's productive capacity and the limited market, and its other contradictions--between production and exchange, production and appropriation, property and production relations, the social

(continued on p. 90)

TROTSKYISM TODAY - An Evaluation of a Series by Harry Turner

Introduction

"What Is Spartacist", the six-part series by Tim Wohlforth, which appeared in the Workers Leagues's "Bulletin" between June 22 and August 10, 1970, purports to be a Marxist examination, not only of the Spartacist League but also, of its "graduates". Included among the latter is one, Harry Turner, an editor of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER.

We can agree with Comrade Wohlforth that the Marxist method requires that phenomena be apprehended in its development to be adequately understood. But this means that all other interacting phenomena must be afforded a similar treatment, and above all, that a genuinely conscientious appraisal be undertaken.

Quite obviously, the scientific detachment of an observer from Sirius can hardly be expected in social phenomena from participants, let alone partisans. However, the great Marxists have set their followers an example in this respect as in others, in combining the most passionate devotion to the cause of the working class with the most scrupulous treatment of the factual materials with which they dealt.

We intend to follow them in this respect as well in evaluating the "What Is Spartacist" series, in examining the record of individuals and groups who came to the fore as oppositional elements in the rapidly degenerating Socialist Workers Party and in their subsequent evolution.

Wohlforth attempts to prove his central thesis in this series, that the disintegration products of the SWP--all with the exception of Wohlforth and his tendency--rejected proletarian internationalism, and thereby, became enemies of the Leninist vanguard party, as a result of their pragmatic adaptation to surface phenomena. Wohlforth, it seems, was spared this fate, because of his mastery of Marxist "METHOD".

As evidence, Wohlforth quotes extensively from materials made available by the Spartacist League, his own voluminous correspondence with Gerry Healy, the national secretary of the Socialist Labour League and secretary of the International Committee of the Fourth International,

the documents of the SLL and IC, and also from letters sent to Gerry Healy by this writer.

Our series will also attempt to prove a thesis, namely, that the "graduates" of the SWP, including Wohlforth, and even before "graduation", from 1962 on, in one degree or another, operated in a manner harmful to the construction of a Leninist vanguard party in this country, and that the current practices of both the WL and SL in particular, act as obstacles to its construction.

We will also have occasion to refer to documents and to produce extracts of our correspondence to support our thesis--including those parts of a letter to Gerry Healy which Wohlforth carefully overlooked.

[As Marxists, we understand that the ideological superstructure--not immediately, not directly, but in the final analysis--is dependent on the economic base, and that serious political struggles, even within a small organization, reflect this base and the resultant movement of social classes.] We also understand with Marx that the "character of the people who first head the movement" play an important role in accelerating or delaying developments.

[As Marxists, we recognize that the negative practices of the SWP "graduates" are not simply the "evil" work of "evil" men. Underlying all the errors of revolutionists and would-be-revolutionists, including those resulting from the erratic behavior and subjectivism of individual leaders, we see the action of economic-political law.

The defeats of the European and world working class in the post World War II period by capitalism aided by Stalinism, produced the

revisionist theories of a Michel Pablo and the immediate or subsequent capitulation to his conceptions by a large part of the world Trotskyist movement. Abandoning attempts to build an international working class vanguard party, they sought for short-cuts to socialism in adaptations to one or another variety of Stalinism and "Third World"ism.

The harmful practices of those "graduates" who "oppose" Pabloism must also be understood in the context of an as-yet politically backward working class, in the absence of a real working class movement which they would be bound to respect, and in their inability to produce a coherent and consistent strategy and tactics to deal with the sharpening crisis of world capitalism, to the extent that they even recognize its existence.

Wohlforth has admitted in this series that the WL made errors in the past, e.g., that it had held "a confused position on the question of Black Nationalism", which has since been corrected, so that it now "ruthlessly fights each and every manifestation of black nationalism". However, Wohlforth not only fails to explore the roots of this error, in this or any other series, to our knowledge, he also delicately refrains from elaborating further on the other "mistakes" to which he admits.

Lenin in Left Wing Communism states that,

"a political party's attitude toward its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is, and how it fulfils in practice its obligations toward its class and the working people. Frankly acknowledging a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analyzing the conditions that have led up to it, and thrashing out the means of its rectification, that is the hallmark of a serious party..."

Using Lenin's criterion, we intend to demonstrate that neither

the WL nor the SL can be considered "serious", in Lenin's meaning of the term.

The infrequent "Spartacist", in its August-September issue, has printed a shrill reply to the "What is Spartacist" series, entitled "The Wohlforth League: Counterfeit Trotskyists". Adopting the maxim that the best defense is a good offense, the SL has let loose a welter of accusations and grievances against Wohlforth and the WL. It is unable, however, to undertake an objective examination of the WL's failings because, despite its pretensions that it is the embodiment of "authentic Trotskyism", it is not a serious organization in any sense of that word. Its hastily written lawyer's brief is concerned to cover over its own sins of commission and omission. Its continued existence as an organization can be attributed, not to its own laggard efforts but rather, to the blunders which the WL has made and continues to make--as we intend to demonstrate.

#### The Left Opposition in the SWP

The Cuban revolution, which brought to power a new Bonapartist formation headed by Fidel Castro, which we understand as having resulted in a deformed workers' state, a state not qualitatively differing from the Soviet, Eastern European or Chinese varieties, was seen by the SWP leadership as the distilled essence of a proletarian revolution--consummated without the proletarian party, without the active participation not to speak of leadership of the proletariat, and without the organs of working class rule, the Soviets--that it was at least the equal of, if it did not surpass, the October Revolution led by the Bolshevik party.]

In his first installment, Wohlforth correctly indicates--and in fact, the series makes a number of valid points and presents some useful information, which we intend to credit in due course--that the left minority faction in the SWP initially arose in opposition to the opportunist direction by the party

majority on Cuba.

He then refers to the documentary evidence to show that the IC leadership had understood earlier and had helped the minority in the SWP to understand that the opportunist adaptation to the new Cuban bureaucracy by the SWP majority was but an expression of its fundamental theoretical and political degeneration, was "an expression of a whole international perspective and method known as Pabloism".

Wohlforth attacks the Robertson conception, which appeared as late as January 1965, in an introduction to a reprint of the minority document of 1962, "In Defence of a Revolutionary Perspective", that the SWP leadership first took an opportunist position on Cuba, and then generalized their opportunism into an opportunist international perspective.

This writer only became involved in the struggle for revolutionary politics in the SWP after the split of the original minority into the "Revolutionary Tendency" of Robertson and the "Reorganized Minority Tendency" of Wohlforth. However, there seems to be no reason for not crediting Wohlforth's version of the sequence of development which produced the SWP minority and its basic agreement with the IC.

We must take issue, however, with Wohlforth's underlying simplistic psychological assumption, that the erroneous views of Robertson in this respect are significant as an expression of a national deviation which "explains" his and "his friends" subsequent "rejection of internationalism". [And in fact, despite his use of the term "interlocking" to describe the questions of Pabloism and Cuba, Wohlforth's presentation betrays his own inability to understand that the SWP's adaptation to the Castro Bonapartist formation was not only an "expression" of its Pabloist "perspective and method", but that Cuba represented that added factor which transformed quantity to quality, which caused an already weakened and disoriented organism to succumb to Pabloism]

Despite Wohlforth's stress on Marxist "METHOD", as the fundamental

attribute which distinguishes the WL from the SL and other pragmatists, in reality, he and Robertson have in common a basic incapacity for dialectical thought, and an eclecticism--in some cases clearly expressed, in others, cleverly masked as "authentic Marxism", and to adaptations which betray the fact that neither are as far from the Pabloism which they condemn as they would like others to believe.

(to be continued)

#### INFLATION...(continued from p. 87)

character of production and capitalist ownership--were not modified but intensified, with the intervention of the state in the productive process increasingly necessary.

Trotsky's posthumously discovered rough notes for an article, published as the pamphlet, Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay, in further evaluating the relations of workers, capitalists and the state, had the following to say:

"...the whole task of the bourgeoisie consists of liquidating the trade unions as organs of the class struggle and substituting in their place the trade union bureaucracy as the organ of the leadership over the workers by the bourgeois state."

But this task is rendered more difficult by the inflation, as the steel capitalist, Harlston R. Wood testifies. Admitting that workers are being robbed of their "real" wages and fringe benefits, he bemoaned the plight of the labor "leaders", who are having difficulty selling sweetheart contracts to the members of their unions, and who are being kicked out of office more frequently.

A continuing high rate of inflation, which the "relaxed" monetary policies of the Nixon Administration ensures, will inevitably bring additional demands for a wage-freeze. But, even in the guise of an "incomes policy", it will meet with the aroused resistance of the workers.

(to be continued)

## STATEMENT OF FRATERNAL GREETINGS

To: The Unification Conference of Progressive De Leonist Organizations

We in Vanguard Newsletter extend to the De Leonists assembled at Ann Arbor warm fraternal greetings. We wish you every revolutionary success in forming a national organization, one which can lead the American working class to the socialist revolution.

"One thing especially was proved by the Commune", said Marx and Engels in their preface to the German edition of the Communist Manifesto in 1872, "viz., that 'the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.'"

This understanding was concretely implemented and advanced by De Leon, an uncompromising revolutionary socialist, by his conception of the "Socialist Industrial Union". He thereby anticipated, in an important aspect, the spontaneous development of workers' councils, of "Soviets", of the representative class organs of the workers and peasants which emerged with the first Russian revolution in 1905, and which became the foundation for the "dictatorship of the proletariat" with the Bolshevik-led revolution in October 1917.

The essential question for revolutionary socialists is the necessary tactics to realize this strategic goal. How can revolutionary Marxists convince the American workers, 18 million of whom are now organized in trade unions, of the validity of the socialist goal? How can we unite them in a nation-wide "Socialist Industrial Union", which is at once the agency of the socialist revolution, and the form within which working class rule can achieve a rational, planned and class-less society?

The Socialist Labor Party's purely propagandistic approaches, from outside the existing working class organizations, its avoidance of the daily economic struggle and the struggles of the specially oppressed Black and Spanish-speaking people, have proven futile.

We in Vanguard Newsletter are convinced that revolutionary socialists must win the confidence of the workers as participants in immediate struggles, that the workers will be won to the socialist cause as they learn, on the basis of their experiences, that "business unionism", the policies and "leadership" of reformists and "pie-cards", is no longer capable of maintaining the "wage-slaves" in their slavery, of even upholding let alone improving, working class living and working standards.

We in Vanguard Newsletter believe that the "Transitional Program", largely written by Trotsky, is the key to a revolutionary policy in trade union and mass work. We have attempted to apply the method of Trotsky in the new conditions, and have called for "rank and file" or "left-wing" caucuses in the trade unions, to lead the workers against the capitalists and their trade union bureaucrats, to unite Black and white workers in the struggle against special oppression in the immediate and fundamental interests of all workers, to raise the transitional demands which will enable workers to conclude that capitalism with its grinding exploitation, unemployment, racism and predatory wars can and must be replaced by a society of abundance, based upon the collective control of the product by the producers.

As world capitalism moves toward crisis, as capitalism manifests its inability to grant even the reforms of yesterday, as the policies of the labor-fakers become demonstrably bankrupt, the growing network

of "rank and file" caucuses can increasingly represent, not merely the advanced layers of the working class but, its preponderant majority, can become, in essence and in fact, its representatives in factory and industry, can demonstrate its control over productive and distributive facilities, can become the "Socialist Industrial Union", the "dual power", the rule of the working class counterposed to the "democratic" rule of the exploiters.

Within the trade unions, the revolutionary Marxists will have to fight against the capitalists and their "labor-lieutenants" for the next important forward step for the American working class, a break from capitalist politics, for a labor party, for its revolutionary program, and for spokesmen who will use the electoral platform and the halls of Congress to defend and advance the interests of the workers, while educating for the socialist revolution.

The fundamental contradiction between the productive forces and capitalist relations of production has now reached a stage of such acuity as to threaten the continued existence of humanity. The most developed capitalist country and world imperialist gendarme, the United States, carries the greatest threat, in poisoning the earth, seas and air, and in nuclear extermination. American revolutionists, therefore, bear a heavy responsibility for the fate of humanity.

At one time, the socialist revolution was seen mechanically as being attained earliest by that country whose productive forces were most fully developed. Trotsky was the first to relate the interaction between subjective and objective factors and the unevenness of development, which would allow a backward country such as Russia to leap ahead of the advanced to the socialist revolution. With the betrayals of the Second and Third Internationals, the growth of capitalism after the second world war, and the lessened revolutionary possibilities, the old mechanical conception was inverted by new opportunists: the workers in the advanced countries had become hopelessly "conservatized"; only the masses in the "Third World" were capable of revolution.

But France in May-June 1968 demonstrated the revolutionary potential of the working classes in the developed countries! As the contradictions of capitalism sharpen, the American workers also begin to show their capacity to struggle against the ruling class and its labor-stooges. Under the whiplash of objective necessity, the as yet politically backward American workers can make the leap forward to the level required by the highly developed productive forces, to socialist consciousness.

This advance in understanding requires that a revolutionary vanguard party be developed, able to lead the workers in immediate struggles and in the socialist revolution. The construction of a party of this type, on a world-scale and especially in the United States, is the most urgent task facing revolutionary socialists.

We in Vanguard Newsletter look forward to "discussion, debate and a principled unity in action" with progressive De Leonists toward this accomplishment.

Fraternally,

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER

labor donated  
8-5-70