

VANGUARD newsletter

Published monthly by independent revolutionary socialists
Editors — Harry Turner, Hugh Fredericks
P. O. Box 67, Peck Slip Station, New York, N. Y. 10038



Vol. 3, No. 5 Price 10¢ (\$1.00 per year) Labor donated May 1971

Contents: ✓ April 24th and the "Mayday Movement"	p. 57
The Ceylonese Uprising	61
Bangla Desh and Leninism	64
Correspondence	67
State and Revolution - Part V --The Weakest Link In the Chain?	68

APRIL 24TH AND THE "MAYDAY MOVEMENT"

The outpouring of protest against the Indochinese war realized the most optimistic projections of the organizers of the demonstrations in Washington and San Francisco on April 24th.

The National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) estimated the demonstration in Washington at 500,000 and at San Francisco at 300,000.

The growing opposition--now a majority--of the American people to US "involvement" in Indochina was clearly visible in the demonstration's composition. Students from colleges and high schools still comprised the large majority, but the adult component was also large. More Blacks were also in evidence.

For five days prior to April 24th, the Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW) had demonstrated in Washington. The publicity given their dramatic action in hurling battle decorations at monuments ensured a significant turn-out of veterans, and even of present members of the armed forces.

Trade unionists were also present in larger numbers than in previous anti-Indochinese war demonstrations. Their working class character was, however, seldom visible in the diffused medley of youth, professionals, assorted clergy and higher-paid white collar workers.

The dominant political theme of the demonstrations, and the basis for trade union leadership support was furnished by the "popular front" coalition of liberals, the Communist Party (CP), the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), and its youth organization, the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) on the least common liberal-pacifist denominator.

Thus, the predominant spirit of the demonstrations was in keeping with the politics of the soft wing of the ruling class, which wishes to end the Indochinese war now, in the best interests of American capitalism. For this reason, Muskie and McGovern endorsed and Kennedy and Fulbright were sympathetic to the Washington demonstration.

The two prominent organizers of the demonstrations were NPAC and the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice (PCPJ). The latter organization, in coordination with the world Stalinist sell-out of the Indochinese revolution, agitates for a "treaty" between the American and Indochinese "people's", and for the Nixon Administration to "set the

date" for withdrawal of American troops from Indochina.

The SWP, working within NPAC, is ecstatic over its great "success" in borrowing the "popular front" technique which the CP originated at Stalin's direction in the '30's. It boasts of the new strength which it has acquired in helping the Stalinists direct the masses toward liberalism. As does the CP, it also reassures its members that this betrayal is really "Marxism" under the "new" conditions, and a way of achieving "socialism".

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER, as did other socialist and radical formations, used the opportunity to present its position on the war to Washington demonstrators.

As our readers know, our leaflet exposed the betrayal of the Indochinese struggle, which world Stalinism is again perpetrating in the name of "peaceful coexistence".

We made clear that the NLF program of preserving capitalist relations would again, as in 1946 and 1954, mean more bloodshed and suffering for the Vietnamese; that this "deal", as part of a Soviet agreement to maintain the world capitalist status-quo, is approved by the soft wing of the ruling class, against the hard wing's demand for surer guarantees.

Our anti-war program, founded on the Trotskyist program against war, called for a world-wide struggle by the international working class against capitalism, as the only way to end the 25 year slaughter of Indochinese and all wars.

We called for a four-pronged offensive: a world-wide boycott of US goods and blacklisting of all cargo with potential for use against the Indochinese; a campaign to demand that the USSR and China supply North Korea and the NLF with military assistance needed to launch defensive and offensive actions against US forces in Indochina; the Permanent Revolution in Indochina -- a coordinated offensive against US imperialism and its satraps, confiscation of landlords' estates distribution to landless peasants, "socialization of the means of production and working class rule"; the

mobilization of the American working class "for political and strike action against the "same enemy" threatening its living standards.

We are happy to say that our leaflet, given the heterogeneous nature of the assemblage, was very well received, and produced a significant number of new subscriptions.

Some socialist organizations, who refer to themselves as Leninist and even Trotskyist, proved by their antics at the demonstrations that they have learned little from either.

Progressive Labor (PL), which has now empirically moved some distance from the cult of Mao, in a leaflet distributed to the Washington demonstrators in the thousands, tried to separate the more radical participants from the liberals by calling its own rally. PL recognized that the temper of a good part of the youth was far more radical than its liberal-reformist-centrist sponsors, but it failed to win support for its rally. PL has still to learn that an attempt to reap where one has not sown is known as adventurism. At least, it did try to influence the demonstrators into taking a more militant step.

The Workers League (WL) complains of a leaflet issued by the Spartacist League (SL), which attacked it as "sectarian" for attempting to organize counter-demonstrations to the NPAC-PCPJ sponsored affairs.

Despite its claim that it has a monopoly on Marxist "METHOD", the WL has not attempted to "theoretically" justify its erratic practice. It participated in last year's anti-war demonstrations organized by the same forces on the same counter-revolutionary liberal-pacifist program, on the grounds that trade unionists would take part. This year, and despite a greater participation by organized labor, it decides that "principle" requires it to counter-demonstrate.

As our leaflet pointed out, the demonstrations were called by its "popular front" organizers "in support of counter-revolutionary deals". But the tactics which Leninists and Trotskyists are required to use in the class strug-

gle are not decided on because of their subjective reactions--as anyone even slightly acquainted with Lenin's "Left-Wing" Communism--An Infantile Disorder should know.

A counter demonstration can be called by revolutionists when their mass support is commensurate with the task at hand.

In circumstances where all signs point to a massive participation, as with the NPAC-PCPJ demonstrations, an attempt by a marginal group such as the WL to organize a counter-demonstration can only be, in effect, a boycott, a form of abstentionism, a sectarian adventure.

The WL boasts of its tactic's success--at least in Washington. It claims that 500--not the mere 150 which the dastardly SWP reports--were in its ranks at the point where it split off from the main march. Moreover, it seems that its rally "attracted over 1000 persons".

Even assuming that the WL's figures are not inflated, they speak against the WL tactic, when measured against the half-million participants in the NPAC-PCPJ demonstration. If the WL really had the support it claims, would it not have achieved far more by taking its politics to 500,000, as we did, than by taking its supporters into a form of "splendid" isolation?

And how did the WL "corral" the 500 in the first place? We note that its leaflet, evidently, given mass distribution prior to April 24th, simply invited militants to arrange transportation and "demonstrate with" the WL in Washington and San Francisco! Not a word about a counter-demonstration! If the WL was not simply interested in carrying "warm" bodies to its demonstration, why the mis-representation? Can it be that on April 24th, it also did not explain to all the 500 that they were counter-demonstrating, and merely "zagged" when the other marchers "zigged", in order to carry with them some of the unwary and unsophisticated youth?

We have not yet seen the SL leaflet rebuking the WL for its "sectarianism", but it happens that we did not spot a single member of the

SL in Washington. We did see one demonstrator with a copy of "Spartacist". [It is possible that they were concentrated in a different section of the vast crowd, but could it also be that they decided that pickings were better at the WL's sectarian rally? We would describe such behavior as doubly-distilled sectarianism. We trust that we are not doing the SL an injustice. However, it would seem that it is only aroused from its lethargy by the fear that the WL might steal an organizational march on them.

[The revolutionary potential of the youth, its readiness for struggle was clearly shown in the first week in May, in the mass arrests in Washington of over 12,000]

The "Mayday Movement" of May 3rd to 5th was organized by the "Mayday Tribe", led by Rennie Davis of "Chicago 7" fame, in cooperation with PCPJ. It aimed at "stopping the government", of disrupting its function, unless it stopped intervening in Indochina, by, among other things, stalling cars on highways feeding into Washington, thus preventing Federal employees from coming to work.

Capital police, with the National Guard in reserve, engaged in wholesale violations of laws they are supposed to uphold, attacked the youthful demonstrators, cracking ribs and heads with clubs, and blinding them with tear-gas. The police herded the demonstrators, who had been indiscriminately arrested, into detention centers, without arraignment on a specific charge, and held them incommunicado and without food.

The youthful, idealistic and "non-violent" demonstrators, were completely unprepared for the Gestapo tactics of the capital police, did not resist arrest, and even tried to engage them in "friendly dialogue", when they were not being assaulted.

[The SWP is attempting to contrast its political behavior to that of the "Mayday Movement". In essence, however, they operate within the same framework, that of bourgeois-liberal protest politics. And, in fact, the SWP's coalition with the liberals and Stalinists set the stage for the "Mayday Movement",

which seemed to open a channel for "practical" action for the youth, who are increasingly frustrated by endless demonstrations which do not result in "ending the war".

The "broad" coalition of the SWP, the "Mayday Tribe" and the Stalinists is founded on by-passing the working class and seeking an "end to the war" on a reformist basis, in not challenging the capitalist nature of a society which breeds more and more destructive wars.

In typical centrist fashion, the SWP has made mild criticisms of PCPJ's "people's peace treaty"-- "set the date" tactics. But its "thorns" do not prevent the SWP from admiring the "rose", its ability to promote liberal support for bigger and better demonstrations.

Rennie Davis, who threatens to organize more "effective" civil disobedience actions in future, is, evidently, an aspirant to the role of the Father Gapon of the "peace" movement. Gapon, it will be remembered, led a mass demonstration of Russian workers, replete with icons and pictures of the Tsar to the Winter Palace, to petition the "little Father" for a constituent assembly and improvements in the conditions of the workers. The resulting slaughter of the demonstrators by the Tsar's troops was the prelude to the 1905 Russian Revolution.

In contrast to Gapon, Davis is not interested in leading workers. He comes forth as an anti-war "radical", who "threatens" the government, as against Gapon's prayerful posture. His "leadership" of the politically and physically disarmed youth into the ready arms of the Washington police will not produce anything but disillusionment and apathy.

Davis and the "Mayday Tribe"'s "feckless" tactics--as one newspaper described them--do not even have the justification of the revolutionists of the Blanquist or Narodnik schools.

In spite of its seeming militancy, Davis' "stop the government" bluster is only a variant of Gapon's approach to the Tsar, and of the bourgeois-liberal conception, in

general, that government should be responsive to the "will of the people". When it fails to do so, the petty-bourgeois in a rage determines to gather to gather "men of good will" to "coerce" it into more democratic behavior. In all instances, the given political and economic organization of society is assumed to be eternal.

April 24th and its aftermath again offered negative proof that only a working class led by a revolutionary party which is firmly grounded in the theory and practice of scientific socialism, of Marxism, is capable of liberating humanity from the scourge of capitalism, of exploitation, war and all other forms of oppression.

We ask our readers who may belong to other organizations, to compare our program, which attempts to unite the lessons of the past to present practice, with the inconsistent and eclectic program--with outright betrayal of program--and the erratic and manipulative behavior of their organizations.

We warn them to beware of organizational fetishes hypnotically dangled before their eyes to train them in habits of dependency and unthinking obedience.

In 1937, Trotsky informed a small French youth organization that, "the idea...is more powerful than the most powerful organization". As history has often proven, those organizations which attempt to mask their abandonment of revolutionary ideas by elevating the organizational side of politics, will wind up with neither the one nor the other.

We are convinced that our "idea" corresponds to the objective requirements of our time, and will achieve the necessary organizational form.

We believe that, in the US at this time, a relatively small group of determined revolutionary Marxists can, in short order, assemble an organizational embodiment of its "idea" in the shape of a working class vanguard Leninist and Trotskyist vanguard party. We invite our readers to take part in fulfilling this historic responsibility.

THE CEYLONESE UPRISING

Our "preliminary statement" in April gave "critical support" to the People's Liberation Front, in revolt against the Ceylonese bourgeois regime, which has unleashed a savage repression against it, its student and peasant supporters and other political opponents on the left.

At this writing, the JVP, also known as "Che Guevarists", is continuing its armed struggle, which began on April 5th, with attacks on police stations from rural areas.

According to a recent spokesman for the student-revolutionists, the movement has 48,000 members, 7,000 under arms in the countryside, with 3,000 in the Sinharaja forest to the south of Colombo.

Also at this writing, the Ceylon government is exuding confidence that it is successfully liquidating the JVP revolt. It has reported that 4,000 insurgents, who surrendered during the "grace" period of May 1st to 4th, are being "rehabilitated" at Vidyodaya University near Colombo, under the direction of the social-traitors, Colin De Silva of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (LSSP) and Peter Keuneneman of the Communist Party (CP).

And yet, the state of emergency decreed on March 16th is still being maintained, and the censorship established at that time is now being tightened. Le Monde, a Paris daily, also indicated that there are still many "rebels", even though poorly armed, who are regrouping in the mountains.

The "United Left Front" government, headed by Mrs. Bandaranaike's bourgeois Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP), the Soviet-oriented CP and the LSSP, have butchered thousands of students and peasants. Corpses are still floating down Ceylon's rivers at this time.

The terror, however, cannot solve Ceylon's social and economic crisis, integrally linked with the world crisis of capitalism, whose expression was the JVP revolt.

The "popular front" SLFP-CP-LSSP government returned to power in May 1970, after a 5 year interregnum, on a "socialist" platform, and with the support of the JVP. Since then, inflation has worsened and unemploy-

ment had risen to 700,000, almost 1/6th of the labor force of approximately 4 million.

Ceylon's tea and rubber industries, which provide it with the bulk of the foreign exchange which it uses for industrial development is totally inadequate for this task. To get capital from the International Monetary Fund, the Bandaranaike regime has agreed to an "austerity" budget, at the expense of the workers' living standards and social services.

The JVP had its beginnings in 1964 in a student strike at the University of Ceylon. It was formed as a split from the Chinese-oriented CP and has since attracted members from the LSSP and Moscow-oriented youth movements. According to reports, 75% of the insurgents are between 18 and 20, and 15%, 16 to 18 years of age.

As its leaders have made clear, the JVP's outlook is based on the concepts of Che Guevara and Castro, Mao Tse Tung and Kim Il Sung. It has ignored the organizations of the working class as "capitalist institutions" to concentrate on, and to achieve a measure of support from the peasantry. 85% of the population still live in rural areas.

In a country in which 20% of the 13 million inhabitants are of Tamil extraction, and mainly agricultural laborers on Ceylon's vast tea plantations, the JVP's members and supporters come almost exclusively from the 65% Sinhala majority.

The JVP calls for the distribution of land to the peasants and the nationalization of the means of production in a socialist outlook which is restricted to a Ceylonese national framework. It has called for the abolition of the tea industry, which was initiated by the British imperialists, and whose tea plantations are still 30% British-owned, and for the growing of rice in its place. The JVP holds the Tamil victims of imperialism to be

its agents.

In the advanced as in the under-developed countries, the revolutionary impulses of a whole generation of youth has been misdirected. The objective situation over the past 25 years, which was created by earlier betrayals, has facilitated the task of traitors to socialism of various vintages.

As we have shown, the Stalinized Communist parties aborted or deliberately destroyed every revolutionary opportunity from 1924 on. Where it was not possible to keep the masses under bourgeois rule, the Stalinists operated over the heads of the workers or from peasant bases to produce states like that of the degenerated Soviet state.

As we have also shown, with imperialism racked by increasingly insoluble contradictions, and with the working class now "passive", i.e., disoriented and straight-jacketed by their "leaders", the "third world" myth could be born. Bonapartist regimes could arise in the under-developed sectors to demand a larger share of imperialist super-profits by utilizing the Soviet bloc as a point of balance.

Responding to surface phenomena without understanding the underlying processes, leaders of the Fourth International (FI), such as Pablo, also became disoriented. They came to view the Stalinists as revolutionary-despite-themselves. They invested the peasantry in the under-developed countries with the revolutionary qualities and potential which Marxists have always reserved for the working class. They, in effect, discounted the workers in advanced and under-developed countries as "conservatized", to make obeisance to the Ben Bellas in Algeria and the Castros in Cuba. They even looked with approval on their attacks on workers' unions. Pablo even accepted a post in Ben Bella's government.

The disorientation of the LSSP, the strongest section of the FI, which, in the 1953 split, remained with Pablo in the International Secretariat (IS), of the IS as a whole, and of the SWP in the International

Committee (IC), led to the abandonment of the fundamental program of revolutionary Marxism, and to outright betrayals. The LSSP, also seeking short-cuts to "socialism", began to accept the anti-imperialist and "socialist" phraseology of the SLFP, and to find points of accommodation with it. In 1964, the process of degeneration concluded with the decision of a majority of the LSSP to enter the Bandaranaike bourgeois government.

The IS, which had by then become the United Secretariat (U Sec), in a unification backed by the SWP on foundations which Pablo had been instrumental in erecting, and which had played a major part in the degeneration of the LSSP, was then forced to expel the majority.

The LSSP's degeneration into a party of social-reformism, which was aided by the prevailing Castroist-Maoist anti-working class outlook, has, in turn, advanced it, as has its split-off, the LSSP (Revolutionary), which affiliated to the U Sec. Under its secretary, P. Bala Tampoe, who also heads the white-collar Ceylon Mercantile Union, it has gone the full revisionist route with the U Sec leaders in the search for "third world" alternatives to the international working class as the bearers of the socialist revolution, and in furthering the cult of Castro.

As we indicated in our last issue, the Soviet Union has been "cooperating" with India, Great Britain and the US in supplying the Bandaranaike regime with MIG 17's. Yugoslavia and other Stalinist regimes in Eastern Europe have also provided it with military equipment. They have also provided Bandaranaike with invaluable help by slandering the JVP as CIA agents and right-wing forces, in justifying their aid to counter-revolution to their own workers.

On the other hand, North Korea's representatives have been expelled from Ceylon for conspiring with and giving aid to the students, raising a question of Chinese "complicity". In recent issues, Hsinhua has prominently noted Mrs. Bandaranaike's "cordial" reception of the Chinese ambassador, the Ceylon government's

denial that China was helping the JVP, and Ceylonese broadcasts refuting "malicious" rumors aiming to disrupt Ceylonese-Chinese relations.

The Chinese Stalinists, however, do not shrink from defending the Pakistani butcher, Yahya Kahn, who is conducting a slaughter of the East Bengal masses. Nor, it seems, does the Bandaranaike coalition government of "socialists", who graciously permitted the Pakistan government the use of its airfields for the same purpose.

Along with JVP members and supporters, the Ceylon government has also arrested a Maoist leader and a LSSP member of parliament. The latter arrest indicates the serious disaffection within LSSP ranks with the counter-revolutionary role of their party.

In giving critical support, it is necessary to state precisely what we criticize, and why and in what manner we give support.

Lenin, in an article on guerrilla warfare, stated the following:

"It is not guerrilla actions which disorganize the movement, but the weakness of a party which is incapable of taking such actions under its control... the party of the proletariat can never regard guerrilla warfare as the only, or even as the chief method of struggle; it means that this method must be subordinated to other methods..." (Coll. Works, Vol. XI, pps. 219-21, Lenin's emphasis)

Marx, more specifically on peasant war, stated in a letter to Engels on April 16, 1856 that:

"The whole thing in Germany will depend on the possibility of backing the proletarian revolution by some second edition of the Peasant War."

For proletarian revolutionists, the central question is always the leading role of the proletariat.

It was Trotsky, who first understood that the proletariat would take power in Russia, not by a revolution in stages, but "in permanence", in "uninterrupted" development, pro-

vided its small working class could lead the large mass of peasants. The proletariat could, however, only fulfill its leading role if it had at its head a party of the type that Lenin had fought for. In 1917, the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky, who were united on program and party, was to achieve the first and only successful proletarian revolution.

In 1932, Trotsky, in a remarkable letter, posed the possibility that the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), which, under the leadership of the Stalinist Comintern "tore itself away from its class" to lead peasant-guerrilla forces of so-called "Red Armies" in rural so-called "Soviet" regions, could do great harm to the socialist cause.

Having "appropriated to itself... the moral and political capital which should... belong to the Chinese workers", might it not direct "this capital at a certain moment against the workers", asked Trotsky? He then projected a danger that "the peasant war", even when led by so-called "Communists", and "even if fully victorious" would, "with the proletariat... on the sidelines... arrive in a blind alley", would only "pass on the power to a new bourgeois clique".

The "blind alley" of petty-bourgeois "cliques" on deformed workers' states which resulted instead, is the "socialist" goal of the JVP.

The tragedy is that the workers which the JVP rejected, and who are without a revolutionary leadership, do not oppose the revolt, but stand apart from it, thus permitting the Bandaranaike government to slaughter the students and peasants.

The JVP will, evidently, continue the armed struggle from forest and mountain, but without arms, and, it seems, with little support from the Sinhala peasants. In addition to its erroneous strategic outlook of a peasant road to socialism, its tactical approaches have also been erroneous. The JVP seems to have engaged in an adventure which is ending in death and imprisonment for thousands who might have been a mighty revolutionary factor under the leadership of a working class,

Leninist and Trotskyist party.

In the wings, stands the reactionary United National Party (UNP), which is, demagogically, using the Bandaranaike government terror against it. It hopes to use the disillusionment of the workers and peasants to come to power to launch an even sharper attack on the wages and conditions of the workers. But, the despair of the petty-bourgeoisie and the disorientation of workers can also be directed against them through a fascist regime.

As for our support, we are clearly obligated to defend revolutionists, even though misguided, against the counter-revolution, to try to defeat the repression, and to use the situation, if possible, to bring the workers into action against the ruling class.

As internationalists, we call upon the international working class to demand an end to the terror, and to the support which their capitalist rulers and the Stalinist Bonapartists are giving to the Ceylonese

counter-revolution.

In Ceylon, we call upon the workers to use their organized strength to enforce their demand for an end to the terror. We place before them our transitional program in the struggle against inflation and unemployment. We call upon the CP and LSSP "socialists" to break with the Bandaranaike-Kerensky regime, and take power. We call for a united front on a concrete program of action, and promise them "critical support" toward this goal.

We forge an alliance with the most oppressed sections of the peasantry. We fight for equal rights for the Tamils. We organize the agricultural laborers into unions.

We, in other words, build a party of the socialist revolution in the process of turning the attack by the ruling class into an attack on the rule of the capitalist class.

A Ceylonese October can occur, but only with a Leninist and Trotskyist working class vanguard party and program.

BANGLA DESH AND LENINISM

As our readers are aware, VANGUARD NEWSLETTER has prominently and often posed the need for a correct understanding of the Leninist position on the national question, as an indispensable tool for achieving the unity of the working class for the socialist revolution.

In this undertaking, we have had to conduct a two-sided struggle: against those who oppose the right of self-determination to oppressed nations and national minorities, and those who adapt to their petty-bourgeois nationalists.

The WL and SLL, in the first category, have adopted a neo-Luxemburgist position toward such peoples as the French-Canadians in Quebec, the Welsh and Scots in Great Britain and the Ibo "tribe" in Nigeria. The WL also brushes aside the question of the special oppression of the Black and Spanish-speaking peoples, to make, what we consider to be a "passive adaptation to white chauvinism".

The SWP and its co-thinkers in the U Sec abandon the working class in oppressor and oppressed nations and national minorities to adapt to the petty-bourgeois "third world"

and "anti-imperialist" nationalist and separatist movements, in the hope that a new Castro might emerge to take the masses to "socialism".

Both have failed to understand or "forget" that Lenin fought for his position, the right of nations to self-determination, i.e., to separate, in order to unite the workers of oppressor and oppressed nations.

Those socialists, who, in the name of unity, oppose this right, play directly into the hands of bourgeois nationalists of both oppressor and oppressed nations.

There is a considerable difference between socialists of oppressor nations who, in the name of unity, insist that their state's boundaries are sacrosanct, and those of an oppressed nation who also attempt to achieve this unity by mistakenly ignoring the national question.

Without Lenin's appreciation of the national question as a dialectical relationship, a descent into one or another variety of opportunism is unavoidable.

We note that, in the April 5th issue of Intercontinental Press (IP), edited by Joseph Hansen, an article by Javed Hussein, an adherent of the U Sec believes the "real tragedy" in East Bengal to have been the inability of the "left" to grasp the importance of the national question. This "Left" turns out, on further reading to be Maoist. In IP's April 26th issue, Tariq Ali also finds "the Left in East Pakistan... at a disadvantage" because of this failure of "understanding", which was also conditioned by the friendship of Mao for Ayub Khan, and prevented it from playing an active role in the independence movement.

It was for just this sort of terminology that Trotsky attacked Shachtman in In Defense of Marxism. He would have considered the allocation of the task of the proletarian party to the "Left" in general and to Stalinists in particular, to have been an unspeakable abomination.

The U Sec, on April 19th, called upon the West Pakistan working class, in the name of proletarian internationalism and in its own class interests, to give "unconditional support to the Bengal struggle for national self-determination". The IP of April 19th also carried the statement of a newly formed group of "West Pakistani socialists", one of whose signatories in Tariq Ali, giving "unconditional support" to East Bengal.

Those who consider themselves to be Leninists and Trotskyists are, of course, bound to uphold the right of national self-determination for an oppressed nation. But as a "fine sentiment", which is never implemented in daily struggle to prevent a butchery such as that occurring in East Bengal, if possible, it is of little value.

We have no knowledge as to whether or not the U Sec has sections in West Pakistan or East Bengal. The aforementioned socialists in West Pakistan seem to be based in London.

Obviously, the assignment of the task of leading the masses in East Bengal to the Maoists, the "Left", would indicate that the U Sec has few if any adherents there.

But the U Sec's formulation of the question of support to East Bengal is consistent with its position toward the Quebecois, to the Black movement in the US and to oppressed nations in general, i.e., adaptation to petty-bourgeois nationalism.

As our last issue indicated, we also "support the right of Bangla Desh to exist as an independent state, and their struggle against national oppression", but we do so "from a Marxist standpoint", which the U Sec has long abandoned.

The overwhelming victory of Sheik Mujibur Rahman's Awami League (AL), a bourgeois party, which could also talk "socialist" on occasion, is indicative of the strength of nationalist sentiment. Running on a six point program of autonomy within a federation, in which West Pakistan would continue to control the armed forces and foreign affairs, the AL won 167 of 313 seats in December's election for a National Assembly, and 98% of the provincial vote.

Now that the West Pakistan army has occupied East Bengal, and murdered hundreds of thousands of its people, with the Hindu minority as a special target, national feeling is at a fever-pitch. More than 3 million refugees at present count, 60% Hindu and 40% Moslem, have fled across the border to India, and are now with little food or shelter.

British imperialism played a large part in the creation of Pakistan in 1947, in cooperation with the Muslim League, the party of the feudal landlords and the bourgeoisie. The "communal riots", which took place at its inception, cost an estimated million lives, and forced millions of Moslems and Hindus to seek refuge on both sides of the new frontier.

From the beginning, East Pakistan was subject to the exploitation of West Pakistan, as the prospering Moslem bourgeoisie replaced its largely Hindu counterpart. Foreign exchange, half of which was brought in by the jute of East Pakistan was

used, in the main, for industrial development in the West. West Pakistan also took the lion's share of the desirable posts in the civil service and armed forces.

The religious tie--virtually the only one binding the dissimilar peoples of East and West Pakistan--began to fray under the abrasive economic-political relationship.

The calloused indifference to the fate of thousands of victims of the last tornado in East Bengal by the West Pakistan military regime, has also helped dissolve the bond.

As head of the army, Ayub Khan was able to seize power in 1958. He was able to hold it until 1969, when the worsening economic conditions caused strikes and massive demonstrations to erupt. The masses in all Pakistan, East and West, the workers, students, peasantry and petty-bourgeoisie were in motion. Ayub, forced to promise that parliament would be reinstated, instead turned over the power to army head, Yahya Khan, who declared martial law. Elections for a National Assembly, held in December 1970, were the first since 1947.

The cost of suppressing the East Bengalis is threatening to bankrupt West Pakistan in a matter of months. The US and Great Britain have agreed to bail out Yahya Khan's regime, which was in desperate financial straits long before, and which needs an immediate \$100 million and \$1 billion extra before June 1972.

China has also come to Yahya's economic rescue with an interest-free loan of \$20 million. Using Chinese support, the Bonapartist regime get leverage to pry out additional economic and military support from the imperialists. China's small arms are presently used by the Pakistani army in concert with British tanks and planes to butcher Bengalis. It has gone even beyond the imperialists in openly approving the slaughter in East Bengal in the name of "unity". Mao's "socialism in one country" thus stands exposed as a counter-revolutionary as is the Soviet style.

The exploitation of East Bengal's resources, including its labor power, the discriminatory treatment of its

people and in the allocation of development funds, enables the U Sec to pin a "neo-colonialist" label on East-West Pakistan relations.

The term, colonialism, has, hitherto, referred to relations in which an advanced capitalist country exploits and oppresses a more backward country. But West Pakistan is also a backward country. Its workers and peasants are little better off than the East Bengalis.

It serves the U Sec's purposes to vulgarize this question, so as to hide its abandonment of Lenin's and Trotsky's position on the national question. It "forgets" that Russia was a prison-house of nations, in which "inferior" nations were exploited and oppressed by Great Russian rulers.

It was just because Lenin lived in this environment that he was able to develop a revolutionary Marxist approach to the national question.

Both Lenin and Trotsky posed different obligations to the revolutionists of oppressor and oppressed nations, in the fight for the unity of the working class within a single state, a fact that the U Sec would like to ignore.

Revolutionary Marxists are now required to support the struggle of Bangla Desh for its right to exist as an independent state, not by adapting to petty-bourgeois nationalism, but in the fight to unite workers in advanced and under-developed, oppressor and oppressed nations, for the socialist revolution.

(to be continued)

NEXT ISSUE: OUR REPLY TO JOSEPH HANSEN AND THE WORKERS LEAGUE

The May 17th issue of Intercontinental Press reprinted the letter of Editor Harry Turner to Gerry Healy from the March issue of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER. It appeared without our foreword and with that of Hansen's, together with his footnotes. The "Bulletin" of May 24th responded to Hansen's reprint--it ignored our original letter--by an editorial. We will respond to both in our June issue.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors:

[A former Stalinist seaman has written a letter from which we have quoted only the following pertinent social-political points.]

I have never stopped my political activity although I refuse to belong to any organized socialist group. After some bitter experiences in four unions, the best advice that I can give to trade unionists is, "Rotate the leadership. Limit the term of office. Salaries equal to top pay in industry." This goes for Marxist organizations including those with Trotsky and Lenin in them...R. C.

* * * * *

It is clearly impossible to organize the working class for the overthrow of capitalism and special privileges without organizing the workers in a class political party with such a revolutionary socialist goal.

You evidently agree with this objective. Yet, you refuse to join an "organized socialist group". Think, comrade. Is your attitude of individualism very revolutionary?

You want a rotation of leadership in every trade union and political party, "including those with Trotsky and Lenin in them". But, how serious can you be in trying to establish such a principle, if you will not join any political party?

You ignore historical experience. Had Lenin and Trotsky not led the Bolsheviks, there would have been no October Revolution. Under your principle of leadership rotation, Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev would have led the party to defeat. There would still be capitalism in Russia.

The Bolshevik victory led to the abolition of capitalist, landlord and imperialist private property. It enabled the workers and peasants to defeat the better armed and equipped forces of their enemies.

The Bolshevik Revolution, the Great French Revolution of 1789 to 1815 and the victory of Cromwell's revolutionary army of "Independents" were achieved by revolutionists who chose not to rotate their leaders because of their vastly superior understanding and capabilities.

It was Marx's understanding that only with the higher reaches of communist society would the subordination of the individual to the division of labor be ended. But, to realize this principle, which we

share with you, requires a struggle for the program of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky. The trade union skates, on the contrary, have the same anti-working class attitude as the "irremovable" Stalinist bureaucracies in the Soviet Union, China, etc.

One word more: Comrade Trotsky, during the depression years, made as much as \$15,000 by the sale of an article to the capitalist press. Yet, he slept on a poor cot. His wife slept on a poor cot. They lived on the most inexpensive diet I have seen. As members of the guard, we slept in better beds and had somewhat better food than did Trotsky and Natalia.

This revolutionist used all his large earnings to aid the revolutionary work of Bolshevik-type Marxists all over the world. It was only after the May 1940 attack on Trotsky's bedroom that we learned of the Spartan living style of this great leader. He would never exhibit his personal sacrifices, and we only learned of them after the Stalinist assassins put ten bullets into his bed, in the first, unsuccessful, effort to murder him.

Comrade, you are addressing your correct demand for working class living standards to the wrong people when you address them to the Marxists. Unfortunately, you only know labor skate and American Communist Party Browder-type "leaders".

Harold Robins, for the Editors

STATE AND REVOLUTION IN LATIN AMERICA - Part V

The Weakest Link In the Chain?

Trotsky, as Lenin once said of Engels, was a writer, "whose every sentence contains a remarkably profound content..."

He would often develop the argument of a critic to its logical conclusion. What then appeared to have only logical significance is today providing Marxists with extremely important lessons.

Craipeau, then a member of the French Trotskyist movement, had thrown a part of Trotsky's words from The Revolution Betrayed back at him, "All the means of production belong to the State, and the State belongs in some respect, to the bureaucracy", to further his thesis that the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union is a collective ruling class.

In answer, Trotsky posed the "logical argument" that the fascist bureaucracy also disciplines and restricts its capitalists, and that if it could continue the process "without effective resistance" from them, this bureaucracy could also "gradually transform itself into a new ruling 'class'" quite like the Soviet variety.

Trotsky did not, of course, intend his "logical argument" to be taken for an "historical prognosis".

Both the fascist and Stalinist bureaucracies defend the property foundations on which they rest: the former on capitalist, the latter on collective property. Any attempt at transforming one into the other would inevitably meet with "resistance" from the ruling class.

The fascist bureaucracy of an advanced country does not attempt to transform itself into a Stalinist-type of "ruling 'class'". Instead, this "inconvenient hireling" sometimes "tears...the juiciest pieces" from the mouth of his employer, i.e., enters the "business".

However, the struggles within the ruling Stalinist bureaucracies, are in part that of a "center" to maintain its base of power, the collectivized property foundations, against the threat from the right wing.

It is always on guard against the left, "Trotskyist", threat that the working class might "discharge" its unreliable and dishonest "watchman" who defends the "dictatorship of the proletariat" by methods which prepare its destruction.

The Cuban revolution clarified the process by which "deformed workers' states" were able to arise, for those able to integrate Marxist theory and past practice with today's reality. Pragmatists, in the name of Marxism, discard its method along with its lessons to achieve a quick "return". Some "defenders" of Marxism, unable to understand a new development, seek a convenient mechanism which will place it in a familiar relationship.

A bad theory can only misdirect practice. The Workers League (WL) and Socialist Labour League (SLL) could only understand the deformed workers' states as products of "structural assimilation", in which part of the original "good" of the October Revolution--nationalized means of production and planning--was mechanically transferred via the Stalinist apparatus. On this basis, of course, Cuba had to remain "capitalist", no matter how indistinguishable it became from the other deformed workers' states.

At the time of the Escalante affair in Cuba, the WL and SLL gave critical support to the Stalinist wing of the bureaucracy as a working class tendency, against the "petty-bourgeois" Castro.

The struggle, however, was between a wing which wished to place Cuba under more direct Soviet control, and Castro's wing which wished to take a more independent Cuban "road to socialism".

As we have also pointed out, the WL and SLL, in the name of Trotskyism, have given a similar critical support to Mao's "Cultural Revolution", again to one wing of the

ruling Bonapartist caste against the other, in a manner reminiscent of the Pabloism which they frequently attack. In both China and Cuba, Trotskyists were required to make clear the nature of the struggle within the Bonapartist bureaucracy, and--in the absence of capitalist intervention--call upon the workers to overthrow both, not to give critical support to either right or center. This was Trotsky's position toward the Soviet bureaucracy.

In all deformed workers' states in Cuba as in Eastern Europe and China, the transformation of a bourgeois state with a weak, a shrunken and/or dispersed bourgeoisie into "bourgeois states without the bourgeoisie" was achieved by bureaucratic means.

As we have noted, in the latter countries, the Stalinists took over as caretakers for the bourgeois state machinery in a bloc with the "progressive" and "national" bourgeoisie. With the onset of the "Cold War" and the Korean War, quantity was transformed into quality. The Bonapartists had prevented the masses from seizing the means of production in the first period, save "in some respect", only later to direct their take-over in all essential respects.

The Bonapartist regime of Castro, which achieved power as a "progressive" bourgeois regime with the overthrow of Batista, also ordered the "nationalization of US and domestic capitalist holdings"--with, of course, the enthusiastic support of the masses--thereby becoming "indistinguishable from those in Eastern Europe, China and the Soviet Union".

In all these countries, as the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste (OCI) has stated was the case in Cuba, "...shoddy, decomposed and unreal bourgeois states(s)" came into being; in Eastern Europe and China, during and in the aftermath of the 2nd World War; in Cuba, in struggle against the Batista regime.

As we have also previously noted, Bonapartism is always a regime of crisis, in which, as Engels has said, an "ostensible mediator" steps forward to preserve order between

the warring classes on the basis of the existing property relations. Now, as we have seen, Bonapartism on capitalist property was able to become Bonapartism on collective property. This transformation, however, could only occur in under-developed countries, where, as Trotsky has pointed out:

"...the pressure of foreign imperialism so alters and distorts the economic and political structure ...that the national bourgeoisie ...only partly reaches the height of a ruling class." (Writings of Leon Trotsky [1937-38] p. 94)

Although world capitalism has expanded since the 2nd World War, the growth of the productive forces in under-developed capitalist countries has been minimal.

The degenerated and deformed workers' states in the Soviet Union and China, and the Stalinist parties throughout the world disorientate the international working class--not least in under-developed countries--while also providing the Bonapartists with a point of support against imperialism. Both factors, press the Bonapartists in the under-developed sectors toward a Castro-type of "solution". Only in this direction, under present conditions, can they hope to acquire the investment capital with which to construct a modern industry, while at the same time, maintaining their power and privileges.

Faced with increasingly insoluble and intolerable contradictions, other Bonapartists on capitalist property in the under-developed sectors may also decide to crush the resistance of their dwarfed bourgeoisie, maneuver with the proletariat against imperialism with Stalinist support, on new property foundations. Thus, they can hope to unleash the productive forces while also forestalling a working class revolution, to trade a base of power under siege for another which seems more secure.

But the Castro-type of "solution" only became possible in the post-war period. While American capital-

ism emerged from the blood-bath with a greatly enhanced productive capacity, able to place Europe on Marshall plan rations, world capitalism had been greatly weakened. It was able to retain control of its "property" in the colonial, semi-colonial and advanced countries only with the help of Stalin and his counter-revolutionary parties in disorientating the international working class. It "lost" Eastern Europe and China, in spite of Stalin's "peaceful co-existence" intentions. It "lost" Cuba because the imperialist contradictions continued to sharpen even under conditions of capitalist expansion.

The period of world capitalist expansion is over. A new decline has again begun which must also exacerbate inter-imperialist rivalries as well as the irreconcilable contradictions between the capitalist and non-capitalist nations.

In the Soviet bloc, contradictions between the bureaucracy and the masses sharpen as the economy grows and becomes more complex. The bureaucracy attempts to solve them by moving in the direction of capitalism, with Liberman plant-profitability schemes.

At the same time, these states continue to exist on collectivized foundations. Soviet Bonapartism defends its "socialism in one country" by providing all types of Bonapartism, Egyptian, Peruvian, Chilean and Cuban, with support against imperialism--and also their masses.

Without the victory of the working class in the advanced countries, the contradiction between imperialism and the workers' states--held in check, not only by the "balance of terror", but also by "prosperity"--must become foremost, and can only end in a nuclear holocaust.

But the working class in all countries is moving into struggle against, not only its capitalist rulers, but also against the parasitic bureaucratic castes in the workers' states.

The victory of the workers in the advanced capitalist countries or in the Soviet Union will end Bonapartist balancing acts everywhere.

The masses in Africa, Asia and Latin America are not idly waiting for that eventuality. The validity of the theory of the Permanent Revolution is again being demonstrated as they move against ruling classes and Bonapartist surrogates.

In Latin America, the Lanusses, Peróns, Tórres, Velascos and Allendes will not prevail against a working class armed with a Marxist, a Leninist and Trotskyist leadership which can march at the head of the peasant masses.

The world capitalist chain may again snap at its weakest link. The law of uneven and combined development may yet assert itself in Latin America as in Russia, as a proletarian revolution in a relatively backward country. Such a revolution, under present conditions, would not remain isolated. Not only would it ignite the socialist revolution in all of Latin America, but its flames would immediately spread to advanced and under-developed countries in all continents.

It would, at the same time, spur a political revolution in the workers' states. In Cuba as well, the workers are in motion against their bureaucrats. The imprisonment of Cuba's leading poet, Heberto Padilla --subsequently released--on charges of "counter-revolutionary activities", testifies to the ferment also taking place among the Cuban masses which threatens to sweep away Castro's Bonapartist clique.

The crisis of world capitalism, which is now manifesting itself with especial sharpness in Latin America presents the revolutionary socialists there with an exceptional opportunity to open the road for the international socialist revolution.

The neo-Menshevik Stalinists and Social-Democrats, the neo-Narodnik Castroists and Maoists, the neo-Pilsudskyists, all, threaten to disarm the Latin American working class.

The revolutionary socialists will be able to win the leadership of the Latin American masses only by conducting an irreconcilable struggle against these anti-working class reformist and revisionist tendencies.