

VANGUARD newsletter

Published monthly by independent revolutionary socialists
Editors—Harry Turner, David Fender, Ed di Tullio
P. O. Box 67, Peck Slip Station, New York, N. Y. 10038

82

Vol. 4, No. 5 Price 10¢ (\$1.00 per year) Labor donated June 1972

A Rank and File Labor Program to End the War

Wallace, McGovern and the Workers League

Lenin on Imperialism

An SWP Opposition on International Questions



Contents: A Rank and File Program to End the War p. 70

Wallace, McGovern and the Workers League 73

Fundamentals of Capitalist Crisis - Part IV
 --Lenin's Imperialism, the Highest Stage
 of Capitalism 76

An SWP Opposition on International Questions
 --"The International Situation: An Initial
 Assessment" 80

LOCAL DIRECTORY

Berkeley-Oakland: PO Box 5261,
 Oakland, Calif. 94605

Boston: David Fender, tel. 354-3751

New York: PO Box 67, Peck Slip
 Station, New York, NY 10038

St. Louis: PO Box 22134, St. Louis,
 Mo. 63116

OUR NEXT ISSUE

Our July/August double issue will continue with part IV of the series on the Spartacist League. It will also carry our rejoinder to the reply by "Masas" to our "Open Letter to 'Masas'," both of which appeared in its June issue. "Masas" is the organ of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (POR) of Bolivia headed by Guillermo Lora.

A RANK AND FILE PROGRAM TO END THE WAR

There must be no illusions among revolutionary socialists about the nature of either the "Labor for Peace" conference in St. Louis on June 23rd and 24th or the "Emergency Election Conference" in Chicago on July 1st and 2nd. Neither have been organized in the interests of either the American workers or the Indo-chinese masses.

Despite the soothsayers of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), the Workers League (WL) and other social-opportunists, the labor bureaucracy has not been "forced" to the "left" by the growing opposition of the American working class to the Indo-chinese war and/or to the direct attacks of the ruling class on its organizations and living standards.

A section of the labor bureaucracy is instead responding to the "soft" wing of the American ruling class now coalescing around presidential candidate George McGovern. With the eager assistance of the Communist Party (CP), it hopes to tie the American workers to the domestic and international policies of the "soft" wing and to its pending "deal" with

international Stalinism. The global status-quo is to be guaranteed and, with it, the sell-out of a quarter-century of struggle by the workers and peasants of South Vietnam and all of Indochina to overthrow landlord and capitalist rule.

Nixon, representing the "hard" wing of American imperialism, also seeks a "deal" with international Stalinism, as his trips to China and the Soviet Union demonstrate. However, he wants firmer guarantees in the shape of puppet regimes under the direct control of US imperialism.

It is with the intention of winning working class militants to its perspective of a national network of rank-and-file caucuses on a united front program of struggle directed against all sections of the ruling class and its "labor lieutenants" and for an end to the war which is in the immediate and fundamental interests of the American workers and Indo-chinese masses that the Committee for Rank and File Caucuses is intervening at the conferences in St. Louis and Chicago with the following leaflet.7

A Rank and File Program to End the War

We of the Committee for Rank and File Caucuses propose that the "Labor for Peace" conference at St. Louis and the Emergency Election Conference of the Committee of Trade Unions for Action and Democracy at Chicago adopt the following four-point motion to:

- 1) Condemn any labor union or labor leader endorsing a candidate of any of the pro-capitalist war parties.
- 2) Condemn any labor leader who is sitting, has sat or who has in any way offered to cooperate with the bosses government's payboards and to refuse to cooperate with any such board that is set up in the future by any wing of the capitalist establishment.
- 3) Call for the building of an independent workers' party based on the rank-and-file in all shops and for the organization of the unorganized to build the labor movement and a political party of the workers.
- 4) Build for a general strike of labor by organizing strike committees in the shops to stop all production and services until the war against the Indochinese workers and peasants is ended in the interest of the American workers and Indochinese workers and peasants.

The war in Southeast Asia and the attacks presently confronting the workers across the country--high unemployment, speed-up, and wage controls--are aspects of the same struggle. Big business intends to secure its imperialist power, privileges and profits at home and abroad. The American ruling class hopes to improve its international competitive position by pushing the American workers harder, by making them produce more at lower wages and with fewer workers. Hence we see the Wage Board effectively cutting negotiated wage increases while the Price Commission is nothing but a facade. At the same time workers have been laid off in steel and auto and speed-ups like those imposed in General Motors plants are becoming increasingly commonplace.

Nixon's escalation of the war in Indochina in recent months through both intensified bombing of North and South Vietnam and mining of North Vietnamese harbors demands a strong response from labor. But as these conferences convene to consider the question, one point should be clear: the strategy of the past has failed miserably. Whether it was demonstrations, petition campaigns, or pseudo-"peace" candidates in the Democratic or Republican parties, the result has been virtually the same--the war continues. Nixon was largely elected in '68 out of disenchantment with Johnson's handling of the war. Johnson was himself elected in '64 out of fear that Goldwater would escalate the war. And, Nixon mined North Vietnamese harbors less than two weeks after a massive turnout of tens of thousands in a downpour at a New York anti-war demonstration.

BUILD FOR A GENERAL STRIKE

Just as the war runs against the basic interests of American workers--and our brothers and sisters, the workers and peasants of Indochina--so it is clear that it is only labor that really holds the power that can bring the imperialist conflagration to a halt. Because of the central role we play in the production and distribution of goods and services, it is we who really make society run. And, properly organized, we can bring the same society to a dead stop. That is precisely what is called for if we are serious about ending the war. No more pleading, cajoling, or begging. Rather, the organization of the prerequisite economic, industrial force to compel the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the American military presence (sea and air forces included) from Southeast Asia.

But even a general strike can only be the first step in an offensive against the attacks of big business. It will also take a concerted political movement to reverse the anti-worker policies of the Republican Nixon and the Democratic "friends of labor." That Nixon is anti-labor is obvious to anyone at these conferences. But the Democrats are equally guilty. Look at the record. Remember, while it was Nixon who actually initiated the wage controls last August, it was the Democrats who handed him the enabling legislation in the form of the Economic Stabilization Act. "Liberal" George McGovern, currently the front runner for the Democratic nomination, has demonstrated his anti-labor stance by the positions he has taken in the Senate. He supported the Economic Stabilization Act, did not oppose price and wage controls, blocked with Southern conservatives in upholding a filibuster against repeal of the "Right to Work" section of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1966, and voted on two consecutive occasions in 1967 to establish periods during which railway workers were prohibited from striking. Most recently, he voted for a bill that compelled striking West Coast longshoremen to return to work and submit their bargaining demands to binding arbitration. McGovern's so-called "new politics" is really nothing more than the old anti-labor programs of the twin parties of corporate interest.

WORKERS' PARTY BASED ON THE RANK AND FILE

What is needed politically is not more of the old formulas but something quite different--not support once again to the Democrats but an independent workers' party, based on and standing for the interest of the rank and file. The Committee for Rank and File Caucuses is organized to promote the formation of rank-and-file committees in the unions united into an industrial, regional and national network committed to the independence of the unions from the state, to drive the labor misleaders collaborating with the bosses on the Pay Board and elsewhere out of the trade unions and for an independent workers' party based on the rank-and-file against the political parties of big business.

RANK AND FILE CAUCUS NETWORK

Building a general strike and a workers' party will not come easily. It will certainly take more than mere formal motions passed at labor conferences. It will take extensive rank-and-file organizing efforts which will meet with the opposition of labor functionaries and bureaucrats--such as the sponsors of the St. Louis gathering--the Mazeys, Woodcocks, Gibbons, and Gotbaums. Only rank-and-file caucuses will enable us to tackle the bureaucratic obstacles in our path. Such caucuses must be constructed not only in every union throughout the country but must also be integrally linked with one another. As these caucuses challenge the careerists with their privileged interests and as the ranks struggle for control of their unions, a functional base will be established from which effective national strike action can be launched and a workers' party can be constructed which not only breaks with the capitalist parties but with the dead-end politics of capital's labor lieutenants.

Committee for Rank and File Caucuses, G.P.O. Box 303, New York, N.Y. 10001
.....

I want to hear more about the Committee for Rank and File Caucuses

NAME.....
STREET.....
CITY.....STATE.....ZIP CODE.....
JOB.....UNION.....

labor donated

WALLACE, McGOVERN AND THE WORKERS LEAGUE by Jim Hays

Readers of the Workers League's (WL) "Bulletin" cannot be blamed if they are confused by the increasingly rapid zig-zag line propounded in that centrist organization's publication in recent months.

Wallace was called a fascist during the Florida primary; a week later, Wohlforth attacked the Labor Committee for holding the same position. An hysterical "anti-fascism" campaign was waged against the Jewish Defense League in alliance with Paul Masas at Brooklyn College; then the "Young Socialist" announced that the JDL wasn't really fascist after all and that Masas was a petty-bourgeois reactionary nationalist. For years the Social Service Employees Union bureaucrat Stanley Hill was called a sellout Stalinist, only to receive the endorsement of the WL members in that union during the recent election campaign. The McGovern vote in the March New Hampshire primary was seen as reflecting the discontent of the workers with the Democratic Party, but it was not until May that we learned that McGovern was backed by big business and has an anti-labor record. At the base of these radical swings are the methods of impressionism and pragmatism which reflect the pressure of the labor bureaucracy and middle-class public opinion on the WL and its co-thinkers in the so-called International Committee of the Fourth International (IC).

A revealing component of the IC's adaptation to the labor bureaucracy is its use of third period Stalinist rhetoric to cover up a Pabloite orientation to the Social Democratic parties. The May 9th "Youth Bulletin" of the Irish Young Socialists states categorically:

"Revolution and counter-revolution are immediate alternatives facing workers in Britain."

It then poses the question:

"If compromise is over, therefore, what are the British workers to do?"

Its answer reflects the whole IC's attitude toward Social Democracy:

"...put a Labour government in power which will be pledged to restore full working class rights..."

Trotsky, in answering the German Stalinist Thaelmann in 1928, could well have been addressing the IC's general secretary Gerry Healy today:

"The radicalization is passing through its first phase, still directing the masses into the social democratic channels. In February, Thaelmann refused to see this; he insisted: 'The situation is becoming more and more revolutionary.' In such a general form, this statement is only a hollow phrase. Can one say that 'the situation is becoming more and more ? revolutionary' if the social democracy, the main prop of the bourgeois regime, is growing?" (The Third International After Lenin, p. 260)

Thus the IC starts with the ultra-left position that since August 15, 1971, we are in "a period in which the basis for compromise solutions has been destroyed." ("The International," May/June, 1972, p. 15) From here it proceeds to the Pabloite theory that the labor bureaucracy can be moved to the left by pressure from groups like the Socialist Labour League (SLL) and used in the making of a socialist revolution. What other interpretation can be given to Cliff Slaughter's statement in the April 18 "Workers Press" that:

"The Socialist Labour League poses, in every working-class struggle, the question of political power, which must go through the road of a Labour government, forced by

the working class into socialist policies." (JH emphasis)

Lenin saw the communist revolution in England coming about through the creation of British Soviets. The Labour Party would be supported by revolutionary Marxists, in Lenin's words, "in the same way as a rope supports a hanged man," i.e., in order to expose it, disperse Parliament and establish a government of workers councils.

Lenin clearly called for the overthrow of a future Labour Party government when he said:

"...we must bring nearer the moment when, on the basis of the disappointment of most of the workers in the Hendersons, it will be possible, with serious chances of success, to overthrow the government of the Hendersons at once..."
(Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 85-86)

However, the SLL even rejects attacks on the Harold Wilson leadership of the Labour Party, preferring to bloc with him against the right-wing MP Jenkins. (April 17, "Workers Press") The present manifestation of the SLL's opportunist policies is their attempt to form uncritical blocs with a section of the labor bureaucracy at this stage. It is this lack of criticism which makes possible the bloc in the first place and which they presume will offer them the possibility of organizing the working class for the "proletarian" dictatorship at a later stage.

How is this revisionist line reflected in the WL in the USA? First, the WL greatly exaggerates the imminence of the capitalist crisis at this conjuncture and, therefore, declares Wallace to be a fascist. Even after the SLL attacked this absurdity at the IC Conference in April, the May 29 "Bulletin" adopted the formula that Wallace is "one of the greatest dangers ever faced by the American working class" and that fascism forms on the "wings of his movement." While Wallace represents a more open move toward Bonapartism by a

very reactionary section of the bourgeoisie, he is by no means a fascist. The developing world capitalist crisis places the Bonapartist "solution" more and more on the order of the day not only in the underdeveloped but advanced countries as well. But the crisis of capitalism has not yet matured into a revolutionary situation, i.e., to the point where the capitalists see fascism as the only possibility of repressing the working class. While more reactionary than his counterparts, nevertheless, like them, Wallace remains well within the spectrum of bourgeois-democratic rule.

The WL's concentration of the main attack on Wallace objectively provides a left cover for the CP's backhanded support to McGovern. The "Daily Worker" said in 1936:

"The CP declares without qualification that the Landon-Hearst-Wall Street ticket is the chief enemy of the American people. Its victory would carry our country a long way on the road to fascism and war." (Howe, Irving; The American Communist Party, p. 330)

In The American Communist Party; a critical history, (p. 328) Howe and Coser describe the new Stalinist line of 1936:

"Still a bit inexperienced and uneasy with their new line, the Communists worked out a curious strategy of not formally supporting Roosevelt but directing their main attack upon the Republican candidate, Landon; which meant, in effect, to steer voters toward Roosevelt."

Just as the WL still talks of a labor party today, the Stalinists gave lip service to a "farmer-labor slate" in early 1936. They cheered Francis Gorman, textile union bureaucrat, when he came out in favor of a labor party similar to the way the "Bulletin" went wild over Paul Schrade's mutterings about a labor party last October only to gloat over his defeat by another bureau-

crat six months later.

The CP continued its 1936 practice in 1964 when it declared Goldwater to be a "Fascist warmonger" in order to support LBJ. Today it can hardly contain its naked support for McGovern despite the left cover of the Hall-Tyner Communist Party ticket. In their enthusiasm for McGovern, the Stalinists attack the revisionist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) for even its half-baked exposure of McGovern. According to the Young Workers Liberation League leader Roque Ristorucce, the

"SWP only helps Wallace and Nixon by its policies of placing the main attack against liberal candidates like Abzug, Dellums, Chisholm and McGovern in an attempt to narrow the people's choice to themselves and Wallace.

"They put out a truth kit on McGovern, whom they see only as an obstacle, but not on Wallace," he noted." (Daily World, June 3, 1972)

The CP is trying to raise the old slanders about Trotskyists being agents of reaction and fascism. What the CP is really complaining about is that the SWP does not offer its backhanded support to McGovern by concentrating its attacks on Wallace the way the WL does. The WL does not--unlike the CP--support any of the capitalist candidates, but it does sow illusions and disorients its readers by concentrating on Wallace. It does the same when the "Bulletin" describes Humphrey's victory in the West Virginia primary as a "repudiation of Wallace by the working class." (May 15) Not without reason did Trotsky declare:

"The very call of Hitler to power emanates from the Hohenzollern field marshall /Hindenburg/ who had been elected by the votes of Social Democratic workers!" (The Struggle Against Fascism in Germany, p. 342)

Hindenburg's election as Weimar Republic president was, according to the SPD, a "repudiation of Hitler."

The Wohlforthites, of course, "call for a labor party against all the capitalist candidates!" But what kind of labor party are they really fighting for? At a recent rank-and-file auto workers meeting in St. Louis, a leader of the WL attacked Nat Mosley of the UAW Local 25 for not calling on Woodcock to form a labor party in a leaflet prepared for the June 23 "Labor for Peace" conference. When Mosley replied that "under no circumstances do we want that...to be a leader of a labor party." The WL leader shouted, "This is not the period of time when a labor party could be bought off." Later, Mosley applauded when VANGUARD NEWSLETTER described the "Labor for Peace" conference as "a farce." But according to the WL this was "sectarian" since the labor leaders were preparing to break with the Democratic Party by not inviting (up to now) a bourgeois presidential candidate to speak at the coming conference. That the WL conceives of the labor party as a reformist party--in spite of any formal objections to the contrary--is convincingly captured in the enthusiasm of "Bulletin" labor editor, Dan Fried's for:

"Woodcock's remark that maybe the US labor movement should consider the Canadian political setup."

From the above it is clear that the WL increasingly depends on a section of the labor bureaucracy even to the point of expressing a certain confidence in some of the labor fakers. The WL can only see a labor party being formed by Woodcock or somebody similar. It should be clear that the bureaucrats would only form or participate in a labor party to distract the workers from the revolutionary road.

The WL concentrates its main fire on Wallace when the important task for revolutionists is to destroy the workers' illusions in any and all candidates of the capitalist class by exposing their relationship to the different sectors of the bourgeoisie. McGovern's victory in California was possible

only through the financing of big business. It seems the majority of the ruling class in the US has decided to try to deal with the developing crisis of capitalism with cosmetic adjustments in tax reforms, welfare programs, and "pacifist" policies while tying the labor unions to the state and making no meaningful concessions to the workers whatsoever. McGovern began his political career as a backer of New Dealer Henry Wallace in 1948. But every worker should know that his labor record is as bad as that of George Wallace.

The big bourgeoisie in the US is out to "discipline" the trade unions, but it does not yet need fascism to maintain its rule. First, the capi-

talists will attempt to divert the new militancy of the working class with the likes of a liberal like McGovern, Humphrey, etc. The liberals' inability to deal with the deepening of the crisis will ultimately lead to a Wallace or a real fascist threat in the absence of the independent organization of the working class under the leadership of a revolutionary party.

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER calls upon workers to fight for rank-and-file caucuses in the unions to be the basis for the independent organization of the working class, and the organization of a workers' party led by a revolutionary vanguard party to struggle for workers' power.

FUNDAMENTALS OF CAPITALIST CRISES - Part IV

Lenin's Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism

In defending the Marxian prognosis of the "catastrophic collapse of capitalism" against the "alternative prognosis" of its "gradual reformation," Trotsky, in his essay, "Marxism In Our Time," also required that it be "amended by partly correcting it and making it more precise..."

The prognoses of the founders of and later contributors to the theory and practice of "scientific socialism" were based upon the dialectical appreciation of social development as the dynamic interaction of its antagonistic parts. "Accidents," said Marx in a letter to Kugelmann, April 17, 1871, "including the 'accident' of the character of the people who first head the movement" and on which "acceleration and delay are very much dependent" are part of the general course of development."

Thus Engels, Lenin and Trotsky continually emphasized that the laws of motion governing capitalist society which Marx had uncovered had to be understood in their concrete manifestation in time and place.

As his preface to the French and German editions of Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism indicates, Lenin, in 1916, utilized the data and, in part, the analysis of the liberal Hobson, the conservative Social Democrat Hilferding, "irrefutable bourgeois statistics" and "admissions of bourgeois schol-

ars" to present,

"a composite picture of the world capitalist system in its international relationships at the beginning of the twentieth century--on the eve of the first imperialist war."

The analysis and synthesis of this material, of capitalism in its further development since Marx's Capital was written--with the method of and on the foundations which Marx had erected--enabled Lenin to conclude that, with the 20th century and as a continuation of its "fundamental characteristics," capitalism had reached a new and higher, a special stage, imperialism. "Free competitive capitalism" had been transformed into its opposite, monopoly capitalism. Monopoly existed "above...and alongside" free competition, giving rise to new "antagonistic frictions and conflicts."

Lenin included five basic features in his definition of imperialism limited to "purely economic concepts"

while stressing the,

"conditional and relative value of all definitions in general, which can never embrace all the concatenations of a phenomenon in its full development..."

These are:

- "1) the concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life;
- "2) the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this 'finance capital', of a financial oligarchy;
- "3) the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance;
- "4) the formation of international monopolist capitalist associations which share the world among themselves;
- "5) the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed."

On the basis of this "composite picture," Lenin was able to demonstrate that the first World War was imperialist on both sides, i.e., to determine whether the "British or German group of financial plunderers is to receive the most booty," and that capitalism had become,

"a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries."

Lenin had also appended the Basle Manifesto of 1912 to the 1920 edition of his pamphlet in which the parties of the Second International had pledged to oppose the very war which was to break out two years later and to raise against it the banner of the socialist revolution. In supporting the war of their respective ruling classes, the major parties of the Second International had demonstrated their

bankruptcy and made the construction of a new international party of revolutionary socialism necessary.

The international centrist tendency headed by Karl Kautsky, the predominant authority of the Second International, had adopted a pacifist position during the war and then reunited with the extreme opportunists in reviving the Second International and in taking part in bourgeois governments. Lenin, in this pamphlet, was also concerned to disclose the opportunist essence of Kautskyism and other varieties of opportunism in the working class movement as resting on the economic foundations of imperialist superprofits, a portion of which is utilized to bribe a section of the working class and to erect a labor aristocracy "led by men bought by, or at least paid by, the bourgeoisie."

On the question of opportunism as well, Lenin was guided by the founders of scientific socialism and refers to the correspondence from Engels to Marx and Kautsky.

Kautsky defined imperialism as a policy of "highly developed industrial capitalism...striving to annex...agrarian territory..." which "we can and should fight." The "urge" of capitalism to expand could best be "promoted" by a policy of "peaceful democracy" and not by the "violent methods of imperialism." Kautsky then logically projected the possibility of a new phase for world capitalism of "ultra-imperialism," a "union of the imperialisms of the whole world" for its "joint exploitation," thereby ensuring "world peace."

As Lenin points out, Kautsky's economic definition which leads to the political conclusion that monopoly capitalism is compatible with "non-monopolistic, non-violent, non-annexationist methods" and its corollary, "ultra-imperialism," are nothing but bourgeois reformism and pacifism disguised as Marxism. And so also is every struggle against "imperialism" as a policy abstracted from the struggle against imperialism as monopoly capitalism, as is presently the case with "socialist" and other Bonapartists of the "third

world,"the present-day Kautskyists of the international Stalinist movement and the more recent "Trotskyist" recruit to Kautskyism.

"Imperialism," said Lenin, "is the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat." It is the task of the "labor lieutenants of the bourgeoisie" to help their masters forestall it. The "fight against imperialism," therefore, must be "inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism," if it is not to be a sham and a humbug."

As though aimed specifically at the de facto "popular front" bloc of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), the Communist Party (CP) and the liberals on the Indochinese war, Lenin criticized the "anti-imperialists," the last of the Mohicans of bourgeois democracy," who also opposed the US imperialist war with Spain in 1898 as "'criminal'," as in "violation of the Constitution," as "despotic," for shrinking from the recognition of the connection between imperialism and capitalism. He attacked Kautskyism for "merging in practice" with the "petty-bourgeois reformist opposition" which arises in opposition to certain "specific political features of imperialism" and which is "really reactionary in its economic basis."

Kautsky's "reformist swindle," the perspective that, in the "epoch of finance capital," the mere operation of economic factors could achieve a "'reactionary ideal,' 'peaceful democracy,'" and his "lifeless abstractions of 'ultra-imperialism'," have at their core the idea that "unevenness and contradictions in the world economy" will be lessened with the rule of finance capital, whereas they are increased.

The later arrivals at the imperialist stage of capitalism, (Germany and the United States) leap ahead of the earlier (Great Britain) in the development of the productive forces, in adopting the latest technique and organization in production and in its military concomitant as well. The relationship of forces among the imperialist powers changes. But colonial territory and spheres of influence for

the super-profitable investment of capital and for securing essential raw materials are already apportioned among the imperialist powers and their international cartels on the basis of the earlier relationship of forces. The national state is called upon to resolve the sharpening contradiction. Under capitalism, no other means than war is available for a more "equitable" division, as the first World War was at that time demonstrating.

The parasitic nature of monopoly capitalism, of finance capital, is also obscured by Kautsky. The export of capital takes on such importance in the "advanced" countries, because capitalism there has become "'overripe'." Capital, states Lenin, "cannot find a field for 'profitable' investment" in the home market as a result of the "backward state of agriculture and the poverty of the masses." The separation of "money capital" from "industrial and productive capital" with the development of the banking system produces the rentier, the "coupon-clipper," who lives solely on the income from money capital. This separation is also an aspect of the transformation of "scattered capitalists" into a "collective capitalist" (the increasing socialization of production) and the rise of finance capital. The reintegration of the now dominant banking with industrial capital on a higher level produces a financial oligarchy which, moreover, increasingly calls upon the capitalist state to intervene in its behalf.

Monopoly capitalism has a "tendency to stagnation and decay" which, "in some countries, for certain periods of time gains the upper hand." Competition spurs the capitalist to technological improvements to lower the unit cost of production of commodities. With monopoly, however, monopoly price comes into being, if only "temporarily" (monopoly does not completely or for long "eliminate competition in the world market") and with it, the "motive cause of technical and, consequently, of all other progress," to some extent, "disappears." The deliberate retardation of technical progress

becomes economically feasible.

Monopoly capitalism's parasitism is clearly visible in its relation to the colonies and in its monopoly control of the world market. In the "creditor" country, the "relative importance of income from interest...dividends...and speculation" increases. The export of capital enables the imperialist country to exploit "the labor of several overseas countries and colonies," transforms it into a "'rentier state'...or userer state", enables it to bribe "the upper strata of the proletariat" with the crumbs of this income and thus prolong the life of world capitalism. Countries such as Sweden or Switzerland without colonies also maintain a labor aristocracy from the profits of imperialist investment.

Lenin carefully notes the tendency of imperialism to "create privileged sections" among the workers. In the US, for example, the immigrants from more backward countries [and Blacks] are engaged in the "most poorly-paid jobs, while American workers provide the highest percentage of overseers or of the better-paid workers." With imperialism, national oppression is intensified and, along with it, "increasing resistance."

The "tendency to decay," said Lenin, does not, however, preclude "the rapid growth of capitalism."

"On the whole, capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before; but this growth is not only becoming more and more uneven in general, its unevenness also manifests itself, in particular, in the decay of the countries which are richest in capital (Britain)."

We have already taken note of the scrupulously scientific approach of Lenin in developing his "composite picture" which takes into account all of the fundamental features of the new parasitic and decaying stage of capitalism as it emerged at the beginning of the 20th century, and of the resulting growth of opportunism in the working class movement.

As we have shown, Lenin clearly

recognized--as a Marxist he could not do otherwise--that capitalism in the epoch of imperialist decay would also continue to develop on the basis of its inner tendencies until the international socialist revolution put an end to it. His definition allowed for further development and, therefore, for alterations in the specifics of his "composite picture." It should be noted in this connection that the struggle for colonies was only one feature of Lenin's comprehensive definition and not the entirety or preponderancy which those eager to proclaim its obsolescence have tried to make it. As Lenin pointed out, colonial appetites also existed in earlier stages of capitalism although with differing purposes.

In the advanced countries, and especially in the US, "the backward state of agriculture" is no longer the barrier it was to "profitable" investment of capital in the home market, although the "poverty of the masses," the fundamental contradiction between the social nature of production and the capitalist nature of appropriation, remains, in the final analysis, the essential barrier to capital investment.

Lenin specifically states that his definition of imperialism was limited to the "basic, purely economic concepts," the "main points." As we have also stated, he was concerned, first of all, to make clear the imperialist essence of the first World War and the essence of opportunism in the working class movement. He does not, for example, discuss the effect of the super-profitable export of capital on the tendency of the rate of profit to fall in the imperialist epoch.

Using as our model Lenin's firm adherence to the dialectical materialist method and to the earlier contributions of the creative Marxists in determining that the new qualities in capitalism place it in a distinctly new imperialist stage, we shall compare Ernest Mandel's theoretical postulate, "Neo-capitalism," i.e., a new stage of capitalism in the post-World War II period.

(to be continued)

AN SWP OPPOSITION ON INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONS

Below is one of the discussion documents of the Communist Tendency written in its struggle inside the

SWP. Readers of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER will note a different interpretation of the Chinese Cultural Revolution.

Due to the pressure of time, we were unable to include in our counter-resolution an analysis of the burning questions now being debated in the international arena.

Despite this, we feel that our position on these questions could be easily inferred by a careful reading and thorough understanding of our diagnosis of the International and of the party. We are, nevertheless, not satisfied with merely implying the line we feel to be correct. In order to present clearly our positions we are submitting this document. Due to the lateness of its publication, we are introducing it only as a contribution to the discussion. Nonetheless, it should be clearly understood that the analysis presented here is the logical conclusion of the line of the counterresolution, and is not simply a possible interpretation.

In the title of this document there is one key word--"initial." It is our belief that internationalism, like charity, begins at home but does not end there. Our movement is a world movement and the pre-World Congress international discussion is now open. We hope to be able to present to the cadres of world Trotskyism a correct political alternative to the Tweedledum-Tweedledee choices now before them. We have no faith in either the "orthodox" SWP or in the unregenerate leaders of the old guard "Pabloites." Despite all the bitter rhetoric, neither leadership is capable of understanding the real situation or of dealing with the problems and opportunities presented by it. If our movement is ever to return to its correct course, the fight against centrist politics must not be confined to the borders of the United States, but must instead be carried into the international arena.

The leadership of the International after 1940 characterized itself by its adaptation to the petty-bour-

geois leaderships in the working-class movement, which culminated in what became known as "Pabloism." The leadership of the International, under the direction of Pablo, began formally to change the traditional program to justify the adaptationism which had long been characteristic of the International's conjunctural political analysis and day-to-day practice. This took place during a period of seeming Stalinist hegemony in the working class and, therefore, took the predominant (but by no means only) coloration of being a capitulation to Stalinism. With the outbreak of the Tito-Stalin dispute, Yugoslavia was declared to have been a workers' state all along, in spite of the Second World Congress Theses which specifically branded it capitalist. The petty-bourgeois partisan movement was endowed retroactively with socialist qualities independent of the working class and of a revolutionary leadership. This analysis was helped along and consummated with the falling into power of the petty-bourgeois guerrilla movement in China led by the Stalinists under Mao Tse-tung. The new regimes established outside of the working class and in the absence of a revolutionary party were declared to have independently established (or to be in the process of establishing) workers' states. Thus not only were the traditional petty-bourgeois leaderships of the working-class movement endowed with a "progressive" role, but now the mass petty-bourgeois movements themselves were endowed with progressive, nay, revolutionary, socialist qualities. The adaptation to the so-called "progressive," petty-bourgeois leaderships in the working-class movement logically called into

question the necessary role of the revolutionary leadership, that is, the bolshevik party. But the claim that a petty-bourgeois movement had independently established a workers' state called into question not only the necessity of a bolshevik party, but also the necessity of the proletariat itself. The petty-bourgeois masses were placed on the same historic level as the proletariat; it too was a class which could effect historic transformations in the age of imperialism: it was no longer a class which vacillated between the two major classes in society, but rather a class which could, like the proletariat, be the grave-digger of capitalism and the progenitor of socialism. From this happy discovery everything followed quite naturally.

The theory of Permanent Revolution was turned into a caricature. The heart of the theory, that is, the necessary and primary role of the proletariat, was merely discarded. But the theory was, for the sake of orthodoxy, salvaged by inculcating it with an impregnable and inexorable "logic" as the "prime mover" in place of the proletariat. The theory was reduced to a textbook of absolute logic used to describe what had taken place, always after the fact. Revolutions were made and healthy workers' states were established by different political tendencies, and their regimes, who were inextricably caught in the "logic" of the permanent revolution. To be inextricably caught in this "logic" meant only that the leadership must be sincerely and honestly indignant about any and all oppression. They would then, even without being aware of the existence of the theory of the Permanent Revolution, be forced to carry out the "categorical imperatives" of the theory, which would put them into the category of being "unconscious Trotskyists." The growing potency of this "logic" was inseparable from the theoretical postulate that the balance of forces on a world scale had shifted in favor of socialism. The historical plane was now tilted so that any "sincere"

leadership would quite naturally slide down the "logical" chute marked with the words "permanent revolution."

The reunification in 1963 of the sections of the International Committee with the sections of the International Secretariat, supported fraternally by the SWP, took place primarily because of their convergent positions on the nature of the Cuban Revolution. The analysis of the Cuban Revolution made by both factions paralleled the positions that the International had originally taken on the Yugoslavian and Chinese revolutions. This rejection of the traditional analysis of Trotskyism by the SWP marked, as we have shown, its formal transformation into a centrist party, thus permitting an ideological reconciliation with the original "Pabloites" who had already blazed the trail of deviationism leading ultimately to liquidationism.

With the analysis that Cuba had independently become a workers' state, came the concomitant idealization of the Castroite Bonapartist regime--just as the International had previously idealized the Titoist and Maoist regimes. Cuba was declared to be a healthy workers' state. Our, the SWP's approach to the Castroite leadership, as well as the International's, was no different from the International's previous approach to the Titoist and Maoist leaderships. We publicized and praised to the heavens everything we thought was good and correct and kept a deafening silence about everything else. Such a condescending approach could only lead to disaster. (This permissive child raising approach has only paved the road to coalition politics with Dr. Spock and other such pacifist ilk in the antiwar movement.) It led us to outright political support of other guerrilla movements without the slightest criticism, a fact of at least six years duration--which we would now very much like to forget.

Translating into layman's terms the theoretical aberrations above, the Cuban Revolution and possible future revolutions were explained

with the "blunt instrument" theory. That is: Imperialism, for any number of peculiar reasons, had its "weak link" in Cuba. This link was so weak that it was not like the chain "link" of Russia, which required the Bolshevik Party to smash it; but was more like a sausage link, which required only a "blunt instrument," in this case, a petty-bourgeois clique leading a band of guerrilla fighters. The impressionistic and pragmatic theories of non-Leninist, non-proletarian leaderships being compelled by the "logic" of the Permanent Revolution to transform capitalist states into healthy workers' states ("healthy" in the case of Cuba because it was not Stalinist!) due only to their good intentions, represents a total rejection of Marxism. They have revealed that the only "blunt instruments" involved are the brains of those who concocted the theories.

Another theoretical contribution for which the SWP can specifically claim credit is the theory of the "workers' and peasants' government." As Comrade Hansen explains it, "the key item in Cuba was the workers' and peasants' government established in 1959..." It was a transitional regime of "petty-bourgeois parties" which "finally destroyed the capitalist state." Generalizing from their newly formulated (ex post facto) theories of the Cuban Revolution, the leadership of the just recently re-united Fourth International pinned all their hopes in Algeria on the new Fidel, Ben Bella. Here was the first chance the theoretical innovators had to apply their theories in action before the fact. Ben Bella's regime was baptized a "workers and peasants' government"--a "blunt instrument" on the way to establishing a workers' state. Pablo, a member of the United Secretariat, even held a post in this government. But something went wrong: the "blunt instrument" of "the workers and peasants" government was brought down." Unceremoniously it was explained, ex post facto, that the transitional "workers and peasants' government" could regress back to a capitalist regime,

government, state or what-have-you.. It was later (five years later) timidly explained in an internal document of the United Secretariat for the Third World Congress since Reunification, that perhaps the Algerian government had been designated a "workers and peasants' government" "too soon." Whether it was ever a "workers and peasants' government," or how the leadership made the "mistake" of designating it a "workers and peasants' government" "too soon"--even to the point of participating in this government--or what relation this setback had to the theoretical phantasmagoria originally hatched to explain the Cuban Revolution, was never even considered in the Secretariat's "self-criticism."

The workers and peasants' (or farmers') government is not a petty-bourgeois "transitional" formation between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and that of the proletariat; it is simply a propaganda slogan for the workers' state, for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Transitional Program clearly states this: "In the final instance it represented nothing more than a popular designation of the already established dictatorship of the proletariat." Moreover, The Transitional Program explains the reality of Cde. Hansen's line: "the Comintern...gave to the formula of the 'workers and peasants' government' a completely different, purely 'democratic', i.e., bourgeois, content, counterposing it to the dictatorship of the proletariat." The SWP's line, like the United Secretariat's, is a Menshevik line.

The reason that Cuba became a workers' state is not because Castro fell into it through his good nature. The Cuban workers' state bears the same birth mark as the Eastern European and Chinese workers' states--"Made in the USSR." The Cuban workers' state was born deformed for the very same reason that it was born at all--the dominant influence of the Soviet Union which ensured Castro's survival, enabled economic "growth," and provided the economic model for Cuba's

transformation. Workers' democracy is not on the horizon in Cuba and never will be without a political revolution. It appears that the leadership--with perhaps the Secretariat showing the way--is preparing to call Cuba a "degenerated" workers' state. We hope they can locate Thermidor and a Stalin to personify it.

In spite of the fiasco in Algeria, the magic formula of a "workers and peasants' government" and its precipitant, guerrilla warfare, was not abandoned. Disregarding all previous experience of Marxism, which indicated that guerrillaism was the classic method of peasant revolt, the leadership placed all its bets on the non-proletarian layers of the "third world." Unfortunately for the party leadership, in Latin America their guerrilla chickens are coming home to roost. Immersed in a narrow, respectable legalistic movement in the U.S., they find the reality of guerrillaism horrible to behold. They try to get out of the dilemma by making a big deal out of "tactic" and "strategy." They are all for guerrillas, but only as a tactic. This false line can be revealed by a simple analogy. Terrorism is a non-Marxist means of "revolution," similar to guerrillaism. Are we in favor of terrorism as a "tactic" to build the party, or as a strategy? It is clear that only in a revolutionary uprising do all these means become legitimate, as a subordinate part of the over-all struggle. Then one might blow up trains, etc., only as a part of total war, just as guerrillaism becomes the peasants' contribution to the armed uprising. Guerrilla warfare can be considered a tactic only in the strategy of seizing state power, and not in the strategy of building the party.

Many comrades, recognizing the insanity of Mandel's and Maitain's line on Latin America, where their official Argentine section is nothing more than a southern branch of the Weathermen, react by supporting the "orthodoxy" of the SWP. It is a hollow orthodoxy and a false per-

spective. The SWP has no "proletarian orientation" for Latin America, just as it has none for the United States.

Their uncritical support to the Peruvian comrade, Hugo Blanco, who organized peasants exclusively, and his limited self-criticism, proves that the SWP has no intention of entering the trade unions, of raising the transitional program--especially the idea of a workers' militia. Comrade Blanco's self-criticism amounted to nothing more than raising the proletariat to the same level of importance as the peasantry and organizing it into a party with the peasantry. This "two-class party" contradicts the theory of the Permanent Revolution, since it eliminates the leading role of the proletariat organized under its own banner. The SWP has no alternative except, perhaps, Comrade Camejo's profundity that Blanco "should have been on campus."

For another proof look at the SWP in India, which is repeating Blanco's mistake in West Bengal. Here, not coincidentally, we have a refutation by Trotsky. "The poor peasants of Hupeh, Kwantung, or Bengal can play a role...only if they support the workers of Shanghai, Hankow, Canton, and Calcutta. This is the only road for the revolutionary peasant..." (Third International After Lenin, p. 226; our emphasis)

One crushing refutation of the SWP's theories has occurred recently. The Palestinian guerrillas have paid in blood for their false policies. The SWP has adapted to these petty-bourgeois movements, and has continually, in a totally false way, counterposed "critical" and "unconditional" support. In addition it has propagated the major slogan of Fatah--the Palestinian Kuomintang--the "democratic secular state." What is a "democratic state," but a bourgeois state? We should counterpose to this our slogan of a "workers and farmers' government." In addition we should not tail-end these movements but instead adopt a program suitable for the Middle East, using The Transitional Program as a basis, and including the role

of the Palestinian working class as a catalyst of the Middle East socialist revolution. The Israeli proletariat, in addition, can and must be won on a class program which would include a policy of revolutionary defeatism, and not by concessions, such as "self-determination," to their present chauvinism. The contradictions of capitalism, which will impel the Jewish workers into action, are as real in Israel as they are in the rest of the world, and flow precisely from Israel's role in the Middle East.

Our press has consistently carried an incorrect analysis of the civil war in Jordan. Comrade Langston's articles on the September blood-bath offer a perfect example of mistaking the ebb for the flow. Since the liquidation has begun, our press has given scant coverage of Hussein's campaign against the Palestinian guerrillas. Apparently the leadership knows enough to keep quiet when its whole perspective is being destroyed--a familiar trademark of our press. But more important, it is unable to analyze the meaning of this defeat. Is it just "a military setback," or will it involve a long-term stabilization in the area? In fact, it is the opportunity for a revolutionary organization to intervene and prepare for the next round, instead of piously relegating to the automatic processes the revolutionary differentiation taking place among the guerrillas.

The leadership has a formally correct position against Israeli Jewish self-determination, but that is all. They, however, never consider how the democratic rights for the Jews are to be reconciled with full self-determination for the Palestinians, since this would include their right to expel the Jews. As an antidote to this we should propose an "Open the Doors" policy for all the imperialist powers, especially the United States. This would also help prevent the strengthening of Zionism by eliminating the advantages Israel receives from Soviet anti-Semitism, and would expose the reactionary and hypocritical role

of imperialism.

The failure of the leadership's analysis is no mere academic matter. Comrade Peng's position of giving critical support to the Liu faction during the Cultural Revolution was rejected. Mao, in his interview with Snow, has revealed that the basis for Peng's analysis, open civil war between the factions, was an actuality. It is now clear that Mao's victory in the Cultural Revolution was a disaster for the world proletariat. The victory of Mao was the pre-condition for the coming open betrayal of the Vietnamese workers and peasants. Even the leadership can attribute no other meaning than this to Nixon's forthcoming visit to Peking.

The leadership has consistently soft-pedalled the Stalinist nature of the NLF/PRG and of their program, as well as that of the Stalinist masters of Hanoi, who refuse to countenance revolution in the area, in order to "secure peace" with the imperialists. Moreover, the leadership has consistently downgraded the fact that both the "Set the date" propaganda and the "People's Peace Treaty" are creations of the Vietnamese Stalinists. Instead of branding the Hanoi and NLF Stalinists as misleaders who have seized control of a spontaneous movement in order to betray it, the leadership has made them out to be revolutionaries. Nor is the International leadership any better. It has glorified the Stalinists, especially Ho Chi Minh, the assassin of Trotskyists.

Both of these approaches are the very opposite of Trotskyism and must be rejected. The leadership's policy on Vietnam is only the logical extension of its policy on Cuba, on Algeria, on guerrillaism, on the Middle East, and on China. It indicates a pattern of departure from Trotskyism, despite small differences between the SWP and the United Secretariat. We will not support "Kautsky" against "Bernstein." This blind alley is not the way out. The leadership's international policies must be rejected if we are to regain our program and our heritage in order to build the World Party.