



discussion bulletin

Published by the
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK 3, NEW YORK

Vol. 20, No. 14

August 1959

CONTENTS

Page

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Analysis of Results of Atkinson Campaign | |
| | By Lois Saunders | 1 |
| 2. | Is the Theory of the Permanent Revolution
Invalid for This Epoch? | |
| | By I. London | 5 |

15¢

1959
vol 20 # 14
SWP PB

Introductory Note

The articles by Comrades London and Saunders contained in this bulletin were received at a date too near the convention to allow time for publication in the pre-convention discussion.

Since no formal deadline had been set for the submission of discussion material in advance of the convention, the Political Committee has decided to publish these articles for the record. This action does not imply reopening of a general discussion, nor should post-convention publication of the articles be viewed as setting a precedent.

The Political Committee believes this situation illustrates the need in organizing future discussions to set a deadline for the submission of discussion material.

Editor

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF ATKINSON CAMPAIGN

By Lois Saunders

The Atkinson campaign is now a thing of the past, but it is important for us to evaluate its results.

In dispute was our application of the policy of conditional support, not in a Democratic primary, but in a non-partisan election.

Those who say we "cannot cross class lines" are arguing at a tangent. There is agreement on this point. There is agreement that we cannot support a Negro running in a Democratic primary. There is agreement also that we cannot support a Negro running in a nominally non-partisan campaign but where he is in reality the unofficial candidate of the Democratic Party which masterminds and dominates the campaign.

The issue under discussion was this: Is the campaign in its basic aspects a concealed Democratic Party venture, and therefore reactionary, in which case it does not merit support of any kind; or is it in its dominant character an independent attempt on the part of the Negro community to gain representation and one which, therefore, is progressive, despite Democratic Party overtones, and which warrants critical support. The disagreement arose over differing estimates of the main character of the campaign and over its direction.

Edwards saw Atkinson as the unofficial candidate of the Democratic Party, which selected him in the first place and directed his campaign. He also saw the direction of the campaign as one leading Negroes further into the Democratic Party.

Others among us considered the campaign as primarily an independent effort on the part of the Negro community to elect one of its own representatives to the City Council. We considered this progressive and felt that by giving the campaign critical support we could strengthen its independent character.

In my opinion, Edwards exaggerated the role of the Democratic Party and mistook the voice of the CP-controlled Democratic Minority Conference (DMC) for the voice of the official Democratic Party.

The campaign to elect a Negro was initiated approximately one year prior to the selection of Atkinson as the candidate. Such organizations as the NAACP and the church federations carried on a long-term registration drive directly aimed at the 10th district. The DMC, however, was politically the best organized section of the Negro community and it was therefore able to dominate the campaign activity following Atkinson's selection.

The Democratic Party orientation of the CP, which it exerted primarily through the DMC, obscured and made difficult the task of judging the fundamental character of the movement.

If Edwards' estimate that the campaign was a thinly masked action of the Democratic Party was correct, it is reasonable to expect that a sizeable number of non-Negro Democrats would have supported Atkinson against the Republican Navarro, Italian-American (not Mexican-American) candidate of Big Business. Democratic support, had it existed to an important degree, should have been

translated into votes, especially since this is a Democratic year.

Likewise, if Edwards' estimate of the direction of the campaign was correct, we should also expect a deepening of the link between Negroes and the Democratic Party following the election.

Neither of these developments has taken place. Or, if the official Democratic Party (as distinct from its CP-controlled clubs) did participate actively in an endeavor to get Atkinson elected, then, despite all predictions, we can anticipate a smashing Republican sweep in 1960, for fewer than two out of 10 non-Negro Democrats voted for Atkinson.

Voting in the 10th District was the heaviest in the city, with 50 to 60 percent of the Negroes turning out at the polls, as against a city average of 36 percent. In predominantly Negro precincts, the voting was 70 to 80 percent in favor of Atkinson; in some precincts almost 100 percent.

He obtained 15,121 votes. This would have constituted a majority in any district other than the 10th in either the primary or the run-off. Navarro, however, won by some 2700 votes, obtaining a total of 17,861.

Following the election, the Atkinson forces made a precinct-by-precinct analysis of the vote. The preliminary report of that analysis showed that close to 12,000 of Atkinson's 15,000 votes were cast by Negroes. Only slightly more than 3000 were cast by all others -- Japanese-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Jews, liberals, fellow travelers, workers and others among the white population.

It is estimated conservatively that there are 20,000 non-Negro Democrats in the district. The bulk of them (80-85 percent) thus did not vote for Atkinson. They either stayed home or voted for Navarro, preferring a white Republican to a Negro Democrat.

Like the white population, Negroes (working class as well as petty bourgeois) also ignored party labels, but with the difference that they voted for the Negro, Atkinson.

The Negro-vs-white character of the campaign was further emphasized during the final days before election when Mayor Poulson made a last minute appeal to voters to go to the polls to "save" the city from "domination" by minority pressure groups. Navarro utilized this statement by the mayor as the basis for a leaflet distributed in the white precincts which said, in effect, unless you want a Negro to represent you in City Council, vote for Navarro.

To both white and Negro voters, the basic issue thus was the race of the candidate and not his party affiliation. The mobilization of the Negro community to elect its own candidate was the dominant feature of the campaign, and not Democratic Party control or participation.

* * *

What of the post-election reaction?

The general tenor of the reaction is that you were either for us (that is, for Atkinson), or you were against us (that is, against the election of a Negro

to City Council). Opposition to Atkinson, or indifference to his election, is being interpreted -- at least in the initial comments -- as opposition or indifference to the right of the community for representation.

Editorials on the election appeared in both the Los Angeles Tribune (June 5) and the California Eagle (June 4).

The Tribune said, in part:

"What we set out to do was to put a Negro on the Los Angeles City Council..." (Not a Democrat, not a Negro-Democrat, but a Negro.)

The editorial continued: "Why should we not focus on our own problems, our own needs, our own goals, our own potential for solution, our own methods, our own approaches, our own arguments, and our own people, for a change?"

Further on the editorial states that Atkinson lost the election because "for reasons of campaign committee strategy and for lack of communication," he "didn't take his issues, his program, his qualifications, and the fact that he is a Negro to the people who were vitally concerned with him being a Negro and would have elected him."

The Eagle editorial draws organizational conclusions based on the same sentiment expressed in the Tribune. It said that the campaign "united the community in a manner that it has never been united before in a political campaign. The campaign showed what can be done when differences are submerged for the good of the whole community..."

"Negroes are understandably divided in partisan elections but there is no reason why they cannot, and should not, stick together in non-partisan races. Los Angeles needs a non-partisan group that will make a continuing study of civic, community and political issues and present the rest of us with its considered judgment in such matters. None of our present community organizations is equipped for that kind of a job."

There is no hint here of Negroes burrowing deeper into the Democratic Party; the opposite is indicated.

Efforts are now being made to organize a non-partisan committee of the type referred to in the Eagle editorial, with the aim of electing a Negro to City Council at the next opportunity. This non-partisan move stems from a division within the campaign committee.

The CP elements and the businessmen within it both attempted to keep the Negro aspect of the campaign from dominating the activity. They were opposed by another group that was largely leaderless and lacking in political experience which pressed for an independent campaign. This group, I am told, increased in numbers as the campaign proceeded.

* * *

In reviewing the campaign, the following seem to me its essential features:

1. In its inception and organization, the Atkinson campaign was a united

effort on the part of the community.

2. Democratic Party involvement, except where the CP exerted an influence, was half-hearted and dragging. It did not support Atkinson in the primary campaign; did so only after the election narrowed down between Atkinson and Navarro. They had no place else to go.

3. The CP, through the DMC and because of its political experience, was able to gain control of the campaign committee, mute the independent character of the campaign and attempt to lead the Negroes further into the Democratic Party. Despite their efforts, the community is more inclined towards independent action following the election than it was before.

4. Our participation in the campaign committee would have strengthened elements within it seeking an independent, non-partisan course.

In future campaigns here and elsewhere, I believe we must guard against permitting the CP camouflage to obscure the reality. I believe also we must guard against permitting the discoloration imparted by the CP to jockey us out of participation in a progressive and important aspect of the Negro struggle.

By giving critical support to such developments as the Atkinson campaign, we can counter the CP influence and help the emerging movements develop along the road of independent political action.

The election results seem to me to confirm this view.

Los Angeles
June 11, 1959

IS THE THEORY OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION INVALID FOR THIS EPOCH?

By I. London

(The following is elaborated from a speech made in L.A. on March 25, 1959)

Comrades:

I am deeply disturbed by some recent editorials in the Militant which indicate clearly that the editors think the theory of the PERMANENT REVOLUTION is not applicable to the colonial revolutions in this epoch, especially for Africa; and to prove it, repeat some glaring errors on the revolution in China.

I believe and hope these are the errors of only the editors, and do not represent a finished tendency of the majority of the party or of the leadership, although they have made some of these errors in the past, partially corrected them, only to repeat them once again.

Let us take the first editorial of January 5 -- this editorial expresses 100% enthusiastic, non-critical support of the present leadership of the African revolution -- the Permanent Revolution is not mentioned.

It takes for good coin all the statements made by the leaders of The All-African Peoples Conference, such as Nkruma, that they are for the "building of socialism on African soil" and for "a United States of Africa," even approvingly cites Nkruma's demagogic paraphrase of the "Communist Manifesto." The editors say further that "they have already transcended the narrow nationalism which refuses to see that nations are mutually dependent" and "even looked beyond the continent of Africa."

Nkruma, who operates a police state in Ghana, is pictured as an internationalist, no less, while he pleads for 5-years tax-free foreign investments. He is pushing a law more vicious than Taft-Hartley, but quotes the Communist Manifesto.

We know whom Nkruma is trying to impress; but whom are the editors of the Militant trying to impress?

No mention is made by the editors of class lines in Africa, no mention of the slogan for "A United Socialist States of Africa," no mention of the Permanent Revolution.

The Comrade from W. Africa Objects

Comrade Ekiomeneskhenigha from W. Africa takes them to task (the Militant, March 3, 1959) in a thoroughly Trotskyist criticism of the editorial and of the bourgeois leadership of the Conference. His letter is completely in the spirit of the Permanent Revolution, for critical support of the African revolutions even under the present leadership, whenever they move even a little bit in the right direction, but for critical support, for the revolution cannot be completed until they are replaced by a revolutionary proletarian leadership, according to Trotsky's prognosis.

Should the editors reject this prognosis out of hand, with no attempt to disprove it? Will majority supporters feel called upon to defend the right-wing of the party against our criticism?

Comrade E. pointed out further that a resolution for fundamental human rights in the new states in Africa was defeated by the Conference. They did not support the struggle in the Congo; only with difficulty did one faction succeed in getting support for the Algerian struggle.

It is not too difficult to prove that the Nkrumas only want to rise to a new level of compradorism, to gain a greater share from the imperialist table.

The Editors Answer

Being given the opportunity to correct themselves, the editors only succeed in adding more confusion, by paying lip-service to the Trotskyist theory, at the same time developing an apologism for their previous editorial by comparing the African revolution to the American revolution of '76 --- and the Chinese revolution of 1949! They then weakly paraphrase the theory of the Permanent Revolution, leaving out only the essence of it. (At the same time, the borrowings from David Miller's theory of the feasibility of the bourgeois colonial revolutions being completed in this epoch through nationalizations are obvious.)

They inform us that there are "two tendencies increasingly noticeable among petty-bourgeois national leaderships since the end of World War II: (1) a greater inclination to display independence toward imperialism; (2) a greater readiness to undertake (if only haphazardly and partially) agrarian reform, nationalizations and even planning."

As examples of such "petty-bourgeois leaderships" capable of nationalizations and even planning, they give us the Egyptian and the Chinese! Indeed, by lumping China with Ghana and Egypt, one can prove a great deal -- a great deal that is not true. If the nationalizations and the planning are the same in Egypt and China, one must conclude that they can complete the bourgeois democratic revolutions in this epoch, and perhaps even move into the proletarian revolution by this path, as the Chinese did according to the majority's thesis.*

*This was D. Miller's technique in his infamous series of articles in the FI in 1954 and 55, although he concluded they are all "state-capitalist," they all nationalize and plan, they can complete their revolutions just as in the 17th and 18th Centuries.

It is necessary to degrade the Chinese revolution and elevate the Egyptian to a higher level to accomplish this (as they demonstrate even in their choice of words). All these revolutions are of the same class character, there is no essential difference in them, according to this thesis; they nationalize, they plan, and go further than they expected, partly due to the pressure of the imperialist and partly due to mass pressure.

They have some words of criticism for these leaderships, too; but the Chinese even come off the worse for it here -- it was "pushed into power despite itself," while Nasser "coolly sank cement filled ships" with "stunning swiftness." Why the slowness to recognize the Chinese revolution as a proletarian revolution and

the stunning swiftness to conclude that the bourgeois nationalist can accomplish almost as much, or at least complete their revolution?

Why so harsh with Mao and so enthusiastic for Nkruma? Isn't this a symptom of petty-bourgeois socialism?*

* The editors surely know the value of editorial selection of pictures -- look at the heroic pictures the editors choose to run periodically of Nkruma (in the same issue), and still hardly a mention of the Chinese Communes -- are these things accidental?

Then comes the extremely weak paraphrase of the Permanent Revolution and the Transitional Program (to be generous about it).

(1) First comes the statement that we defend all the colonial struggles against imperialism. Listed as examples are Ethiopia, Chiang's China against Japan, and the Soviet Union against imperialism -- the only mention of class differences is that Ethiopia is defined as feudalistic. Nowhere in these articles is China or Russia referred to as workers' states -- was this accidental? Do we defend them in the same way? With the same program? Is political revolution the same as social revolution?

(2) Secondly, they advocate "fighting for the political independence of the working class in preparation for providing consistent leadership to the struggle."

(3) We will support all progressive measures they take -- if they "transcend the limitations of their own program, so much the better."

(4) "Due to the well-known hesitations and back-slidings of petty-bourgeois nationalists in carrying out revolutionary bourgeois measures in the world of today, socialists should include such measures in their own program for workers' power." "Hesitations and back-slidings?" But we have always said that they were incapable of completing their revolution in this epoch -- this prognosis lays the basis for the Trotskyist program for workers' power. Is it serious to base such a program on the contention that they can complete their revolution? At best, the editors' program returns to Lenin's pre-1917 thesis. (D. Miller also had recourse to this argument).

(5) "We favor the working class accepting government power, if the opportunity offers." "Accepting?" "If?" There is no must here, no orientation toward the seizure of power, no revolution. No further elaboration is made of a "program for workers' power," and why should they? They have already expressed confidence in the bourgeois leadership. Historically, doesn't this lay the basis for Popular Frontism?

Trotsky thought: "Only the working class can complete the bourgeois democratic revolution in this epoch, by going over into the proletarian revolution... There is NO middle road... Any other course would but set a trap for the workers of the East." So wrote Trotsky quite a long time ago -- has something changed to cause us to alter this basic orientation of our party? If so, I wish the editors would tell us about it.

The Chinese revolution has occurred, validating in an unexpected way the theory of the Permanent Revolution; nothing has happened in Egypt or Ghana invalidating it. *

* (Comrade Miller used India, Burma, Formosa, etc., to prove that the bourgeois democrats could complete their revolution through nationalizations and state planning -- these articles were printed without disclaimer by the editors -- FI, Fall '54 & Winter '55.)

The theory of the Permanent Revolution still stands as a bed-rock of Marxist science, i.e., for Bolsheviki.

As the theory of the Permanent Revolution puts it, the bourgeois democrats cannot complete their revolution in this epoch, because they are too closely tied to the landlords and the imperialists to break loose sufficiently to establish a fertile soil for the growth of capital -- transitory and partial gains, with "hesitations and backslidings," and pleas for foreign investments will not establish the conditions from which they can exploit their own resources of material and men in an expanding economy, on the basis of which they can establish a stable regime, and keep their country independent and united. Have they done it anywhere? Much less can they satisfy the needs of the people, which means a long period of unity and growth is excluded -- the proletarian revolution is on the order of the day, as it was not in '76.

THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

The majority theoreticians laid the basis for their misunderstanding of the colonial revolutions by their lack of understanding of the Chinese revolution -- this is the focal point of infection for their theorizing on the colonial revolutions -- at the very least they have left the rear window open, as well as the editorial office doors, to every kind of revisionism on these questions, including the Johnsonite.

They lost the understanding of the class basis of Bonapartism -- combine this with "the key question of every revolution -- the question of power in the state" (Lenin), and the enigma of the Chinese revolution can be dispelled.

All Bonapartists have a mass base and a class base. How do Marxists determine the dominant class ties of any Bonapartist cadre? This can only be determined by knowing the history of this cadre, its origin and evolution -- then one can answer the question. The ties with which class determine in the long run the policy of this party and this cadre? The answer to this question will give us the class character of this cadre and the state they dominate.

With the use of this criterion Nasser's cadre and state come out quite differently from Mao's.

This is not a simple gauge, but a sensitive microscope. It requires of its user a careful study and the elimination of special impressions and biases. Evidently it can be easily upset, to judge by the large number of false theories we have been treated to in the last 10 years.

We certainly recognized the CCP as proletarian in 1921, even in 1927 when

they betrayed a revolution. When did the CCP become a petty-bourgeois party? Trotsky prognosticated that they might become lost in the peasantry -- were they? They continued to recruit their leading cadre from the cities. They kept their ties with the Third International. This one prognosis of Trotsky's that was not fulfilled the majority clings to; but the historic principle which he repeated many times, that when in power, a Bonapartist cadre must harmonize its economic base with its class base, they choose to forget, and tell us, We must wait and see.

Shachtman challenged Trotsky, Where are the nationalizations you promised? Trotsky answered, If they hold the power, they must nationalize. When Napoleon marched through Europe, he abolished feudalism.

Why does the majority choose to ignore this and tell us, We had to wait (6 years) until we knew they could not turn back? Even the bourgeois press had long before recognized the Chinese state as a state of the "Communist" type.

Zapata was a peasant leader, too. When he entered the capital city, he had to seek ties with one of the fundamental classes -- he found it with the bourgeoisie, and gave up the power.

When Mao entered the cities, Chiang and the four families (analogous to America's 60 families) fled, and the dominant sectors of the economy fell into the new state's hands. They did not turn it back to other capitalists as Hitler did, or become capitalists themselves, as Chiang did; but they nationalized the property, as Trotsky predicted.

The majority must set the nationalizations ahead until the Yalu river threat -- why must they do this? Unless they have a special bias which forces them to distort the facts. *

*"Accordingly the new Government took over all Kuomintang State enterprises and confiscated all enterprises owned by the Kuomintang leadership, which greatly facilitated the establishment and extension of State ownership" -- p. 40, "The Chinese Economy," by Solomon Adler.

He then presents a great deal of data to show that this constituted a major sector of the modern economy. "A major sector of the modern economy was thus under nominal State ownership and control before the turnover" (footnote, same page).

"Thus, the socialist sector immediately assumed the leadership in industry and finance in 1949 and continued to grow throughout the New Democratic stage." (p. 35).

Could the Mao regime operate a capitalist society? But the British Laborites could, for the same reason they were never much concerned with the power -- their dominant class ties are with the bourgeoisie (Lenin defined it as "a Labor party with a bourgeois leadership.")

When in power, the Bonapartist cadre must turn to its own class for its main support, as water seeks the sea, or give up the power. They must harmonize the economy to the needs of their class, i.e., "assimilate the structure."

(Pablo used to put this forward as the key theory to understanding the new deformed workers' states coming into being, but now correctly puts it second -- see their V World Congress documents.)

How can any state "structurally assimilate" without the power? Yet the majority still clings to this ridiculous theory, eclectically combining it with the waiting for the imperialist to force them thesis.

They held the power in China, they did not give it back (as, close to power, they gave it back in Greece and refused the excellent opportunity many, many times).

Holding the power, they had to nationalize. Operating society, they became further and further entrenched, and became like any ruling class in history, incapable of yielding the power to another class, without a struggle. I know of no such case in history, do you? And yet the majority theoreticians continued to call this a bourgeois state, then a workers' and farmers' government, and then a workers' state, with no change of personnel in the ruling cadre.

Where is the dialectic in such a theory? Where is the revolution? "A watched kettle never boils," i.e., if you watch for the kettle to boil and not the water.

The "dialectic leap" which must occur first in every revolution occurs at the power level, i.e., the state level, as Marx pointed out quite some time ago, and as all history has attested to since. Would the bourgeoisie permit nationalizations with expropriation, if they still had the power? Isn't it ridiculous 111 years after "The Communist Manifesto" to hold that a capitalist state nationalized itself into being a workers' state?

And if China did it, why not Ghana? Or at least nationalize itself into the capability of completing the bourgeois-democratic revolution? In the epoch of the death throes of world capitalism?

Marxism is to know, predict, act.

Comrade Swabeck said last week, "Marxism is to know, in order to predict." Right! What were the majority theoreticians able to predict about China?

That the CCP would take the power and oust the landlords and capitalists, in '49 perhaps? Our leaders should have demanded this as Trotsky did, not take six years to discover that it had happened. They should have understood it better than the CCP leaders or the bourgeois press.

Were you able to predict that the Chinese economy would explode, while the Indian economy would stagnate? The FI editors published articles by Comrade Miller equating them. Now Ghana, Egypt and New China are equated. (Are these the same editors who edited the recent issues of The Militant?)

Concerning predictions, did you not predict for six years that they might "turn back" and sell out, and therefore we could not call it a workers' state? Did it happen? Could you orient correctly on the basis of such a prognosis?

May I add what I am sure Comrade Arne will not disagree with, that Marxism

is also to act, to develop a program on the basis of the predictions which were based on knowledge. Concerning program, did the majority support the Chinese revolution as a proletarian revolution or a bourgeois revolution? Did you support The N. Koreans in the Korean War, which you did courageously, as a proletarian revolution or a bourgeois revolution? There is a difference, and it would have made an enormous difference in our press, and even more important, to the general orientation of the Fourth International -- instead the International has been disoriented, theoretically and organizationally, largely on the basis of such questions. And now, shall we have a new line on the bourgeois revolutions? Shall we have another dose of anti-Trotskyist theories? Will this help reorient the International?

Getting enthusiastic over Nkruma and Mboya will help build our party no more than touring Davies and Hyams helped build our party -- do we want to be identified with such people? Whom are you trying to appeal to? I asked the same question of the delegate to the Young Socialist conference in Detroit, in re their watering down of the Defense of Workers' States slogan -- I was informed that the Johnsonites were very strong there.

CHINA, HUNGARY AND THE DIALECTIC

The CCP, without a clear plan and against Stalin's orders did give leadership to the revolution (I rather like Comrade Cannon's analogy with the birth of the CIO.) They raised Transitional demands they could not later escape -- land to the peasants, democratization of the army (See "A Documentary History of Chinese Communism" -- Schwartz, et al. Pgs. 243, 307, etc.). When they organized vast Red Armies and moved toward power, they refused to give up these armies -- the break-up of the Marshall Mission was not totally Chiang's fault, as the majority likes to say -- Chiang demanded control of the Red Armies -- the CCP leaders refused! Why does the majority ignore this little factor?

In '49 and '50, did they fulfill the essence of Stalin's program for China or Trotsky's? The Permanent Revolution threw them into power, not U.S. Imperialism!

From this, it is not necessary to draw Pablo's old conclusions that they would reform themselves or that they could planfully lead revolutions in the future, as a general rule -- nor Marcy's that they would have to lead the global class war until Trotskyist parties should spring up fully and perfectly formed, like Venus from the sea, much less that a political revolution against the Kremlin could not begin until such a time.

It was not necessary to be pro-Stalinist to recognize the Chinese social revolution as proletarian in '49 (as the majority charged), anymore than it was necessary to be State-Dept. socialist to recognize the Hungarian political revolution as proletarian in '56 (as Marcy charged).

Marxist science was adequate for both.

The dialectician must know how to recognize the definitive question -- what is essential?

The definitive question for China in '49 was that a Bonapartist proletarian party had seized the power -- they had to nationalize or turn the power back to

the bourgeoisie -- this came second.

The definitive question for Hungary in '56 was that the working class with guns in hand were moving toward Soviet power -- that they gave provisional support to a petty-bourgeois orienting government was a secondary and transitory matter.

Their support was provisional upon the government's fulfilling the Workers' Councils' programmatic demands, the chief of which were: struggle against the Kremlin's army and AVOs and defend the public property. The main enemy, capitalism, was not the immediate enemy, due to its weakness. If the balance of forces had shifted in favor of the bourgeoisie, advanced workers would have offered a United Front to the Kremlin to beat them back.

I ask of the Marcy supporter in the room: 1) Since you were afraid the counter-revolution was dominant, why didn't you demand of "Comrade Khrushchev," "Arm the Workers!"? 2) Would advanced workers support a Hoffa against a rank-and-file revolt so long as a threat exists from the capitalist? 3) I remind you to ask yourself, as Lenin advised: What good is your prognosis for raising the consciousness of the proletariat or building the revolutionary party?

What of the Future?

Concerning the false line on the colonial revolutions in the Militant, I ask:

1) If this line is continued or periodically reappears, can it not undermine other elements of our theory? If Nkruma, Nasser, etc., can complete their revolution through nationalizations and due to imperialist intransigence, and the CCP can even establish a workers' state this way, what about the British Labor Party? What about a Labor Party in the U.S.? When we come to revolutionary times in the U.S., could not this kind of approach, which the Militant has applied to other countries, of non-critical support of progressive movements, affect our policy? To answer this, should we depend on faith or Bolshevik doctrine?

2) If the analysis in the Militant were true, would it not signal a new birth of capitalism for many decades? Then what of the future of the party?

3) A great deal in these editorials is contrary to the latest resolutions of the party and much that appears regularly in our press. What authority had the Militant editors for such a line? Why so spotty? Why can we not publicly defend the main line of every leading article in the Militant, as we used to?

Conclusion

We need an international resolution for the coming convention which would clear up these old errors and the new ones based on them, appraise the pre-revolutionary situations in Bolivia and Ceylon (we get very little information on these developments in our press), straighten out the error on Algeria, which appeared in the Militant (if you must choose one of two movements in a bourgeois-democratic revolution, at least choose the one that's doing the fighting).

The convention must deal with the question of the re-fusion of the world movement. The Pabloists have come far in correcting their old errors, usually forthrightly and honestly, as evidenced in their magazine, "Fourth International."

Will the delegates to the convention get enough information to make a decision on this question?

The convention must in general reaffirm Bolshevik doctrine and insist that the PC and the editors of our press abide by it, in their interpretation of world events.

I want to conclude with two quotations:

W.E.B. Dubois sent this message to the Accra conference: "There is no choice facing Africa between a capitalist development and socialism, for Africa has not the time to catch up to the advanced industrial countries by the capitalist road, and has no interest in experiencing such a regime of exploitation."

For those comrades who feel called upon to always defend "the majority" and are terribly incensed by criticism, I quote Trotsky:

"It is through thoughtful, work-loving and critical minds that the truth in the long run makes its way to broader circles."

#