

For N.C. Information:

(The following announcement of resignation by Hildegarde Swabeck was received at the National Office Sept. 25, 1967.)

(C O P Y)

To the 22nd National Convention of the Socialist Workers Party  
An Answer to the Political Committee's  
From Trotskyism to Maoism -- A Review of the Swabeck Case

I ACCUSE

The Dobbs-Kerry regime dared not accuse Arne Swabeck of disloyalty to Marxism or to the socialist cause. As the following pages of this testimony show, they could not answer theoretically or factually his challenge on the question of the Chinese Revolution. As Trotsky said of Stalin: They strike not at his ideas, but at his skull.

In truth the charge of disloyalty belongs on the other foot. So:

I accuse the Dobbs-Kerry regime of disloyalty to the truth in their charge of disloyalty against Arne Swabeck.

I accuse them of disloyalty to Marxism-Leninism for their criminal libel of the Mao Tse-tung leadership, as later delineated herein.

I accuse them of disloyalty to proletarian revolution for their vicious slandering of the Chinese Revolution under CPC leadership as concretized in later page of this testimony.

I accuse them of disloyalty to their own rank and file for years of miseducation and some conscious deception related herein, about the Chinese Revolution "in its scope the greatest in all history."

I accuse them of disloyalty for their perversion of honest discussion and to proletarian comradeship and human decency as demonstrated in their hatchet job at the 1960 Plenum, related herein.

I accuse them of disloyalty to socialism for their echoing of the foul imperialist and Kremlin press on China's Cultural Revolution as shown later herein.

In the milieu of this crassly cynical and corrupt society with their present line of opportunism and parliamentarism, the SWP may grow and prosper for a time. But "What profiteth a man if he gain the whole world but loseth his own soul?"

However, retribution may be near. For the bright and shining light of China's Cultural Revolution is beginning to emerge above the blanket of filth and slander heaped upon it by many sources including the SWP. And when it appears clearly for what it is -- an enormous advance on the road to

socialism, SWP disloyalty to socialist revolution will be exposed to all.

To be called a Maoist is an honor. I am proud to be counted in that fraternity.

### A RANK AND FILE TESTIMONY

#### Why I Resign from the Socialist Workers Party

#### After 33 Years Membership

#### I. ANATOMY OF PARTY DEGENERATION

One does not casually or impulsively leave a party to which one has given loyalty and devotion throughout many years; a party which has been the center of hopes, desires -- one's very existence. Not if one is serious about revolutionary commitment. The decision comes slowly through a series of shocks. Gradually the realization grows that this party is not a revolutionary instrument. And hope dies hard that the truth will be recognized by comrades long revered and trusted. The agonizing reappraisal was for me eight years of struggle.

It began with an important piece of Party history.

In 1958 the news of the Chinese Peasant Communes broke on a startled world. An event the SWP leadership dared not ignore. The Political Committee in New York prepared an article on the subject projected for publication in the ISR then sent it to Los Angeles for the approval of the National Committee members residing there.

The five L.A. NC members in discussion of the matter had agreed that the Communes, together with other progressive developments in China were indeed a big leap forward and should be supported. The PC article took an entirely different approach: not an objectively informative and positive line, but one of hostility and criticism. Reading that article today, one is shocked by the glaring errors of fact and that party leaders could present such a document as a Marxist analysis.

The NC members in L.A., Cannon, Swabeck, Novack, Liang and Alvin, advised the PC of their adverse opinion, urging that the article be withdrawn from publication until a thorough discussion could be held and suggesting what they considered a correct line on the Chinese Communes. The PC consented to the withdrawal of the article but rejected the proposed political line. Then after some "dickering" the PC submitted a draft resolution on the Chinese Communes. Since this was a repeat of the line of the rejected article the L.A. PC members found it totally unacceptable.

When this decision reached the PC it seemed as if all hell broke loose. Judging from the hostile, factional reaction it can be assumed that the PC felt their authority and prerogatives had been flouted and belittled and given an intolerable veto. Then when the L.A. NC members submitted their draft resolution on the Chinese Communes it was summarily rejected. Tit for tat. All this was made clear in an internal bulletin at the time.

A truce was imperative. The National Convention was only two months away. It would not do to disrupt that with the sudden introduction of a hotly contested question. So it was agreed to merely introduce the commune development in pedagogical fashion and to continue discussion later in internal bulletins.

However, since it was the tenth anniversary of the Chinese revolution, Arne Swaback suggested that an article be written for the magazine commemorating the event. The PC agreed and made no objection to the proposal that Swaback and Liang write the article, although advised that it would contain their views in general.

When this article was submitted it was summarily rejected. Tit for tat.

The next development was a shocker. Suddenly, without notice or explanation to Swaback and Liang, Cannon, Novack and Alvin, switched their position on the Chinese Communes to that of the PC.

Why did they flop?

One can only deduce the answer. Probably because of the adamant, factional attitude of the PC, Cannon realized that a full-fledged faction fight might ensue if he continued his opposition. So he decided he'd rather switch than fight. That, in that case, the Chinese question was expendable. And probably he surmised that Swaback and Liang would not capitulate on a question they considered vitally important.

In the light of the following nine-year struggle, another cogent reason may have influenced Cannon's thinking; the question of how an independent Trotskyist position would be affected by recognition that the Mao Tse-tung regime in China was not a carbon copy of the Stalin regime in Russia.

It was a Chinese Trotskyist, living in Macao, who wrote to a comrade here in this vein: "If the Mao regime is not Stalinist we would have to maintain it is, as justification for our own existence."

In other words, better to live a lie in this respect than to risk our long-maintained role of the only true Marxists.

Whatever his reason, Cannon made a running jump into the camp of the Stalinophobes of the PC, Novack and Alvin at his heels.

As stated above, the 1959 convention confined discussion to internal bulletins. But oral discussion broke out on the Chinese Communes triggered by a book review of Gerald Clark's "Impatient Giant" which gave a favorable picture of the communes.

Novack led the assault on our pro-Chinese tendency position chiefly with scare stories -- lurid tales of Trotskyists murdered by the CPC. This theme, the CPC murder of Trotskyists, became a constantly recurring one in discussions on Red China. But never were we given any concrete evidence to substantiate this serious charge. Was it from this sort of reporting that Regis Debray found reason to write: "Has anyone ever seen a concrete analysis of a concrete situation from the pen of a Trotskyist?"

It is likely that some Trotskyists were killed during the civil war struggles for there was bitter hostility between Trotskyists and the Chinese Communist Party. For instance, Li Fu-jen, writing in The New Internationalist, March, 1938, admitted that several Trotskyists "fingered" some CPC members to the Blue Shirts, -- Chiang Kai-shek's secret police.

Judging from the claims of so many Trotskyist murders, one would think they numbered thousands in China. Yet in Isaac Deutscher's "The Prophet Outcast," we read: "Even in China, where his (Trotsky's) opposition to Stalin's policies in 1925-7 might have been expected to make the greatest impression, the Fourth International did not possess a section worthy of the name. Trotskyist groups consisted of two dozen in Shanghai, a few dozen in Hong Kong and smaller circles scattered over central and eastern provinces."

It is admitted that during the civil war years a number of Chinese Trotskyists fled to Hong Kong. Admittedly, a number of Trotskyists went over to the CPC. This would not have left many Trotskyists in China to be murdered.

In 1944, Gunther Stein in his book, "Challenge of Red China," wrote: "A few days later we met another of the "Living Corpses" as we came to call them, the former Trotskyite, Wang Shi-wei, who came to the Guest House at our request. This is Wang's account:

" 'I joined the Communist Party in 1936 without admitting my former Trotskyist affiliation and came to Yen-an the year after. I expressed dissatisfaction with conditions in Yen-an during the difficult period in 1941 when the Kuomintang blockade became so strict that we had a very difficult time. I published a series of articles in the Communist

Liberation Daily here in Yen-an early last year in which I accused the Communist Party of deterioration. After many discussion meetings I convinced myself that I had once more been under the influence of Trotskyist ideas.

" 'But my problems have all been solved. I was never detained or tried. The progress of the Border Region since that difficult time has proved to me even more striking than theoretical arguments did before then. I was wrong and defeatist during our most critical period. However, the Party treated me with its new policy of Magnanimity and I was again accepted in its ranks soon after resignation.

" 'You see that I am very much alive in spite of the "Memorial Meeting" that was held for me and all those others who are equally alive.'

"The ghost of this man later crossed my path in the United States. One of the most widely read American magazines was led to believe and print a badly distorted story about Wang, projecting his past political position into the present and alleging his mysterious disappearance."

I am convinced that this ex-Trotskyist Stein interviewed in Yen-an in 1944 is the same person as a Wong She-wei reported to have been tortured and killed in Yen-an in 1942. (World Outlook, July 14, 1967)

The March, 1960, National Committee Plenum had put the Chinese question on the agenda. When Arne and I arrived at SWP headquarters in New York, we "smelled a rat." Arne got the drift of something unusual pending when informed that a whole day would be devoted to the Chinese question; Dan Roberts to present the Majority position and Arne Swabeck the Minority. Discussion would follow, but no summary or vote to be taken.

After these reports and with the beginning of the discussion "the cat jumped out of the bag." This was not to be a serious, honest truthseeking discussion, but an organized, factional assault of venomous vituperation against the Red Chinese regime in general and Arne Swabeck in particular. Hour after dreary hour it continued -- a steady stream of abuse -- a hatchet job right out of the school of Dan Tobin. (Dobbs's Alma Mater)

The wisdom of Mao Tse-tung's dictum: "No investigation no right to speak" was never more forcefully demonstrated than in this so-called discussion. So evident it was that comrades had been lined up, not to deal objectively with a question of vital importance, but to crush with an avalanche of invective, a comrade who was intent upon correcting a party policy -- the overthrow of the Mao regime in China -- which was sure to have degenerating and disastrous effects on the party.

Among those lined up for the assault were a number of comrades who had formerly expressed some degree of agreement with our pro-Chinese position. Larry T., for instance. He made a screaming speech denouncing the CPC for murder of Trotskyists -- even their women and children!

James P. Cannon set the low political level of the "discussion" by a speech the triviality of which could be summed up in its major line: They faked the figures! They will never fool me again! Cannon in the following eight years of struggle never again spoke on the Chinese question. Nor wrote on the subject.

The objective of this shocking performance was so obvious that being told it by one privy to it, was superfluous: That because of Arne Swabek's high standing in the party, this prestige must be destroyed in order to head off serious consideration of the Chinese question by the rank and file.

Here was an old comrade, with a record of fifty years unstinted devotion to the revolutionary movement; a founder of the CPUSA, a member of its Central Executive Committee, a delegate to the Fourth Congress of the Comintern, in 1922, also party representative to the Comintern Executive Committee for six months; a founder of the Trotskyist party in 1929, its National Secretary for several years, now a target of a clear conspiracy to annihilate him politically and to eventually bury his revolutionary record under a torrent of political and personal abuse.

Here also as a target of unbridled reviling was the authentic leadership of a mighty revolution which even Isaac Deutscher admitted "is in its scope the greatest in all history," now leading a new development which a discerning Marxist would see as promise of a giant advance to socialism.

And here were leaders of a party, self-designed heirs of Marx and Lenin, denouncing as scoundrels and betrayers of the Chinese masses, the authentic leaders of that revolution, calling for their overthrow! On what grounds? Nothing concrete that could be substantiated.

I thought: "Is this the way they expect to teach the youth the concept of Communist Man?"

But did the SWP leadership believe that by destroying Arne Swabek they could destroy the truth of the mighty Chinese Revolution?

Subsequent developments have shown that the damage done in this shocking "discussion" was not to the leaders of the Chinese Revolution or to Arne Swabek. It was done to the party. By this shameful and unprincipled action the ensuing dialectical reaction brought a big leap to the insidious degeneration taking place in the party.

Another symptom of this insidious degeneration was the method used to line up comrades who might be disposed to lean to the pro-Chinese tendency. We were given the following graphic description of this method a few years later.

(Excerpt from a letter to Arne.) "In closing I will describe the experience of your last supporter in N.Y. after D. and R. left. V. had continued his contact which was certainly understandable. But this contact was revealed by the correspondence which D. and R. had sent to supporters of the Chinese tendency which the PC got!

"V. was called at his home and then at his job and told to go to headquarters at once. When he arrived he was taken into an inner office and the door was locked. His interrogator began with sly inuendoes about secret documents they had acquired while thumbing through a dossier of hidden letters. Piece by piece in an atmosphere of intrigue and terror, V. gradually became aware of what they had.

"Finally it was demanded that he appear before the branch and apologize! I sit in stunned disbelief to write such words. Stalin's puny imitators performing a macabre burlesque with no power and no audience. Comical? Yes. But not to V. -- terror is never comical to the victim, even when it is impotent. And, Arne, it is not comical to me either. The SWP had an heroic past which these vermin drag through the mire."

Through our agitation in internal bulletins comrades, particularly youth, became interested in our position on China. The Majority opposition in the L.A. branch, led by Alvin, retaliated by button-holing these comrades in the corridors, etc., with "information" designed to discredit us politically and personally. Arne Swabeck, as leader of the tendency was the chief target. (Liang had quickly wilted under Majority attack and took no active part in the struggle.)

In this corridor campaign, according to reports we got from those whose ears were bombarded with it, the attack was vicious. Character assassination, personal slander, misinterpretation of our political statements -- anything and everything was done to intimidate people who might be recruited to our tendency.

When leaders of the youth asked Arne Swabeck to teach a class on the colonial revolution for them, the SWP branch organizer and members of the branch Executive Committee, by whipping up a witch hunt against Arne got the assignment canceled and then rammed through the branch an insulting motion restricting subjects on which Arne could speak!

The Political Committee in New York aided in the smear campaign. Throughout the years of its existence, Arne Swabeck had been a regular contributor to the party press,

especially on such subjects as Marxian economics and labor problems. Now all such non-controversial articles from him were summarily rejected. All measures were taken to denigrate him -- to make an "unperson" of him.

Why this volcanic fury against our small pro-Chinese tendency? We had not organized a faction for a struggle for power. Why were we treated as a dangerous threat because we were urging serious consideration of the monumental question of the Chinese revolution?

Today the Dobbs-Kerry regime is claiming publicly credit for always having defended the Chinese revolution. The latest is Novack's statement in the Fall ISR: "The Socialist Workers Party has demonstrated its solidarity with revolutionary China, not only in words, but in deeds: first in the struggle against Chiang Kai-shek, then by our opposition to the Korean War, by our support to the Workers State against Nehru's bourgeois government in the India-China border clash."

This is as boldfaced a lie as ever was foisted upon a trusting membership. It is a brazen claim, for their own printed record tells otherwise.

I suggest that anyone interested in "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth" which Novack boasts about, get the bound volumes of The Militant and Fourth International for the years 1948-49 and look at the record. Here are just a few excerpts from that sordid record of hostility to the Chinese Revolution. Fourth International June, 1949, Editorial: ". . . A political not a social overturn is occurring in China in which the Stalinists have utilized agrarian reforms and a minimum of revolutionary measures to bring them to power. But since the Stalinists are neither the legitimate representatives of capitalism or of the proletariat whose interests they have betrayed again and again, their rule can be only transitory and an interim state in the development of the class struggle in China. . . . The Stalinists can remain in power only . . . until a new upsurge of the proletariat takes place under the leadership of the Chinese section of the Fourth International. . . ."

The Militant, Feb. 7, 1949: "The Stalinists at the head of the insurgent peasantry enter the cities not to liberate the workers from slavery to the capitalist class but to prevent the workers from rising. . . ."

The Militant, June 13, 1949: "A military-bureaucratic shift of political power has taken place in China, not a social revolution. . . . The new rulers of China are preserving fundamentally the same rotten social and economic foundation as Chiang Kai-shek's regime did." . . . "Standing as an obstacle in the way of a (socialist) reconstruction are the bayonets of Stalinist power in China, which are employed not only to prop up the bankrupt capitalist system but to



regiment the masses. That's why Stalinism must be mercilessly opposed and destroyed."

Constantly throughout this record such derogatory characterizations of the Red Chinese forces are used as the following: rotten, deceitful, treacherous, deadly foe of the toilers, counter-revolutionary, class collaborationist, crassly cynical, the greatest obstacle to revolutionary development, too corrupt to ever redeem itself bureaucracy. But no concrete evidence on which to base such criminal charges was ever forthcoming. And for a good reason. There is none.

Moreover this is the truth. During the great battles of 1948-49 when the Red Army of the CPC -- guided by Mao's thought -- went on the offensive against the much superior forces of Chiang Kai-shek aided by U.S. and British imperialism -- aided too by Stalin who had a pact with Chiang -- at this crucial time the Chinese Trotskyists in essence joined that jackal pack with their unbridled attacks of venomous hostility to the Chinese Communist Party struggle.

Can you believe that the Chinese masses welcomed this sort of "support" and "solidarity" to the Red Army which had been fighting for 22 years for their liberation? Is it any wonder that the Chinese masses look upon Trotskyists as counter-revolutionary enemies?

It is pertinent to ask: Did the Trotskyists actually believe the slanders they hurled at the CPC? Incredible as it sounds today, I believe they did -- at least in the beginning. But how can they believe them today in face of the volumes of contrary evidence?

How can the SWP leaders claim "solidarity with revolutionary China "not only in words but in deeds" in the face of this fact:

On October 1, 1949, when the victory celebration in Peking brought forth hundreds of thousands of wildly cheering Chinese masses, who for four hours, hilarious with joy, waved red banners, scattered flowers, pushed floats and performed drum dances and thundered the words of the anthem which for fifteen years had been sung in China: "Arise you who refuse to be slaves,/ Our very flesh and blood will build a new Great Wall./ A savage indignation fills us now,/ Arise! Arise! Arise!" and then listened to the low Hunanese voice of Mao Tse-tung: "The Central Government Council of the Peoples Government of China today takes power in Peking."

This stirring event, so pregnant with revolutionary power did not rate a single line in The Militant!

But three days later: The Militant, October 3, 1949: "A head-on collision between such a regime and the mass of the people whose interests are being flouted more and more is, in the long run unavoidable."

When the Korean War broke out, The Militant first came out with a "plague on both your houses" line. It was fast discarded in the face of much concrete evidence of the revolutionary struggle by North Korea and then by China.

In its issue of November 9, 1959, The Militant castigated Red China for defending its revolution against the attacks of India in the border dispute. When Arne Swabek wrote a letter to the editor protesting such "support" it was refused publication.

So much for Novack's truth!

It was in 1955, six years after the CPC victory, that the SWP acknowledged that the overturn in China was a social revolution. A Party Plenum passed a resolution, "The Third Chinese Revolution and its Aftermath," which designated Red China as a "workers state" but declared: "On the road to socialism the workers would have to abolish the bureaucracy along with the Mao leadership that now leads it." This incredible document repeats all the slanders given above in press statements.

Formerly information from Red China was hard to obtain, but in 1955 the facts of the actual struggle as well as official documents were easily obtainable. In particular Mao Tse-tung's writings -- the authentic voice of the revolution -- were available.

Is it not the duty of party leaders in the party center, entrusted by the rank and file, to keep them informed concerning events so important to the revolution? Nothing like that was forthcoming from SWP leaders in 1955, concerning China. On the contrary.

James P. Cannon made a speech at this 1955 Plenum so full of factual errors, so full of double-talk and gobbledegook, it seemed designed to deny any credit for the winning of the Chinese Revolution to Mao Tse-tung and the CPC. Cannon declared:

". . . the program proclaimed by the Stalinist leaders at the moment of victory . . . was a capitalist program." And ". . . on the very eve of crossing the river to final confirmation of their military victory the Stalinists were still dickering for a coalition government which would have meant handing the power back to the bourgeois class represented by Chiang Kai-shek."

Could it be that Cannon was misled into making such outrageous misstatements of fact by Farrell Dobbs's report in his "Digest of 1949 U.S. White Paper on China"? Cannon had stated: "I was struck by the information Farrell quoted here -- from the U.S. White Paper."

Now on page 293 of the White Paper is a correct listing of the eight points demanded by the CPC for entering into negotiations with the Kuomintang. The White Paper stated: "These terms were equivalent to unconditional surrender." (emphasis added) Dobbs knew this. His abbreviation of the eight points can be construed only as a deliberate deception. Otherwise he surely would have corrected Cannon. This was a falsification of an important piece of history. It was a betrayal of the revolutionary cause of the Chinese proletariat.

It is interesting to note that in the bulletin which contains Dobbs's digest of the White Paper the major part is devoted to a review of "China Under Communism -- The First Five Years," by Richard L. Walker. And who is Richard L. Walker? Among other things a paid propagandist for Chiang Kai-shek's China lobby!

It was a severe shock to learn during research on the Chinese Revolution of such a deception as related above by Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary of the party, who above all others is entrusted with party guidance. More shocking still to discover that at least 80 percent of what I had learned in the SWP about the third Chinese Revolution is not the truth. Every attempt made to present the true record of the decades of struggle by the CPC and its Red Army to liberate China was met with hostility and a furious defense of every statement in the incredible 1955 resolution -- so vile and vicious and false. The idea of reading what Mao had to say was met with scorn -- Mao must be overthrown.

This grim determination not to entertain a study of the concrete events of the revolutionary struggle in China led inexorably to the conclusion that the SWP central leadership has a vested stake in the framework of falsehood they have erected around the reality of the Chinese Revolution and its leadership.

No wonder Farrell Dobbs denounced criticism and self-criticism as Stalinist garbage! In that, he and those who concur, spit on the past of their party. In The Militant, Feb. 15, 1929, in "The Platform of the Communist Opposition" signed by James P. Cannon, Arne Swabeck, Martin Abern and Max Shachtman, we read: "A genuine Leninist self-criticism is a primary prerequisite for the establishment of clarity, the raising of the ideological level of the party and the elimination of distrust and cynicism caused by its absence. Instead of self-criticism the party leadership has instituted a regime of diplomacy, concealment, distortion and self-praise."

Likewise the present party leadership spits on one of Lenin's most important dictums: "The attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes is one of the most important criteria of the seriousness of the party and how it fulfills in practice its obligations towards its class and toward the toiling masses. To admit a mistake openly, to disclose its reasons, to analyze the conditions which gave rise to it, to study attentively the means of correcting it -- these are the signs of a serious party; this means performance of its duties, the means of educating and training the class and subsequently the masses." (Left Wing Communism -- An Infantile Disorder)

1933 was a year of shocks. Shocks which revealed a deepening degeneration of the party. The interaction between the debilitating effect of isolation from the correcting influence of proletarian class struggle and the objectively counter-revolutionary line on the Chinese Revolution had opened all pores to the infestation of bourgeois ideology and capitalist corruption. It was inevitable that this political deterioration be reflected organizationally.

In February Myra Tanner Weiss was reprimanded by the Political Committee for "violation of party procedure," this said violation being her correct protest of an act of petty persecution of the minority Robertson group, by the PC. A tape recording of the proceedings was sent to all National Committee members. This was sickening reading, portraying as it did a resort to shameful gutter-type politics.

In March the Milwaukee branch -- almost solidly with the pro-Chinese tendency -- was the target of PC persecution. The Milwaukee Executive Committee, as was their right and duty, had voted to expel a comrade who had absconded with defense committee funds entrusted to his care, and also owing comrades substantial sums. The PC stepped in and like a policeman who arrests the victim instead of the perpetrator of a crime, sent to Milwaukee twice a Control Commission for an investigation of improper conduct -- the Milwaukee comrades! This raw frame-up failed for the Milwaukee comrades stood solidly against what they sensed was a splitting maneuver. This did not end their harassment, however. After many months of futile maneuvers against them, the final straw was the SWP expulsion of one of their youth members on trumped up charges. The Milwaukee branch disaffiliated from the SWP unanimously.

Early in 1963, the Progressive Labor Movement published in their Marxist-Leninist Quarterly, a declaration addressed to all those on the Left with socialist orientation stating: "We seek only a frank discussion of differences and, whenever possible, a coordinated struggle against the imperialist enemy. . . . Our aim is . . . a Vanguard Leninist Party that can lead millions in mass movements against imperialism."

A Marxist Party proclaiming the same aims would have welcomed this invitation, and with alacrity, responded affirmatively. The SWP leaders, with bitter hostility, rejected it. Their reply in The Militant was an attack on the PLM for a mild, but valid criticism PL had made against Trotskyism.

Our pro-Chinese tendency protested this and from then on agitated for collaboration with the PLM with fusion as a long-range goal.

In July the bi-annual National Convention was held. This was the first time the Chinese Commune question was debated before the whole party. And now it was but one of a number of tendencies presenting minority views. This circumstance tended to shove our pro-Chinese tendency into the background. In branches where other issues were "hot" the Chinese question had not been discussed! Surely an indication of the theoretical poverty and provincialism prevailing in the party.

The Majority resolution on China was, of course adopted. This resolution reaffirmed the 1955 resolution, calling for the overthrow of the Mao Tse-tung regime stating: "There are no legal means . . . through which . . . the one-party state can be changed or corrected in a peaceful way. . . . A new party will have to be formed to conduct the struggle."

The Majority leadership demonstrated that it was chiefly interested in burying all dissidents with a barrage of verbal vitriol. The piece de resistance, a distillation of this predominating aim, was a characteristic obscene rage by Tom Kerry with its closing line: "All the minority tendencies combined are not worth a pinch of sour owl shit!"

The Convention set the stage for the expulsion of the Robertson group on the charge of "disloyalty." Expulsion of the Wohlforth group followed soon after. The charge? Again "disloyalty." The fabric of the party was beginning to rot -- coming apart at the seams.

The pro-Chinese tendency had protested the pacifist position taken by the Majority leadership on the test-ban treaty.

As usual our protest was ignored. This was in 1961.

In 1963 came something of a milestone in the deepening degeneration of the SWP leadership -- their reaction of sniveling opportunism to the Kennedy assassination. The contrast between this and the special edition of Progressive Labor with its splendid revolutionary line was devastating to the SWP.

This shocking revelation of SWP rank opportunism reinforced my budding conviction that Progressive Labor was the

viable revolutionary organization in the United States. On the other hand hope that SWP downward direction could be reversed was eroded by the continued rigid imperviousness of the SWP Majority to any argument no matter how well documented, which differed from their Stalinophobic conclusions concerning the Chinese Revolution. As Arne had written in an article to the party Plenum: "The propensity of the SWP majority leadership for using every possible occasion to hurl brickbats at China, its regime and its ideological dispute with the Kremlin is only a hairline removed from the danger of giving aid and comfort to the imperialist enemy."

In 1965 the SWP-YSA joined the anti-Vietnam war movement and we hoped that by study of the Vietnam struggle, interest of some comrades would be led to an examination of the real target of U.S. imperialism -- Red China. But the SWP took an opportunist "one slogan" line and the YSA did not question it.

In our tendency struggle for a Leninist revolutionary defeatist position on the Vietnam War, the Seattle branch played a most active role. The Dobbs-Kerry regime retaliated with a maneuver of a particularly vomituous variety against the Seattle leadership. To the Seattle branch this was the last straw in a stack of long continued harassment. Seattle's disaffiliation was another milestone on the downgrade road of the SWP.

The Seattle episode convinced me that the moral capital of the Dobbs-Kerry regime was running out -- that lies, frame-ups and nasty dishonest maneuvers had become their way of life. Having been the target of one such a lying nasty maneuver I had concrete reason for that belief.

Our tendency ranks had been thinned, but not by defections to the Majority. Some young comrades had been virtually witch-hunted out of the party; others became politically discouraged and "fed-up" with the petty persecution and ostracism and left. Some, convinced that reform of the SWP was hopeless, resigned in favor of Progressive Labor. I felt the latter were correct about the PLP and it was time to resign. But Arne, feeling responsibility for the SWP as a founder of it, insisted that the fight must go on until the end -- and the end was not yet.

Then came an historical development of such monumental importance to the world revolution, so pregnant with Communist advance, that the imperialists greeted it with torrents of hate and abuse as has seldom been seen in history: China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

To its everlasting shame the SWP tailed the imperialists.

## II. ON THE WRONG SIDE OF THE BARRICADES

"Trotskyism has nothing to learn from history. It already has the key to it." -- Regis Debray.

Not only that -- SWP Trotskyism today, writing about Red China uses a divining rod for their "Marxist interpretation." Thus their treatment of China's Cultural Revolution.

Radicals of thoughtful mind, baffled as many were by this entirely new and gigantic development in China, studied and listened and sought guidance from those who knew China first hand, who had lived in China and had shown revolutionary understanding. For as Rewi Alley wrote:

"The China of 1967 is something that few without knowledge of and belief in the revolution will understand."  
(Challenge, March, 1967)

Since the Dobbs-Kerry regime of the SWP "had the key" they were cocksure. No need for waiting. No need for study. In the Fall issue of ISR, George Novack presented the party position, boasting that the SWP was the first on the left to publicly state their views. Novack wrote:

"We take the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth for our guide." In this article on China's Cultural Revolution and in others following in The Militant and World Outlook the "truth" taken for their reporting was scoopings of counter-revolutionary filth from the journalistic cesspools of imperialism and its running dog, Chiang Kai-shek and also -- perhaps most venal -- from the Kremlin revisionists.

This reckless echoing of the imperialist press, repeating its vile and vicious and false reporting; and then when the truth caught up with the lies, refusing to print that; treating with contempt and ridicule the official statements of the Chinese Communist Party, questioning their veracity; -- can a revolutionist regard this otherwise than with utter loathing?"

With sure instinct for their imperialist interests the bourgeois press was rooting for "those in authority taking the capitalist road," gloating whenever there were any indications the Mao Tse-tung forces might be losing. This also the SWP echoed. And in this the Dobbs-Kerry regime stepped over that "hairline removed from the danger of giving aid and comfort to the imperialist enemy."

In speeches and articles, with unbridled hostility, the SWP broadcast their smear of the Cultural Revolution in China. This could be characterized as a compound of the valor

of ignorance, petty bourgeois snobbery, over-weening arrogance and Stalinophobia. "Mao's thought" was a special target for the gleeful denunciations. They regarded it as nothing but repulsive adulation of Mao's person. Concerning this reaction, Kurt Mendelssohn, the noted British scientist, wrote:

"To the Chinese this is simply the acknowledgment of that spirit which, after a century of decay and misery, has turned China again into a great and prosperous power." And he added, ". . . we expect them (the Chinese) to think and act as we do. In fact, they do not. While their reasoning may follow the same lines as ours, their way of expression may be totally different." ("A Personal View of China's Cultural Revolution," Challenge, March, 1967)

Han Suyin has said something of the same sort and saying also that she is always appalled at Chinese translations into English.

Mao's thought is "Chinese" for Marxism-Leninism, for Dialectical Materialism. No doubt these Marxist terms would sound formidable to workers, peasants and soldiers largely illiterate only seventeen years ago. Mao's thought they understand and know what it means to them -- a tool for use in their work. As Anna Louise Strong says: "Now Mao, in a pamphlet, 'On Practice', gives the entire theory of knowledge in fourteen pages in words that a peasant can understand. Even an illiterate peasant could understand it if it were read to him."

That workers, peasants and soldiers of China do understand it is illustrated in twenty articles in, Philosophical Research, written by these workers, peasants and soldiers who, using Mao's thought in their research, demonstrated various practical applications of dialectics.

Of course, the super-sophisticates of the SWP, Hansen and Novack, are not the audience to which the study of Mao's thought is directed, but to Franz Fanon's "Wretched of the Earth" -- those recently liberated from economic slavery and oppression and those seeking liberation. These are the people who are welcoming Mao's thought as a weapon in their struggle. It is no accident that the little Red Book of Mao's Quotations has become a world best seller -- a phenomenon the like of which has never before happened in history. It has its adherents in this country also as witness H. Rap Brown's reading of it in the courtroom at Alexandria! And as Sidney Rittenberg tells in Peking Review:

"A friend who works in Peking was in America recently. At one meeting he attended a discussion arose on the use of the phrase 'Chairman Mao is the Red Sun in the hearts of revolutionary people everywhere.' A young Afro-American got up and said: 'I don't understand a lot of the theory you



people have been arguing about, but on this point as far as I am concerned, there is nothing to discuss. Chairman Mao is the Red Sun in my heart.' "

This brings to mind John Reed's story of the dialogue between the self-proclaimed Marxist student, Panyin, and the unnamed soldier who, trying to refute Panyin's boasted learning, kept repeating: "It seems there are only two classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie . . . only two classes . . . and whoever isn't on the one side is on the other." ("Ten Days That Shook the World")

In their petty bourgeois snobbery, sneering at Mao's thought, Novack and Hansen are "lifting a rock only to drop it on their own feet."

How large a rock it was and how crushing its weight, the Dobbs-Kerry regime discovered in January, 1967. The Monthly Review editorial for that month was a splendid, well documented, well reasoned treatise on China's Cultural Revolution. The basis for this analysis was the official statement of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, stating the objectives of the Cultural Revolution. In a summary of this statement the editorial declared:

". . . we are dealing with what is on its face, a rational, radical and humane document with which it is hard to see how any genuine revolutionary can find serious fault."

This positive, objective judgment coming from a highly regarded Marxist journal of first rate international repute was sure to receive wide attention and to influence the thinking of many radicals on China's Cultural Revolution. It struck a body blow to the SWP position, effectively refuting their wholly negative and slanderous line.

This editorial must have been a thunderbolt, hitting the Dobbs-Kerry leadership in a vital spot, judging from their fast reaction of something like panic. Here, coming from an influential source, was the line on China they had been treating with ridicule and contempt when coming from Arne Swabeck. Might not it bring forth some questioning from SWP ranks such as: Could Arne be right? They evidently felt the need to quickly attack this potential danger.

So Dobbs-Kerry harnessed their hounds, Hansen and Novack, for a galloping rush to judgment.

The brazen, bumptious bombast that Hansen-Novack produced in rebuttal (The Militant, Jan. 23, 1967) revealed the stark theoretical poverty of the SWP leadership. Formless, shallow in content, using old formulas for analysis, reiterating the old slanders, it exposed the depth of self-imposed ignorance concerning the Chinese Revolution.

On a question so fundamentally vital to the advance of communism, the Chinese Cultural Revolution, the SWP leadership was on trial as never before in their history. Their failing the test was a big leap in their political degeneration as shown in their inability to distinguish between revolution and counter-revolution in China.

In this they stand naked on the wrong side of the barricades.

In the May, 1967, issue of Monthly Review the editors added much substantial evidence for the correct understanding of what the Chinese Cultural Revolution is all about. Indirectly this was an answer, devastating to the Hansen-Novack article in The Militant. The editorial stated in conclusion: "As we see it, the Cultural Revolution is designed to make sure that China will accomplish just what Barry Richman and all the other bourgeois professors in the world regard as impossible. Marx and Engels believed it was possible. So did Lenin. So does Mao. We are happy to be in that company."

I subscribe to that!

But the Dobbs-Kerry regime clings stubbornly to the "analysis" of China's Cultural Revolution which they share with the bourgeoisie and the Kremlin. The Militant article rebutting Monthly Review was published in a pamphlet wherein to the pitiful punditry of Hansen-Novack was added the pitiful piffle of Peng Shu-tse.

Thus is the door closed to change in the headlong rightward direction of the SWP. Yet to the Dobbs-Kerry leadership a nagging irritant remained -- the revolutionary voice of Arne Swabeck. They considered it a threat to their regimented organization. So they seized upon an occasion which provided them with an excuse for charges, trivial and fraudulent though they were, and expelled him. By any criterion this is an international disgrace to Trotskyism.

But do they believe that by getting rid of Arne Swabeck they can escape dealing honestly with the gigantic question of Red China?

Nevertheless they have achieved their long desired objective -- a monolithic party. But for how long will the youth be content with the deadly routinism now prevailing in the party?

"Condemned to exist in the present within the categories of the past, Trotskyism withers on the vine," said Regis Debray.

Now one sees clearly that the once hoped for revolutionary rejuvenation is dead. And so with no regrets or looking back I sever ties with the now humiliating burden of SWP membership.

And as I do I think of Anna Louise Strong, her saying: "I'm already over 81 years old, but I can still do revolutionary propaganda. New things are taking place around me every day. And now I think I shall probably witness events far beyond what I ever expected in the development of China's revolution and the world revolution. What wonderful vistas for an old revolutionary!"

Those sentiments, I share.

S/ Hildegard Swabek