

YOUNG socialist discussion bulletin

Volume 16, No. 5
NOVEMBER 9, 1972

Contents

- | | |
|--|---|
| THE MEANING OF THE "CLASS STRUGGLE FACTION"
by Andy Rose | 2 |
| THE POLITICS OF THE NEW RADICALIZATION: CLASS
STRUGGLE OR CLASS COLLABORATION?
by Sharon Curtis, Madison YSA | 3 |

Published by:

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE
P.O. Box 471 Cooper Station, New York, N.Y. 10003

25 cents

THE MEANING OF THE "CLASS STRUGGLE FACTION"

by Andy Rose

A faction in the YSA is a tight-knit grouping of YSA members united around a political perspective so fundamentally irreconcilable with the political line of the YSA and its elected leadership that they must embark on a course of aiming to capture the leadership of the YSA themselves by winning a majority of the organization to their views.

The so-called "Class Struggle Faction" declared by Sharon Curtis of the Madison YSA is not a faction. It undeniably is a group with fundamental and irreconcilable differences with the political line of the YSA. However, far from constituting a serious faction, this group consists of a tiny handful of individuals who have no perspective of attempting to win the YSA to their views and whose loyalty lies not with the YSA but with a sectarian grouplet that has recently split from the Trotskyist movement.

Curtis's letter announcing the formation of the "Class Struggle Faction" states that the "Class Struggle Faction" is "in political solidarity with the Leninist Faction, a revolutionary faction within the SWP."

YSA members may have heard of the group calling itself the "Leninist Faction" of the Socialist Workers Party. The fall 1972 issue of Spartacist published a "Declaration of Leninist Faction" along with a letter from five members of the "Leninist Faction" -- four SWP members and one YSA member -- resigning from the SWP and the YSA to join the Spartacist League. (The Spartacist League is a small sectarian group that split from the YSA and SWP almost 10 years ago and that aims to destroy the YSA.)

The logic of these five individuals in leaving the YSA and SWP was unimpeachable, since judging from the "Declaration of Leninist Faction" there is little to differentiate the "Leninist Faction" from the Spartacist League.

The remaining members of the "Leninist Faction" in the SWP sought to open a general political discussion in the SWP, submitting hundreds of pages of resolutions to the SWP, despite the fact that no pre-convention discussion period was open.

YSA members will note that the resolution submitted by Sharon Curtis is not a resolution concerning the program or policies of the YSA, but rather consists solely of attacks on the Socialist Workers Party. Curtis attempts to justify this by advancing the position that the most important task facing the YSA is to break with the SWP. The real reason is that Curtis's document is merely a condensation or digest of the lengthier documents the "Leninist Faction" was attempting to get published by the SWP.

The submission of this SWP document to the YSA pre-convention discussion was a crude and undisguised maneuver to

circumvent the democratic-centralist norms of the Socialist Workers Party and circulate the "Leninist Faction" material when no SWP pre-convention discussion was being conducted.

By failing to make any attempt to give their document even the surface appearance of being written for the YSA, Curtis and the other members of the "Class Struggle Faction," i. e., "Leninist Faction," merely demonstrate their contempt for the membership of the YSA. They attempt to abuse and debase the YSA pre-convention discussion by using it as a factional club against their main enemy -- the Socialist Workers Party.

The document of the "Class Struggle Faction" is not directed at the YSA and is not a legitimate contribution to the YSA's pre-convention discussion.

The cynically irresponsible attitude of the "Class Struggle Faction" toward the YSA and SWP is also shown by their false references to the relation between the Socialist Workers Party and the Fourth International. Their document repeatedly states or implies that the SWP is a section of the Fourth International. These false statements endanger the security of the SWP and the YSA. Because of reactionary legislation, neither the YSA nor the SWP can affiliate to the Fourth International, although we are in political solidarity with the Fourth International.

In a letter dated October 26, 1972, the remaining members of the "Leninist Faction" -- fifteen individuals in Boston, Chicago, and Minneapolis -- resigned from the Socialist Workers Party. All those "Leninist Faction" members who were members of the YSA as well as the SWP resigned from both. In their letter, they characterized the Socialist Workers Party as "liquidationist," "reformist," and "bureaucratic centralist." They explained their former membership in the SWP as a "tactical question" of carrying out entry work in a reformist organization. They indicate they now intend to establish a new public group. Thus the "Leninist Faction" has departed for the fantasy world of sectarian pseudo-Trotskyism inhabited by the Workers League, Spartacist League, Vanguard Newsletter, etc. It is with these splitters that Sharon Curtis and the "Class Struggle Faction" declare their solidarity.

November 9, 1972

Sharon Curtis
Madison, Wisconsin

YSA National Office
Box 471, Cooper Station
New York, New York

Dear Comrades,

This letter announces the formation of the Class Struggle Faction, around the program contained in the document The Politics of the New Radicalization, Class Struggle or Class Collaboration, and in political solidarity with the Leninist Faction, a revolutionary faction within the SWP.

We wish this letter to be printed, with the accompanying document, in the YSA pre-convention discussion bulletin.

Comradely,
s/Sharon Curtis
Madison, Wisconsin
for the Class Struggle Faction

The Politics of the New Radicalization: Class Struggle or Class Collaboration?

by Sharon Curtis
for the Class Struggle Faction

Introduction

As comrades in the YSA begin their consideration of political questions raised in this document, they may be surprised that a document presented to the YSA is devoted mainly to an analysis of the Socialist Workers Party.

Though the YSA is organizationally independent of the SWP, it is still politically subordinate to the party and has looked to the SWP for leadership since its foundation in 1960. The Where We Stand declaration adopted at the founding convention of the YSA in April, 1960, stated that:

"The revolutionary socialist youth are well aware that by themselves youth cannot lead the working class to power. That is the historic task of the working class revolutionary party... The YSA recognizes that only the SWP of all existing political parties is capable of providing the working class with political leadership on class struggle principles.

"As a result of its three-year development the supporters of the Young Socialist have come into basic political solidarity, on the principles of revolutionary socialism, with the SWP."

However, not only does the theoretical possibility exist that a revolutionary party, or even International, can degenerate, but the possibility becomes actuality when we study the history of the communist movement, where many once revolutionary groupings have sunk into the class collaborationist swamps of centrism and reformism.

We in the Class Struggle Faction consider ourselves to be in political solidarity with the Leninist Faction of the SWP. We believe that the SWP has lost the orientation of revolutionary Marxism, and instead has turned to the petty-bourgeois opportunism characteristic of reformism. Though the SWP tries still to maintain a veneer of orthodoxy we see this as only a gilded cover to a rotten hulk, as the writings of Lenin, Trotsky, and Marx bear little resemblance to the present-day program of the SWP. The most serious task facing the YSA today is a break with the SWP, by analyzing the politics of both class struggle and class collaboration, and in the end choosing class struggle. We present this document in the spirit of serious discussion and re-evaluation leading to Marxism.

Problems of the Early Fourth International

The crisis of the present epoch can best be summed up as the crisis of leadership of the world working class. An international party of the working class, organized around the transitional program of socialism and revolution, is the only possible solution to the crisis of proletarian leadership.

Trotsky founded the Fourth International in response to this need. The world working class at the time of the founding of the Fourth International was left leaderless in light of the capitulations and counter-revolutionary betrayals of the Stalinist Third International in China, Germany, and Spain, and within the USSR itself in the form of brutal suppressions against the Left Opposition.

Objective conditions were by no means perfect for the formation of the new international. Stalinism had shown itself incapable of leading the workers in making a socialist revolution. But the Third International, in spite of its betrayals, retained great credibility and respect in the eyes of many of the world's class conscious workers.

As a result, the cadre of the early Fourth International were few in number and isolated from the masses of workers, consisting mainly of communist intellectuals. Their value had its weak side--a certain disdain for theory, a bent toward theoretical inventiveness. As Trotsky found in the case of Shachtman and Burnham, it is harder to teach an intellectual. The problem was to a certain extent inevitable, originating in the objective conditions in which the Fourth International struggled. In order to be effective, however, a communist international must achieve a base within the working class, and a large part of the task of the Fourth International was that of breaking out of its social composition and milieu and placing its roots within the working class. As a part of this

task, the Fourth International needed an intense theoretical grounding in Marxism as opposed to the impressionism and eclecticism which are usually the methods of intellectuals trained in capitalist society.

These weaknesses of the Fourth International were well understood by Trotsky; in fact, many of his writings from this period were devoted to an analysis and correction of these weaknesses. Trotsky understood that criticism is necessary to the analysis of error. It is with this in mind that this document criticizes the weaknesses of the early Fourth International. Analysis and criticism are necessary to an understanding of the political bankruptcy of the Fourth International today.

Prior to the founding of the Fourth International Trotsky found it necessary to do constant political battle with centrist and sectarian tendencies among those who recognized the bankruptcy of the Comintern. These tendencies opposed the immediate foundation of the Fourth International on the grounds that every single political question had to be clarified first. Then the building of the Fourth International could begin.

Trotsky fought this idea implacably, counterposing to it the Marxist idea that the organization and the full elaboration of the program must be built at precisely the same time; that the two processes are inseparable. The program can only achieve full development through the political development of the organization. The correct lessons can only be drawn from the context of the actual struggle of the working class against the capitalist class.

On the question of how to form the Fourth, Trotsky stated that the formation of factions, regroupments with other groups on the basis of fusion on a principled program, and the formation of new groups were all in order under this condition: That principled political struggle must never be replaced by methods of organizational or political diplomacy, by suppression of program to adapt to another grouping, by any means of political dishonesty. As Trotsky stated in an article called **MARXISTS AT ALL TIMES AND UNDER ALL CONDITIONS OPENLY SAY WHAT IS** (Writings 1935-1936, p. 19):

"...on whatever arena, and whatever the methods of functioning, they (Marxists) are bound to speak in the name of unqualified principles and clear revolutionary slogans. They do not play hide and seek with the working class; they do not conceal their aims; they do not substitute diplomacy and combinations for a principled struggle."

Trotsky and Lenin knew that only the correct Marxist idea can create the correct Marxist organization. This is why both of these great revolutionary leaders did not hesitate to make harsh criticisms of any vacillations or capitulations on the part of those purporting to lead the working class to socialism.

Lenin and Trotsky understood that the organization will

easily stray from its principles if the reasons behind those principles are not fully understood by all concerned. A correct program, by itself, will not remain intact if the analysis of society which makes the program correct is not understood; and organization must be completely able to apply Marxist methods of analysis in every situation or it may come to a lack of understanding of the reasons lying behind its program. It will throw out its revolutionary program because it doesn't understand it.

A general humanitarian desire to relieve the conditions of the oppressed does not make one a Marxist. Marxist analyses and Marxist methods of struggle are essential. Mistakes, once made, must be tirelessly criticized in order to prevent their recurrence. This is the only way an organization can come to understand the correct analysis of capitalist society in order to overthrow it. He who does not understand Marxism will eventually find only the methods of the bourgeoisie to be of use.

Democratic Centralism, the SWP and the Fourth International

To a Marxist, democratic-centralism contains a dialectical relationship. On the one hand, the centralist aspect of the party's functioning states that, in order to be effective, the party must strike as one, having complete unity in action. On the democratic side of the relationship, the party must have complete and democratic discussion before, and analysis after, a particular plan of action is carried out or a particular political position adopted.

The SWP's interpretation of democratic-centralism is a complete revision of the concept. In common with other bureaucratically degenerating parties, the SWP has done a hatchet job on the democratic side of the relationship. The meaning of democratic-centralism, as we have stated, is one of constant discussion with unity in action. Centralism is not lacking in the operations of the SWP. But the SWP says that democracy is present in the relationship only for three months out of twenty-four, and centralism takes over the rest of the time. Attempts at discussion of any issue during the remaining twenty-one months are a serious infraction of the rules. The SWP carries its lack of understanding of dialectical materialism into its revision of democratic-centralism. Instead of a dialectical relationship between democracy and centralism in which each side complements and strengthens the other, the SWP believes in a formula of 1/8 democracy, 7/8 centralism. Democracy loses by more than a nose.

Lenin, arriving in Russia after the March Revolution, immediately began his attack on the leadership of the RSDLP in the form of the April Theses. He demanded his rights, the pre-existing rights of all Bolsheviks to criticize their leaders politically, which was passed at the Third Congress of the RSDLP. He received his rights in spite of the grumbling of Stalin.

If the Bolsheviks, instead of holding the correct attitude

toward democratic-centralism, had subscribed to the SWP's view of the question, they may have said "Sorry, Comrade Lenin, pre-convention discussion period is closed. You must wait for the opening of pre-convention discussion period in 21 months. You must withhold your criticisms completely until December, 1919."

Lenin stressed the need for constant political discussion for two reasons. 1) It was necessary as a means of educating the party. 2) It was necessary as a means of keeping the discussion on a political level, rather than an organizational level.

In the Shachtman faction fight, Trotsky and Cannon had two different attitudes toward democratic discussion in the SWP. Trotsky wished the minority to have the right to an article in the Fourth International. Cannon opposed this because he felt the discussion had gone on long enough and should be stopped; that the party should stop the discussion and get on with its activities. Trotsky felt that it was necessary for the theoretical development of the party to allow further discussion; Cannon wished to cut off discussion by organizational means. Cannon's attitude, which we may infer from his actions, was that theoretical discussion was somehow separate from the task of party building, was in fact harmful to that task. In fact, theoretical discussion cannot be separated from the task of party-building. Internal discussion is never to be cut off by organizational means outside of the most exceptional circumstances.

We will now show how the incorrect attitude of the SWP toward democratic centralism and theoretical discussion had disastrous repercussions in its attitude toward the FI from the beginning.

The Fourth International, because of its program, was able to survive the murder of Trotsky and other leading comrades during WWII. But in order to grow, in order to keep up with world events and to prove its program in struggle, the FI needed an understanding of Marxism, applied to the class forces working on it. Revolutionary organizations degenerate without revolutionary understanding, without the Marxist method of analysis.

Part of the reason for the Pabloist disintegration of the Fourth International lies in the failure of the SWP, one of the "orthodox" parties within the international, to develop the proper attitude in the beginning toward the concept of a communist international as a democratic-centralist world party. This was a very major fault, and after the SWP's federationist attitude toward the Fourth International helped lead to the unchecked inroads Pabloism had made in Europe. Cannon, in his open letter which helped create an unprincipled split during the international pre-convention discussion period, unwittingly shed light on the process:

"Since we were barred from belonging to the Fourth International by reactionary laws, we placed all the greater hope in the emergence of a leadership capable of continuing

the great tradition bequeathed to the movement by Trotsky. We felt that the young, new leadership of the Fourth International in Europe must be given our full confidence and support. When corrections of serious errors were made on the initiative of the comrades themselves, we felt our course was proving justified."

"However, we must admit that the very freedom from sharp criticism which we together with others accorded this leadership helped open the way for the consolidation of an uncontrolled, secret personal faction in the administration of the Fourth International which has abandoned Trotskyism."

Eight years later the SWP's lack of true Bolshevik internationalism showed up again in the SWP document "Problems of the Fourth International and the Next Steps" which stated:

"In our opinion internationalism is essentially a process of comradely discussion and collaboration in which the constituent sections of the world movement exchange views and jointly work out, if possible, common positions on the most vital problems of world politics. Discipline in action follows that, but cannot substitute for it."

Ten years later, the SWP has wandered even further from the Bolshevik attitude toward an international party. Witness this statement favoring a federation of parties rather than a democratic-centralist world combat party.

"The principle condition for an international organization is in international collaboration between leaderships developed out of real organizations fighting to build mass revolutionary Trotskyist parties in every country." (Jack Barnes as quoted by Krivine and Frank in April 1971 ISR.)

A communist international is more than a mutual aid and discussion society. It is a democratic-centralist world party, bound to a common program and led by an elected central leadership.

This does not negate Cannon's decision to side with Trotsky and fight the American section of the Comintern as evidence of a correct impulse toward internationalism. The publication of the Militant three times a week with Trotsky's articles on Germany also point up to the early SWP's raw, but correct, internationalist orientation.

However, Bolshevik internationalism is more than merely sympathizing with the struggles of the communist movement in other countries. Bolshevik internationalism is based on the understanding of the necessity of a national party being bound to the discipline of the international party, of constantly contributing to the discussion of major issues, and of subordinating its own program to the decisions of the elected leadership of the international. This is where the SWP went wrong. An international party is not merely for the purpose of collaboration between friendly national sections on an equal basis, although this is part of the functioning of an international. The

foremost function of the communist international is leadership-- with the national sections under discipline to the decisions of the International.

The American section of the Fourth International, being relatively untouched by the war in comparison to European sections, was in the best position to lead it during the post-war period. The SWP did not wish to.

The existence of the Voorhis Act is a totally inadequate reason for the SWP to forego participation in the political leadership of the FI. Though not a formal member of the Fourth International, the SWP has full rights of political discussion. The frequent mention of the Voorhis Act as grounds for abstaining from its international responsibilities is a red herring, an excuse. It is a poor excuse indeed when compared with Trotsky's exile from Russia and his harassment by Stalinist and Fascist agents. This did not stop Trotsky from founding the Fourth International. Should the Voorhis Act stop the SWP from fullest political participation in the Fourth International? Is the building of the world party of the proletariat any more difficult or less important than it was then?

The Adaptationism of the SWP

Coupled with the lack of a correct understanding of Bolshevik internationalism, due to a theoretical weakness, was a tendency toward opportunism and adaptationism on the home front arising from the same weakness. Because these tendencies arose from a theoretical weakness which was never corrected, trade union adaptationism in the early period of the SWP changed later into adaptationism to a different milieu -- adaptation to the petty-bourgeoisie.

The adaptation of the SWP to trade unionism took the form of sowing illusions about the role of "progressive" trade union bureaucrats, and the form of mistakes in tactical formulation of its slogans during WWII.

Then, as now, the SWP misunderstood the concept behind the demands of the transitional program. The leadership then, as now, explains the purpose of the transitional program as one of adapting to the backwardness of the workers, "tricking" them into making a revolution, rather than its true purpose of offering the workers solutions to problems they are already aware of. The whole purpose of the SWP's rotten program today is one of "reaching the masses where they are." Unfortunately the masses of today, being in a state of false consciousness, a state of bourgeois ideology, can be reached, according to the logic of this position, by raising only bourgeois-democratic slogans. The masses not being class-conscious, the slogans the SWP raises are perfectly acceptable to liberal imperialists, because they do not reach beyond bourgeois property rights: "Out Now", "Repeal All Abortion Laws", "Black Control of the Black Community" and other slogans to be dealt with in this document.

The SWP's main slogan during WWII was adaptationist in its formulation. "Turn the Imperialist War into a War Against

Fascism" is a slogan which sees the Proletarian Military Policy as a means of better prosecution of the war against Germany in the mutual interests of the American working class and the American capitalist class. It implies that fascism is the mutual enemy of both, American workers and American capitalists have no mutual interests. However, both German fascism and American imperialism are enemies of the world working class. A war against fascism can only be a class war against imperialism itself. Only a revolutionary war can fight fascism and put an end to all imperialist wars.

This tendency toward adaptation to trade-union consciousness later changed to adaptation to the petty-bourgeoisie in later times, a tendency which is expressed in its worst form in the current positions of the party on black nationalism, feminism, and others.

The party's tendencies toward adaptationism appear all the more serious when considered in light of the early SWP's greatest area of strength: its emphasis on proletarian orientation. This emphasis, insisted upon by Cannon, is the most important major contribution of the SWP. It is all the more important to understand how even this important strength of the SWP could not prevent its demise as a revolutionary party. In spite of the proletarian orientation, the major weakness of the SWP, its theoretical weakness, was left uncorrected and proved to be the millstone around the neck of the SWP in hard times following the war. The SWP did not know how to survive the extremely difficult objective conditions of working class passivity and witchhunt which followed WWII. Tough times under capitalism require tough leadership on the part of the vanguard party. The SWP was simply not equal to the task because its theoretical weaknesses were not corrected in time.

Pabloism

The SWP bears only a part of the responsibility for the degeneration of the Fourth International. Other sections of the Fourth International committed various social-patriotic errors and incurred sharp criticism from Trotsky. The Fourth International as a whole suffered from theoretical weaknesses which WWII and the resulting isolation from the working class left it in a poor situation to correct. Most of the leaders which could have contributed to this correction were murdered during the war. There were few cadre capable of preventing these theoretical weaknesses from crystallizing, in the period of 1947-1953, into the revisionist theory known as Pabloism.

The world situation following the war can be characterized by three conditions: 1) The economic stabilization of capitalism 2) the creation of deformed workers states in Europe through means of the intervention of the USSR 3) deformed workers states arising under the leadership of reformist parties.

None of these conditions were foreseen by the Fourth International before the war. Neither were they inexplicable after the war if Marxist methods had been applied. But instead of implying the tools of Marxism, Pabloism applied the tools of

impressionism, eclecticism, and empiricism to the situation, and came up with the theory of deep entry into the Stalinist parties because the world would soon take the form of centuries of deformed workers states. The Pabloist theory states that the Stalinists had created (deformed) workers states in China and Eastern Europe, therefore Stalinism could eventually create deformed workers states throughout the rest of the world. Pabloism no longer saw the absolute need for mass Trotskyist parties as the only road to socialism, because Stalinism had proven itself capable of creating (deformed) workers states.

The label of Pabloism is applicable to the SWP and the Fourth International today, because both of these groups use the method of Pabloism -- impressionism, eclecticism, empiricism, and adaptationism. The theory of deep entry-deformed workers states is only the product turned out by the Pabloist machine after WWII, just as the programs of the SWP and the Fourth International are the products of the Pabloist machine today. Pabloism is a question of method, not just of results.

The strategy put forth in the Transitional Program for overcoming Stalinism and Social Democracy is too difficult for Pabloism. Pabloism seeks an easier road--and finds it in a completely objectivist theory of social revolution. Thus, Pabloism sees Trotskyism as applicable only in the context of an advisory capacity to the objective historic processes. There is no need to create an independent leadership, according to the Pabloists. History will take care of itself and the job of Trotskyists is only the modification of the results of history. Deep entry is a tactic designed to push to the left Stalinist parties, which are the agents History has appointed to carry out the task of abolishing capitalism. In the present time, the automatic process of "Permanent Revolution" will cause guerrillas to abolish capitalism. In the US, the various mass movements will do the same thing. According to the Pabloists, capitalism's days are numbered, therefore anything and anybody can carry out the task.

Pabloism in its American version sees as unnecessary the task of basing itself in the working class. This does not eliminate the need for a Pabloist organization to have a social base, so the SWP turns to the petty-bourgeoisie. This is only Pabloism's solution of the American question. Other Pabloist organizations have liquidated into the peasant movement (S. America) or into the bourgeois state itself (Algeria, Ceylon).

Both Pablo and Cannon shared the fear of the bourgeoisie of a return to the economy of the 30's as capitalism would fail to adjust to conditions of peace time production. They failed to see that the redivision of the world's resources resulting from the imperialist war coupled with the political defeats of the western European proletariat had prepared for a new rapid capitalist accumulation.

Cannon foresaw the imminent rise of fascism as a result of

the failure of the capitalists to forestall this crisis. He felt that the rise of fascism around the world, especially in the US, would result in a corresponding rise in the membership of the SWP, which would then defeat fascism and establish socialism.

Pablo also incorrectly forecasted the immediate collapse of imperialism, but he felt that the Stalinist parties, with collaboration from the deformed worker's state in Russia, would be the replacement of capital. He saw this as the only logical outcome and so formulated his theory of deep entry. The working class, in Pablo's mind, chose Stalinism as its method of opposition to imperialism after WWII.

Pablo and Cannon, in their incorrect analysis, both misjudged the extent of the bankruptcy of capitalism in the post-war period. The US imperialists realized the necessity for stable blocks of capital in Europe, and through the Bretton Woods agreements and the Marshall Plan, US imperialism rebuilt European capitalism through large loans of capital and wholesale capital exports, ending up, of course, with wholesale penetration of American capital into the European economy.

Pablo and Cannon were unable to understand this process, and after the 1953 split in the International, each continued in the wrong direction, Pablo carrying out his plan of deep entry and Cannon and the SWP by analyzing McCarthyism as fascism.

The inability of the Fourth International to correctly analyze the postwar economic restabilization haunts it to this very day. Mandel's revisionist theory of neo-capitalism is based on a faulty analysis of the postwar period. Mandel mistakes the passing, empirical fact of the economic restabilization for a new, higher stage of capitalism, and fails to see today the headlong rush of imperialism back to the depressed state of the 1930's.

The discussion of the East European workers states which arose out of the general discussion of the economic situation of the time was a completely inadequate discussion for it never once touched upon the Marxist theory of the state. The Marxist theory of the state says that the class nature of the state is determined by the question of who holds state power. It is a question of who controls the standing bodies of armed men who are, in essence, the state. Lenin taught that the question of state power can only be decided by force of arms. The state is capitalist if the army is deployed by the capitalist class in its interest; the state is a workers state if the army is deployed by the working class in its interests. A state is a deformed workers state if the army is used by the bureaucracy, in its interests, against capitalism.

To be sure, the discussion in the Fourth International at this time did center on the question of whether or not the East European buffer states were capitalist states or workers states. But the decisions favoring either side of the question were

arrived at without the slightest consideration being given to the Marxist definition of the state. Both sides presented lists of characteristics, and their own particular definition of the class nature of the buffer states was decided on the basis of whether or not it had more external characteristics of either a capitalist state or a workers state. To the minds of the majority of the Fourth International, the East European buffer states became workers states through a gradual period of structural changes, structural reforms. This is a revision of the Marxist theory of the state. Capitalist states only become workers states on the pre-condition of the smashing of the capitalist army and state apparatus and its replacement by a working class army and state apparatus.

The Vern-Ryan position of the time, never answered by the SWP, states the matter correctly by saying that the buffer states of Europe became workers states the moment power was consolidated by the Red Army, at the moment the fascist armies were driven out or destroyed, because this was the moment when the Red Army could do whatever it wanted with the economy or state apparatus of any of the states without meaningful, military interference from any quarter.

The objection to this position runs something like this: How can a state be a workers state, given that it is controlled politically by the Red Army, if its economy is still capitalist, as was the case in the Eastern European buffer states?

A workers state arises out of the class struggle, that is, it originates through political means. China in 1949 became a deformed workers state when the workers and peasants army smashed the bourgeois army; the formula of workers state here embodies the political relation of class forces. The Chinese workers state rested for several years upon a bourgeois mode of production. The revolutionary Marxist theory of the state is unequivocal on this point: A bourgeois state cannot evolve peacefully into a workers state; its creation is ultimately a military question and a question of nationalizations.

Stalin did not understand the Marxist concept of the state-- he did not understand that the occupation by the Red Army of a buffer state in Eastern Europe created a deformed workers state. He wanted to create stable capitalist economies out of the buffer states, so long as the Soviet Army reigned supreme.

Stalin did not understand that a workers state cannot be based permanently on a capitalist economy. The two are in constant contradiction with each other, and the contradiction must be resolved. The capitalists in the buffer states were constantly striving for economic collaboration with the capitalists of Western Europe because it was in their interests to do so. But Stalin wished to construct a military perimeter around the Soviet Union in defense against imperialism, and found it necessary to liquidate the capitalist economy, and replace it with a nationalized, planned economy.

Both sides of the dispute in the Fourth International used impressionist methods of analysis rather than the Marxist

method. One faction reached the correct analysis of the East European buffer states as deformed worker's states, but this conclusion was reached on the basis of all the wrong reasons! The buffer states did not become worker's states because of nationalizations, they became worker's states because the Red Army held state power.

Both the SWP and the Fourth International, then as now, applied impressionist methods of analysis to the situations confronting them; both factions in the 1953 split relied on the same methods, although the SWP tried harder to cling to orthodoxy. The split was around the question of applying some common points of incorrect analysis to the practical political orientations of the parties involved.

The Split in the Fourth International: 1953-1963

The SWP voted for Pablo's economic and political analysis at the Third World Congress in 1951 and was in complete agreement with the decisions of that congress. The SWP found it necessary to criticize the Third World Congress only when Pablo began interfering with the American section. Cannon expelled the Cochran-Clarke faction in the SWP and split the international only because he found Pablo's organizational interference untenable. Clarke, Pablo's man on the spot in the US, formed a faction with Cochran and attempted to carry out the decisions of the Third World Congress by turning the party towards the CP.

Cannon split from the Fourth International although he did not initially disagree with Pablo's politics. In the faction fight in the SWP, Cannon claimed that he supported the decisions of the Third World Congress, it was the interference of the Fourth International in the internal affairs of the SWP that Cannon resented. This is the reason behind Cannon's open letter of 1953 in which he split from the international without a political fight, right during the pre-convention discussion period leading up to the Fourth World Congress.

If Cannon had wished to carry out a principled political battle in the Fourth International, he would have formed a faction and fought for the correct program. Cannon was not able to do this because he was not able to counterpose a Marxist analysis and method to the Pabloist analysis and method. His own method was the same as Pablo's: one of impressionism and eclecticism. His analysis of Pablo's program as being liquidationist was partially correct but the purpose of the letter denied the importance of the formation of a faction within the Fourth International.

After the split the SWP, SLL, and OCI joined together and formed the organizational shell called the International Committee of the Fourth International. The SWP called for self-criticism and an open discussion of the issues -- a phony call, as it turned out. This is the period when the Vern-Ryan tendency offered over sixteen documents of criticism of the SWP and were, for all practical purposes, ignored. It is also the period when the lack of internationalism of the SWP was

evidenced by the fact that only six international documents were published during the ten-year split. The IC itself was not a democratic-centralist world party. It held no world congresses during the ten years of the split after its "founding" convention.

The SWP, after formally repudiating Pablo's deep-entry tactic as liquidationist, four years later took a step away from proletarian orientation by coming up with a "regroupment" policy. This "regroupment" was to take place with the Gatesites, a right-wing split from the CP. The SWP engaged in an electoral block with this group in which it gave full support to the "United Socialist" ticket and subordinated its own political positions.

Another evidence of the SWP's opportunist tendencies were the overtures American leaders, with the rest of the FI, made to Marshal Tito, the "independent-minded" Yugoslavian Stalinist, asking him to join with them in the formation of a new "Leninist" international (!) The SWP does indeed have hideous skeletons in its revisionist closet.

After a tough ten years of quiescence in the class struggle, the SWP was looking high and low for any force which would replenish its general radical fervor, its basic faith in the possibility of social change in our epoch. The Cuban Revolution, which, according to Gus Horowitz in his forward to the latest edition of The Third International After Lenin "helped inspire a new revolutionary generation. . . to think independently" was to the SWP like a drop of water to a man dying of heat prostration.

It was on the question of Cuba that the SWP finally decisively capitulated to the Pabloist theory of socialist revolution, i. e., the creation of healthy worker's states without a revolutionary party leading a class conscious proletariat. All the Pabloist-type theories of the "new radicalization" have their theoretical roots in the mistaken analysis of the bourgeois state and the role of the vanguard party in smashing that state which is glaringly obvious in the SWP's mistaken position on Cuba. 1961 marked the year in which the SWP became a centrist party, and our struggle today continues the fight then waged by the Revolutionary Tendency (precursor to the Spartacist League and the Worker's League).

It was in this period, on the basis of superficial agreement on the Cuban Revolution, that the SWP abandoned the IC and re-unified with the International Secretariat, packing up its revisionist bags and going home to mother. Things had gotten too hot for the SWP in the IC, because the SLL had made a nuisance of itself by continually pressing for a discussion of Pabloism.

The SWP was not interested in the call for criticism raised by the SLL. It was especially not interested in the SLL's criticisms of the Pabloist position on Cuba, (incorrect though these criticisms were), because on this particular issue, the SWP was

in agreement with the Pabloists.

In retrospect, there is a certain logic in the SWP's re-unification with the IS. It would have been sectarian of the SWP and IS, what with their common method and political agreement, to have remained apart from each other.

It was in this period that the RT-RMT opposition arose in the SWP. They were both bureaucratically expelled in an unprincipled attempt to prevent discussion over Ceylon and Cuba. The RT became the Spartacist League. The RMT became the Worker's League and affiliated itself with the International Committee as its American section after the SWP withdrew to join the IS. The Worker's League, or the American Committee for the Fourth International as it was called then, and the Spartacist League conducted a long period of unity negotiations which broke down and in 1966 the Spartacist League broke with the IC.

The IC, led from England by the SLL and from France by the OCI, found no salvation in mere orthodoxy. Just as happened with the SWP after the '53 split, the IC found itself unable to use the Marxist method of analysis and today is politically centrist, with opportunist adaptations to the labor bureaucracy, embracement of youth vanguardism, sectarianism on women's liberation, and support to the New York police strike.

As we have stated, the re-unification of the IS and the SWP did have a certain kind of logic behind it. But it was unprincipled, because principled Marxist methods of proceeding were thrown overboard. There was no political discussion of positions which the IS still held from the immediate postwar period. The re-unification was an organizational maneuver. The two groups joined together on the basis of what could be called purely physical attraction, with no principled political discussion. Their common impressionistic method led them to re-unification because they were impressed with each other.

The two wings of the USEC today have differences which may again cause a split. The SWP, "right-wing" Pabloists, and the Mandel-Maitan leadership, "left-wing" Pabloists, have differences on the best way to liquidate the vanguard party. The SWP says the revolution will be led by students, gays, women, and blacks, with the backward working class only being caught up in the swirl of events. The "left-wing" Pabloists say the revolution can be led by petty-bourgeois guerrilla bands in Latin America, thereby negating the strategy behind the Permanent Revolution. Both of these "theories" use as their justification Mandel's revisionist concoction which he calls "neo-capitalism", a new stage of capitalism. The old capitalism could be overthrown only by the working class, led by the vanguard party. The theory of neo-capitalism creates a new kind of capitalism which can be overthrown by neo-vanguards, presumably creating neo-socialism on the basis of a neo-dictatorship of other forces besides the proletariat. All of these neo-theories are based on a neo-method, Pabloism, which is actually the same old non-Marxist method of empiricism and impressionism. We fully agree with the characterization of the

SWP as poly-vanguardist made by the Communist Tendency.

The correct Marxist-Leninist-Trotskyist position on revolution, as proved negatively by the May-June French events and the 1971 Bolivian events, be it in colonial countries or in imperialist countries, is as follows: Socialism can only come about through the leadership of the vanguard party of the proletariat, advancing transitional demands which are aimed at the overthrow of the capitalist states and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Socialism will only come about in Latin America and the US by this process. Guerrilla fronts will only be destroyed unless they are subordinated to the armed force of the proletariat.

To recapitulate, neither wing of the USEC today is Marxist, and neither wing deserves the support of any proletarian revolutionist. We do not support Kautsky against Bernstein; we do not support Barnes against Mandel.

The Weapons with which Marxism is Attacked

Mandel's theory of neocapitalism and its twin of structural assimilation are the cannon which the SWP and the Mandel-Maitan leadership use in their attempts to shoot Marxism full of holes. It is necessary for us to explain both the revisionist theory itself and the revisionist methods which gave birth to it.

We will start with Mandel's theory that workers states can come about through structural assimilation. Mandel, in his "Marxist Theory of the State", finds it unnecessary to raise the question of the smashing of the capitalist state. This is because he believes that socialism can, and has, come about through a series of structural reforms. Mandel believes that capitalism can be changed (apparently peacefully) into socialism without changing the nature of the capitalist state. Mandel, in his Introduction to Marxist Economic Theory, calls for:

"... the development of a powerful public sector in industry, alongside the private sector. This is the road out of the capitalist framework and its logic and passes over into the arena of what we call structural anti-capitalist reforms..."

"The fundamental goal of these reforms would be to take away the levers of command in the economy from the financial groups, trusts, and monopolies and place them in the hands of the nation, to create a public sector of decisive weight in credit, industry, and transportation, and to base all this on worker's control. This would mark the appearance of dual power at the company level and in the the whole economy and would rapidly culminate in a duality of political power... This stage could in turn usher in the conquest of power by the workers and establish a working class government."

This theory ignores the Leninist theory of the state, which states explicitly that the capitalist state cannot be reformed

into socialism but must be overthrown and replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat. This theory of structural assimilation also postpones the problem of political power through a series of two stages. First, the immediate stage of the strategic struggle is the achievement of certain reforms under capitalism. The struggle for political power is to be carried out once the workers have sufficient economic power. The aim of the present movement becomes reformist, with the maximum aims postponed to the future.

This formula arises out of Mandel's theoretical inability to understand the postwar economic stabilization, the same hurdle Pablo was unable to surmount in the late 1940's. Mandel, trapped as he is, by his method, at the bottom of the imperialist swamp, is unable to use Marxism to keep his head above the muck. He mistakes the prolonged boom prepared for by the Bretton Woods agreements and the Marshall plan following WWII, for a period in which capitalism has overthrown, by the use of Keynesian economics, its increasing tendency toward major economic collapse. Since capitalism is now immune to major collapses, the workers won't be driven to action on the basis of their realization that capitalism has completely exhausted its social possibilities. They will be driven to action by their "alienation". The SWP uses this theory to say that trade unions, the organs of economic defense of the workers, will not be the centre of activity in the coming revolution, thus justifying its isolation from the working class.

What Mandel doesn't understand is that any stage of capitalism is transitory; there is absolutely no way for the capitalist class to escape the contradictions of capitalism. No matter what methods of improvisation and stopgap measures are used, the basic contradictions of capitalism cannot be changed. So Mandel formulates this theory in the very period when the US imperialists are being forced to recognize the collapse of the Bretton Woods agreements and are launching the first phase of an all-out attack on the trade unions in the form of wage freezes, anti-strike legislation and so on.

We can only say, "Wake up and spit, Mandel, the world's on fire!"

The Nature of the SWP

The two political extremes of working class tendencies are on the one side the method of class struggle and on the other side the method of class collaboration. In some instances these opposites will be confined in one party in relatively equal parts. Where neither the impulse toward class struggle or the impulse toward class collaboration are clearly dominant we can speak of centrism as the unstable equilibrium between the two extremes.

The SWP has passed the stage of this conflicting equilibrium. The SWP calls itself Trotskyist but like the Communist Party which calls itself Leninist, the SWP is a reformist party. The SWP's program, its rhetoric to the contrary, codifies an attempt to achieve socialism through a series of reforms of capitalism rather than by smashing the capitalist state militarily and poli-

tically and replacing it with the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such a party embodies the essence of reformism, the inability to lead the proletariat to make an independent stand against the bourgeoisie -- class collaboration. Our attitude toward a party in such an advanced state of decay must be one of relentless criticism. Only by understanding the mistakes of the past can we guard ourselves from falling into the same errors.

The reformist nature of the SWP is most glaring in the most obvious place -- its program. The three major demands of the SWP do not reach beyond bourgeois property rights: "Out Now", "Black Control of the Black Community", and "Repeal All Abortion Laws" are all reformist demands. In no way do they challenge the right of the ruling class to rule.

Centrist tendencies toward adaptationism, as we have illustrated, always existed in the SWP. These tendencies did not find a base of realization and continued degeneration into reformism until the objective conditions of the 1960's -- the growth of petty-bourgeois discontent and a passive working class -- provided the soil for the growth of the SWP into a reformist party.

The party's present-day lack of proletarian orientation is only a symptom of its lack of Marxist understanding. This is why the stress on proletarian orientation being raised by some of the European sections of the USEC does not make them qualitatively any better than the SWP. A party must take the correct Marxist program to the workers. The CP has long had a proletarian orientation, but this does not change its basic nature.

Criticizing the party's program and offering the correct alternatives must begin with a thorough analysis of the SWP's program.

Foremost among the SWP's mistakes is the pacifist, class-collaborationist nature of its anti-war work, carried out through NPAC.

Along with the development of the Vietnam War has developed a deep-seated pacifism. There are two antagonistic forces joined together in this pacifist mood. The pacifism of the popular mass is linked to the pacifism of the liberal wing of finance capital. The pacifism of the liberal capitalists originates among the more farsighted exploiters, who sense war-induced erosion of their political influence among the workers.

But what is seen as a danger by the bourgeoisie, is an opportunity to revolutionary Marxism. The task is to utilize the pacifism of the working masses to enlighten them on the need for mass revolutionary action against the bourgeoisie. The SWP does not try to advance the popular sentiment beyond pacifism towards revolutionary class consciousness, but instead hides behind it and utilizes it only to enhance its own popularity. The line, single-issue-non-exclusion-immediate-withdrawal formulates a block with the liberal imperialists.

Pacifism on the question of the Indo china War plays into the hands of the capitalists. The job of Marxists is to agitate around explicitly revolutionary slogans and to destroy all pacifist illusions. The MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL ON THE IMPERIALIST WAR AND PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION, 1940, states:

"The real struggle against war means a communist struggle against imperialism and a merciless exposure of petty-bourgeois pacifism... All other methods are either charlatanism or stupidity, or a combination of both."

NPAC, because it does not teach that imperialism causes war and that only world revolution can end all wars, sows illusions about the only way imperialist wars can be ended once and for all. It is an obstacle to the understanding of the masses. If the SWP were a revolutionary party instead of a reformist one, it would seek to smash NPAC politically instead of building it both organizationally and politically. Instead, the SWP supports the NPAC slogan of "Out Now" wholeheartedly, without any alternatives or elaborations. **This** is the only slogan on the war issue which this supposedly revolutionary party raises in its own electoral campaigns!

The strategy used by the SWP in its founding of NPAC was this: "We will raise the slogan of "Out Now" as the major demand we wish NPAC to raise. Because it does not have a specifically revolutionary content it will draw to the SWP many people who oppose the war on a "non-class" basis, who oppose the war, not realizing it is a war of self-defense on the part of the NLF-DRVN. It will also draw liberals who are opposed to the war because they support the continued functioning and unhampered growth of the capitalist system, but we don't care because they give us lots of money. The revolutionaries who actually, in secret, support the victory of the NLF over the armies of imperialism will not raise criticisms because the slogan of "Out Now" implies that the SWP supports the victory of the NLF."

Revolutionaries never imply and insinuate about revolution but openly call for it. A group is opportunist, not revolutionary, if it tries to hide its implications behind non-revolutionary slogans.

James Lafferty, one of the more obviously non-Trotskyist members of the NPAC coordinating committee, once said: "I'd walk with the devil himself if he were for immediate withdrawal." The SWP, because of both the fact and the nature of its "intervention" in NPAC, does just that. It is a block with the liberal imperialists against the conservative ones. It consciously seeks the support for its program from bourgeois politicians. It is an embryonic popular front; a conscious attempt is made to draw bourgeois elements into its activity, which can only be done to the detriment of a revolutionary program against war. This is impermissible. Instead of exposing the fact that the liberal imperialists wish to end the war only in their own interests, in the interests of capitalism, NPAC gives them a forum to broadcast their interests. NPAC is a pop front

because it is a coalition with one wing of the capitalist class against the other, with the correct program hushed up for fear of scaring the capitalists away.

"Out Now" by itself is a reformist demand because it states that the situation of the human race, the situation of workers under capitalism, will be improved in the long run if the US pulls out of Vietnam. This is incorrect, because, in the long run, the US pulling out of Vietnam will have no effect on the condition of workers under capitalism. Only the destruction of capitalism will improve the lot of the workers, and the immediate withdrawal of the US from Indochina will certainly not cause the downfall of world imperialism.

This is not to say that we do not support the slogan of "Out Now". We do raise it, but only in the context of also calling for the military victory of the NLF. Out Now raised in conjunction with this slogan, points up the fact that the imperialists have absolutely no right to be in Vietnam in the first place.

The slogan of self-determination, which the SWP does raise, is totally inapplicable to the question of Indochina. The US is not trying to deny the right of the Vietnamese to their own state; it would gladly withdraw if it could only be guaranteed that the independent Vietnam state was a capitalist state and not a workers state. The Vietnamese war is essentially a class war and not a national war. The goal of US policy is to roll back the Vietnamese workers state, the DRVN. Calling for self-determination plays into the hands of the Stalinists who deliberately hide class issues beneath democratic slogans.

The SWP, by not raising the slogan of victory to the NLF-DRVN, contributes not a whit to the education of the American working class in elementary class solidarity.

The SWP's call for draft repeal is also contrary to the Bolshevik policy. The SWP's call for repeal of the draft with no alternative is contrary to the Proletarian Military Policy. The alternative in this case is provided by the capitalists -- a highly paid volunteer army to be used in subjugating anyone who opposes the wishes of the capitalists. A volunteer army, in a pre-revolutionary situation, would be used against the proletariat.

The revolutionary party supports the concept of universal military training. As a way of dealing with the capitalist army, the revolutionary party does not raise the slogan of draft repeal. The revolutionary party instead calls for abolition of the standing, capitalist army, not just repeal of the draft, and supports universal military training, a popular militia, under the independent control of the workers. We do not oppose the concept of the draft, of obligatory military training of every member of society, women included. What we oppose about the capitalist army is not the fact that people are drafted into it, We oppose the capitalist's right to have an army, because their need of an army arises out of their need to oppress the working class.

The SWP is silent on the need of the proletariat for universal military training, thereby leaving the workers defenseless in the face of a highly trained volunteer army.

This is the revolutionary program against the war which the Class Struggle Faction raises as the fighting alternative to the reformist program of the YSA.

The first major demand is never to be raised without the second:

*IMMEDIATE, UNCONDITIONAL WITHDRAWAL OF ALL US TROOPS AND MATERIAL FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA

*MILITARY VICTORY TO THE NLF-DRVN. DEFEAT US IMPERIALISM.

*ABOLISH THE STANDING ARMY -- FREE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING FOR ALL MEN AND WOMEN BETWEEN THE AGES OF 16 AND 65 -- FOR WORKER'S MILITIAS

*FOR A UNITED FRONT OF WORKERS STATES AGAINST US IMPERIALISM -- NO STALINIST SELLOUTS

*FOR SOCIALISM IN VIETNAM -- NO COALITION GOVERNMENTS

Support of the SWP to reformist ideology also shows itself in the support the SWP gives to feminism. Feminism is a patently reformist formula, a bourgeois ideology. Feminism says that women organized as women can end their oppression, when actually the oppression of women can only be solved by the working class when it accomplishes socialist revolution. This is the Marxist definition of feminism, which the SWP ignores.

The party's formation of WONAAC and its slogan "When Women Say the War Will End, the War Will End" are perfect examples of the reformist lie in action. Its support to WONAAC (also a popular front), and its support to the slogan of "abortion law repeal" are results of the false, reformist strategy of the SWP applied to the problems of women's liberation. This strategy states that the oppression of women can be alleviated through a series of reforms; one-at-a-time repeal of all the conditions which oppress women under capitalism. The oppression of women under capitalism will only end with the abolition of capitalism. Capitalism can only be abolished by the working class.

We are for the vanguard party raising many slogans in the women's movement. We are against the building of single-issue women's groups. Our most important work toward the liberation of women from capitalist oppression is in the working class, among working class women.

This is the revolutionary alternative which the Class Struggle Faction offers to the reformist program of the YSA:

To end the problems of the oppression of women as workers under capitalism, we raise slogans of EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK, EQUAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING, FREE 24-HOUR CHILD CARE CENTERS, JOBS FOR ALL

FREE AND UNRESTRICTED RIGHT TO DIVORCE
FREE BIRTH CONTROL INFORMATION AND DEVICES
FREE ABORTION ON DEMAND, NO FORCED STERILIZATION
MILITARY TRAINING FOR ALL CITIZENS, MEN AND WOMEN

The SWP also ignores the basic Marxist definition of nationalism. Nationalism is a bourgeois ideology which seeks to unite people on the non-class basis of their nationality; it states that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat of any given nation have no interests apart from those of the nation as a whole. It states for instance, that a French worker and a French capitalist have common interests because they both speak French, because they are both citizens of the bourgeois French nation and must protect each other from hostility from all other bourgeois nations. This is a totally reactionary ideology. The Marxist is an internationalist, believing that bourgeois nations must be abolished and the world governed by a world worker's government.

The SWP equates nationalism with support to the colonial revolution against imperialist exploitation, a progressive struggle which is always supported by Marxists. The SWP confuses the two and uses this confusion to lend support to the bourgeois ideology of nationalism in its slogans for independent nationalist parties.

It must be stressed that nationalism and proletarian internationalism are enemies and cannot co-exist. Marxists choose proletarian internationalism, non-revolutionaries choose nationalism. Nationalism is an outgrowth of bourgeois society and the concept of nationalism must be smashed along with that society.

The reason for the correct support by Marxists of the right of nations to self-determination is the fact that Marxists support the right of free and voluntary association of nations. This right of free and voluntary association of nations can never be realized while imperialism stalks the earth. Lenin states also that the right of nations to self-determination means only the right of nations to secede and form a separate state.

Nationalist consciousness in the minds of nationally oppressed workers must be replaced by class consciousness. This is the task of Marxists toward nationally oppressed workers. We must call on them to recognize the fact that the problem of their national oppression can only be solved under socialism, under the dictatorship of the working class.

"Black Control of the Black Community" is a nationalist,

reformist demand which is supported by the SWP. Community Control states that the problems of workers in the community can be solved if they are allowed to control their own community. This demand would only solve problems if the community in modern day capitalist society could exist hermetically sealed, suspended beyond the reach and control of the capitalist system. This is clearly not the case. It is a Utopian demand. The only demands which can solve the problems of racially and nationally oppressed workers are demands from Trotsky's Transitional Program such as Jobs for All, Sliding Scale of Wages and Hours.

The building of nationalist parties like La Raza Unida Party and an independent black nationalist party is also incorrect. We do not build, or support, these bourgeois parties although we support the right of nationalities to form them. Nationalist parties and nationalist ideologies divide the working class. In order for the proletariat to be united as a class, it must consciously overcome its national divisions, it must break from the national bourgeoisie. The nationalism of the oppressed is reactionary in the sense that it impedes the development of class consciousness, tying the workers to the national bourgeoisie. It is a consciousness of a real oppression, but for the proletariat, it remains a false consciousness.

The only political party revolutionaries call for and support without reservation is the revolutionary party. The SWP says a black nationalist party would be a revolutionary labor party because it would consist mainly of black workers. This is not true; a labor party can only be revolutionary on the basis of its program. A nationalist party may contain many workers, it is not controlled by them. The logic of a bourgeois-democratic program subordinates black workers to the capitalists. If La Raza Unida Party developed into a mass party, it could only do so on the basis of complete bourgeois domination because of its bourgeois program.

Much of the SWP's program for black liberation is one of demanding special privileges for the blacks over white workers. This is impermissible, and amounts to nothing more than opportunist adaptations to nationalist sentiments.

These are the demands in the SWP's "Transitional Program For Black Liberation":

PREFERENTIAL HIRING

This is a hopelessly reactionary demand. It's logic states that there will always be only a certain amount of jobs available in the capitalist system; that the jobs made available by the discretion of the capitalists should only be redistributed on more of an equal basis. This demand leaves open the interpretation that a white worker who may very well be just as poor and economically exploited should be refused a job in favor of giving the black worker the job. This demand accepts the illogic of the capitalist system. We call for JOBS FOR ALL -- SLIDING SCALE OF WAGES AND HOURS -- EQUAL JOB OP-

PORTUNITY -- EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK. Only in these slogans does the fight against racial oppression achieve a class basis.

FREE UNIVERSITY EDUCATION OF ALL THIRD-WORLD STUDENTS WHO DESIRE IT

What is the logic behind this demand? Will the problems of black people be solved if they are given degrees and made better able to share in "the abundant fruits of capitalism"? The demand is also preferential in nature. The demand which must be raised in this case is FREE EDUCATION FOR EVERYBODY, STUDENTS TO BE PAID SALARIES TO SUPPORT THEMSELVES WHILE AT SCHOOL.

EXEMPT BLACK YOUTH FROM MILITARY SERVICE

Should black youth be exempt from military service, thereby allowing the capitalist class to carry out imperialist wars using only white soldiers? The essence of the problem of the capitalist draft is that more priveleged sectors of the population can avoid the draft by means which are unavailable to the majority. We are against this reformist demand. We support the concept of universal military training. We say ABOLISH THE STANDING ARMY, FREE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING UNDER THE INDEPENDENT CONTROL OF THE WORKERS TO BE PAID FOR BY THE STATE.

AUTONOMOUS BLACK STUDIES DEPARTMENTS IN UNIVERSITIES

We are for the teaching of black studies and Chicano studies in all schools. We are for equal opportunities for Black and Chicano teachers, as well as equal rights for all cultural minorities. We are for free education for everybody. We are not for autonomous black studies departments. All education must be under the control of the working class and no one else.

Our task in the struggles of oppressed national and racial minorities is one of raising, within the labor union, the fight for complete equality with white workers; against discriminatory hiring and discriminatory pay rates. We must propagandize for the formation of a revolutionary labor party, based on the trade union rank and file, with a program of transitional demands aimed at replacing capitalism with socialism.

The best working definition of a nation is this: A nation is a group of people sharing the same language, culture, or land area surrounded by other languages, cultures, and land area, and economically united under a national bourgeoisie. The last condition does not apply in some exceptional cases, i. e., the Jewish nation in Eastern Europe before WWII. Blacks are not a nation. They do not have a separate language, culture, or land area from the American nation as a whole. Blacks are an oppressed racial minority. Since they are not a nation, they do not have the right of nations to self-determination.

Puerto Ricans and Chicanos are national minorities -- members of the Puerto Rican and Mexican nations who are living within the boundaries of the United States. They are not nations in themselves and have no right to self-determination apart from the Mexican and Puerto Rican nations. They are oppressed nationalities and races and it is the task of the party to teach them that their oppression can be ended only through working class revolution.

Trade Union Work

Work within the working class is the top priority and constant purpose of the revolutionary party. The SWP, and its fraternal organization, the YSA, as part of their reformism, have physically abandoned the proletariat and seek paths to socialism outside the working class. The working class can not be led from outside the class. The working class vanguard party must be of the class, within the class. It can only develop in the actual process of the formation of a vanguard of the class. In order to lead the class it must be composed in its vast majority of class conscious communist proletarians. We cannot politically influence the working class unless we are in that class.

In order to lead the working class, the SWP and the YSA must solve the dual problem of physical and political isolation from the working class. They cannot hope to lead the working class from outside, the type of strategy which led to the defeat of the May-June French uprising. The party must be within the working class in order to be the leadership of its fighting organs, its soviets and trade unions.

This isolation can only be solved through proletarianization. This is accomplished through a process of requiring all comrades without fulltime political positions in the party press or party administration to find jobs in basic industry according to a fully developed strategical plan. Finding jobs is not, of course, an automatic process, and this means comrades must look all the harder. The task is of crucial importance. Comrades who have trouble finding jobs because of insufficient skills should be asked to go to some kind of trade school to enhance their ability to get proletarian jobs.

Proletarianization is of crucial importance because it is the only way we can devise correct tactics, propaganda, and agitation which can be relevant to the actual condition and consciousness of the working class. The fact that the American labor bureaucrats use anti-communism and physical repression makes it all the more important that we challenge these bureaucracies for leadership from within the unions. Communists have had to overcome physical intimidation in the past, and we can't expect the situation to be any different for us.

Proletarianization is only of use if it is done on the basis of the correct program. The SWP sees the task of its union fractions as that of building reformist, single-issue caucuses like the Right to Vote Committees. This is incorrect. The party's

caucuses must lead trade unionists beyond trade union consciousness to revolutionary consciousness. The program of the caucus must be revolutionary. The program of the caucus must be the Transitional Program of Trotsky, which is still the only program which can end the capitalist exploitation of the working class.

The trade unions, like the proletariat as a whole, must be led by revolutionary caucuses or they will be used by the state against the workers. They cannot remain neutral.

We do not have a separate program for work in the trade unions apart from our program for women's liberation or the anti-war movement. Our program for all of these movements is the same one: The Transitional Program.

We must intervene in the unions on the basis of our program by forming caucuses, raising our program in pre-existing caucuses, or, if these methods are not permissible because of security questions, by contact on a purely personal basis. All our interventions in the working class are to be on an organized basis under party discipline. Our comrades in the unions are to raise the demands of the party and no others.

Comrades who are building caucuses in the trade unions are only the organizational expression of the party's political demands. Work in the trade unions must be organized by the party on the basis of a national, strategic plan and closely supervised by the party. The large bulk of our resources and energies must be devoted to this task. This is our responsibility as Marxist revolutionaries. If the SWP and the YSA do not do this, they will be of no use to the working class in the coming class war.

Program for Action

We of the Class Struggle Faction offer these nine slogans as the major propagandistic and agitational slogans of the YSA. We call upon the YSA to break from the reformist SWP on the basis of these slogans. This is the revolutionary alternative to the reformist program now held by the YSA, its three major demands of Immediate Withdrawal, Black Control of the Black Community, and Repeal All Abortion Laws. These are the demands of the Transitional Program and the program of the Class Struggle Faction:

JOBS FOR ALL -- SLIDING SCALE OF WAGES AND HOURS

This is our central demand. In this period of inflation and unemployment, this slogan provides the solution to the difficulties faced by workers under capitalism. The capitalists demand the right to hire labor on the basis of the profit margin. The workers demand their right to work regardless of the economic instability of the capitalist class. JOBS FOR ALL -- SLIDING SCALE OF WAGES AND HOURS demands that jobs be created by a shortening of the work week and that inflationary inroads upon worker's paychecks be offset by corresponding rises in pay.

ORGANIZE THE UNORGANIZED AND UNEMPLOYED

Working class solidarity is essential to any revolutionary struggle. The unorganized and unemployed workers must be seen correctly by the unionized workers as a part of the working class. This slogan is inseparable from the demand of jobs for all.

NATIONALIZE INDUSTRY UNDER WORKER'S CONTROL

This counterposes socialist state property to capitalist private property. It is the only way the working class can overcome the stagnation of the productive forces and the resulting periodic crises. Industry must be planned in order to assure full employment and optimal economic progress.

FOR A WORKER'S REPUBLIC

A worker's republic is the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is where we call for socialist revolution instead of hinting about it as the SWP does. This is the call to smash the capitalist state and replace it with a healthy worker's state.

AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR -- AGAINST IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION IN VIETNAM -- FOR VICTORY OF THE NLF IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL OF US TROOPS AND MATERIAL DEFEAT US IMPERIALISM

The imperialist war in Vietnam is being conducted out of the desire of the imperialists to roll back the North Vietnamese worker's state. This slogan is the expression of our defence of the Vietnamese workers and peasants in their fight against imperialist domination. This slogan educates the American worker on the necessity for class solidarity against imperialism on the part of the world proletariat. This does not mean that we suppress our criticism of the Stalinist political nature of the program and leaders of the NLF-DRVN. Linked with the call for a military victory against imperialist exploitation is the call for a political revolution in the North to throw out the Stalinist betrayers.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF TRADE UNIONS FROM THE STATE

Unless trade unions are independent of and opposed to all interference from the capitalist state, they will be used against the workers. The workers must understand that the government is the executive committee of the ruling class. We must call for "no government arbitration" and "no government anti-labor laws".

FOR TRADE UNION DEMOCRACY

The breaking of the control of the union bureaucracy can only be accomplished by the full democracy which can result in the adoption of a revolutionary program. This slogan does, of course, necessitate a full political fight against the bureaucracy.

AGAINST ALL FORMS OF RACIAL, NATIONAL, AND
SEXUAL OPPRESSION -- EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR
ALL, EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

This is also an essential slogan in the struggle for the unity of the proletariat against the capitalists. This slogan fights against all divisions which the capitalist class creates within the working class.

FOR A LABOR PARTY TO ORGANIZE THE STRUGGLE OF
THE PROLETARIAT

The program of this party must be the revolutionary program. It calls on the workers to make a political break with the capitalist parties. This demand would be dropped when it becomes clear that the party is capable of being the revolutionary labor party, when the party begins recruiting thousands of workers to itself.

October 10, 1972